

UNSEARCHABLE RICHES

A Bi-Monthly Magazine
for God and His
Word

VOLUME VIII.

from October, 1916, to August, 1917

V. GELESNOFF
A. E. KNOCH
EDITORS

PUBLICATION OFFICE, 2829 EAST SIXTH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A.

[UNSEARCHABLE RICHES, OCTOBER, 1916]
BEING THE FIRST NUMBER OF VOLUME EIGHT

EDITORIAL

THIS number commences our eighth volume. For seven years have we enjoyed the favor and blessing of God in increasing measure. Our way has been beset with difficulties, with trials, with opposition; but our God has proved Himself superior to all the perplexities of the path, and has brought us safely through this, the infancy of our magazine.

The purpose of our publication is to open up the Scriptures. We aim to remove the shadow which theology has cast across the sacred page. We strive to illuminate the original text so that our readers are not dependent upon the opinions of men, whether expressed in a translation or a commentary, whether others or ourselves. When we point to the Scriptures we desire grace to stand aside and not intrude our own opinions or deductions. When these are offered we compel no one to accept them, but furnish the facts upon which they depend.

We desire, at this time, to thank those whose hearts have been stirred up to help us in our efforts. It has been and is a source of deep satisfaction and joy to know that the truths which have been entrusted to us are appreciated and have awakened in our friends a zeal and a determination to make them known which is not discouraged by indifference or insult.

Let us not be weary in well doing, for in due season we shall reap if we do not faint. Hitherto most of our labor has been spent in the preparation of the soil and in sowing the seed. Some of the seed has already yielded its increase. But we must not expect a harvest in a day, but wait patiently, for, with God's blessing, the harvest will surely come. Neither is it always wise to be too choice as to the soil. An

instance which came before us lately shows how marvelously God works. The pamphlet "All in All" was sent to a family who have since repudiated its teaching. While they were reading it, however, a visitor heard a little of it, and wished for more. The acceptance of the universal reconciliation followed and thus it was conveyed to quite a company who are now rejoicing in its light. Humanly speaking, the pamphlet was sent to the wrong parties for they rejected it: yet God saw that it reached its proper destination and accomplished His purpose.

WE have been favored with a glance at the proof sheets of a prospectus of the Chinese mission, which, under the leadership of Stanley Smith, M. A., is boldly teaching the universal reconciliation. The cost of such a step, humanly speaking, is very great. Is it not the privilege of those who rejoice in this truth to co-operate as much as they can with this, the only mission (that we know) which teaches the truth as to God's grand consummation? The effect of this truth on the minds and hearts of the "heathen" is bound to be very great. The god of Christendom is more cruel than their gods know how to be: the God of the Scriptures, who gains His goal, is the only God worthy of the name.

COPIES of Vols. I and III are in such demand that we have withdrawn them from sale and will henceforth loan them to those who are interested, without charge, except as they may wish to pay towards the expense and labor. They should not be returned to the Publication Office except on request, as the same postage will carry them direct to the next reader. Kindly let us know if you wish to have it and notify us when through with reading it.

WE often are asked to recommend a concordance for those who do not know the original. The only one which we can heartily commend is Wigram's Englishman's Greek Concordance (\$10) and his Hebrew Concordance. We have supplied quite a few of these, and those who have used them will not be without them. They may be ordered through the Concordant Publishing Co., at the address of the magazine.

The Nephilim

Studies in Genesis 6.1-8

ADAM'S FAMILY

No PORTION of Scripture presents greater perplexity to the student than the narrative contained in the first six verses of the sixth of Genesis. It has been the sport of expositors. The interpretations which have gained currency are either fanciful or puerile; and thus many have come to regard this Scripture as too obscure to allow any certain meaning to be attached to it. The obscurity, however, is not in the text but in the comments. These have remained so long and have been so often repeated, that now we are liable to identify the comment with the text. "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning"; and as learning cannot come from what cannot be understood, we conclude that this part of Scripture is really understandable, for it was written to enlighten and instruct.

We propose to investigate the subject of the Nephilim, on Scripture grounds alone, for we wish to see for ourselves, and point out to others, what it really teaches, in contrast with what is said about it by expositors and theologians, who have on this, and many other matters, sadly misled the public mind, and raised objections against the Scriptures which apply only to their own utterances.

The first step to a right understanding of the subject is a careful examination of the original. This will remove a great many difficulties which the carelessness of translators has transferred to Scripture, greatly to its detriment and much to the hindrance of the truth.

We will now proceed to examine the text verse by verse. When this shall have been done, an attempt will be made to summarize the teaching, and point out the light it sheds on ethnological and archæological problems.

“And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth.” This opening sentence of the chapter claims special notice. The first point of inquiry relates to the word rendered “men” in the current versions. The Hebrew is *ha adam*—the man. The features of this word may be summarized as follows:

(1) The word *adam* has no plural number. It refers to many, and to one. Therefore each occurrence raises the question, Is it singular or plural?

(2) It occurs in two different forms: with and without the definite article—*ha*.

Wherever it takes the definite article *ha*, in the twenty-two instances before chapter six, the first man alone is invariably intended.

1.27: “God created *ha adam* in his own image.”

2.7: “The Lord God formed *ha adam*.”

2.7: “*Ha adam* became a living soul.”

2.8: “There he put *ha adam* whom he had formed.”

2.15: “Took *ha adam* and put him into the garden.”

2.16: “The Lord God commanded *ha adam*.”

2.18: “It is not good for *ha adam* to be alone.”

2.19: “And brought them to *ha adam* to see what he would call them.”

2.19: “Whatsoever *he adam* called every living soul, that was the name thereof.”

2.20: “*Ha adam* gave names to all cattle, etc.”

2.21: “A deep sleep fell upon *ha adam*.”

2.22: “The rib which the Lord God took from *ha adam*.”

2.22: “Brought the woman unto *ha adam*.”

- 2.23: "*Ha adam* said, this now bone of my bone."
 2.25: "They were both naked, *ha adam* and his wife."
 3.3: "*Ha adam* and his wife hid themselves."
 3.9: "The Lord God called unto *ha adam*."
 3.12: "*Ha adam* said, the woman whom thou gavest me."
 3.20: "*Ha adam* called his wife's name Eve."
 3.22: "*Ha adam* is become as one of us."
 3.24: "So be drove out *ha adam*."
 4.1: "*Ha adam* knew Eve his wife."

What is the force of the word when used without the definite article? Chapter 5.2 gives the answer. "He called *their name Adam*." Here *Adam* is the name of the first man and the appellative of the race. In the following passages *Adam* is the name of the first man:

- 2.20: "But for *Adam* there was not found an help."
 3.17: "Unto *Adam* he said, because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife."
 3.21: "Made for *Adam* and for his wife coats of skins."
 4.25: "And *Adam* knew his wife again."
 5.1: "From the day that God created *Adam*."
 5.3: "*Adam* begat in his own likeness."
 5.4: "The days of *Adam* after he begat Seth."
 5.5: "All the days that *Adam* lived."

In the following instances *adam* has a generic force; it is used in a collective sense, and may therefore be properly rendered "Adamites."

- 1.26: "Let us make mankind (*adam*), and let them have dominion."
 2.5: "There was not mankind (*adam*) to till the ground."
 5.1: "The book of the generations of mankind (*adam*), from the day that God created *Adam*."
 5.2: "Made and female created he them. . . . and called their name *mankind (adam)*."

Now since throughout the five chapters *ha adam* means the individual Adam, there is no reason for taking the same expression to mean the race in 6.1. A change in the use of the term might be allowed after ch. 6.9, where the narrative takes up Noah; but Gen. 5.1-6.8 form a distinct section, giving a resumé of mankind as connected with Adam, hence a change in the use of the term is not admissible at all. To those who are not influenced by traditional preconceptions, nothing can be clearer than that *ha adam* and *adam* are not interchangeable terms, but are used designedly to maintain the distinction between Adam and Adamites, a distinction that gives point and purpose to the narrative.

When the foregoing facts are duly weighed, it becomes evident that the current versions have misled the reader, by leading him to suppose that many are spoken of, and that they and their families made a numerous population, whereas, the reference is only to the first man, Adam. Moreover, when it is observed that the events recorded in v. 2 did not even take place when Adam had multiplied, but when he *began* to multiply, then it will be seen that there is no ground for the prevailing notion that the population then was exceedingly large.

The two forms, *ha adam* and *adam*, occur in ch. 6.1-8, and it is a striking fact that, in the two instances where the definite article is wanting (v. 3 and v. 7), *adam* stands in direct contrast to *ha adam*.

"And the Lord said, My spirit shall not abide in *adam* (mankind) for ever; for that he also is flesh" (v. 3). The clause "he also is flesh" shows that two parties are singled out as being flesh—one included in "adam," and the other implied in "also." Now if *adam* designates Adam's descendants, who is implied in the "also"? The "also" is no

expletive, but a principal word in the clause. Its presence cannot be accounted for on the supposition that *adam* refers to the first man or to mankind without exception. Its purpose is to enhance a contrast: others are flesh—that is too evident; but he *also* is flesh. Adam's descendents are indicated by "adam," and Adam himself by "also." The writer seeks to impress upon his readers, first, the lamentable fact that Adam's descendents had corrupted their way, and, second, the still more lamentable fact that Adam himself, instead of using his authority as head to stem the tide of corruption, was the chief leader in transgression. "The evil of Adam was great in the earth, and every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

Just as *v. 3* maintains the distinction between Adam and his descendants in the matter of offense, *v. 7* maintains the same distinction in the pronouncement of the Divine sentence. "And the Lord said, I will destroy *ha adam* whom I have created from the face of the ground; both *adam* and beast." The words "I have created" prove that *ha adam* can only refer to Adam, for he alone was created; his descendants are begotten, as *ch. 5.2* clearly declares. But the decree of destruction did not stop with Adam: it passed upon those that sinned after his likeness, and even upon guiltless animals—"I will destroy both mankind (*adam*) and beast."

Next we turn our attention to the word "multiply." The reader instinctively turns to *Gen. 1.28*, and, with good reason, associates *ch. 6.1* with the charge there given, "multiply and replenish the earth." But while the two passages are undoubtedly related, the current versions, by making the word "multiply" do the duty for two Hebrew words, have obscured the nature of their relation. The word in *Gen. 1.28* is *rahvah*, in *Gen. 6.1* *rahvav*. These words, though re-

lated, are not exactly the same, but each has its own peculiar force, and is used in its own peculiar way, as may be seen from the instance where they occur side by side.

Eccl. 5.11: "When goods increase (*rahvah*), they are increased (*rahvav*) that eat them."

In each clause the emphasis is on "increase." But whereas the first statement is absolutely unqualified, the second is dependent on the antecedent. The writer shows that the increase of eaters is due directly to the increase of goods. The same dependence of the later statement on the earlier is evident in the passages in question. Gen. 1.28 declares the Creator's purpose that mankind should fill the earth; Gen. 6.1 records the incipient stage of its enactment. Hence, too, in the former passage, mankind was destined to fill *erets*, or the earth at large; whereas, in the latter passage, Adam began to multiply in *adamah*, the soil, or family estate, for the propagation of mankind from one man must necessarily have had its commencement in a restricted area.

Further study will show that the word *rahvav* is generally used when a modified number is intended.

1 Sam. 25.10: "There be *many* servants now-a-days that break away every man from his master."

Job 35.6: "If thy transgressions have *multiplied*."

Ps. 3.1: "How are mine adversaries *increased!*"

Ps. 38.19: "They that hate me wrongfully are *multiplied*."

Isa. 59.12: "Our transgressions are *multiplied*." In these instances a quantitative change is expressed, and a change implies a contrast. Thus, in the first passage in the foregoing list, the words of Nabal to David's men express the fact that, in his day, desertions among servants had become more frequent than formerly. There are more

occurrences of *rahvav*, but these are sufficient to substantiate our position. A reference to the remaining instances will confirm the conclusion here expressed.

The translators have also misled the reader in regard to the place where Adam began to multiply. The rendering "face of the earth" seems to indicate its whole surface, and tends to foster the erroneous impression of a teeming population. The writer employs two words, *adamah* (v. 1) and *erets* (v. 4), both of which the A. V. renders by the word "earth," and has thereby given rise to many traditional misconceptions. Let us see how the two words are used.

Gen. 2.6: "A mist went up from *erets* and watered the whole face of *ha adamah*."

Gen. 4.12: "When thou tillest *ha adamah*, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a wanderer shalt thou be in *erets*."

Gen. 4.14: "Thou hast driven me this day from the face of *ha adamah* . . . and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer in *erets*."

Gen. 1.28: "Multiply and replenish *erets*."

Gen. 6.1: "Adam began to multiply on the face of *ha adamah*."

In all these passages we see a broad contrast between a particular region and the earth at large. Gen. 3.23 points out the locality in question. "The Lord God sent *ha adam* forth from the garden of Eden to till *ha adamah*." Here *ha adamah* is a region outside Eden, toward the east, where the first pair took their abode after their expulsion from Eden, and where they labored for their support. Here Cain engaged in agriculture, and Abel reared his sheep. Here Abel was murdered, and it is concerning this that the Lord said to Cain, "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from *ha adamah*." And here it was that Adam

began to multiply. In all these passages *ha adamah* is the section of land which formed Adam's estate, though its borders would, from time to time, enlarge, as Adam's family increased; and the fact that the word takes the definite article, shows that a definite locality is meant.

When the distinction between *adamah* and *erets* is kept in view, the sacred text is relieved of the incongruities which the translators leave foisted upon it. The A. V. makes Cain contradict himself. It represents him as saying, "Thou hast driven me from the face of the *earth*; and I shall be a fugitive in the *earth*" (4.14). Whereas what Cain *did* say is consistent: "Thou hast driven me from the face of *ha adamah*; and I shall become a fugitive in *erets*." The contrast is striking. Cain is banished from the ground, which formed his father's estate, to the earth at large, there to fix upon a spot in which to reside.

"And daughters were born unto them." Here the fact is recorded that no daughter was born to Adam until he began to be many. He had many sons before he had any daughter. For a long period no child had been born like the mother. All had been like the father. Hence, when at last daughters were born, the event became epoch-making from a chronological and historic point of view. If daughters had been born intermixedly with sons, there could be nothing in it to make it an incident worthy of especial notice in either case. We know, from ch. 5.4, that no daughter was born until after Seth, and 6.1 expressly declares that none were born until Adam became many.

Now the question arises, how is the pronoun *them*, in 6.1, to be accounted for? "And daughters were born unto *them*." It may be said that if the passage refers to Adam, then the plural pronoun is out of place. The objection is groundless. When children are spoken of as born, two

persons are necessarily implied. In the "them" Eve is included as well as Adam; and then the pronoun becomes natural and proper. Genesis affords several examples where a plural pronoun refers to a single noun grammatically, but to a plural noun by implication.

Gen. 1.26: "And God said, let us make *adam* (singular), and let *them* have dominion."

Gen. 5.2: "In the likeness of God made he *him* (singular) . . . and called *their* name Adam.

The scriptural use of the words employed demands that we read the verse—"and it came to pass, when the man (*Adam*) began to multiply on the face of the ground (*his family estate*), and daughters were born unto them."

The following list will be useful to those wishing to investigate the subject, who have no access to a Hebrew concordance.

הָאָדָם, the man. Used 28 times in Genesis. Refers invariably to the first man only. In Gen. 6 it occurs in *vv.* 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7. The R. V. renders it "men" in *vv.* 1, 2, 4, and "man" in *vv.* 5, 6, 7.

אָדָם, mankind. Used 6 times in Genesis. Found in *vv.* 3 and 7 of ch. 6. The R. V. renders it "man" in both instances.

אֲנָשִׁים, mortal. This word also is rendered "men" in both versions—"men of renown" (6: 4).

Both versions arbitrarily insert the word "men" in *v.* 4, "mighty men", where there is no word in the Hebrew answering to it.

The Unsearchable Judgments of Our God

INTERCESSION

(Lamentations 3:48-66)

In the concluding part of the third lament the man of sorrows appears in the capacity of intercessor. He distinctly identifies himself with the cause of his forsaken and disheartened people.

Mine eye runneth down with streams of water for the destruction
of the daughter of my people.
Mine eye poureth down, and ceaseth not, without any inter-
mission,
Till Jehovah look down, and behold from heaven.

The circumstances under which the man of sorrows emerges in the role of intercessor deserve attention. The proclamation of God's goodness struck a responsive chord in the people and startled them out of the lethargy of despair. The newly-begotten hope vents itself in confession. The immediate effect of God's goodness has been to kindle in the wayward people a desire to return to Him (40-41). The acquired experience of the deceitfulness of sin gives added impetus to the desire. In acting toward Israel in anger, God has displayed His severity; they have smarted under its lashes, and thus have been prepared to appreciate whatever favors He may extend. They know the awfulness of repudiation, they have proved the bitterness of transgression, and long for change and rest (43-44). However, the most aggravating feature of the situation lies in the pressure of external adversity. The withdrawal of God's favor has made them contemptible in the eyes of neighboring nations

(45). Their enemies have taken advantage of their defenselessness and pounced upon them to avenge old scores and wreak their spite (46-47). Unmitigated hardships of existence, constant subjection to indignity and abuse, unrelenting persecution—each and all of these tend to choke God-ward aspirations. There is no prospect of a change, no sign portending relief. The bitterness of the situation, the hopelessness of the outlook act depressingly on the spirit. They need encouragement in coming to God.

Right at this juncture the man of sorrows, deeply affected by the plight of his suffering brethren, enters the arena as the champion and helper of their cause. He is moved by their plight. He sympathizes with them, and his influence is exercised on their behalf. They have already learned from his lips that their case is neither exceptional nor solitary. He has traversed before them the length of the road they are treading, and knows its hardships from personal experience. Has God forsaken them? Has He smitten them in wrath? He had received a like treatment at His hands. Has He delivered them into the power of cruel, heartless foes? He had been abandoned to a like fate. In all points he has been made like unto them. He is one of them, and, in his suffering and deliverance, is their representative and file leader. His experience is a concrete demonstration, a living embodiment, a pre-realized accomplishment of God's foreordained purpose for them. Therefore, having made known his active, unfailing concern in their welfare (48-51) he proceeds to relate his career of suffering and its aftermath of peace.

Before reviewing this speech, it may be well to point out that here, as everywhere else, intercession is associated with the adverse nature and operation of things arising out of the constitution of the present evil age. This is its setting, not alone in the Lamentations, but also in Hebrews and Romans,

where it appears in its finished and perfected form. In this fact lies the key to this much misunderstood truth.

If the intimate connection of intercession with the ills and woes of life had been duly weighed, the prevalent unscriptural and unreasonable misconceptions would never have gained a footing. Popular theology represents the intercessor *in contrast* with God, the latter stern, and inexorable; the former, tender, merciful, loving. God is pictured as angry, only prevented from striking the sinner by Jesus Christ standing between, holding Him back with one hand while extending the other in compassion and mercy toward the cowering sinner. This awful misrepresentation is altogether at variance with two cardinal principles; first, that *love* is the motive power of all God's dealings; and second, *God* is the prime mover in redemption. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. 5:19). God is the author and prime mover in redemption; Christ is only His agent and executive, revealing His will and effecting His purpose. The Father's love is not the consequence of Christ's redemptive work; but Christ's redemption is the consequence of the Father's love. Any view that contradicts or obscures this fact must be erroneous.

But even where this gross error has been recanted and eschewed, the idea of intercession amounts to little more than an appendix to Christ's finished work necessitated by the failures and shortcomings of the saints. God is supposed to cut off communion the moment a saint stumbles and lapses into sin, and is induced to be favorably disposed toward the erring by Jesus Christ pleading the merits of His work; as if God had forgotten having accepted the Son's sacrifice and needed an occasional reminder. Through such ceaseless pleadings of the Savior the saints are kept in

right relation with God, while backsliders are led to repentance and restored to fellowship.

Think of the awful character of God which this idea conjures. Think of the beggarly conception of Christ's sacrifice which it involves. Such idea is the product of self-occupation. As a matter of experience we know ourselves to be far below the Scriptural standard. We are deeply sensitive of the discrepancy between what we are and what we ought to be. Brooding over the discrepancy we become overwhelmed by the disproportion. In our anxiety to improve our walk, we have cast about for a remedy, and have supposed the existence of some "special" aspect in the work of Christ designed to meet this very exigency.

His work is finished. His exaltation at God's right hand is an attestation of its completeness. Though the redemptive plan takes ages to develop, and does not attain to fruition until the ages have run their course, yet the "purpose of the ages" has been realized in the person of Jesus Christ. All the thought and will and purpose of God concerning man is fulfilled and expressed in Jesus Christ, and therefore He is the Divine Word or Expression. Since the object of His suffering was the redemption of humanity, His exaltation through death is and means humanity's eventual exaltation. He is the very image of the thing, which, through Him, humanity is to become; the exact pattern which we are to attain. He stands in the Divine presence, the complete realization of God's purpose for man, the representative of the race.

The verb "intercede" means simply to converse with, have dealings with. In Act 25:24 it is rendered "dealt." From this it is clear that the word has no such theological meaning as is commonly attached to it. Since Christ is the head of every man, His exaltation through death represents the

norm of God's method with man, and therefore is the means by which the Spirit of God fashions human lives. Intercession, then, is not an aspect of the work of Christ, but the practical medium through which the potency of His finished work flows and becomes operative through faith. It is not that our Lord is actually making ceaseless suit, presenting the needs of His own, and opportuning the Father to be indulgent and bestow favors on His children. But that His presence before God as the forerunner of humanity, being a practical exhibition of God's love and of how His strange ways work out the universal advantage, is a source of inspiration which wields a power over faith, begetting confidence and hope, imparting courage and determination to brave the world, and power to overcome it.

When we see that intercession is the means of transmitting the virtue of the Savior's finished work, it becomes apparent why it should be limited to the household of faith, whereas His saving work is expressed in terms of absolute universality. He died for all, and in virtue of His death all will eventually be brought to the enjoyment of salvation. To hold that His salvation becomes effective only in some is to affirm His inability to carry out His intention. Salvation becomes effective in all at the close of the age-times. During the age-times, when estrangement exists, experimental knowledge of His saving power is necessarily the portion of such only as acknowledge His work and believe in His word. For this reason intercession is connected with the filial relation. The Old Testament and Hebrews present it in connection with Israel, the people of the saints, while Romans views it in relation to the members of His body.

In this passional the man of sorrows stands out as the companion and associate of the sons of Zion, made in all

points like unto them, sharing with them all their woes and troubles, and not as a substitute bearing a penalty and carrying a burden in which they have no share, that they might escape that penalty and that burden altogether, he taking their punishment, and they going scatheless. He has suffered *for* them, but not *instead* of them. He does not bear the *penalty* of their sin, he bears the sin itself. Nowhere in this whole speech is there the remotest approximation to the idea of an innocent victim being offered to satisfy justice and set the guilty free. (What sort of justice is it that is satisfied with the sufferings of an innocent victim?) This mystic figure is the companion, friend, equal sharer in all the nation's experiences. He has seen sorrow at its height; they fill up that which is left behind of his afflictions. He drained the cup of wrath, that they might drink it in a measure. They bear his reproach that they might share in his honors.

The same idea is brought out very distinctly in Isaiah's portraiture of the Suffering Servant. The words "Surely he has borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows" are cited in Matt. 8:16, 17 where we see the manner of their fulfillment. The Messiah "took their infirmities, and bare their diseases"—not *instead* of them, that they might *not* bear them, but as sympathizing companion and helper, delivering them in God's appointed time.

When the man of sorrows says, "Mine eye poureth down, and ceaseth not, without any intermission, till Jehovah look down, and behold from heaven," we should not allow a crass literalism to betray us into the crude belief that the comforter of the sons of Zion actually and incessantly weeps until the clock of time strikes the hour of Israel's restoration. If this were the case, then Messiah's reward for His obedience unto death is not "pleasure forevermore," but a

sorrow before which even Gethsemane itself would dwarf into insignificance. The point is that since His passion proved the prelude to glory, and since He is their fore-runner, His experience is a standing and unfailing fount of inspiration and strength as long as their trial lasts.

In the opening part of his address (*vv* 1-21) the speaker had dwelt on the subject of Divine enmity. In this, its concluding part, he takes up the topic of *human* antagonism. He recounts the ill-treatment received at the hands of man. He presents the two phases of human enmity—physical violence which impairs the bodily frame, and moral outrage which crushes the spirit. The comforter points out that human antagonism, like Divine enmity, is but a mile-stone on the road to peace. But in this case deliverance takes the special form of reversal—the oppressed and their oppressors exchange places.

The triplet of verses 52 to 54 describes the various forms of violent persecution to which our author had been subjected by his enemies. These were so dreadful and severe that he despaired even of life. He cried, "I am cut off." This brief exclamatory sentence conveys the fiendish character of the torture by means of a striking figure. The figure is folded in the verb "cut off." Two passages illustrate the shade of meaning which the verb *gazar* is capable of assuming. When Solomon rendered the famous verdict, he said "*Divide (gazar) the living child in two*" (1 Ki. 3:25). The other passage is even more forceful. In Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones the same verb conveys the thought of dismemberment by dissection (Ezek. 37:11). Our writer compares the ordeal of his torture to the slow, painful process of vivisection. The cruelty of his enemies had attained to a degree of refinement which found delight in devising means to intensify and prolong agony.

The following triplet (*vv.* 55-57) relates God's intervention to his rescue. In his extremity the afflicted one cried unto the Lord, and the Lord drew nigh, allaying his fears, softly whispering, "Fear not." The subject of God's intervention has hardly been broached when the train of thought is momentarily suspended. The speaker breaks away from his subject to utter a fervent petition, and then resumes the argument and carries it to completion. He recalls a former experience. In keeping with this fact, the recital proceeds in the past tense. But in the central line of the triplet, following the statement that God heard his voice, there is an abrupt change to the present tense.

Thou heardest my voice (hide not thine ear at my breathing,
at my cry),
Thou drewest near in the day that I called upon thee; then
saidst, Fear not.

This sudden transition is both remarkable and suggestive. He implores attention to his prayer in relating a past experience. It cannot be that he asks God to take notice of a prayer already answered. Evidently the efficacy of his prayer was not exhausted by his personal deliverance, but has a lasting virtue beneficial to the nation. There flashes out of this parenthetical sentence the existence of an indissoluble tie binding the comforter to the people. It reveals the depth and breadth of his sympathy. What touches them touches him, and he longs for their deliverance as fervently as he did for his own when he cried to God out of the depths.

With the next triplet (*vv.* 58-60) another form of human enmity is introduced by the speaker. His detractors were not satisfied with torture. They went farther, and endeavored to crush his spirit by making life unbearable. They traduced his character by spreading false reports, and thus

aroused popular prejudice and indignation against the object of their hate. It is interesting to observe that in developing this part of his theme our author deviates from the course hitherto followed. In the preceding instance he began with persecution and finished with deliverance. Now he reverses the order and starts out with deliverance—"O Lord, thou hast pleaded the causes of my soul." This change in method is no literary caprice, but a case where literary form is adjusted to the truth of which it is the vehicle. Deliverance from bodily harm is an accomplished fact in our experience, whereas the avenging of enemies lies in the future, and therefore is not a matter of experience, but a hope.

This paragraph exhibits the same peculiar feature of a parenthetical interjection in a changed tense which we have met in the antecedent triplet.

O Jehovah, thou hast seen my wrong (judge thou my cause),
Thou hast seen all their vengeance and all their devices against me.

The speaker has already identified himself with the sufferings of the people. Now he identifies himself with their hope. As surely as the Lord pleaded his cause, so surely will He plead their cause. The day of vindication is future for him as well as for them. Thus they are cemented by the bond of common interest. Their cause is his cause. Both look forward to the fulfillment of a promise rich in glory for both.

There remains to emphasize one more point before the speech can be concluded—the certainty of a coming retribution. Just as Israel is now enduring God's displeasure, so will it come upon the nations. The fate in store for Israel's oppressors forms the topic of the last triplet. The idea of recompense is developed by instalments in a series of successive clauses. God will give them a "covering of

the heart." This implies inability to see. The next clause defines this covering as God's "curse." The word, *talah*, occurs only here. The Septuagint renders it "recompense." Their reading gives force and cogency to the passage. With each line there appears a lightening in the idea of "recompense." The last line drops the metaphor and reveals the essence of the "curse"—"Thou wilt destroy them from under the heavens of the Lord."

The expression "heavens of the Lord" is the counterpart of the "land of the Lord." The Hebrew word *erets* may mean the earth in general, but in the majority of instances it is used in the restricted sense of our word "land." This is always the case when *erets* is qualified by some word, as "the *erets* (*land*) of Nod" (Gen. 4:16), "the *erets* (*land*) of Shinar" (Gen. 10:10). In like manner, when *erets* is qualified by "of the Lord" the reference is not to the earth at large (unless this is demanded by the context), but to the land which He claims in an especial manner as His own—the holy land. So also the "heavens of the Lord" do not denote the heavens as such, but the segment overhanging the holy land. Thus we see that the portion of transgressors will be exclusion from the Kingdom. In the words of our Lord, "They shall not see the Kingdom of God."

The man of sorrows concludes his address by emphasizing the certainty of the hope of Israel. That is the limit of his vision. The outlook of blessing is confined to Israel's pale. The Lamentations go no further. God's universal dealings lie outside its scope. It was reserved for the apostle Paul to take up these very truths in relation to all created intelligences and extend the sphere of the grace glorious to creation's utmost bound. V. G.

THE DIVINE ASSUMPTIONS

AMONG the glories which grace our Lord Jesus Christ is one of surpassing interest and splendor, but this, like many another gem in His diadem, has been long lost and forgotten. It is brought before us in that galaxy of glories which graces the opening of the epistle to the Hebrews.

Like every inspired gem, it is fitly set. The world to come was allotted to Abraham, the father of the Hebrews. So now Abraham's greater Son is set forth as the Allottee of all. The nation of Israel is the conian nation and so we see Him as the Maker of the eons. As these eons are made for the display of God we are now introduced to the One who is to be the means of His revelation. First He is the Effulgence, or out-shining, of God's glory. And then He is introduced to us as the impress of the divine assumptions.

In meditating upon the relations between God and His Son, it will be our wisdom to observe and preserve the figures and illustrations which He Himself suggests rather than any of our own invention. "The effulgence of His glory" leads us to the most notable of all natural representations of God's glory, the sun.

The sun itself is not visible to human eyes. What we see is the luminous photosphere or radiance which surrounds it. What we feel is the radiance of which it is the source. In the richer Hebrew tongue two terms are used to describe the sun. One, referring to the sun itself (Job. 9:7) is but seldom used, but the other, the common term, refers rather to the radiance of the sun, its shining. Thus when we read

the phrases at which so-called scientific scholars scoff, and are told that the sun rises and sets, moves and stands still, gets hot and scorches, it is not the astronomical idea of the sun which is intended, but the phenomenal thought—the sunshine—which is suggested. By appealing to the poverty of our language and not noting the precision of the tongue of inspiration the wisdom of the wise has confounded itself.

All our physical blessings are borne to us by sunbeams. All light and life relies, not only on the sun, but on its radiance, its effulgence. Should the sun shut in its beams and shroud its shining it would be like God apart from the offices of His Son—unappreciated, unknown, inscrutable. And so He is to all who have not seen and felt His light and love as these radiate from His Effulgence.

To us who know God and all His warmth of love and life-giving illumination, He still remains invisible. But by His Son His glories have filled our hearts with blessing as the sun's beneficent beams spread blessing on the earth.

The next illustration, in which we are particularly interested at this time, brings before us quite a different picture. Just as this page is printed from type whose form corresponds to that of the characters which appear before the reader's eye, so it is with God and His Son. The type and its impression are distinct and different in many ways, yet, so far as the interpretation of thought is concerned, they are one. The printer who reads the type and the reader who scans these lines are impressed with precisely the same ideas. So the Son of God is the Impress of His assumptions.

This phrase has been variously rendered. The Authorized translates "the express image of His person." That this is rather in the nature of a commentary, or a suggestion as to what they thought it meant, rather than a true rendering of the original, is manifest when we note their translation of the word here rendered "person" by "substance" in the first verse of the eleventh chapter. "God

is Spirit." How then, can we speak of His *substance*? The Greek word here translated "substance" has been rendered *confident* (2 Co. 9:4), *confidence* (2 Co. 11:17; Heb. 3:14), and the Revisers have followed the A. V. in using *substance* in Heb. 11:1. But faith is not substance. In fact, it is quite its opposite.

In order to rest satisfied as to the meaning of this important word we will need to find an expression which will fit into the context of each of its occurrences. "Confidence" seems to suit the Corinthian contexts fairly well. But the apostle has shown more than simple confidence. He has expressed this to others. He has *assumed* that they were ready and feared lest this assumption may not be true. Here we have hit upon an expression which will fit each occurrence as a key fits the lock. It does not strain the context but fills its place perfectly and opens up the significance of the passage. Using this as the basis of a concordant version we have this satisfactory definition of faith (Heb. 11:1):

Now faith is an assumption of what we are expecting, a conviction concerning matters which we are not observing.

Faith in God's word rests, not on evidence, but rather exists because of the lack of it. It is a *conviction* concerning matters where evidence is withheld. It is an *assumption* of that which we are expecting. All our blessings, like those of the worthies of this chapter, may be perceived afar off, and may be greeted, but have not yet been obtained (Heb. 11:13).

Faith, as related to hope, or expectation, *assumes* all the force and flavor of the longed for object. The fulfillment of faith alone can substantiate it. But faith refuses to wait for fact and takes for granted that He who has spoken will not fail to fulfil His word.

Palestine, we assert, belongs to Israel. That is faith. In fact, it is the territory of the Turk. But we *assume* that God's word is true and that the Turks have only a temporary term.

Faith, then, is the *assumption* of that which we are expecting, and when we transfer this thought to the phrase in the first chapter of the epistle, it not only fits perfectly but suggests a vast field of almost unexplored truth. The Son of God is not the image of God's *substance* or *person* (whatever these may mean) but the Impress of His Assumptions. . He made the eons. Throughout these eons God places Himself in various attitudes and relations to His creatures. He *assumes* various characters; He is Creator, Ruler, Provider, Master, Husband, Father. He is Jehovah and Elohim. He assumes these parts, but how can His creatures become aware of His assumptions? How can they know His relationship to them? He makes this manifest through His Son, Who is the IMPRESS of these assumptions.

The Greek word for "impress" is the source of our word "character." Indeed, the Greek word, transliterated, is *charakteer*. It occurs only in this passage, but, with another affix, marking the fixed result of a stamp or die, it is used often in the Revelation to denote the "mark" or stamp of the beast. It is also used in Acts 17:29, where it is translated "graven." Idols were sculptured to depict the character of the god or goddess which they represented. Hermes (Ac. 14:12 Mercurius) with his herald's staff and winged sandals is proved to be the messenger of Olympus; Artemis (Acts 19:24, 27, 28, 34, 35 Diana) was known as a huntress by her pack of dogs; while Zeus (Acts 14:12, 13 Jupiter) proclaimed himself by his sceptre and his throne. But the Son of God is no mere *charagma*, no sculptured image of His God. He is a *charakteer*, and displays Him by His words and works, by a life of love and a dread death, by a radiant resurrection and an august ascension.

He is the facsimile of God's assumptions, their *characteristic* presentation. In Him God's peculiar and salient attributes are converted into terms of human speech and action. When God is indignant He frowns, when He rejoices then the smile will play upon His Beloved's lips.

He is the impress of all God's assumptions. It is vain and vicious to drive in a wedge, as we so often do, between the Son and the Father, as though there were as little sympathy between them as there is in the average human family. He and His Father are one just as He and His saints are one. This unity is one of spirit, not identity of personality.

Failure to apprehend the truth that our Lord is the Impress of all the Divine Assumptions has led to many a self-imposed difficulty. Some passages prove that He is Adonai, not Jehovah. Other passages make it clear that He *is* Jehovah. Still others give Him the title El or Elohim.

"The Lord (Jehovah) said unto my Lord (Adonai) (Ps. 110:1; Mt. 22:44) seems to show clearly that David's Lord was *not* Jehovah. Yet it is David who speaks of the crucified One "I beheld the Lord (Jehovah) always before my face. . ." (Ps. 16:8; Acts 2:25). Thus, while we *infer* from one of David's utterances that He is *not* Jehovah, we have clear evidence from another passage that He *is*.

The same is true of the title Elohim. In Heb. 1:9 Elohim is called His God. Yet in the preceding verse He Himself is called Elohim.

In His distress on Calvary He calls upon El, "Eloi, Eloi" (Mt. 27:46), yet in the very same book He Himself is called Immanuel—El with us. This, too, is the title given the Son as the Creator (Heb. 1:10; Ps. 102:24-27).

In the Greek Scriptures Master or Lord is used indiscriminately of the Adonai or Jehovah of the Hebrew, yet this is the peculiar title which is used to distinguish Him from His God. "There be gods many and lords many, but for us there is one God and one Lord (1 Cor. 8:5, 6).

Often is God spoken of as the God and Father of our Lord, Jesus Christ. Yet the title God is not denied the Son. Thomas acknowledges Him to be his Lord and his God, and is not rebuked for his confession (Jn. 20:28). There is a strong probability that He is called "the Only Begotten God" in the first chapter of John's gospel (v. 18). The same apostle tells us that He is the true God (1 Jn. 5:20). The apostle Paul characterizes Him as "God over all, blessed for the eons" (Ro. 9:5).

Indeed, while the title Father is the one most distinct from the Son, He is the Impress of the Divine Fatherhood, too. He told His disciples "If ye had known Me, ye should have known My Father also; and from henceforth ye know Him and have seen Him. Philip saith unto Him, 'Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.' Jesus saith unto him, 'Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known Me, Philip? *He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father*; and how sayest thou 'Show us the Father?' Believest thou not that *I* am in the Father and the Father is in Me? The words that *I* speak unto you *I* speak not from Myself; but the Father that abideth in Me, He doeth the works. Believe Me that *I* am in the Father and the Father in Me" (Jn. 14:7-11).

From all of these examples it is evidently beside the mark to seek to limit any divine characterization to Deity, for we cannot hear Him apart from His Expression, we cannot see Him apart from His Image, we cannot perceive the characters He assumes apart from the Impress of His assumptions. This does not obliterate manifest differences of identity and personality. Indeed, we are forced to distinguish between the Image and its invisible Original, we cannot confuse the Expression with the One Who speaks, and we are not distressed when the Impress is spoken of in the same terms as the Assumption. The one great Mediator between God and humanity is fully authorized to speak and act as God; and to receive the honors which are due

to Him only. And this because His will and ways and words are not His own but His Who sent Him.

From this it is manifest how unscriptural is the theological theory of a "trinity." We are asked to believe that there are three gods whose three wills act in unity. Scripture knows of but one God whose will is supreme and needs no subordination or compromise or harmony with any other will. The Son of God always did the will of His God, and never presumed to co-operate with Him. As the Expression of God He does not announce His own will; and He renounces any will of His own as the Impress of the Divine Assumptions.

A. E. K.

ETERNAL AND EVERLASTING

Two distinct terms are translated *eternal* and *everlasting*. One of these, ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ, eonian, has already been fully discussed in "The Eonian Times." It speaks of duration during the eons. The other word, ΑΙΔΙΟΣ, has no connection with the eons and must present a different thought.

We have resolved ΑΙΩΝ-ΙΟΣ into its elements and found that it was composed of two parts, ΑΙΩΝ, an *eon*, and the adjective ending ΙΟΣ, which corresponds to our *ian*. Thus we have *eonian*.

Let us likewise analyse ΑΙΔΙΟΣ. It is made up of three elements: Α-ΙΔ-ΙΟΣ, UN-PERCEIVE and the same termination as *eonian*. Its etymology yields the meaning *imperceptible*. It is very closely related to the word for *hades*. In fact it is the descriptive form of *hades*. Thus we could render Jude 6 "*hadean* bonds" (not *chains*), but it is better to preserve the real meaning of *hades* and translate *imperceptible* bonds. This is in closest harmony with the succeeding phrase "under gloom." To say that He has kept His deserting messengers under the gloom of imperceptible bonds for the judgment of the great day makes no demands on our credulity such as the binding of angels with *chains* whose everlastingness terminates at the judgment of the great day. Imperceptible bonds are well calculated to bind angels: everlasting chains are hardly in keeping with such creatures. At any rate the epithet *everlasting* is quite useless, since it is immediately denied any force, for the chains are discarded at the judgment. This corresponds with the truth that *hades*, the imperceptible, comes to an

end with the advent of the lake of fire. It finds its finish in the second death.

The one other occurrence of this word is in Romans, first chapter, verse twenty. The more this passage is considered the clearer it becomes that *imperceptible* affords a far more vigorous, harmonious and satisfactory sense than "eternal." The whole passage is concerned with the evidence which the visible world furnishes for the apprehension of the invisible. God's "unseen attributes are made obvious from the creation of the world, being apprehended by His achievements—His imperceptible power as well as His divinity." God's imperceptible power and divinity are the unseen attributes referred to which are apparent from His achievements in creation. The literary setting is a reversal, a common but striking device:

His unseen (attributes)
 The creation
 His achievements
 Imperceptible power and divinity.

In the central members, "His achievements" is but an amplification of "creation" and in the other members the phrase "His imperceptible power and divinity" is but an amplification of "His unseen" attributes.

The power and divinity of God cannot be perceived directly in nature but can be apprehended through His creative achievements. Every wind and wave is witness to an unseen force which impels it, with a hidden power like the electric current, to fulfil His will. Every living thing bespeaks a Living One Who is divine. This power and this divinity is imperceptible to the physical eye. It must be apprehended from the phenomena of nature.

ΑΙΔΙΟΣ is usually derived from another source than the one we have suggested. It is usually traced back to ΑΕΙ, translated "ever" (Mk. 15:8) and "always" (Acts 7:51; 2 Cor. 4:11, 6:10; Tit. 1:12; Heb. 3:10; 1 Pet. 3:15;

2 Pet. 1:12). Not one of these passages can refer to eternity in any sense. Pilate had not released a prisoner to the Jews throughout eternity past or future. A dissection of this word into its elements will guide us to its true meaning. It is from A, UN and EI, IF. Pilate had always granted a prisoner *without an if*. It was a matter of course. So that, even if we are inclined to follow the ordinary etymology and derive ΑΙΔΙΟΣ from AEI, we must stretch the use of the words "ever" and "always" altogether out of their proper limits before we get the thought of endlessness.

In Greek, as in Hebrew, the most stable letters are the consonants. The vowels vary much and form no sure sign of the relationship of one word to another. It is a difficult matter to see how ΑΙΔΙΟΣ could ever be derived from AEI. That the A in one carries the same force as the A in the other is freely admitted. But then the likeness ceases. ΙΔ cannot be found in EI even if they have one common vowel. The only reason they were ever associated was a supposed identity in meaning.

Thus we have expunged the words "everlasting" and "eternal" from the sacred records. And is it not strange that they should ever have found a place there? No human being knows aught about eternity. We can go back, in spirit, to the past, but we can never go so far back but that a shoreless ocean of time still lies before us of which we know naught. And if we attempt to grasp the eternity ahead we gaze into the future wholly unfitted to comprehend its endless abyss of time. Within the realm of revelation we are at home. We long for our Lord's advent, His revelation, the long day of His righteous rule, the new heavens and the new earth, and the grand consummation. These are revealed, and we can readily read the future by their means. But when all these waymarks have been passed we shall be content to walk the eternal way without the need we now feel of knowing our future path. Now the present is discounted: the future is filled with blessing.

Now faith and hope urge us to hasten to the bliss that lies ahead. But then all will be changed. Love alone will rule our hearts. The future will have no dread, neither will its hopes tempt us from a delectable present. With God as our All, the past will fill our cups with brimming bliss, the present will suffice to quaff its unfailing fulness, and the future will be but another present when we embrace it.

It is vain to tell the old man not to envy the days of youth; it is futile to tell the youth not to wish for the days of manhood; it is useless to ask a man to be satisfied with his lot; for each finds his all in himself. But when God become All in all His creatures the past and future are swallowed up in a blissful unbroken present.

It is the part of Divine wisdom to give a revelation suited to human need and capacity, and when endlessness is intended, to employ the negative terms *no end*—the very method to which men are forced when they seek to define “everlasting” and “eternal.”

A. E. K.

The Mystery of Babylon

FOREWORD

BABYLON means *in confusion*: and this may well describe, not only the city and its secret, but the present state of theology on the subject. Luther's vigorous denunciation of the Romish church was spiced by his attempts to show that she is the scarlet woman of the Apocalypse. Many of the Protestant sects have followed this course and still teach that Catholicism is the embodiment of the mystery of Babylon. During the rapid corruption of Protestantism those who have risen in protest against it have not been slow to turn this weapon against it, and the Protestant sects have been denominated the daughters of Babylon. Some have gone still further and insist that all outside their favorite communion are Babylon. Could all of these charges be substantiated by Scripture, not one of the saints could free himself from the guilt of association with Babylon, or would escape her dreadful doom! Thus the whole teaching with regard to Babylon has become reduced to an absurdity. It has become a mere lash of party leaders. It is the sting of slanderous tongues, anxious to proclaim their own sanctity by disparaging others.

Were it our object, in this meditation, to fasten this byword, Babylon, on some of our theological enemies, we could not conscientiously ask anyone to waste his time in reading it. But we are convinced, by much labor and study of the Scriptures that, not only is the spirit which urges the use of this epithet by theological belligerents contrary to the spirit of Christ, but the interpretations are contrary to His Word.

Leaving out of consideration, for the time being, the *mystery* connected with Babylon, it has become clear to us, past all contradiction, that Babylon means *Babylon*—and not Rome or Jerusalem or any other city. The burden of proof, of course, does not lie with us. God says Babylon and we simply believe that He refers to the city of Shinar which has always been known by this name. If He means some other city it will be necessary to show this by the Scriptures and some satisfactory reason must be given for calling another place by this name.

The *mystery* of Babylon is presented to us under the figure of an unfaithful woman. It is conceded by all that she is in contrast with a faithful one. The fact that Christendom believes the present church to be the “bride of Christ” is the source of all the misapplications of the mystery of Babylon. If the church is the true wife, why Babylon is the false one, and is to be found today in the false, apostate systems which abound. But if the present grace is not presented under the figure of a bride or wife—which we hope to show in due course—then we may not characterize the false as Babylon.

Our first task, then, will be to show who is the bride of the Lamb. Yet, even before this, we must consider the teaching concerning the wife of Jehovah. After we have seen how He wooed and won her, and how, in spite of her unfaithfulness, He keeps Himself for her and promises to renew His marriage vows, then we are prepared to see that, since the wife can be none other than the nation of Israel, then the bride must be out of that same nation. *The bride is the elect company of faithful Israel.*

As this will unlock to us the Song of Songs, we will briefly consider its bearing on our theme.

We will also consider those passages which are usually supposed to prove that the present church is the bride, and will endeavor to show that we have a nearer and dearer place—the *body* of Christ.

In order to understand more clearly the contrast which is presented in the book of the Revelation between faithful Jerusalem and false Babylon, we will consider the "openings" of the Apocalypse.

Then, after a brief review of Babylon in the past, we will attempt to show that, just as Jerusalem will be the home of faithful Israel, so Babylon will be the refuge of unfaithful Israel in the future. There the wealth and opulence of Hebrew merchant princes, Jews who control the finances of the world, will combine to build the most magnificent commercial capital of the earth. By means of their wealth they will have a "kingdom over the kings of the earth." The "bonds" which the nations are so eager to sell will be bought by the money-lending Jew and, in their hands, will become "bonds" in quite another sense. The nations will become so heavily indebted to the despised usurers that they, when they combine in Babylon, will be able to dictate the financial policies of all their debtors.

Jehovah has promised Israel a kingdom over the other nations, but we may rest assured that He never intended that they should get it by such means—and all apart from His Messiah and His grace. The kingdom of Babylon is a false fulfilment of His promises to His faithful people. The true fulfilment will be the marriage supper of the Lambkin, during the thousand years.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter will be a discussion of the relation of the Jews to the present European struggle showing how it is inevitably leading the nations into bankruptcy with the Jews as their creditors. Its effect on the Eastern question is most significant, too. It will doubtless lead to the development and restoration of the desolate yet fertile plains of Shinar and bring the ancient city of Babylon once more into the center of the world's politics and religion. It is as though we see the curtain rising for the next, the most stormy and terrible act in the drama of this earth's history. And we are hastening the publication of

these papers lest, before we are ready, our study of prophecy become a review of history.

Great Babylon, the most hateful of all the opposition to God's Kingdom, is fast becoming a fact. She will soon raise her proud head in defiance of Jehovah, but her short-lived grandeur will find a sudden and desperate end, for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her.

May it be our privilege to enter into sympathy with Him, and our portion to perceive His hand in the terrible times which impend. And may it lead us to appreciate the grace which delivers us from it, seeing that we are not appointed unto wrath. During the pangs of earth's sorrows we will be enjoying salvation and eonian glory with our blessed Lord.

A. E. K.

PRELUDE

HE WHO created all things for Himself welded the bands of relationship to bind its beauties to Him. Blessed are the family ties—father and mother, husband and wife, or child and parent, for in each we may see a picture of Himself and of His varied excellencies.

As our Father He has engaged Himself to sustain and nourish, counsel and guide, correct and discipline. He fulfills all those kindly offices which an earthly father feebly counterparts. We are His children. No mother's tender solicitude can equal His.

How wonderful a harmony and spiritual accord His works reveal! Shattered and discordant chords are everywhere, but when attuned to Him, each in its true place, there is music to His ear and ours. Children in glad obedience to the parents' gentle rule; wives in loving subjection to their husbands; and men, loving their wives as they love themselves—how pleasant are such scenes!

As our hearts dwell on these various virtues, we see His heart unveiled. His virtues are they all. The glorious halo of a manifested God crowns all. It transmutes the bands of earth into most fine gold. The little candle light that scarce can pierce the gloom, by this divinest alchemy is transformed into the effulgence of His glory.

The chiefest and the sweetest of all earthly ties is that which welds two hearts into one—the marriage bond. What rarer bliss, what higher happiness on earth than this? What closer covenant of love has earth been called to witness?

And can we find in this a picture of Himself?

Yes—He, too, as lovers will, has chosen one to be His own; and more than all earthly lovers can, He woos and wins her to Himself. How precious such a theme must be. None of earth's stories sway the heart like those of love. How engaging then, must be the story of Jehovah's love!

Shall not our hearts leap as we see His chosen one in all the ardor of first love, gladdened by His presence and His bounty! But then, alas, how sad to see her heart grow cold and see her turn away from Him, forsake Him and prove unfaithful; how heart-rending the divorce—she lonely and forsaken for her sins; He in patient faithfulness, waiting the day of restoration!

These are pathetic scenes; but the gloom deepens as we behold that false woman boldly usurp the place and portion He reserves for her, taunting Him in shameless style, "I sit a queen and am no widow; no mourning shall I ever see!" And as the dread darkness is broken by the lightning of His wrath, can we not join the joyful chorus as they sing their judgment song? (Rev. 18:7; 19:1-2.)

"Alleluia!"

But joy such as this we soon forget as we see His bride again, no longer lonely and desolate, but with youth renewed and adorned with her beautiful bridal robes of purest white and glistening gold, beneath His glorious marriage canopy. Then indeed will she respond as in the days of her youth and break forth into singing.

But our eyes turn even from her beauty, which He has put upon her, to Himself, as we whisper to our hearts and say:

"As the bridegroom rejoices over the bride

So shall thy God rejoice over thee." (Isaiah 62:5)

I.

THE WOOING AND THE WINNING

“ * * * the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord.” (Jer. 31:32)
“And she shall respond there as in the days of her youth;
As in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt.” (Hos. 2:15b)

Love longs for leave to show itself in signal acts and daring deeds of devotion. What ardent lover has not aspired to be the hero of some thrilling scene, to lay his life at his beloved's feet, to put an everlasting seal upon his loyalty?

And so Jehovah won His wife. Egypt's bitter bondage brought forth His might and majesty. With surcharged heart they see the Egyptians upon the seashore and burst forth in song to Him:

“Who is like unto Thee! O Jehovah among the mighty ones?
Who is like Thee,
Glorious in holiness,
Fearful in praises,
Doing wonders,
Thou stretched forth Thy right hand,
The earth swallowed them.
Thou in Thy loving kindness hast led forth the people whom Thou hast redeemed.
Thou hast guided them in Thy strength unto Thy holy habitation.” (Ex. 15:11-13.)

“Ye have seen,” said He, “what I did unto the Egyptians and how I bare you on eagle's wings and brought you unto myself.” (Ex. 19:4.)

A precious quality pervades all this. His mighty deeds were done in the sight of all—both the Egyptians and His own. He glorified Himself in the sight of all; but for one the path He made proved the path of peace; for the others it was the way of wrath. Judgment was the background that set off the wonders of His kindness to the Sons of Israel. His arm made bare revealed His heart.

But He did not *send* them forth; He *brought* them—not only out of Egypt; not only into the wilderness—but to *Himself*.

He had *visited* them in Egypt; but now He *dwelt* amongst them. Nor did He dwell at a convenient distance, but in their very midst.

Can we not discover in all this the desire of His heart toward her? What does He seek but her response?

With overflowing heart she sings:

“I will sing unto the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously.
The horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea.
Jehovah is my strength and song,
And He is become my salvation.” (Ex. 15:1-2)

O, the fervor of first love! Again and again in later days His heart turns back to this. His heart never can rest satisfied with less than this—her first, her fervent love.

“I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth,
the love of thine espousals,
When thou wentest after me in the wilderness
in a land that was not sown.” (Jer. 2:2)

“Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold thy time was the time of love, and I spread My skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness; yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith Adonahy Jehovah; and thou becamest Mine. Then washed I thee with water; yea I thoroughly washed away thy blood from thee, and I anointed thee with oil. I clothed thee also with

broidered work, and shod thee with badgers' skin, and I girded thee about with fine linen, and I covered thee with silk. I decked thee also with ornaments, and I put bracelets upon thy hands, and a chain upon thy neck. And I put a jewel upon thy nose, and earrings in thine ears, and a beautiful crown upon thy head. Thus wast thou decked with gold and silver and thy raiment was of fine linen, and silk and broidered work, thou didst eat fine flour, and honey, and oil, and thou wast exceeding beautiful, and thou didst prosper into a kingdom. And thy renown went forth among the nations for thy beauty; for it was perfect through my comeliness, which I had put upon thee, saith Adonahy Jehovah" (Ezek. 16:8-14.)

How wondrous wise are all of God's dealings! He not only *knows* all things; but His acts are governed by His knowledge. "To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven." (Eccles. 3:1.) In nature each season is attended with its own peculiar fruits. Man's life is divided into seasons. There is infancy and childhood, and youth. The entrance to maturity is through the door of love. So when Israel was about to come to a mature estate, then was the fit time which He chose to take her to Himself. And then it was that they entered into a mutual covenant and she promised obedience and subjection and He engaged Himself to love and bless her.

What nation was then so great that had statutes and judgments so righteous as the law He gave her? Thus He washed her from the filthiness of the nations round about and gave her a righteousness to put on.

It is the way of love to give. And so He gave her abundantly of all good things. He exalted her in the eyes of the other nations.

All her comeliness was from Himself. Was she weak? He was her strength. Was she sick? He was her Healer. Stiffnecked and crooked? He was her Righteousness.

What more could He have done to draw her to Himself?

Our Question Box

Did Paul in his zeal for his countrymen, overstep the plain instructions of the Spirit (Acts 21:4)?

It is a pity that the great apostle should be accused of disobedience at the very time when he was risking his very life "for the name of the Lord Jesus" in spite of the protests of his friends. He was in haste to get to Jerusalem before Pentecost (20:16). Twice he was delayed (21:4, 10). On both occasions the Spirit speaks. As they tarry *more* (not many) days at Caesarea Agabus tells of the bonds that awaited him. Indeed, the spirit witnessed in every city that bonds and afflictions were to be his lot (20:23). How then could the same spirit say that "he should not go up to Jerusalem"?

When they come to Tyre they find out the disciples while the ship is unloading. Paul's evident intention is to keep on going but, at the instance of the Spirit, he prolongs his stay to seven days. "Should not go" *at any time* is not the thought in the Greek tense employed. It should read "not to be boarding" (the ship) *at present*. The best texts read as in 21:2, "went aboard," and 21:6, "took" ship. So their stay was *prolonged* (21:10, 28:12, 14, *tarried*) beyond the time intended in obedience to the Spirit's mandate.

We would suggest a tentative translation as follows: Now, finding out the disciples, we prolong our stay seven days, seeing that some said to Paul through the Spirit not to be going on board for Jerusalem.

The following is a reply to questions which have come up concerning the translation of Phil. 1:23.

It is deplorable to add to the confusion by asserting that EK is translated *between* in John 3:25. The A. V. reads: "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying." Literally it is "a questioning out of the disciples of John with the Jews concerning purifying." From this it is seen that the concordance is correct in assigning *of* to EK and *between* to META as a substitute for *with*. Those who are handicapped by the necessity of studying the original through the distorting lenses of English idiom should not add to the difficulties of their readers by presenting passages in which the constant meaning of a Greek word is obscured because of the twist of the tongue which attends its expression in English. We must admit that EK cannot always be rendered "out of" in an English

48 EK always Carries the Force of "Out Of"

version, yet the essential thought contained in this expression must always be maintained. One who reads the original without English spectacles sees the same word EK and receives the same impression each time, which is modified only by the context. For instance, in the passage in John, we would not say "a questioning *out of* John's disciples." We object to this, not because it is not true, but because it is not good English. So we omit the "*out,*" and render it "*of* John's disciples." That is where the questioning came from. It has been insisted that, in the plural, EK should not be rendered simply *from among* but "*out from among.*" We stood corrected on this point, though it is difficult to see that much is gained by the added word. Now, from the same source, we are told that it has no such force as *out* at all! So we will simply stand aside from such surging to and fro, and continue to consistently render Phil. 1:23: "I am being pressed *out of* the two . . ."

We are also told that "in a strait" means *in* always and not *out of*, in spite of the fact that it is so expressly stated. That the word here used, which is compounded of *together* and *have* (literally TOGETHER-HAVE) does not indicate being pressed *out of* in other places we fully admit, for in no other passage does the expression *out of* follow it. In English we might argue that *have* always means having *in* and cannot mean having *out*. But our best authors will still use "have *out*" (2 Sam. 13:9). In Greek thousands of words are modified by such connectives when they are joined to the word. No one doubts the power of a connective to change the direction of thought. This is the first time that it has ever been suggested that we must give the connective an opposite meaning to conform to the usage of a word in other connections. If we apply this principle consistently, the resurrection *from among* the dead is a fable, for the word resurrection in itself does not contain the idea of *from among*. Pressure ordinarily is *in*, but when it is expressly stated to be *out of* as in Phil. 1:23, we bow to the Divine dictum and render it "being pressed *out of* the two."

We are further assured that "the only return that *analysis* can indicate is death," and "there is no passage where the Lord is said to have an *analysis*, a 'return'." "Luke 19:12 is the only passage that can be brought forward." We reply: Luke 19:12 is an entirely different term, *hupostrepsai*, which proves nothing as to the word in question. Luke 12:36 proves that our Lord is said to have an *analysis* or return, and we submit that, if He had *died* when He returned from the wedding, His servants would wait long and hopelessly for His knock on the door!

EDITORIAL

It is the heartfelt hope and deep desire of all of us who love His appearing to be alive and remain till the coming of the Lord. We know that death will be defeated in the resurrection, but we would very much prefer to vanquish death by avoiding it altogether. But in this, as in all things else, we would bow to the will of our Father, and echo the words of His beloved Son: "Nevertheless, not my will, but Thine, be done."

And so it has seemed well to Him to take one of our number before His blessed advent. Our dear sister in Christ, Mrs. Ernestine Gelesnoff, wife of the Editor of our magazine, fell asleep very suddenly about midnight of the 30-31st of October, and was buried on November 2d at Rosedale cemetery, Los Angeles, Cal., in hope of a glorious and speedy resurrection and transfiguration.

As her final illness lasted but a few hours, her friends did not know that she was sick until after she had died. And, humanly speaking, we cannot but be thankful, for her sake, that it was so. A long and lingering illness, hopeless suffering, is not the desire of any one, especially as we know that, in His sight, death is but a refreshing sleep from which He will rouse His saints, after the night has passed and the morning brings the promise of a glorious day.

Mrs. Gelesnoff was closely connected with the magazine, especially in the first few years of its existence, giving attendance to the subscription list and correspondence.

THE time of the end seems to be striding closer and closer as events follow one another which conform to and presage that time of earth's distress. Then, we read, "*nation shall rise against nation.*" Not content with leaving warfare to a military class in a nation, as heretofore, the combatants in the present European conflict are mobilizing entire nations for the prosecution of the war. The distinction between soldier and civilian is becoming less marked. Even if not actually fighting at the front, it is proposed that civilians do much which was formerly the work of soldiers. And, besides this, the entire man power of a nation is to be concentrated on the one object of carrying on the conflict. Is not this a foretaste of the time when "*nation shall rise against nation?*"

Another sign, which is of special interest to students of prophecy, is the interest shown in the League to Enforce Peace by the foremost men, not only of neutral nations, but of the belligerents themselves. The idea of some sort of a league to assure peace has made rapid strides, and it is most likely that it will take tangible shape once peace is proposed. Who knows but that we may soon be called upon to witness all things in readiness for the final scenes of man's tragic drama of misrule and rebellion?

The cry is for a *permanent* peace. Alas! there is no permanent peace until they welcome back the Prince of Peace!

The Nephilim

Studies in Genesis 6.1-8

THE SONS OF GOD

THE second verse of the sixth of Genesis describes the fateful cause that brought about the destruction of the "ancient world." "The sons of God saw the daughters of the man that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose."

We will remind the reader that the word "men" in the current versions of this verse, is the identical Hebrew phrase which we have encountered in the first verse—*ha adam*, the man; so that only the daughters of the individual Adam are meant, and not the daughters of other men then living. Of these women it is said that "they were fair." The word "fair" is not comprehensive enough. The Hebrew word *tov* implies grace of manner and stateliness of bearing, as well as beauty of appearance. This is clear from the advice of the Persian nobles to king Ahasuerus—"Let the king give her royal estate unto another that is better (*tov*) than she" (Esth. 1:19). It is quite evident from the tenor of the narrative that the counsellors meant a woman superior to Vashti, not in beauty, but in manner. Adam and Eve had already many sons, and they must have been men of splendid physique. But for a long time the world had not seen a specimen of female human beauty, except Eve herself. When at last daughters were born, and grown to womanhood, they were seen to be lovely specimens of female beauty and bearing. Their natural qualities must have improved with education; for they were brought up and trained by

their mother, and in their father's house, and were women of cultivated minds and refined manners. They combined high accomplishments and charming manners with a degree of beauty worthy to be celebrated; and it is not surprising that their appearance in society was the sensation of the age.

The statement regarding the beauty of Adam's daughters evidently implies a contrast; for if all marriageable females then living had been fair, there could not have been any reason for singling out these daughters for their beauty. But the consideration of this point must be deferred until we come to consider the fourth verse.

Now we come to the knotty and long-debated question: Who are the sons of God? We will first briefly review the generally accepted interpretations, and then attempt to examine the subject afresh.

The first view is that the writer intends to describe a fusion of races hitherto distinct, and that the result of their intercourse was a thorough and hopeless corruption of both families alike. The "sons of God" are said to be the Sethites, and the phrase "daughters of men" is taken to designate the women of the Cainites. Two considerations are fatal to this interpretation. (1) It obliges us to make assumptions at variance with the clear statements of the text. If the A. V. be taken as a standard of test, then, since the assertion in *v.* 1, "men began to multiply," is taken to mean men in general, the phrase "daughters of men" must necessarily mean women in general. On what ground are we to take "men" as meaning the race in the first verse, and then, without any intimation to that effect, restrict its meaning to a particular family in the second verse? Surely there ought to be some very clear and decisive reasons for thus making us deviate from the constant meaning of terms. Again, why should we, without the slightest shred of evidence,

apply the term "sons of God" to the Sethites as a body? If we follow the Hebrew text (whose authority is decisive) then the notion of a fusion of races is ruled out of consideration, for the passage deals only with Adam's family. There is no hint of inter-marriages between distinct races, no allusion to the character of the parties involved. There is no intimation of any fusion of mixed races having been the cause of apostasy. On the contrary, it is intimated that the origin of that wickedness which brought down the deluge was the incestuous and plural marriages between blood relatives. (2) Whenever the phrase "sons of God" applies to human beings, women are included as well as men. But here the "daughters of Adam" are excluded and stand in contrast with the "sons of God." When the facts of the case are considered, it becomes apparent that this interpretation is founded on mere guesses; the whole theory stands out as a tissue of contradictions, and must go "to the moles and to the bats."

The second current interpretation, assuming that the Old Testament phrase "sons of God" applies exclusively to angels, identifies them with the "angels that sinned", mentioned in the epistles of Peter and Jude. In the lifetime of Adam—so runs this theory—some of the fallen angels broke through the bounds of their domains, came down to earth, mingled visibly and corporeally with men, and contracted unholy marriages with women. In consequence of this commerce between angels and women there sprang up a bastard race of composite creatures, semi-angelic and semi-human, possessed of prodigious strength and prowess, and beyond all measure famous and renowned. This interpretation is as untenable as the preceding. (1) The Old Testament phrase "sons of God", as will presently be shown, refers to both men and angels, and therefore cannot denote creational

status. (2) As a fact, Jude 6 and 7 points out the analogy between the crime of the cities of the plain and the sin of the angels. It is the men of Sodom and Gomorrah, not the antediluvians, that sinned "in like manner" with the angels kept in bonds until the judgment of the great day. A reference to the nineteenth chapter of Genesis shows convincingly that the sin of Sodom differed in kind, and was altogether unlike, the one referred to in Gen. 6:2. In the one instance it was a case of "men abusing themselves with men"; in the other it was a question of misconduct between men and women. The passage in Jude, therefore, has no bearing whatsoever on Gen. 6:2, and is of no value in establishing the identity of the "sons of God."

The first step toward a solution is to examine the phrase itself. The Hebrew word *ben* (son) has a wide range of application. Its use is not restricted to intelligent beings. It is derived from the verb *banah*, to build, and either refers to anything that is produced, or expresses dependence between one thing and another. Here are a few examples—

1 Kings 4:31, "Ethan the Ezrahite, and Heman and Chalcol, and Darda, *sons of Mahol (sons of verse, viz., poets).*"

Job. 5:7, "man is born unto trouble, as the *sparks (sons of flame)* fly upward."

Job 28:8, "The *proud beasts (sons of pride)* have not trodden it."

Job 38:32, "Canst thou guide the Bear with her *train (sons)*?"

Job 41:28, "The *arrow (son of the bow)* cannot make him flee."

Ps. 102:20, "To loose *those that are appointed to death (the sons of death).*"

Prov. 31:5, "Pervert the justice of *any that is afflicted (sons of affliction).*"

Prov. 31:8, "In the cause of all *such as are left desolate (sons of destruction).*"

Isa. 21:10, "The *grain (son)* of my floor."

Isa. 65:20, "The child shall die a hundred years *old (son).*"

Jer. 48:45, "The crown of the head of the tumultuous *ones (sons of tumult).*"

Lam. 3:13, "The *shafts (sons)* of his quiver."

Jonah 4:10, "The gourd *which came up in a night (son of a night).*"

Zech. 4:14, "These are the two *anointed ones (sons of oil).*"

Sometimes the term "son" expresses subordinate relation or dependent position. The message of king Ahaz to the king of Assyria affords a typical illustration of such use—"I am thy servant and thy *son,*" viz., thy vassal or subordinate. (2Ki. 16:7).

The various relationships which created intelligences sustain to God differ from one another in point of character and position. The special scope of each several relationship is indicated by combining the term "son" with some particular Divine name or title.

1. "Sons of God"—Gen. 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7.

2. "Sons of the Most High"—Ps. 82:6.

3. "My sons" (Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel)—Isa. 43:6; 45:11.

4. "Sons of the Living God"—Hos. 1:10.

5. "Sons of Jehovah Elohim"—Deut. 14:1.

In the references under No. 1 (except Gen. 6:2, 4) the "sons of God" are powers attending upon God as a council of officers upon a king. They are functionaries through whom God's government is carried on, and come to report. The last reference in the list (Job 38:7) shows that these "sons of

God" are not human beings, for they witnessed the laying of earth's foundations. No. 2 also refers to spirit creatures of the invisible world, the principalities and powers in the heavenlies. This is abundantly evident from the statement in v. 7—"Ye shall die like mankind." In the references under Nos. 3, 4 and 5, the "sons of God" are members of the elect and royal nation of Israel. One of those prophecies—Hos. 1:10—is applied by Peter to the "elect of the dispersion" redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ (1 Pet. 2:10).

An examination of the scriptures in question brings out two things: (1) the term "sons of God" applies to both men and angels; (2) the "sons of God," whether human or angelic, are *rulers*. Thus "sons of God" is a title designating rank or official position. When we bear in mind that mankind were made to "have dominion over all the earth" (Gen. 1:26), and the further fact, that there was disorder in the earth which Adam was commissioned to "subdue" (Gen. 1:28), then it will be seen how natural and appropriate it is that such of Adam's descendants as were in authority, as God's ministers and personal attendants, should, in virtue of their official position, be called "sons of God."

The foregoing conclusion regarding the "sons of God" is fully borne out by other scriptures. The judicial and administrative heads in Israel are called *elohim* (*God*, A. V. "judges," Ex. 21:6; 22:8, 9; 1 Sam. 2:25). The spirit world-rulers of the darkness of this age are also called *elohim* (*gods*) in Ps. 82:6, and our Lord's comment on this passage, in John 10:34-35, shows that they were so called in virtue of the official position held by divine appointment. In the New Testament those in authority, irrespective of personal character, are called "ministers of God" and "ministers of God's service" (Rom. 13:4, 6).

In this connection, we may pause to consider the interesting fact that, in certain instances, the definite article, *ha*, is prefixed to *Elohim*, while in other instances it is wanting.

The question arises, Is this use of the article accidental or designed? To do full justice to the subject would require a separate paper. Meanwhile, as a stimulus to earnest study, it is suggested that the use of the definite article in connection with *Elohim* serves the purpose of differentiating between the Deity in relation to the universe and in His relation to earth's affairs. Thus, throughout the account of creation's work the definite article is never prefixed to *Elohim*, because creation is the exclusive work of Deity, and created intelligences have no part in it. But when it is a question of earth's government, a work in which created intelligences share, *Elohim* takes the definite article. Thus it is written, "Enoch followed *ha Elohim*" (Gen. 5:22, 24), "Noah followed *ha Elohim*" (Gen. 6:9).

The title "sons of God" affords a striking illustration of the discriminate use of the definite article in connection with *Elohim*. In Job 1:6 and 2:1, as in Gen. 6:2, 4, it takes the definite article—*beni ha Elohim*. But, in Job. 38:7, the writer leaves out the definite article and writes *beni Elohim*. The suggestion here offered fully accounts for the omission of the article in this instance. In Job. 1:6 and 2:1 the "sons of God" are represented as inspecting the earth and taking part in the deliberations of the Court of Heaven relative to the conduct of earth's affairs. But in the latter passage (Job 38:7) where God Himself describes the grand operations of earth-building, the "sons of God" are not participants in the transactions, but mere spectators, solemnizing the occasion by loud outbursts of joy.

The laws of Sinai furnish another set of passages showing the judicious use of the article. The section relating to

thefts is summarized as follows: "The cause of both parties shall come before *ha Elohim*, he whom *Elohim* shall condemn shall pay double unto his neighbour" (Ex. 22:9). Here the definite article is prefixed to *Elohim* when the point in question is administration of justice in the land, but when God is referred to as universal Sovereign the article is omitted. Further on in the same chapter occurs another instructive instance. "Thou shalt not revile *Elohim*, nor curse a ruler of thy people" (Ex. 22:28). The A. V. rendering "gods" and its marginal variant "judges" rob the passage of its force. *Elohim* cannot mean rulers, for these are expressly mentioned in the next clause. The contrast is between God in the capacity of Creator and those holding authority under Him. The passage enjoins reverence for God and respect for authorities. The few instances here given do not cover the entire field, but are interesting enough to warrant a close study of the subject.

The "sons of God" in Gen. 6:2, 4, then, were the prophets, teachers and rulers of that time. They were the official great ones of that day, and, by their office, as God's representatives, they were exalted. The power of office gives greater opportunity to do good, and at the same time it affords greater facilities to do a vast deal more harm, if the incumbent abuses the prerogatives of his station. The most serious consequence of official abuse is not its debasing effect on the officials themselves, but its demoralizing influence on the community. Corrupt officials are the most effective means of corrupting the masses. A bad example always finds a large and ready circle of followers. But when a bad example is set up by men of prominence, then it acquires the added charm of fashion which insures its popularity. Vice practiced in high places soon becomes fashionable and frequent. The officially exalted ante-

diluvians cast off all restraint, and did what they liked. Nobody controlled them. Actuated by the lusts of the flesh they prostituted their power and position to the worst of purposes, and profaned the sacred relationships which it was their duty to protect. Their scandalous conduct spread wickedness among the people and corrupted public manners. Thus in time vice became the rule and virtue the rare exception.

“The sons of God saw the daughters of Adam that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose.” Two crimes are laid to the charge of the “sons of God.” One is incest. Captivated by the beauty of Adam’s daughters, they violated the law of God and nature and contracted consanguineous marriages. The tense of the verb “saw” employed by the sacred writer implies that these sons of God did not bestow a mere passing glance upon the women, but gazed longingly on their beauty until the spark of passion was fanned into a blazing flame. How great the power of a look! Eve looked, and the expulsion from Eden followed. The “sons of God” looked, and the decree went forth immediately “I will destroy both mankind and beast.” The startling feature of the narrative is the appearance of Adam in the limelight of scandal. The current versions, by their arbitrary and capricious renderings, completely obscure his lurid part in those criminal transactions. “And Jehovah saw that the evil of Adam was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” Adam, like Lot in a later day, lapsed into incest; but whereas Lot committed it in a state of intoxication, no such excuse can be pleaded in extenuation of Adam’s culpability. He committed it with his eyes wide open.

The second sin was polygamy. The “sons of God” “took them wives”—that is, each one took wives, and not merely

one wife. If the writer wished to convey the idea that each "son of God" took a wife of the daughters of Adam, he would have employed the same precise language as in Judges 21:21-23.—"Catch you every man his wife of the daughters of Shiloh." "We reserved not to each man his wife." The idea of polygamy is supported by the next clause—"from all which they chose," that is, consisting of all that they chose. It is evident that they took more than one. The Hebrew *kol* points to a plurality.

When we see that incest and polygamy, with their attendant evils, were the special sins of that age, the magnitude and intensity of corruption is not surprising. When woman's virtue is destroyed, then society's strongest safeguard is demolished, and vice and crime become rampant. Patronized by those in authority, it flows like a mighty torrent through all the strata of society, ever widening and deepening and gaining force and impetus, sweeping away all resistance in its furious rush, until the whole of society wades knee-deep in a cesspool of infamy and all are overwhelmed in the avalanche of destruction. Such was the state of mankind from the early times until the days of Noah. "All flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth." There was no ground to work upon, no fulcrum for any lever to raise them; the cements of community had melted away and the very foundations were broken down. Sodden in sensuality, steeped in vice, they steeled their hearts against God and mocked his prophets, and there was no remedy but to sweep them all away. But we must not fail to take home the lesson that the wreck of the antediluvian civilization was due to the very incestuous marriages which theology asserts were God's own arrangement for the ancestors of the human race.

Orthodox theologians, the supposed custodians of God's

truth and guardians of public morals, teach that incest was the only possible arrangement God could make for the propagation of the human species in the early stages of its history. Hardly a week goes by but some learned "divine", with prefixes and affixes to his name, endeavors to answer the infidel taunt "Where did Cain get his wife?" by asserting that Adam had daughters as well as sons, and that Cain married one of his own sisters. If those who repeat this notion would give the subject a moment's consideration, they would see that the conventional "explanation" is as unfounded as it is immoral. Seth was born after Cain went into the land of Nod (Gen. 4:25), and since it is expressly stated that no daughters were born until Adam became many, Cain could not possibly have married a sister.

It may be said that there was no law at the time prohibiting consanguineous marriages. True, there is none on record, but does this prove that there was none in existence? For example, there was no law forbidding murder, and yet Cain's conduct proves that he knew he had done wrong. If consanguineous marriages had been in order, or if men and women were unaware of their unnaturalness, God would not have pronounced sentence, for "sin is not imputed where there is no law." The fact that sentence was pronounced, that as soon as unnatural marriages were contracted God said "My spirit shall not remain in mankind indefinitely," is sufficient evidence that the fundamental laws governing unchanging human relationships must have been made known in some way. We should not allow ourselves to be misled by theologians. Scripture is not responsible for the errors of theology. It is the tradition of the elders that has imposed belief in the necessity of incestuous marriages in the antediluvian age, and the sooner it gets its deserved

fate, with the commentaries that uphold it, and is relegated to the scrap-heap, the better it will be for the truth and for belief in Scripture.

V. G.

The Mystery of the Resurrection

THE SECOND DEATH

DEATH may be literal or figurative. In the statement "let the dead bury their dead" (Mt. 8:22) it is first used figuratively and then literally. The literal dead could not bury their dead. Neither would our Lord countenance the burial of the figuratively dead. It is important that we determine in each instance whether literal or figurative death is in view.

In deciding this point as to the second death it will help us to note that the phrase "this is the second death" is an *explanation* of what the lake of fire is. We have quite a few such explanations in the book of the Revelation. They are of two kinds, explanations of figures and explanations of literal facts. The important point for us to note is that, in no case, is the *explanation* figurative. The seven stars (Rev. 1:20) are figures; those they represent, the angels or messengers, are literal. So with the lampstands and the churches (Rev. 1:20). The statement "the horns are ten kings" stamps the beast with the horns as a figure and the ten kings as literal. (Rev. 17:12). Likewise, the waters which John saw may not be real water, but the peoples and multitudes and nations are just what these words ordinarily imply. (Rev. 17:15). So with great Babylon. When we read, "the woman which thou sawest is that great *city*" let us rest content with God's explanation and refuse to explain it. (Rev. 17:18). If the messengers and the churches and the kings and the peoples are *literal*, then the city must also be a literal *city* and not some religious system or ecclesiastical power.

By this test, the Divine explanation of the lake of fire must be literal death.

We may not reason backward from this that the lake of fire is figurative, though it undoubtedly is full of significance. When we read of the "fine linen, which is the righteousness of saints" (Rev. 19:8) we may well take the robes as literal, yet at the same time a most apt symbol of the just deeds of those who wear them. A literal statement may be explained as well as a figurative one. But in any case, whether the lake of fire be taken literally or figuratively, the laws of language bar us from making the *explanation* of it aught but a literal fact. In some instances when involved with other figures, as in an allegory (Gal. 4:25), the explanation does not, at first glance, seem literal. But a closer view of even such cases will show that the rule still holds. *Never let us explain God's explanations.*

For the sake of the student who may be interested in further study of figures and their explanation, as well as to guard against possible misapprehension, we will point out an interesting fact, which must always be taken into consideration by the reader of any version. In Greek the verb substantive (*to be* in its various forms, as *am, is, are,* etc.) is very often omitted, especially when it has its usual force. But when it has the special duty of explaining that one thing *represents, or means,* another, *then it cannot be omitted.* The Lamb (Rev. 17:14) *is* Lord of lords and King of kings. No one believes that a literal lamb will occupy this position, but that the figure of a Lamb *represents* the Lord of lords and King of kings. But when we read on that "they that are with Him [are] called and chosen and faithful" we take it literally. He is not followed by certain qualities, such as faithfulness, but by those who have these qualities. The verb is omitted in the Greek. Luther had great difficulty in discriminating the literal from the figurative. Had he noticed this simple fact, that *is* is used only when emphatic or when it has the force of *represents* he would have been

saved much controversy and trial, and would not have forced the statement "This is My body" to mean that the bread was the literal body of our Lord. The same argument could be used to prove that we, too, are all His literal body, for the assembly is His body (Eph. 1:23).

When, however, the verb is *omitted*, the statement is not explanatory but descriptive, even if, as is often the case in the original languages, the descriptive term is a noun, for the sake of emphasis.

On the other hand, the statement that "death and hades were cast into the lake of fire" is purely figurative, for neither death nor hades is of such a nature as to be "cast." Fire would have no effect on them. This figure (metonymy of the subject) is so common that we need only to mention a few instances and everyone will see its force. Death and the unseen are put for their contents, for those in them are judged. So the world is put for those included in it. "God so loved the world"—that is, the people in it. Jn. 3:16; 7:7; 2 Cor. 5:19, etc.). The earth is often put for its inhabitants. (Gen. 6;11, 12, 13; Mt. 5:13, etc.). Death, which includes all who had not been made alive in the former resurrection (Rev. 20:5) as well as the unseen world—all the remaining creatures still out of harmony with God—are cast into the lake of fire.

A consideration of the last class which is to be raised and vivified (1 Cor. 15:23-24) will also lead us to the conclusion that the second death (which is the only death left at the consummation) must be a literal fact.

The Firstfruit of vivification was Christ. His death was a literal, physical fact. The second class, who are made alive at His presence, will also be raised from the dead in the resurrection of life.

Long before this, while they were still alive, they had known both death and resurrection in their figurative meaning. But we who are alive to God now, having been quick-

66 Being "Made Alive" at the Consummation

ened by His Spirit, look forward to a literal vivification—the redemption of our body.

The third class—those who are vivified at the consummation, are previously raised to physical life to stand before the great white throne. It is evident that they must die again before the consummation, in order that they, too, may be included among those whom Christ makes alive. The Firstfruit was raised from literal death; most of those who are His enter death and await His lifegiving call. Does it not follow that the rest of the dead who will be raised at the resurrection of judgment, and are judged according to their deeds, must die again before they can be included in the third class of those who triumph over death? The last enemy is not banished when they are raised for judgment, but more than an eon later, at the consummation.

The last eon differs from all which precede it in some important particulars. The former things have passed by; all things are new; evil has been segregated and consigned to the lake of fire (Rev. 21:8) and *there is no change in character* (Rev. 22:11).

Not only will the unbelievers suffer the loss of eonian life and such a judgment as accords with their deeds, but the earth is cleansed of their presence so that this last and most glorious of all the eons comes nearest of all to perfection. It will be the crowning glory of Christ and may be enjoyed only by those who have, by grace, believed on Him and have the gift of eonian life.

It is well to note, in this connection, that, during the last eon, death is *not* abolished. It is the *last* enemy. Other enemies are "sovereignty and authority." These continue during the last eon, for while there is no *temple* (Rev. 21:22) there is a *throne* (Rev. 22:1) and it is the throne of the Lamb, and the saints reign for the whole eon (Rev. 22:5). Death cannot be abolished until after the reign of the saints has ceased, till the Son has handed over the Kingdom to the

Father. Then the last enemy of all is banished by means of the vivification of all.

That the second death leads to results immeasurably beyond the death which they had previously passed through cannot be gainsaid. Death, for the unbeliever is the portal to judgment. The second death will, at the consummation, usher into life in Christ. Nevertheless, while they are so distinct in their fruitage, the very fact that the lake of fire is defined for us as the second *death*, leads us to the inevitable conclusion that we are to discover its nature from the first death. The second Adam is so called, not because He is so superior to the first Adam, but because of His similarity to Him. Each heads a humanity. In fact, in every case the second thing must be interpreted by the first.

If the second death is death figurative, such as is spoken of in Romans—the regarding of the flesh—the result would be that the raised ungodly would continue to live to man, but be dead to God—a condition which, if undergone in a lake of fire, would be the equivalent of eternal torment reduced to one eon in its extent. The “spiritually” dead, or much better, *figuratively* dead are always represented to us as physically alive. The dead who were to bury their dead and those who are minding, or regarding, the flesh (Rom. 8:6) are all alive so far as this world is concerned. It is only in relation to God that they may be considered as dead at all. Now they suffer this alienation from Him in the midst of many comforts, oblivious to the loss which their condition involves. To transport such into a lake of fire (either figurative or literal) would be the most terrible fate which they could meet. One consideration forbids this. They are raised from the dead in the resurrection of *judgment* (not of *life*), hence *they are already figuratively dead*. If the lake of fire simply causes figurative death (a condition of alienation from God) then it really has no effect on them whatever. Instead of providing for ultimate reconciliation, it would only confirm them in their estrangement from God.

68 Salvation is Based on the Work of Christ

Sin's natural result is death. This is true of saint and sinner alike. For the present, until the presence of Christ, there is no difference between saint and sinner in this respect. But it is especially true of those who take part in the first resurrection, that over them the *second* death has no jurisdiction. Why? Because they are Christ's, and His blood fends them from all God's judgment.

The phrase "second death" occurs but once again. It is presented as a dreadful ordeal and one to be shunned. The overcomer in Smyrna is exhorted to be faithful unto death and is comforted with the assurance that he will not be *hurt or injured* by the second death.

During this life suffering and death come to all in most unexpected and unequal ways. Even among the ungodly the worst criminals are spoiled and petted and lead a life of ease and die a painless death, while some bear patiently all their days with poverty and disease,—harming no one by their deeds, and yet they drag out a miserable existence till death seems to end all. Is this right? Is this just? Not at all. And it is for the rectification of all this unequal and unjust distribution of the ravages of sin, that the ungodly are summoned before the bar at the great white throne, to be judged *in harmony with their deeds*. God's justice will then be vindicated and the path prepared for their reconciliation at the consummation.

Let no one complain that the details of this last great assize are not fully made known to us. We have no personal interest in it and we may rest content that even in the case of those who are not conciliated to our God through the death of His Son, the Judge of all the earth *will do right*.

Yes, He will do much more than what is right. He will use the evil which overtakes them, just as He has always used it, for their own ultimate welfare and His own glory. His purpose is ever the same; only His *method* varies. He adjusts the means to the individual requirements of each case.

With unbelievers, who may not share in eonian life, He does not deal on the principle of *faith*, but *sight*. He ushers them into His presence and pays them the wages which are their due—death for the eons. After such a righting of wrongs, a sweeping away of all false and deceptive illusions, the road to reconciliation is very short. Faith is not needed as now for He no longer hides Himself. Only life is needed, and this He gives them at the consummation.

Why, we are asked, is this death accomplished by means of *fire*? God uses various agencies to attain His ends, but there is always an aptitude and fitness in the instruments He employs. In Noah's days He cleansed away the abounding sin by means of *water*. And was not water a purifier well suited to the task? And if, in preparation for the last eon, He once more wishes to dispose of evil, what more effective agent can be found than fire? Water may wash off outward, physical filth: fire is a chemical agent and enters into the inmost substance. It is the most searching purifier known. The flood did not purify its victims, but the earth on which they lived; neither does the lake of fire purify those who enter it, but the universe of which they form a part. It is no purgatory. All the salvation and blessing which will eventually come to those who emerge from it when the last enemy vanishes will be due to the virtue and power of the death of Christ.

It alone, unaided and unencumbered by aught that they may suffer or sustain, is amply sufficient to cleanse and purify and to insure the life which Love has purposed shall be theirs when the eons shall have brought their harvest to His feet.

A. E. K.

The Unsearchable Judgments of Our God

CORRECTION

(Lamentations 4)

THE first two laments were specially concerned with Divine anger in its bearing on the political and religious status of the people of Judah. The opening section of the third lament carried the subject to its farthest limit and viewed Divine antagonism at its highest. When the zenith of wrath was reached, the lament took a sudden turn and hope came into view. Thus the central lament is the converging point of seemingly irreconcilable opposites. Here wrath and hope meet and melt in the warmth of Divine Goodness. We see the extremes: but it is not possible to say just where the severity of judgment and the glory of grace divide; so strange and splendid is the merging. Just as the opening section of the third lament continued and carried to a climax the sombre topic of the preceding laments, so the two last laments take up and develop the brighter theme of hope introduced in the central section of the third lament.

The two closing laments are further linked together by a common situation. Adversity in its most aggravating forms fills the scene as far as eye can see. But while identity of theme and setting binds both laments each emphasizes a distinct aspect of the subject. The fourth shows the effect of circumstances on hope. Changes for better or worse in external conditions result in a corresponding reviving or dimming of hope. The fifth presents the triumph of hope—its dominion over unfavorable surroundings.

A distinctive feature of the fourth lament is the delicate balancing of its ideas and phrases. The opening section of it, from the beginning to the twelfth verse, contains a pair of companion pictures portraying the plight of the people of Judah subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem—the first from verse one to verse six, the second from verse seven to verse thirteen.

A characteristic of these twin passages is a massing of similes to emphasize the tremendous contrast between the former condition of the people and their present wretchedness. The pathos of the situation is heightened by the force of contrasts. The two descriptions follow similar lines, with sufficient variation of idea and figure to render them supplementary. Both passages open by describing the violent change of circumstances in the condition of the privileged classes—one of the nobles (*vv.* 1-2), the other of the Nazarites (*vv.* 7-8). Their humiliation is intensified by contrasting their fate with the splendor of their estate prior to the fall of the city. Next the prophet describes the still more degraded and miserable condition of the masses. In the one instance the whole aspect of the lives and fortunes of the people is compared to the lair of the fierce scavengers of the wilderness (*v.* 3); in the other to a battlefield where a cause has been fought and lost, so that those slain in the heat of battle are to be counted happier than the survivors left to eke out a miserable existence. Both passages make special reference to the fate of the children—the first points to their starvation (*vv.* 4-5), the second tells of the violent reversal of the maternal instinct under the maddening influence of famine (*v.* 10). Both passages trace the calamities back to the ill-doings of the people.

The writer concludes the first picture of the dreadful desolation with the startling declaration that the iniquity

of the daughter (that is, the city) of his people is greater than the sin of Sodom (*v.* 6). The comparison is not new. In an earlier day Isaiah declared that, but for a loyal few, Jerusalem had become like unto Sodom (*Isa.* 1:9). The overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah stands out in the prophets as the exceptional visitation of proverbial wickedness. But now Jerusalem has smashed all records and holds first place in the annals of doom. Even heathen Sodom has been outdone in the headlong course of the holy city. Two features are singled out as constituting Jerusalem's pre-eminence in misery. The destruction of Sodom was instantaneous, and it came directly from the hand of God; but Jerusalem is abandoned to a long, lingering agony; and her punishment is meted out through the cruel heathen—a calamity which David judged to be worse than falling into the hands of God.

At the close of the second graphic portrayal of Jerusalem's desolation, the writer reiterates the idea of antecedent laments and attributes the misfortunes which have come upon his people to the anger of God (*v.* 11). The awful fate of Jerusalem indicates a fierceness of Divine wrath—a protest of righteous indignation, an outburst of retributive justice which is not satisfied until the very foundations of Zion had been demolished. As Judah declined and profession of God became largely a matter of form, there grew up a superstitious belief in the inviolability of the temple. Jeremiah strove to break the spell of this popular delusion. "Trust ye not in lying words, saying, The temple of Jehovah, the temple of Jehovah, the temple of Jehovah are these I will do unto this house which is called by my name, wherein ye trust, and unto the place which I gave to you and to your fathers, as I did to Shiloh" (*Jer.* 7:4, 14). His efforts were unavailing. The super-

stition held sway over the deluded people until the downfall of the city advertised to all eyes its vanity.

The prophet shows that the effects of the shock were felt beyond the Jewish pale. We see the kings of the earth amazed at the fall of Jerusalem (*v.* 12). In former days God's arm had been laid bare, and Jerusalem saved without a blow, when the destroying angel thinned the ranks of Sennacherib's army. So profoundly did the event impress the nations, that many brought gifts unto Jehovah to Jerusalem (2 Chr. 32:28). Was not such a city impregnable? But now the incredible has happened. Jerusalem has fallen. The news of the disaster sends a shock through foreign courts. How huge a calamity must that be the mere echo of which spreads consternation in remote countries!

The following verses reiterate the idea that the miseries of the people are the direct consequence of their sins. There had been an earlier and much greater spiritual collapse. Long before the Chaldeans appeared at her gates the city had succumbed to a subtle foe nursed within her own walls. It had fallen a prey to faithlessness. Disguised for a time, the latent canker of an unsteadfast spirit was certain to break out sometime; and when it broke out it was met with a measure of indignation proportionate to the previous formal and false profession. The shame and sorrow of Jerusalem's doom lie just in this fact, that it was a foul degradation of Jehovah's friendship.

The crimes of priests and prophets were at the root of all the troubles that had fallen upon the Jews. Their duplicity was the prime cause of the calamities that accompanied the siege and sack of the city by the Chaldeans. Then, as always, the cause of truth suffered more from the hypocrisy and conceit of some of its avowed champions than from the attacks of all the host of pronounced foes.

The sham professions of priests and prophets had been the chief provocative of practical scepticism.

The Revised Version throws a false color over the quatripart of verses 13-16. The interpolated "it is" makes verse 13 an extension of the preceding, and refers the triplet of verses that follow to the reversal of the external fortunes of the priests subsequent to the fall of the city. This involves the passage in inconsistency. The italics represent nothing more than the private opinion of the translators and are not entitled to consideration. The fact is, verses 13-16 constitute a separate paragraph. The writer has been describing the desolation of the city and the sufferings of its citizens. Now he proceeds to point out the cause responsible for the terrible situation. Verse 13 lays the blame for the fall of Jerusalem at the door of her priests and prophets. Verse fourteen details the sufferings which the misconduct of the priests brought upon the people.

Because of the sins of her prophets, and the iniquities of her
priests,
That have shed the blood of the just in the midst of her,
They (the people) wander as blind men in the streets, they are
polluted with blood,
So that men cannot touch their garments.

The priests were criminals. In the promotion of their nefarious schemes they made use of the people, rendering them partakers in blood guiltiness. Thus the priests, whose function was to cover the sins of the people, actually burdened them with a weight of transgression which implored the vengeance of heaven. The two remaining verses are concerned with the heathen—verse fifteen and the first line of the sixteenth record their taunts, the second line of the sixteenth their conduct toward the Jews.

In the opinion of the nations the withdrawal of the Divine mercy from Israel was irrevocable and final. To them the

exercise of anger precluded the possibility of eventual restoration and denied the very idea of hope.

The face of Jehovah hath scattered them; He will no more regard them.

They saw only the surface view of the event, and accordingly drew one-sided conclusions. The misunderstanding of God's acts by the heathen is directly chargeable to the Jews. It was the natural result of the perversions of truth entertained by the Jews themselves. These perversions arose from a vicious interpretation. The very Scripture declaring Jehovah's choice of Jerusalem made its security contingent on the fidelity of David's descendants, predicting, in case of defection, the very disaster which the Lamentations bewail. (2 Ki. 9:2-7). But the Jewish theologians (and they have many modern imitators) eagerly emphasized the blessings and totally ignored the qualifying provisos. They took as much of Scripture as pleased their fancy and left the rest out. Such deceitful handling of Scripture engendered and fostered a superstitious belief in the inviolability of the temple. The superstition became an article of faith, and was regarded by the nations as an essential tenet of Judaism. Truth reached the heathen in the distorted form of religious tradition, and we cannot expect them to draw fine distinctions. Men will not pause to distinguish between truth and its interpretations; they will draw rough and ready conclusions from the crude current beliefs that pass for truth. If we bear in mind the Jewish notion of the impregnability of their metropolis, we are not surprised that the heathen should have looked upon the collapse of Jerusalem as the defeat of Israel's God.

After-events demonstrated that Israel's fall was neither final nor hopeless. The subsequent restoration of the Jews

proved that the fires which consumed Jerusalem were purgatorial. Since then they experienced another fall when their city and temple were demolished by the Romans. We are assured, however, that their fall is only temporary (Rom. 11:25). This fact must profoundly affect our views of judgment. It would be sheer folly to minimize the awfulness of God's anger. If God is angry at all His anger can be no light thing; for no act of His is feeble or ineffectual. But the intensity and fierceness of His wrath against sin should not blind us to the kindness of its motive or the benevolence of its aim. The exercise of God's severity does not exclude the possibility of mercy, but rather prepares the way for its reception and appreciation.

We have seen, thus far, the effects of judgment on things temporal. We are now to see its spiritual results. The quatrain of verses 17-20 touches on brighter ideas. There appears a faint sign of a healthy awakening. In sharp contrast to the rest of the lament, which is written in the third person singular, this section is composed in the first person plural. The pronoun "we" comes in for the most natural reason--viz., because the writer introduces the captives speaking as a concrete multitude.

To appreciate more thoroughly the beautiful sentiment of this passage we will recall the historic situation and the general teaching of the law. Moses commanded the people not to return to Egypt. In his farewell speech, foreseeing the establishment of the monarchy, the king is enjoined not to return the people hither (Deut. 17:16). Conforming with the law, the prophets repeated warned the Jews against an alliance with Egypt. In his day Isaiah had vigorously denounced the partisans of an Egyptian alliance as "rebellious children" (Isa. 30:1). Jeremiah, at the time immediately preceding the disaster lamented in our book,

predicted the failure of the Egyptian alliance. "Behold, Pharaoh's army, which is come forth to help you, shall return to Egypt into their own land, and the Chaldeans shall come again, and fight against this city; and they shall take it, and burn it with fire" (Jer. 37:3-8). Time proved his advice to be sound and his prediction correct. But his message fell on heedless ears. People who will not turn to Him Who is the one true refuge from all danger and trouble are tempted to substitute a variety of vain hopes. The Jews' confidence in Egypt—"a nation that could not save"—became too fanatical to be amenable to reason. It required a rude shock to prove it to be a frail bubble.

The opening utterance of the confession calls for careful consideration.

Our eyes do yet fail us in vainly watching for help;
In our watching we have watched for a nation that could
not save.

The first line describes the people in a state of expectancy. The adverb "yet" indicates, first, that some time has elapsed since the fall of the city; second, that the captives did not give up hope, but continued to look for help. The current versions by associating the word "vain" with "help" mar the force and beauty of the passage. A sense more in harmony with surrounding thoughts and the general drift of the book is obtained by following the Septuagint, which connects "vain" with the verb "watch," omitted by ellipsis and supplied by the succeeding line—*we vainly watch, or watch in vain*. There is a tinge of disappointment in the words; but it is the disappointment of hope deferred, not of disillusionment. The weary watchers have been waiting for God's help, but so far their waiting has been fruitless; no relief has come; their expectation has failed to materialize.

The second line is retrospective. It looks back. It acknowledges the vanity of the hope formerly entertained. The two lines are antithetic: one breathes the sigh of a heart suffering the pangs of hope deferred, the other reflects the decay of dead hopes.

We gather from the context that both the real and false faith of the captives were resting on the same foundation. Both founded themselves on the Davidic covenant. The difference between the real and the false was the difference between the hope of Israel as set forth in Scripture and as interpreted by man. The Jewish theologians disregarded the clauses in the Davidic promise relative to chastisement, and were thus blinded to the fact that the safety of the city consisted in submission to God. They boldly claimed the Divine favor while placidly ignoring the Divine will. Thus belief in the destiny of the city, fostered by a bastard form of religion, became practically a fetich.

When the logic of events exploded the long-established superstition, the disillusionment fell upon the people with all the shock of a thunderbolt; and when it came they were thrown into a state of desperation proportionate to their previous confidence. We have an expression of their frame of mind in the midst of the disaster. "Our end is near, our days are fulfilled; our end is come." It is emphatically one of despair verging on madness. But God's will is to correct, not to overwhelm us. His ways are delicately adjusted to both His aim and our needs. A healing virtue inheres in His severest blows. The fall of Jerusalem could not fail to suggest that the grandeur which could be so easily turned to ashes must have been somewhat tawdry at least. God is educating us through illusions. Through disappointment hope is purged and elevated by the discovery of the vanity of its pursuits. The very experience

of disappointment is a ground of fresh hope. The discovery that we have been misled by a mirage while seeking an oasis makes the longing for it the more deep and real. Thus the captives were led to look through the collapse of their hopes on to the One Who is in truth the Hope of Israel.

By the touching confession of the sobered captives the fourth lament adds its contribution to the doctrine of judgment: *Judgment is the purifying and educating office of grace.* In carrying out this process of purging and education God uses everything good, evil, bright, dark, joyous, painful, that enters human life in the natural course of events. Through every hardship that develops from disobedience He throws into our minds some suggestion of patience, wisdom, self-control; through every pang of suffering He broadens our sympathies and affections; through the most trying and humiliating experiences He still reaches us with His influence, till His wandering people, neither seduced by life's pleasure nor vanquished by life's woe, with melted hearts and tear-dimmed eyes look up to Him and say "all our springs are in thee."

The confession in verses 17-20 has shown the purging and educating effect of judgment on the nation. It has renounced the hidden things of darkness; it has recanted vain hopes; it has ceased from man. Its spirit is chaste and humble. It lacks one thing—the assurance of the ultimate triumph of goodness to steady the spirit and nerve it for the race. This want is supplied by the proclamation that the iniquity of the daughter of Zion is to be finished (vv. 21-22).

It is remarkable that the advent of Israel's deliverance is set in contrast to the fate of Edom. This singular fact cannot be accounted for on the ground of racial prejudice

between the two nations. The reason for their linking is a psychological necessity. If hope is to be effective it must rest on the bedrock of Divine supremacy. A hope held out by a deity balked in his achievements by his own creatures cannot inspire confidence. An alien nation is introduced to show that the supremacy of God over the heathen is quite as effective as His supremacy over Israel. Edom—her most annoying tormentor—is singled out to enforce the fact that the deadliest enemy is under His control. We must also observe that iniquity is ascribed to Israel in the identical terms that are applied to foreign nations. Jehovah is not a mere tribal divinity like the Philistine Dagon; and the Jews are not so much His favorites that the treatment of their sin is essentially different from that accorded to their neighbors.

The announcement of the end of Israel's sin occurs in the middle of the passage describing the coming doom of Edom. The language is striking.

Thine iniquity is accomplished, O daughter of Zion;
He will no more remove thee.

The phrase "punishment of" at the beginning of verse twenty-two is a translators' interpolation and should be expunged. It simply means "iniquity," and is so rendered further down in the verse, where it occurs again, and where the parallel word "sins" settles its meaning. The word "accomplished," literally *finished*, is the same used in chapter 2:17 of the fulfillment of God's decree. The two lines reveal the intimate connection between sin and judgment. Judgment has in view the reformation of the corrupt nation, and when its end shall have been accomplished it will be removed.

V. G.

THE CALL TO CHINA

BEING, under God, the founder of a Mission in China which teaches universal reconciliation, and having been most kindly invited by the editors of *UNSEARCHABLE RICHES* to publish a brief account of our work from time to time, it has occurred to me that I might first briefly touch on the steps which led me to missionary service, the way in which I was led to embrace the truth of final reconciliation, and then go on to describe our *Tsehchowfu Mission* by giving an account of the work, and of individual conversions.

I received the gift of eternal life by faith at a meeting led by D. L. Moody in the Agricultural Hall, Islington, London, in 1875. The Scripture which led me to decide in the after meeting was Ro. 6:23. I was then 14 years old.

In 1879 I went to Cambridge University, and during the three years there, was enabled, by God's grace, to take a stand for Christ. The last year, as stroke of the Cambridge University boat in the annual race between Oxford and Cambridge, I was enabled to hold special evangelistic meetings among the undergraduates, which were attended largely by boating men.

In my second year at Cambridge my heart became specially interested in foreign missionary work, so much so that I wrote, asking my father if I might go out at once to the foreign field. He replied that he would sooner I first finished my course at Cambridge.

Just after that time the Lord brought to me powerfully this Scripture, "Thou art not sent unto a people of a strange speech and of an hard language, but to the house of Israel" (Ezek. 3:5), and this seemed to confirm my father's wishes. In 1882, having taken my degree, I took up the profession of a schoolmaster.

Just about that time the truths of Consecration and Holiness were receiving very special attention in England. The cry of "*All for Jesus*" attracted my heart, and I was led into deep spiritual blessing, and the filling of the Holy Spirit for service. Doors opened on all hands for taking meetings, and the Lord gave manifest fruit. Meanwhile my interest in foreign Missions kept deepening, and I found myself burdened with the need of the heathen, and *longing* to go to them, but I was restrained by the Scripture mentioned above, and, moreover, that Scripture was at that time being constantly fulfilled, through God enabling me to lead young Christians of my own age into a greater fulness of the Divine life. The state of my mind, however, was as an arrow placed on the thong of a bent bow only waiting to be released.

In the early morning of November 30, 1883, the release came through the only Scripture which could meet my case (Isa. 49:6), "It is too light a thing that thou shouldst be My servant . . . to restore the preserved of Israel; I will *also* give thee for a light to the Gentiles that thou mayest be My salvation to the ends of the earth."

I went to breakfast and said to my hostess with a full heart, "Praise God, He has let me go to China"—for it was on China that my heart was set.

STANLEY P. SMITH.

(To be continued)

The Mystery of Babylon

II.

HIS JEALOUSY

“For love is as strong as death,
Jealously is cruel as the grave;
The coals thereof are coals of fire,
A flame of Jah.”—(Song of Songs, 8:6b)

“For jealousy is the rage of a strong man;
Therefore he will not spare in the day of
vengeance.
He will not regard any ransom:
Neither will he rest content, though thou
givest many gifts.” (Prov. 6:34-35)

FIERCEST of all burning passions is jealousy. You can bear to have your child cherished by a stranger; or even to have your son receive the bounty of another; but your *wife*—*that* is another matter.

The wife must be single towards her husband and the husband towards the wife. The invisible fetters of this great moral decree bind not only man but embrace some of the lower creatures as well. Blessings it brings to all who obey it; but for those who disobey it is a raging ravenous flame. The glory of God demands this for it reveals to us the knowledge of His ways and the jealousy which fires His heart for the people of His love.

Even while her soul is yet satiated with His gifts, her heart turns from Him. Instead of leaning on His arm, she takes the arm of Egypt; instead of calling upon Him in the moment of danger, she asks Assyria's aid. As a foolish woman she goes about to seek the favor of the nations round about and barter the very ornaments He had given her to win them to her.

"And I will judge thee as women who break wedlock and shed blood are judged and I will judge thee in fury and jealousy." (Ezekiel 16:38.)

The ten tribes are especially guilty in this matter.

And so He turned against her the lovers she sought after. They laid her desolate and bare so that she became a by-word and a hissing. All her delights with which she tempted her lovers were stripped off. The garments of shame and infamy now took the place of the bright linen and the silk. Her crown was baldness and her girdle weakness. Sad was her state indeed, but only thus could the fierceness of His jealousy be appeased.

"So will I make my fury towards thee to rest, and my jealousy shall depart from thee and I will be quiet and be no more angry." (Ezek. 16:42.)

When, in her desolation, her hard heart still hungered for her lovers, and she said, "I will go after my lovers, that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink," then said He, "Behold, I will hedge up thy way with thorns, and make a wall that she shall not find her paths. And she shall follow after her lovers, but she shall not overtake them, and she shall seek them, but shall not find them." Then shall she say, "I will go and return to my first husband. For then it was better with me than now. For she did not know that I gave her corn and wine and oil, and multiplied her silver and gold, while they prepared for Baal. Therefore will I return, and take away My corn in the time thereof. And My wine in the season thereof. And will recover My wool and My flax given to cover her nakedness. And now will I discover her lewdness in the sight of her lovers and none shall deliver her out of Mine hand. I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her appointed seasons. And I will destroy her vines and her fig trees, whereof she hath said, *These* are my rewards

that my lovers have given me:’ and I will make them a forest, and the beasts of the field shall eat them. And I will visit on her the days of Baalim, wherein she burned incense to them, and she decked herself with her earrings and her jewels and she went after her lovers and forgot Me, saith the Lord.”

“When a man hath taken a wife and married her and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some uncleanness in her; then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house” (Deut. 24:1.)

“And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel committed adultery I had put her away, and given her a bill of divorce, yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not; * *” (Jer. 3:8).

How solemn is the thought that God has chosen so to figure forth His mind concerning those who forsake Him, the fountainhead of every pleasure, the source of all delight, and turn to others for the satisfaction He alone can give! Among men this is no sin at all; among His holy ones it is esteemed a trifle; but by Him, in fiery jealousy, the crime of crimes; the apex of the pyramid of sin. How graciously has He preserved (though in these last days this is failing, too) the sense that bids men speak in whispers of such shameful deeds; that brands the participant with the mark indelible, so that they need not as lepers cry “unclean,” for they are shunned by all who have a spark of moral virtue left. And still, as in our Lord’s day, when they accused the woman of such heinous crime, indeed, in the very act, He could reproach them and retort, “He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone.” Like the poor woman, Israel, in the presence of her God, was guilty of the deed they so condemned in her. But worse by far, they never dreamed that they, moral, upright and refined, were subject to so severe a charge.

III.

THE TEN TRIBES

Then said the Lord unto me, "Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, according to the love of the Lord toward the children of Israel, who look to other gods and love flagons of wine."

So I bought her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for a homer of barley, and a half homer of barley; and I said unto her, "*Thou shalt not play the harlot, and thou shalt not be for another man: so will I also be for thee.*"

For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod and without teraphim:

Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days. (Hosea 3.)

"THE lost ten tribes" (as man misnames them) have not strayed out of Jehovah's sight. They are not a kingdom, for they have neither king nor prince. All the rites by which they worshipped Jehovah are departed from them. But in it all He keeps her for Himself. None other can touch her. They went astray even when they shared His house and bounty. But now that they are sent away His divine power is engaged to keep her free from other gods.

And He has engaged Himself to wait for her! How wonderful is this, that while He keeps her for Himself, He should keep Himself for her! He has pledged His word. None other can take the place of Israel in His affections. (Hosea 3:3.)

It is not for mortal man to defend Jehovah's honor. Some there are who say He has not kept His word to her. Some say He has taken to Himself a stranger of the nations. It is not for us to listen to such tales or hearken to the word that breathes of broken vows and joins His name therewith.

He has promised her and shall He not fulfill it? She will fulfill her part because He willed it so. Does He lack power to fulfill His own pledge to her?

Does it fall on us to defend the honor of Jehovah? Solemn and deep indeed must be the darkness when His word, His faithfulness, His promises are neglected, and ignored, and denied.

By His power He has kept His people Israel, in all their iniquity and hardness of heart, from that sin of sins—they have not chosen them another God. They never promised this. They could not have kept it if they had. He compels them by His power and keeps them for Himself. But He has promised.

Has He been unfaithful? (May He forgive the thought!)

Has He not cast away His people? By no means. They shall abide thus "many days" but not forever.

Have not the nations displaced them?

Not at all.

Every blessing that He promised them He will yet fulfill; not in spirit only, not in part; not according to the measure of men's minds, but in spirit and letter according to the fulness of His heart. Nothing shall fail of all His goodness and His grace and all the blessings with which He has engaged to bless them. The gifts and callings of God are without repentance.

Their blessing was national, and in days to come all Israel shall be saved.

The blessing which has come upon the nations, is entirely different in *character*, in *scope*, in *destiny*.

In Israel there will be blessings in the earth in earthly store of feasting and fatness and every delight of the soul.

The nations' blessings are spiritual and invisible except to faith.

Israel's place will be the head of all the nations. They will govern all the earth.

Those among the nations who believe are subject to the powers that be.

The blessing on one is in the earth in their souls.

The other is in the heavenly spheres by the spirit.

And so, as God's blessing of the nations in no way interferes, or displaces or destroys or dims the blessing of His earthly people, His faithfulness (which is more than all) is not in question.

Israel is presented to us as a woman who, by covenant becomes, in figure, "one flesh" with Him—the closest earthly bond.

But in the heavenly sphere there is no woman now, but there is a man: and we are members of His body.

The Son of Nebat caused Israel to sin. He forsook the law of the Lord and all Israel with him. Jerusalem was despised and Samaria became their capital. Idolatry reigned on every side. "So the king of Assyria did carry away Israel unto Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes; 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 or do them" (II Kings 18:11-12).

Thus was Israel divorced and sent away.

The ten tribes become "Lo-ruhamah"—for His mercy forsakes her. They become "Lo-Ammi" for He refuses to be their God any longer.

"For she is *not* my wife
Neither am I her husband." (Hos. 2:2.)

IV.

THE PROMISE OF RECEPTION

"They say, If a man put away his wife, and she go from him and become another man's, shall he return to her again? * * * Yet return again to me, saith the Lord." (Jer. 3:1.)
See Deut. 24:1-4.

In days of old, He pleaded with her in His love. His mercy overflowed His just and holy law, which cut them off. But she would not listen to His entreaties. The law is holy and just and good. Under it they never can be His again. They had joined themselves to other gods; and, as a divorced woman, having become another's wife, could not again become the wife of her first husband, so they also, under the law, could not be His again. So long as law reigns this must be so. But God is higher than the law He gave. He is more than holy, more than just, more than good. God is gracious. And who will set the boundaries of grace?

The husband is head of the wife—he is her lord. Ever since the Eden transgression the daughters of Eve must be subject. But where love reigns—where the husband heeds the charge that bids him love his wife—the stern decree is far from galling; and though it lie hidden in the heart it never need reveal itself in word or look. Happy are those who, knowing Him who so has ordered it, bow not as slaves, but with the pleasant cheerfulness of God's elect.

In the days of her first love, when Egypt hardly had passed from her sight, then He gave forth His law. The authority which He then exercised was fitly shown by the name He took—Baali—He was their Lord. But when He

once again restores them to Himself, the law will be implanted in their hearts and impel a willing obedience; love will take the throne and reign—she will no longer call Him Baali then but by the dearer name—Ishi—husband.

But yet again He will invite her to Himself.

“Turn, O back-sliding children, saith the Lord,
for I am married unto you;
And I will take you one of a city, and two of
a family and I will bring you to Zion:
And I will give you pastors according to mine
heart,
Which shall feed you with knowledge and un-
derstanding.
And it shall come to pass, when ye be multi-
plied and increased in the land,
In those days, saith the Lord, they shall say
no more,
“The ark of the covenant of the Lord:”
Neither shall it come to mind:
Neither shall they remember it;
Neither shall they visit it;
Neither shall that be done any more.”

(Jer. 3:14-16.)

While the ten tribes were Lo-ammi, Judah obtained mercy.

“Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ‘Ye are not my people,’ there it shall be said unto them, ‘Ye are the sons of the living God’” (Hosea 1:10).

And when He came in the days of His flesh, He spake of “other sheep which were not of this fold.” And as the chief shepherd, He appoints Peter to feed them. In Peter’s pastoral epistle he writes of them, “Which in time past were not a people, but are now the ‘people of God’ which ‘had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.’” I Pet. 2:10.)

V.

JUDAH

THE haughty Assyrian did not know that God had given Israel into his hand, but magnified himself against the God of Israel. So he sent a message to Hezekiah, king of Judah, saying, "Let not thy God in whom thou trustest deceive thee, saying 'Jerusalem shall not be delivered into the hand of the king of Assyria.'" (II Kings 19:10.) But Jehovah answered, "Because thy rage against Me and thy arrogance is come up into Mine ears, Therefore I will put My hook in thy nose, and My bridle in thy lips, And I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest (II Kings 19:28). And again, "For I will be a shield to this city, to save it for Mine own sake, and for My servant David's sake." (II Kings 19:34.) "And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians a hundred fourscore and five thousand; and when Israel arose early in the morning behold, they were all corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt in Nineveh." (II Kings 19:36, 37.)

For when Jehovah would no more have mercy on Israel He had said, "But I will have mercy upon the house of Judah, and will save them by the Lord their God, and will not save them by bow, nor by sword, nor by battle, nor by horse, nor by horsemen." (Hosea 1:7.)

And was Judah better than Israel, that He should reward her thus?

When His judgment upon Israel was still in Judah's

eyes, His complaint was heard: "And yet for all this her treacherous sister Judah hath not turned unto Me with her whole heart, but feignedly, saith the Lord. And the Lord said unto me, Backsliding Israel hath justified her soul more than treacherous Judah" (Jer. 3:10-11).

Though thou clothest thyself with crimson,
 Though thou deckest thee with ornaments of
 gold,
 Though thou circlest thy eyes with painting,
 In vain shalt thou make thyself fair;
 Thy lovers will despise thee, they will seek thy
 soul. (Jer. 4:30.)

Our own hearts would suggest that Judah was suffered to remain in His house because of some virtue, or some righteousness of her own; so that she did not deserve the severe judgment of Israel. Not so. Judah became worse than Israel. Nevertheless He did not cast her off. The punishment of the seventy years captivity brought a little reviving for a time. But before the days of the prophets ended, we see her again lower than ever, her heart far from Him, though striving to keep up the outward form.

All the charges brought against her she denied.

"I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say 'Wherein hast thou loved us?'" (Malachi 1:2.)

For the Lord the God of Israel saith that he hateth putting away (Malachi 2:16).

Nothing remained but to try her according to the law of jealousy.

VI.

THE LAW OF JEALOUSY

* * "Then shall the man bring his wife unto the priest * * And the priest shall bring her near and set her before the Lord: And the priest shall take holy water in an earthen vessel and of the dust that is in the floor of the tabernacle the priest shall take, and put it into the water: * * * And he shall cause the woman to drink the bitter water * * * (See Num. 5:14-24.)

JEHOVAH came down and dwelt amongst them in human guise. So far was their heart from Him that they did not even recognize Him. So cold were their hard hearts that they distrusted Him. Far from seeing their hearts' desire in Him, they went elsewhere to gather the blessings He would have her enjoy only as His bounty. This it was that stirred the fire of jealousy.

"He that believeth on Me," said He, "out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." (Jno. 7:38.) The precious outflowing spirit was His gift to all who received His word. But alas! of those who heard how few believed! So He went to the mount of Olives only to return at early dawn and teach in the temple. Then came the Scribes and Pharisees, in all their unbelieving pride and haughty arrogance. They could not disperse the spirit that He gave with all its precious refreshment. Filled with hatred and envy and variance, they hasten their own judgment by bringing before Him a woman whose guilt was open and discovered in the sight of all. They bring her to Him hoping to prove that His gracious blessing was contrary to the law of Jehovah—which they called Moses' law. And then the Lord, conscious of the true and inner state of those He dealt with and His own divinity proceeds with an action which was most significant. He stoops and writes in the earth with his fingers, yet answers not a word.

But let us ask, what is the condition of the nation at this time? Were they not blind to their own guilt? Did they not deny it? So the Lord, in His great jealousy, deals with them here as He taught them by His servant Moses in the law. He causes them to drink the bitter water of jealousy and so discover to their own selves that in the sight of God—in Whose presence they now stood—their guilt far exceeded that of this woman. By their denial of their departure from Him, and His jealousy for them they made necessary the ordinance He gave to them of old.

As there the priest mingled the cursed earth from the presence of God with living water, so He, too, stoops and, interrupting the living stream which had been flowing from Him, mingles His words—the words of God—with the cursed earth. Sin is not only blind but mad. And so they urge Him. Shall not the law be fulfilled? Since they insist He deals it to them. Again He stoops and writes.

But they will not understand and so He gives into their hands the bitter water, "Let him that is without sin amongst you cast the first stone." How it causes their belly to swell and their thigh to rot! The pains of an accusing conscience drove them away condemned. But the woman, confessedly guilty in the natural sphere, receives His blessed word in its purity. Not the bitter water, but the unmingled stream of grace and love. "Neither do I condemn thee—go, and sin no more." Her accusers are condemned, but she, though guilty, is at once forgiven.

Again and again he likens them to a wicked and adulterous generation. (Matt 12:39, 16:4; Mark 8:38.) Not only wicked, but guilty of that crime which only those in the marriage bond may commit. (Rom. 7:3.) Indeed, to Him it meant far more to lose her love than to witness their wickedness.

The woman who drank the bitter water of jealousy and was guilty became a curse among her people. So now Judah finds herself a curse and a byword among the nations.

EDITORIAL

WE live in days of abounding formalism and waning faith. The "perilous times" of which the apostle warned his child in the faith are upon us (2 Tim. 3:1-5). The general tendency to worldliness is too plain to need any proof. Worldly aims govern more than the Scriptures. Social amusements and entertainments usurp the place of prayer; witty, entertaining "sermonettes" on light subjects and current events have replaced the teaching of God's word. The church's reputation with men is thought of greater consequence than its standing before God. The church has been sidetracked. Instead of giving its full time and energy to the ministry of the word of God, it has devoted itself to the pursuit of purely worldly and commercial enterprises. Needing money to gratify its luxurious tastes and prosecute its ambitious schemes, the church courts the patronage of the rich and fashionable; and, absorbing worldly principles and concupiscences, is characterized by form without power.

The outlook for the world is fearfully gloomy. Everything seems to be ready for the final outburst of the devil—everywhere all over the world devilish agitations are simmering, the earth itself begins to tremble and smoke, with earthquakes and volcanoes. The signs are multiplying so plainly that one marvels at the stupidity of the professing church not being awake to the nearness of the great hour. All the toilers and workers are ready to strike work—all the luxurious and rich are racing madly about the world after phantoms and shadows and the miserable pleasures of sense. Everything trumpets into our ears that the conclusion of the age is upon us, and yet the professing church sleeps on and on, and will not be warned nor turned to proclaim the Saviour's return.

And as the signs of the approaching end of the age are multiplying, the "blessed hope" of His coming, both in its relation to His Body and to Israel, should engage our minds.

The hope of the Church which is His body is stated in Philippians 3:20-21, "For our citizenship is in heaven; whence also we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself." 1 Thess. 4:15-17 and 1 Cor. 15:51-52 show how this hope will be fulfilled and His Body delivered from coming tribulation.

Such as live in the pure atmosphere of this hope are least affected by the changing temperature of these present times. There is an evenness about them which speaks of heaven. There is no more potent influence for detaching the children of God from present things than prospects of glory with Christ. "Christ in you, the hope of glory," is a mighty purifying force.

Thinking of Israel in the fearful days of coming tribulation the full meaning of our Lord's similitude grows upon us. "A woman when she is in travail has sorrow, because her hour is come: but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world. And ye therefore now have sorrow, but I will see you again and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no one taketh away from you" (Jno. 16:21-22). Israel's remnant who will then know and see the future, so pregnant with big events, will be like the travailing woman—full to the brim, awaiting the future to be born, but in sorrow and pain, until it is born. V. G.

THE series on the book of Lamentations, which closes in this issue, has been reprinted in pamphlet form under the title "God's Strange Work."

Much light has been given since The Divine Calendar was issued. As the first edition is exhausted we are correcting and clarifying some of its obscure passages, and hope to have a new edition ready shortly.

The Problem of Evil and Free Moral Agency have both entered a second edition.

"The Son of Abraham," one of the series on His Glories, is now obtainable in pamphlet form.

The Nephilim

Studies in Genesis 6.1-8

THE DEATH SENTENCE

THE second verse has acquainted us with the fact that polygamous unions between members of the same race, within the unnatural and forbidden degrees of consanguinity, were the source of the gross and growing immoralities which debased mankind and wrecked the antediluvian world. The third verse reveals God's thought concerning those mis-marriages. "And Jehovah said, My spirit shall not strive with man for ever, for that he also is flesh: yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years." As this Scripture has been invested with mysterious and recondite significations, it will be necessary to examine it closely in order to ascertain its teaching.

We first approach the famous passage "My spirit shall not strive with man for ever." At the very outset we face the question, Does the phrase "my spirit" refer to the Spirit of God or the spirit of man? A few considerations will aid us in deciding this important point. Life in all its phases depends absolutely upon breath and spirit; hence its intimate association with these in the notable phrase "the breath of the spirit of life" (Gen. 7:22). This truth is impressively taught on the forefront of revelation. Before the impartation of breath, man was in an inert earthy form; but the moment breath was imparted, he became a *living* soul. Other writers reiterate and amplify this doctrine. We meet it everywhere in Scripture. "Thou takest away

their spirit, they die; and return to their dust; thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created" (Ps. 104:29-30). The context shows that the Psalmist speaks of the "creeping things innumerable" (v. 25). Now, though all animals have the spirit, they do not have the Spirit of God, hence the possessive pronoun "thy" indicates source: it emphasizes the fact that the spirit which gives life to all things emanates from God. Elihu said, "If He gather unto Himself His spirit and His breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall return again unto dust" (Job 34:14-15). Here the expression "His spirit" is first applied to all flesh in general, and then to man in particular. Solomon voices a like sentiment. "The breath of man is the lamp of the Lord, searching all the innermost parts of the belly" (Pro. 20:27). The fact that the sacred writers should speak of the spirit of man and animals as God's, is in keeping with the idea that "in Him we live and move and have our being." It is the natural sequence of the teaching that the spirit is not the man, but rather God's gift to the man, a gift reverting back to its source when man crumbles into dust (Eccl. 12:7).

Furthermore, not a word has been said about the Spirit of God descending upon any man to give him power of utterance, as in the case of the prophets in Israel, or to equip men for the performance of special works of art, as in the case of the builders of the tabernacle. The absence of any reference to the Spirit of God obliges us to take the phrase "my spirit" as referring to the spirit of man, the same as in the other texts which have been examined.

This fact alone, independent of other lines of evidence, exerts a decisive influence in determining the kind of action expressed by the verb represented in the English versions by "strive." If the reference were to the Spirit of God,

“strive” would yield a suitable meaning, showing, either that the Spirit of God moved in opposition to mankind, or that He wrestled with them in an effort to break down their resistance. But since the spirit of man is the subject of discussion, the word “strive” is wholly out of tune with the sentiment of the passage. The spirit of man can not be divided against itself. It can not be rent in twain, and each half strive against the other. The spirit inhabits the body, acts through its medium, and remains in it throughout man’s days on earth. When it departs, death ensues, for “the body without the spirit is dead”. What we have here is not the inward struggle between conflicting emotions, but the pronouncement of the death sentence on mankind. The preceding verse makes it clear that mankind has embarked upon such a criminal career that God is about to withdraw His spirit from them, and they will perish. This He does in the deluge.

The rendering “remain” has the support of all the ancient versions. The Septuagint used the word *katameinei*, “abide” (Acts 1:13). The Vulgate renders it *permanebit*, “remain.” The Syriac or Arabic have “dwell.” In all probability the texts they used had *door* (דוּר), to dwell, as in Ps. 84:10, and that subsequently, by an error of transcription, it became corrupted into *doon* (דוּן -). Be that as it may, the fact abides that the ancient versions unanimously read the Hebrew word “remain,” and their rendering agrees both with the tenor of the narrative and the general teaching of Scripture.

We must now inquire whether the phrase “with man” is to be understood as implying the man Adam, or as referring to the race. As has been shown, throughout Genesis 1:1-6:8, the word *adam* preceded by the definite article *ha* invariably refers to the man Adam. But here the pres-

ence of the article does not depend on the sacred text, but on rabbinical opinion. The original Hebrew text presented a physiognomy very different from the text we have today. It had neither vowel points nor accents. These were supplied about the tenth century of our era by the Massorettes, or "possessors of tradition," who by means of little dots and lines stereotyped upon the text such meaning as they approved. The unpointed Hebrew is **בְּאָדָם**. In the Massoretic text it is **בְּאָדָם**. Under the first letter (reading from the right) they place the sign (τ), called *kamets*, which indicates that the article is to be understood. **בְּאָדָם**, according to the Massoretic pointing, would be its form without the article. It will be seen that the only difference is in the vowel points under the first letter. The sign (τ) denotes the article: the sign (:) denotes no article. But when the points are brushed aside, the difference is gone. Thus the distinction is based entirely on human tradition, not on divine revelation.

There are two lines of evidence showing that the passage refers to mankind, not Adam alone. (1) The Septuagint, which had the advantage of earlier and unpointed texts, read "men." Evidently three centuries before the Christian era (when the Septuagint version was made) the notion respecting the article handed down by the Massorettes was unknown. (2) If *badam* refers to Adam, who is implied in the phrase "he also is flesh?" The word "also" is emphatic. Why should it be inserted at all if Adam were meant? The Massoretic pointing makes the phraseology of this verse a puzzle. Stripped of their pointing, the text gives satisfactory account of itself. The definite article is absent, therefore *adam*, as elsewhere in this book, denotes mankind. The writer has in mind two parties, and he gives expression to his difference in feeling toward each. He uses the language of

surprise: mankind are flesh—their ways loudly and unmistakably publish the fact; but he also is flesh—he from whom better things might have been expected; he who should have upheld justice and refrained from the vices which manifest their doers to be flesh—be also—he especially—is flesh. The language is intensely individual and points to a particular personage. “*He* also is flesh.” “*His* days shall be.” Manifestly the writer draws a line of distinction between the one and the many. That the clause “he also is flesh” is closely related to the antecedent is shown by the connective “for.” It introduces a reason for, and an explanation of, the preceding statement. The spirit is to be withdrawn from mankind *because* Adam also is flesh. His culpability is the chief and primal cause for the wholesale condemnation of the race. The great principle of the solidarity of humanity and federal headship flashes out with singular impressiveness and force. Adam’s lapse into sin established a precedent. Influenced by his example, others followed in his footsteps, and thus mankind sinned as one man, and was condemned as one man.

The expression “for ever” now presents itself for consideration. “My spirit shall not remain in mankind *for ever.*” The Hebrew word is *olam*. It occurs again in *v. 4*, where both versions render it “of old.” There is a strange inconsistency here. The same word is made to convey two diametrically opposed ideas. In verse 3, *olam* is rendered in a way implying infinitude, whereas, in verse 4, it is made to denote finiteness. Such a method of procedure is defective in principle, and untrustworthy in its results. A translation which thus arbitrarily changes the meaning of words proclaims itself as an attempt to harmonize Scripture with a preconceived theory.

The word *olam* is a derivative of *alam*, to hide. The

reader may satisfy himself of its force from the subjoined examples.

2 Ki. 4:27: "Jehovah has *hid* it from me, and has not told me."

2 Chr. 9:2: "There was nothing *hid* from Solomon which he told her not."

Job 28:21: "Seeing it is *hid* from the eyes of all living."

Ps. 90:8: "Thou hast set our *secret* sins in the light of thy countenance."

Eccl. 12:14: "God will bring every word into judgment, with every *secret thing*."

Isa. 1:15: "I will *hide* mine eyes from you."

The term *olam* presents the following features:

(1) Its association with such marks of time as the preposition "for" and "from" proves it to be a measure of duration.

(2) Its usage proves to demonstration that it never denotes endlessness, but invariably applies to limited periods of time, with definite starting and terminal points.

(3) Its derivation from *alam* shows that the actual length of the periods designated by it is not chronologically measured. In other words, *olam* expresses *terminability of undefined or hidden duration*.

Sometimes, as in the passage under consideration, the term has an adverbial force, and in such instances our versions render it either "always" (Job 7:16), or "perpetually" (Lev. 25:34), though "indefinitely" would be a more suitable and better rendering.

There remains to examine the concluding clause of the verse—"Yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years." The intention of this last member of the sentence is to extend the thought of the antecedent. The preposition "yet" has an adversive force; it assigns a reason notwithstanding.

Though Adam is flesh, and though the spirit is to be withdrawn from him, yet, from the time the warning was given to the day of his death, there shall be a hundred and twenty years. As soon as Adam came to know good and evil, God took steps to prevent his living "indefinitely" (Gen. 3:22-23). Now, however, the time has arrived to definitely fix the day of his death. The flagrant misconduct of the sons of God with the daughters of Adam drew forth a decree of general condemnation. However, there is a difference in the application of the decree to the various parties involved. Mankind was like a culprit on parole, whose sentence is suspended pending good behavior. If they mend their ways, the execution of the penalty, if not altogether revoked, is likely to be indefinitely postponed; but if they continue in evil, it will be swiftly meted out. With Adam it is different. His personal guilt has encouraged the practice of an evil he should have repressed. As head and highest in office, his example exerted a powerful influence for evil; his presence was a standing menace to the safety of the community, and cannot be allowed to continue much longer—a brief reprieve is all that can be granted him. The date of his execution is irrevocably fixed and published abroad as a warning to other offenders.

We are now in a position to determine the exact chronology of verse 3. Since the total length of Adam's life was nine hundred and thirty years (Gen. 5:5), the decree "My spirit shall not remain in mankind indefinitely, for that he also is flesh" went forth in the eight hundred and tenth year of Adam's life. That was the year of the incestuous marriages. That ill-fated year constitutes an epoch-mark in the history of the "ancient world." How matters progressed theretofore, we have no means of ascertaining. How they proceeded thereafter is intimated in God's communication to

Noah. But the most suggestive light on the doings of the period is reflected in our Saviour's reference to the "days before the flood," in Matt. 24:38-39. "They were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not until the flood came, and took them all away." The words "until Noah entered into the ark" make it evident that our Lord had in mind the state of antediluvian society, not at the time of Noah's entering the ark, but for some time prior to it. Marriage, eating and drinking are all indispensable. The one is as necessary in the sphere moral as the others are necessary in the sphere physical. Therefore our Saviour can only mean the abuse of those vital functions. He points out the fact that the mismarriages mentioned in Gen. 6:2 not only had become a general practice, but that they were made the occasions for indulging in excessive eating and drinking. Absorbed in sensual delights, they did not grasp the significance of Adam's condemnation, and thus it failed to act as a deterrent. This is the force of the words "They knew not," which cannot imply ignorance, for Enoch was already making his protest heard.

The curious prophecy of Enoch, preserved in Jude's epistle, throws additional light on the moral tone of the period. "Behold, the Lord came with ten thousand of his holy ones, to execute judgment upon all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their works of ungodliness which they have ungodly wrought, and of all the bold things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him" (Jude 14-15). The recurrence of the word "all" emphasizes the *extent* of the apostasy, while the repetition of "ungodly" accentuates its *character*. Two features of Enoch's message claim special notice—the conduct of the sinners and the object of the judgment. The antediluvian sinners spoke

"hard things" against God. When men do wrong they soon find excuses (which they dignify by the name "reasons") to justify their actions. Enoch's contemporaries despised criticism, and resented interference. Seeking to justify their conduct they did not hesitate to traduce God's character and vilify His name. Hence the judgment was especially designed to "convict". The nature of the sin called for a tangible demonstration of its unnaturalness that would once for all show it in its true light. The exemplary severity of the judgment was designed to accomplish this.

We have now examined every part of the sentence and are ready to translate it accordingly, and offer a few remarks on some of the words.

"But Jehovah said, My spirit shall not remain in mankind indefinitely, because he also is flesh: yet shall his days be a hundred and twenty years."

עלום *olam*, age, eon. Here, as in Gen. 3:22, it is used adverbally. I Chr. 15:15, Job 7:16, Jer. 20:17 afford examples of a like use.

ב, a preposition. Used twice in this verse, before "man" and before "also". When used of place and time, *in, within*, as the first time in this verse. When causative, *on account of, because*, as in the second instance.

ו, a causative particle. The manner and nature of its connection is to be determined from the character of the discourse. Occurs thrice in this verse; (1) contrastive, "*But Jehovah said*"; (2) adversative, "*yet shall his days be*"; (3) copulative, "*a hundred and twenty years*".

THE UNEXPECTED IN JOHN'S GOSPEL

"THE heart of man is deceitful," was the inspired utterance of an ancient prophet. Not only is man a deceiver but he is also deceived. He fools others, he fools himself as well, and is the biggest fool of all in consequence.

In John's Gospel we are given an insight into the deceitfulness of the heart. We shall refer to but a few instances to be found there. Sufficient now to remark that when deceitfulness is unmasked by inspired truth the result is ever an unexpected one. John's Gospel abounds with unexpected things, some of which we will endeavor to point out.

A truly remarkable character is found in the opening chapter. The genius of the Old Testament is well reflected in him who was not so much a man as the voice of the Man who was the Word. So skillfully are the elements of the Baptist's ministry suggested to us that but little difficulty can be experienced in picturing such scenes as are outlined in verse nineteen onward.

He had been preaching a true national "preparedness," a preparedness not of might but of morals; not of the flesh but of the spirit. His message had a keen edge and a sharp point, and dealt not with evils such as poverty and such like social ills, but with the cause of all national decay, viz., national sin. Not Rome, though Israel lay beneath the heel of Roman conquest, but Israel's deceitful heart was the worst of Israel's foes.

The Baptist's voice thundered through the land, and men

came to him confessing their need of "preparedness." But amongst the crowds that flocked to his baptism were many whose hearts had given them a deceitful consciousness of superiority: men who mocked and sneered; curiosity-mongers and mere sensationalists, who cared not for what the preacher taught.

News of the revival soon reached the ears of those who were the leaders of organized religion, the men of form and ceremony, the men of sabbaths and jubilees. These sent their messengers to the preacher to test the various rumors which had spread abroad concerning him, and learn perhaps the truth about his origin and purpose.

The desires and the deceits of the Jewish heart at that time were manifested in the character of the questions propounded to John. These questions also revealed the channels in which Judaism hoped to receive a solution of its national problems, and a panacea for its national suffering. The burden of their inquiries is summarized in verse twenty-five.

Here we have indicated two methods by which mankind has always hoped to attain to peace and plenty: One method being government; the other education. Apparently the nation was willing to give the throne to a king who would measure up to their ideas of what a king should be. It also seems evident that they were willing to give attention to prophet, or teacher, or educator, whose message or culture would tally with their approved standards. A king to rule, or a prophet to teach, these were the demands and expectations of the Jewish people.

Are not these two things—government and education—still supposed to hold the key to the human problem? Do not the nations still imagine that a scheme of politics will yet be evolved which will destroy much if not all of the

injustice in society? Do they not think that education will ultimately bring salvation to the people? Will it prove difficult to have the people confess their need of better government, or to own to their ignorance? No, they will not hesitate a moment in owning their governmental or educational deficiencies.

But let us particularly note who sent these messengers to John. "The Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, who art thou? PRIESTS, mark you. Men whose daily occupation brought them to the altars of Jehovah. Men whose hands were crimsoned by the bloods of victims slain in sacrifice. These were the men who asked for a king, and sought for a prophet, but who seemed to know nought of the SACRIFICE, that ONE Sacrifice to which the many others pointed in mute eloquence.

Surely *priests* would ask about the Sacrifice! But no, they had apparently lost the sense of sin. Rule they would receive, but not redemption. A prophet but not a propitiation.

This is one of the surprising things in the Gospel of John. It is one of the things we would not expect to find—a priesthood ignorant of sacrifice, ignorant of the first step towards the solution of evil, ignorant of spiritual destitution. We must note, however, the character in which the Word was presented to Israel, including this ignorant priesthood. "Behold the King!"—was that it? "Behold the Prophet!"—was that it? No, "Behold the Lamb!" There you have it. The Spirit of God preaching Christ to Israel in the character and office in which they stood in primal need of Him.

They would accept Him on a throne. "No," God decreed, "you shall accept Him on an altar first." And the priesthood, the class that should have known all about it, knew not the mind of God concerning the matter.

Is it any different today? Do the leaders of organized religion know what they should know? Have they the conception of sin which these Jewish priests lacked? Alas! no! the Gentile heart is not different from the Jewish. It is still deceived as to its real need.

This is the first unexpected thing that we find in this Gospel. There are many others. We shall look at the next.

Inspiration purposely calls our attention to the occasion on which the recorded visit to the Temple was made by the Master. It was a solemn national event—"the Jew's pass-over was at hand." (2:13). This was a busy time for every Jewish family, for every house was subjected to a rigorous search lest ceremonial defilement should be found therein in the form of leaven. "No leaven within your houses" was the dictum of the Law at this time.

The Temple, the sacred palace of the God of Israel, was the centre of Israel's ceremonial purity. It was the hub of the law of the priests. Israel gloried in her temple. Was it not that which marked Israel from the nations as the favored people of God? What other race on earth could speak of Jehovah dwelling in their midst? And now the One of whom the priests knew not came to his Father's house.

Let us not imagine that those who sold the wherewithal of sacrifice were without argument or excuse. They could justify themselves if asked to do so, for the merchants as well as the priests had hearts "deceitful above all things." Did they not make worship easier?

The Light discovered the Darkness. The finger of God was placed on the real motive which lay beneath the sale of sacrifice. The covetousness of the heart was the dictating motive of it all.

But what is covetousness? The same Spirit who inspired

the history refers to it as LEAVEN (see 1 Cor. 5). But what horrible desecration is this? *Leaven in the temple of Jehovah!* With all their searching of house and home Israel had forgotten to search the house of God. And what priest for a moment would have thought of finding corruption there? But the Light shined into Jewish darkness at the Feast of Passover and discovered leaven in the most sacred spot in Israel's possessions.

A darkened priesthood and a degraded temple! Sad too to know that the more we contemplate the then existing conditions the darker does the picture grow, and the deeper the degradation becomes. For instance, we have in part referred to the Spirit's symbol for covetousness. Let us examine it more fully.

But first let us bear in mind Israel's age-long boasts in the purity of its monotheism. The many gods and countless deities of the heathen nations were unknown to Israel. The nation prided itself upon its freedom from idolatry. Now let us, from another scripture, complete the definition of covetousness; "covetousness which is IDOLATRY!" (Col. 3:5). Not mere leaven in the physical sense, not mere covetousness (as men would lightly describe it) but IDOLATRY was what the Son of God found in His Father's house!

The magi found the infant King in the very last place human wisdom would have expected to find Him. Man's reasoning would have led their steps to Jerusalem, and indeed did so, but it was divine illumination which compelled their retracing them before their search was crowned with success. If these wise men had been told that the task appointed them was to discover idolatry in Israel, the Temple would have been the last place they would think of searching, as the stable would have been the last in their search for the royal Babe.

Though their hands were crimsoned, so to speak, with the blood of bulls and goats, the priests had failed to learn the erue meaning of sacrifice. As learners in God's great kindergarten they had failed to read the meaning of the pictures and emblems He had spread before them. Little wonder that when the higher knowledge was unfolded to them in the Incarnate One they were unable to discern the truth.

We have been told by some that John's gospel is not dispensational. But, as we read, there appears to be a very definite purpose back of the historical facts as grouped together by its writer. He reveals an ignorant priesthood in his first chapter. He exhibits an idolatrous temple in the second. Who can fail to see dispensational intimations here? Israel, on the very threshold of the promised land—for was not the kingdom of heaven "at hand"?—was about to be turned back again into the wilderness. The time of fulfilment was ripe; the doors of promise were ajar; all prophecy awaited its consummation; God was ready; the King was ready; but Israel was unprepared. Their spiritual unreadiness is revealed by John. He goes on to tell us more of this.

Who has not seen at night the pencil of light thrown by a searchlight into the surrounding darkness? Who has not seen it moving to and fro, hither and yon, until at last it rests its beam upon some hitherto unseen object, which now stand out in sharp relief from the surrounding gloom? Just such a shaft of revealing light is found in John Three where the simple inquiry "Art thou a teacher in Israel and knowest not these things?" reveals something of the depth of Israel's night.

The evidence against Israel is cumulative. We would have gone to Jerusalem to find the King. We would have

approached the priests to learn of sacrifice. We would have gone to the Temple to behold true worship. We would have sought such as Nicodemus in order that we might learn. Our every expectation would have been blasted with disappointment, for official religion was spiritually bankrupt.

An ignorant teacher! A professor who knew not his own textbooks! How similar to the incident we found in chapter one! A priesthood whose ignorance of man's need of redemption has to be placed alongside of the fact that their daily occupation had to do with redemption's machinery; a teaching class ignorant of the lesson lying on the surface of the scroll which they held open before their eyes. Such was Professor Nicodemus—a dunce in the school of the prophets.

We need not linger upon these aspects of Israel's grave condition. Indeed, the whole of this gospel appears to have been written in view of Israel's approaching national dissolution. Consequently the doctrine, or rather the fact of resurrection occupies a place in this gospel that is not given to it in any of the other three, as if national hopes and promises could find fulfilment only beyond the grave.

But if we would have gone to Jerusalem, with its temple, its priests, and its teachers, to learn the secrets of God, of worship, and of truth, who could possibly imagine that one would find these secrets unveiled by a weary, way-worn Hebrew, by the side of one of Samaria's wells?

Who were the Samaritans? Perhaps a knowledge of their past history will throw light upon this scene of John Four. And how would we expect to read of them in history? Would we not imagine that such a highly-favored woman, and such highly-privileged people, would be the descendants of some race of age-long seekers after God? Would we not think that they must be the progeny of men who

had spent the centuries in one grand endeavor to purge their thoughts and ceremonies of every false and impure admixture? But the truth about the Samaritans would once more strike imagination dumb in its own confusion. In 2 Kings we have the unlovely story of their origin.

Let us now go very carefully, for we tread upon the borderland of wondrous grace and no less wonderful gloom. Having acquainted ourselves with the facts of 2 Kings 17, we would naturally expect that when the Master visited Jerusalem and Samaria he would find idolatry in Samaria and worship in Jerusalem. Not so! the record reads: **IDOLATRY IN JERUSALEM; WORSHIP IN SAMARIA!** Yes, idolatry in the home of worship, and worship in the land of idolatry! Let us cease our vain imaginings, dear reader, and seek instead to simply follow with adoring hearts the unnumbered revelations of our Father's grace. What we think will be, more often than not, never is. Our assumptions are but poor, blind, groping, haphazard things at best. Our heart's best thoughts, if not supported by His word, defraud us of the truth.

How utterly opposed are the ways of God and man. How foolish man's reasoning is! How wise God's foolishness! A lesson of tremendous importance is contained within the limits of John Three and Four. Man's methods turned topsy-turvy and simply because God chose to do the unexpected thing.

We have already remarked how human wisdom would have led us to Jerusalem to find the King; to learn of worship; behold the undefiled shrine of a nation free from idolatrous custom; and find a priestly and a teaching class who were intelligently acquainted with the need and nature of sacrifice and regeneration. The same so-called wisdom would have led us to reverse the order of ministry in these two chapters.

Let us consider the sharp contrast between the two persons with whom these passages are concerned. Nicodemus is presented to us on the one hand, and on the other the unnamed woman of Samaria. A religious ruler and a moral outcast. A learned rabbi and an ignorant woman. There was a national, social and intellectual chasm between the two, which nothing could bridge.

Now here is where the bankruptcy of our ideas would be manifested, for if we had met this noble Jew and this unnamed Samaritan, we would have preached the new-birth to the woman, and the nature of God and worship to the man. But He, in whom divine wisdom was incarnate, preached new birth to the religious leader and unveiled the secrets of true worship to the outcast woman of Samaria.

Other designed contrasts may be easily found in these two chapters. It has been a question with many as to just why the learned Jewish teacher chose the darkness of the night in which to approach Him who, verily, was a "teacher come from God." They have felt led to question the current or popular theory that it was "for fear of the Jews," on the ground that such a reason for his so coming is never given in Scripture. We feel, however, that the numerous contrasts which abound between these two chapters indicate that the traditional view is correct.

But now the contrast is not between Nicodemus and the woman whose name we do not know (but which in all probability was on the tongue of every gossip in her village), but between Nicodemus and the Lord. And remember that it is night in chapter three, but broad daylight in chapter four.

We are all careful of our reputations. Our "good name," of all things, must be guarded well. If we had Nicodemus' standing in the community; if we had his position and place,

we might not have come to Jesus by night, *we might never have come at all!* But if we had come to Him by night, the overwhelming probability would have been that it was in order to safeguard the reputations that we loved so well.

And if it was his reputation which brought the Ruler under cover of night to the Master, is there not a designed contrast in the broad publicity given to His meeting with the woman at the well? *We* would not have done it *that* way! But all the difference between what He did and what we do lies in this "*He* made himself of no reputation."

Oh, that each of us would learn the sacred art of dwindling! That we might just dwindle and dwindle until in the end we just dwindle away into nothingness, that nothingness of self-esteem which alone makes room for His being All in all.

ALAN BURNS.

“THE CAMBRIDGE SEVEN”

I COME now to the year 1884, and the story of the formation of “the Cambridge Seven”. In February a Christian brother and I held a fortnight’s mission in Clapham Conference Hall. Rev. W. W. Cassels (now Bishop Cassels of West China), an old school fellow, also with me at Cambridge, was a curate near by. He came to some of the meetings, and we had walks and talks about China after.

On April 10 I went to a Holiness meeting of the Salvation Army, and received the fulness of the Holy Spirit by faith. Next day I went to Aldershot to hold a fortnight’s mission among the soldiers, which was greatly owned of God. On June 26, with a view to service in China, I determined to spend spare time in waiting on God; this continued till August 10, when, over Eph. 1:3, I felt God had granted the answer. On July 28 I again met Mr. Cassels, whose interest in China had been deepening, and in my diary I record the prayer, “May the Lord send him out to China with me!” On August 18th I went to Lambeth to see him. After a talk, we went to his church and had an hour’s waiting on the Lord. This resulted in deciding definitely to go to China. On November 1, I went to lunch with Mr. C. T. Studd, during which time I told him and the others at table stories about God’s work in China, and asked him to go with me to the C. I. M. prayer meeting. There Mr. John McCarthy spoke, and I told of recent meetings I had been

holding at Cambridge. On the way back from the meeting Mr. Studd told me he had decided to go with me to China. Two days later, I was holding a Holiness meeting, and Mr. Montagu (now Sir Montagu) Beauchamp was there. We were at the same school and university. On the way back I had a serious talk with him about China, on the lines of its appalling need, and the duty of helping where the need is greatest. Two days after I got an invitation to go and see him, saying the Lord had guided him through the Word to obey the command of Mat. 28:19, and he decided to go to China. Mr. D. E. Hoste, a brother of one of my bosom friends at Cambridge, had decided independently to go there. Thus five of our band were called out.

During December I took meetings with Mr. C. T. Studd in Scotland. In the next year, January 2-5, Mr. Studd and I went to stay with Messrs. Cecil and Arthur Polhill, mutual friends of us both. They were with Mr. Studd at Eton, and also at Cambridge, Cecil afterwards having a commission in the Dragoon Guards. We all had prayer together, and they decided to join us and go out to China, thus completing the seven.

After this Mr. C. T. Studd and I went to different Universities in Scotland. The Lord was pleased to begin a great work among the students there, which was continued after by Prof. Henry Drummond, and developed into the student volunteer movement in Great Britain, the same movement having been started previous to this in America.

Our band of seven left London February 5 and arrived at Shanghai March 18.

(To be continued)

The Mystery of Babylon

THE BRIDE OF THE LAMBKIN

Who is the bride? John the Baptist, friend of the Bridegroom, will help us to answer this question. He introduced his disciples to the Bridegroom when He said to them, "Behold the Lamb of God, who is bearing away the sin of the world!" And the next day, when he saw Him as He walked, he said, "Behold the Lamb of God!" and the two disciples who heard, left John and followed Him. And when, some time later, the Baptist is told of the effect of his Lord's ministry he reminded them, "Ye yourselves bear me witness that I said 'I am not the Christ,' but that I am sent before Him. *He that hath the bride is the Bridegroom; but the friend of the Bridegroom, who stands and hears Him, rejoices greatly because of the Bridegroom's voice. This, my joy, therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease.*" (Jn. 3:28-30).

"He that *hath* the bride" makes it clear that the bride was in view at the very commencement of our Lord's ministry. The faithful little band that gathered around Him was the beginning and representative of that blessed company, the Bride of the Lamb. John introduced Him to them by this figure. As the Lamb of Jehovah, the antitype of the shadowy sacrifices under the law, He does not merely cover up their sins, but bears them quite away. The wife of Jehovah included the whole nation. The bride of the Lamb is more exclusive. Only those united to Him by the affectionate ties of salvation could claim a share in this happy class. Let us not miss the preciousness involved in the name He gives her: Not "wife", but "bride". It is not merely

a resumption of the old relationship which ended so disastrously because she could not fulfil the covenant into which she entered. It is a new commencement, a union based, not upon mutual vows, but upon the blood of the Lamb.

The nation at large had become "an evil and adulterous generation" (Mt. 12:39; 16:4), unfaithful to the One to Whom they owed all the allegiance of their hearts. Only a remnant amongst them responded to His invitation, and only these become His bride.

First among the seven signs, or "miracles", of John's gospel, is the wedding feast at Cana, of Galilee. That it is called a *sign* is of itself sufficient to show that it had a deeper significance than appears upon the surface of the narrative. The fact that the mother of Jesus was there may well suggest the nation from which He sprang. The failure of the wine tells us that all the joy of Jehovah's espousals had vanished, and all they had left was the formal ceremonial of the law with its round of cleansing and defilement, represented by the six water pots of stone, but even these were empty and powerless to purify. Is not this a true picture of the nation as it was in the days of His ministry? And just such a condition of affairs offers Him an opportunity to manifest His glory.

In the Kingdom, when the wedding of the bride to the Lambkin takes place, He will write the law in their hearts, and change it from a stern, impossible, unsatisfying command to a hearty and enjoyable privilege. Hitherto its office has been to cleanse; then, when they no longer need cleansing, it will be transformed into brimming cheer.

Israel's water pots were empty. They went through the motions of purification, but there was no water. Then there will not only be cleansing, but such a fulness of joy will flow from the holy springs within, and from an appreciation of the blessings without, that the law written on their hearts will cheer the heart of God and man.

It was the custom at a wedding to have a director, a reliable friend, who would take charge of the feast. Unlike the rest of the guests, however, he could not allow himself to indulge freely, but was obliged to keep sober and discreet. Hence he would be a good judge of the quality of the wine which was offered. The director at Cana noted the excellent quality of the water which had blushed into wine.

So will it be with Jehovah's people. The joys of the past will be eclipsed in that day when the marriage feast of the Lambkin surfeits their hearts for a thousand years.

Men put forth their best at the start and their joys end in heartaches and headaches. Jehovah reserves the best wine till the last. When the marriage of the Lamb comes, it will bring joys till then untasted and unknown.

While John the Baptist introduces the bride to the Bridegroom, John the Apostle, in his Revelation, gives us full and ample details of the bride herself. Indeed, if we except the three occurrences in which the same word is translated "daughter in law" (Mt. 10:35; Lu. 12:53), John is the only one who mentions the bride, just as Paul is the only one who has anything to say as to the body. Is it not most fitting that the disciple whom Jesus loved, who leaned on His breast at the supper, and whose ministry is burdened with the message that "God is love"—is it not well that he should trace the future of his people under this affectionate figure? The bride is presented to our view twice. First, when great Babylon is overthrown, her marriage feast begins. The festivities usually lasted seven days or a fortnight, but hers will probably brighten the whole millennium (Rev. 19:7-9).

In our study of the Mystery of Babylon it is of prime importance that we grasp clearly the Israelitish character of the Bride of the Lambkin. The Bride is the true, Babylon the false nation. These contrasts will become clearer when we study Babylon itself and its place in the Apocalypse.

So long as we cling to the unscriptural thought that the nations in the present economy constitute the Bride we must, perforce, find Babylon in the false church. Babylon itself will never be understood in its true light until we acknowledge the place Jehovah has given His faithful followers in Israel. Time was when the church appropriated every blessing which was ever promised the nation of His choice. But the church has not enriched itself by robbing Israel: it has lost rather than gained. By filching Israel's earthly material privileges it has lost its appreciation of its own proper spiritual blessings; by claiming to be the Bride it has lost the blessed portion of the Body.

The most entrancing and satisfying view of the Bride is given us in the closing visions of the Apocalypse. For a thousand years of millennial feasting, the wedding of the Lambkin has been celebrated and now the Bride is taken to her conian home. The former things pass away and all is made new. The holy city with its *chuppah* or marriage canopy (Isa. 4:5) formed by the cloud of His presence, the holy oblation with its magnificent temple, the holy land of the happy holy nation—all these are engulfed in the fiery purging through which the whole earth shall pass (2 Pet. 3:10). But out of it all comes a new earth from which all the shame and sorrow of the former earth are absent, and God tents in the midst of mankind. Strange to say, when John first views the new earth, the Bride is not there. But the first thing that engages his attention is her descent from heaven. A magnificent city, new Jerusalem, adorned with all the splendor and ornament of an eastern bride, is seen coming down out of heaven to its place on earth. This is the city for which the saints in Israel all had longed. Even Abraham looked beyond the land to the city of God. It was indeed a heavenly city, yet finds itself on the earth.

The seven bowls are poured out upon apostate Israel.

Babylon falls under the seventh bowl (Rev. 16:19). One of the very angels who poured out the bowls of wrath is now to pour out the cup of blessing. He shows John the Bride, the Lambkin's Wife.

Today, in all its squalid desolation, Jerusalem is called *El Kuds*, the Holy, by the natives. How much truer will be this title in the day of the Lord, when the bells upon the horses will have the high priest's inscription, "Holiness to Jehovah" (Zech. 14:20)!

But such holiness will be completely eclipsed by the new Jerusalem, effulgent with the crystalline radiance of the glory of God. No longer does it need the sun, for the Lambkin is its luminary. No longer does it need a sanctuary, for He is its temple.

So bright are its beams that the sacred nations will walk in its light. They will bring their glory into it. The throne of God and the Lambkin will make it the capital of the earth and the center of the administration of all earthly suzerainty.

There is no reason at all for doubting the description of this figure. The figure is in calling it a Bride. It is not a literal woman, but it is a literal city. Each detail of its glory is literal, yet at the same time representative of higher and greater moral glories.

The foundations are beautiful gems of various colors and lustres. Yet when we are told that they had in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lambkin our thoughts are turned from the costly stones to the more precious virtues which underlie the character of the Bride, as inculcated by the twelve apostles.

The gates are each of a single pearl. They had the names of the twelve tribes. Now the gate, in the east, is not simply the means of ingress or egress, but the place of authority and power. The pearls, no doubt, symbolize the place of power which the various tribes possess over the other nations.

Let us turn our eyes from these glories for a time and focus our attention on the *identity* of the Bride. Who is she? Is she, as our previous studies have indicated, the faithful nation of His choice raised to the pinnacle of her conian bliss? Or can it be that we have intimations here that she is composed of saints from among the nations gathered out during Israel's apostasy.

There is not a single suggestion in the whole description of the Bride which gives the nations any place. When nations are spoken of they are always *without*. They walk in its light. They bring their honor and glory into it. If the city itself included those who had once been of the nations, it would hardly be sufficient to speak of "the nations of those who are saved" (21:24) without some further explanation which would define between them and the saved nations within the city.

As a matter of fact the entire structure and symbolism and all of the inscriptions point with unmistakable force to the beloved nation, to whom this city had been promised. It is called holy *Jerusalem*. What nation ever had a right to that holy city except Israel? We who believe today have no promise of any place on earth. Ours is a celestial destiny. The city is indeed heavenly, but its place is on the earth.

The gates are inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes. Where, in all the universe, shall we put these twelve tribes if not within the city whose very gates are unalterably assigned to them?

The twelve foundations are inscribed with the names of the twelve apostles of the Lambkin. How shall we account for the omission of the other apostles from this honor? Paul and Timothy and Silas (1 Thes. 2:6) were recognized as apostles. But above all, any foundation which is supposed to support the church *must* include the apostle Paul, through whom all the truth of this economy has come. Since he is absent the proof is positive that, whoever the city may

contain, it has no place for those to whom Paul ministered. The church which is His Body is not the Bride.

That Paul was not one of the twelve is evident from his own record of the Lord's appearances in resurrection. He was seen of the twelve (which must include Matthias) long before He appeared to Saul on the road to Damascus. (1 Cor. 15:5). Cephas, indeed saw Him first, but Saul saw Him last. Between these two appearances He was twice seen by the twelve. These twelve cannot be the same whose names are seen on the foundations of the holy city, the Bride of the Lambkin.

John's ministry, if we are to believe his own words, was not for the nations, but for the circumcision. When he, along with James and Cephas (all of whom have left inspired records of their ministry)—when they perceived the grace given to Paul, they gave him the right hand of fellowship, that he should go to the nations, *but they to the circumcision*. (Gal. 2:9). How foolish, in the light of these apostolic arrangements, to thrust them into spheres which they expressly affirmed they would not enter. John writes to and for the Circumcision, who alone are the Bride, the holy city of which he is one of the foundations.

There is no question in the minds of any that the present ecclesia is the body of Christ. It is plainly asserted in half a dozen passages (1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 1:23; 4:12; 5:29, 30; Col. 1:18, 24) and taught in as many more. (Rom. 12:4, 5; 1 Cor. 6:15; 12:12; Eph. 3:6; 4:13-16; Col. 2:19). In sharp contrast with this *there is not a single passage which so much as mentions a "bride of Christ."* The bride is always associated with Him as the Lamb or Lambkin, and never is His official title Christ coupled with this figure.

That the present ecclesia is ever spoken of as the bride is from three passages inferred (Rom. 7:4; 2 Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:22-33). In none of these scriptures is a bride so much as mentioned. The whole difficulty comes from an

attempt to force out of a figure what has never been put into it. In discussing the figure of a body we are warranted in developing it to the extent in which this is done in Scripture. We may speak of its Head and of its members and draw many a profitable lesson from the relationship. But the moment we go beyond what is written, and speak, for instance, of the body as the Husband (as is done by some most excellent students) we involve ourselves in difficulties from which we cannot emerge except by a retreat to the ground of Scripture.

As an illustration of the way in which the figures and types of scripture are wrested, we are reminded of the marriage of Isaac and Rebecca, which, it is said, is a type of the church of today, as the bride. The entire action of this story is against such a supposition. If the nations were to be the bride, why did Abraham insist that the bride should not be taken from among the nations where he dwelt, but that the servant should go to his own kindred to find a wife for his son Isaac?

This condition is repeated seven times, and is the most prominent point in the type. Rebecca could never have been Isaac's bride if she had not been of his own kith and kin. Whatever interpretation may be offered for this type it cannot stand unless it accords with this sevenfold demand, that the bride be of the same stock as the Bridegroom. The faithful remnant in Israel fulfill this condition perfectly and every other part of the type fits equally well.

If we would follow a few simple principles in dealing with figures of speech many of our difficulties would vanish. No figure should be pressed beyond its stated limits. An example will suffice to make this clear. Our Lord is the Lion of the tribe of Judah (Rev. 5:5). A lion roars and devours. Hence He is a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. But this is the description of the Slanderer (1 Pet. 5:8)! Hence we have proved (?) that the Lord and the Slanderer

are the same! And it is just such logic which proves the bride and the body to be the same.

The subject of the seventh of Romans is the relation now sustained to the law by those who were once subject to it. It can refer only to the Circumcision for *the nations never were under law*. Law is limited to life: it has no jurisdiction over the dead. The law forbids a woman being subject to another while her husband is alive. But the law no longer holds when the husband dies. Those who were once under the law have died to it, through the body of Christ. Here the figure ends. The law was not the husband and the law did not die. There is an intentional change here to keep us from carrying over the figure. Its object has been attained by illustrating the fact that death is outside the jurisdiction of law. Those who were once under law find that Christ has taken its place for them. As a result they are *slaving* in newness of spirit, rather than in oldness of letter. There is no marriage here: the relation is the same as it was under law—that of slavery. The slave has died to one master and now belongs to Another. Why should the illustration which limits law's jurisdiction be forced into this relation? Does the bride *slave* in newness of spirit? Are only those who have died to law (which excludes the nations) included in this bride?

The eleventh of second Corinthians is concerned with their singleness towards Christ. What illustration could be more apt than the relation of an engaged virgin to her lover? He did not want them to turn to "another Jesus" whom he had not preached. He did not wish a rival to distract them from the gospel which they had received. What right have we, or anyone else to add to the figure the idea of marriage? The point of the apostle's argument is *singleness*. This is most aptly conveyed by the *unmarried* state. Let it suffice us to leave it there.

We were much struck once with the remark of a brother

that the fifth of Ephesians proved that the church was the bride. His argument was based upon the unique place which the doctrine occupied in the epistle. All other doctrines were expounded in the early part of the letter. And the fact that this teaching is reserved for the hortatory half shows that the church is the bride! He could not have brought a much stronger reason against it! Why should such a doctrine be omitted from the didactic portion of the epistle? Why, in the midst of a continuous line of exhortations should this exhortation (for such it assuredly is) suddenly divert to teaching which had not been taken up at all when he was developing the doctrine for this economy?

Our reply to this argument, if such it can be called, is contained in the accompanying framework of the epistle.

FRAMEWORK OF "EPHESIANS"

Reversion

DOCTRINE	Paul's commission 1 ¹ Salutation 1 ²
	The allotment—in heaven—blessing 1 ³⁻¹⁴ Paul's prayer for them 1 ¹⁵⁻¹⁹
	The body—in Christ 1 ²⁰⁻²¹⁰ The members
	Participation—believers 2 ¹¹⁻²² The new humanity
	Summary of grace <i>now</i> shown to the nations 3 ¹⁻¹³
	Petitioning the Father 3 ¹⁴⁻²¹
	Beseeching the saints 4 ¹⁻⁶
	Summary of grace which <i>had been</i> shown to the saints 4 ⁷⁻¹⁶
	No participation—unbelievers 4 ¹⁷⁻⁵²⁰ The new humanity
	The body—in the Lord 5 ²¹⁻⁶⁹ The Head
	The allotment—in heaven—warfare 6 ¹⁰⁻¹⁷ Their prayer for Paul 6 ¹⁸⁻²⁰
	Tychicus' commission 6 ²¹⁻²² Salutation 6 ²³⁻²⁴
DEPARTMENT	
JOINT ENJOYERS	
JOINT MEMBERS	
JOINT PARTAKERS	
SUMMARY	

It will be seen that every subject occurs twice—once in the didactic section and again in the second section, dealing with a deportment in keeping with the doctrine previously developed. It will be seen from this that *every* item of deportment is based on a previously developed doctrine. *That part of the fifth chapter which is supposed to teach that the church is the bride corresponds with an earlier section of the epistle which teaches the truth of the BODY of Christ.*

The earlier, as well as the latter part of Ephesians presents the truth in three different aspects—as related to God (the allotment); as related to Christ (the body); and as related to other saints (the new humanity). There is not the slightest hint in the didactic part of the epistle which treats of our relation to Christ, that we are His bride. The figure used is that of the human body. And an unprejudiced examination of the corresponding section in the fifth chapter will be found to be based upon the previous teaching that we are His *body*, not His bride.

Perhaps the most direct and conclusive way to prove this is to point out the fact that by far the most of the argument employed by the apostle was quite unnecessary and useless if the church were the bride. Then it would have been most simple. Christ loves His wife the church, therefore husbands should love their wives. That is all that would be needed. But the apostle brings in a man's *own* flesh, his *own* body. Why should a man be directed to his *own* body at all, unless *such* is the relation of Christ to the church?

The following is a version of the passage in which we have crossed out all that part of the apostle's argument which is needless and redundant if the present ecclesia were the bride or wife.

Thus men, too, ought to be loving their wives as their own bodies. He who is loving his wife is loving himself. For no one ever hates his own flesh, but is nourishing and cherishing it, as Christ the ecclesia, seeing that we are members of His body. Corresponding to this a man will be leaving father and mother, and will be joined to his wife, and the two will be one flesh. This secret is great: yet *I* am speaking for Christ and for the ecclesia. However, you, too, individually, let each be loving his wife thus—as himself.

Let us glory in the affectionate bonds which bind Him to His ancient people. Let us rejoice in the response which He will secure from their hearts in the glad days which He has in store for them. But above all let us exult in the transcendent favor which He lavishes upon us. Her blessing will be the sum of earthly bliss. But let us not for a single moment envy her the happiness and nearness which is her blessed portion. Let us not cringe so low as to try and steal a single blessing from her.

We have no need to take aught from her. The very figure under which our distinctive favor is figured is enough to satisfy us with our higher, grander, richer, nearer, dearer portion. "No man ever yet hated His *own* flesh." Men have hated their wives. The bond can be strained and even broken. But our relationship to Him is such that He *cannot* but cherish us, for we are members of His own body! What *could* be nearer? What *could* be dearer? A. E. K.

The Unsearchable Judgments of Our God

RESTORATION

CHAPTER 5

THE fifth and last lament presents some distinct morphological features. The acrostic dress of its predecessors is entirely discarded. Only a reminiscence of it remains in the agreement of the number of the verses with the number of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Then there is a change of versification. While the third lament consists of triplets, and the fourth of couplets, the fifth has single line verses. Each verse is a long line broken into two parts of unequal length, the second part of which carries out the thought of the first in a modified form. The effect produced is something like a sound and its echo.

Again, this lament differs from the others in being entirely a prayer. In the earlier laments are found brief, exclamatory prayers, and the third contains two longer appeals—one calling attention to the insolence of the conquerors, the other imploring vengeance; but this lament from beginning to end is a prayer addressed directly to God. It is not a formal rehearsal of set petitions, but a meditation in the presence of God. With childlike simplicity and freedom the supplicants tell God what is on their heart. They would have Him know everything. With the confidence of those who have accustomed themselves to believe in the presence and sympathy of God, and have cultivated the habit of

communing with their heavenly Father, they relate their long acquaintance with sorrow and the lessons gleaned therefrom.

The prayer rises by degrees, each degree an octave higher than the preceding. Two lines of thought run parallel to each other. There is a progress of humiliation. Concurrent with this intensification of misery there is a corresponding elevation in spirituality. The opening section reviews the distressing yoke of external conditions (*vv.* 1-10). The terrible hardships of existence keep the people in a state of weariness verging on exhaustion. "We are weary, and have no rest." With the next section we pass into the sphere moral. The downtrodden people recite the terrible abuses and vile outrages perpetrated against them by their arrogant captors (*vv.* 11-18). The effect of these has been to change the aspect of all life. Joy has departed from their heart. Both these sections dwell on the common topic of "reproach" struck in the opening sentence. With a few keen, clear strokes the triplet of verses 16-18 summarizes the exact situation. "The crown is fallen from our head." Such is the reproach of Israel. It is degradation from royal rank. The unhappy nation has run the entire gamut of experience from royalty to slavery. "Woe unto us! for we have sinned." These words reveal the cause of the fall. Israel has experienced failure through sin. It has been deposed from royal estate on account of unworthiness. When the people follow the confession of their sin with the words, "for this our heart is faint; for these things our eyes are dim," etc., it is plain that they attribute the forfeiture of the crown to the guilt that has invited the disaster. The humiliation is now accounted for. The abject wretchedness is admitted by the people to be the effect of their defection. Their condition is like that of a swooning

person, and there is nothing in their surroundings affording relief. The desolate temple site, with jackals prowling over it as though it were a desert, brings home with point and force the memory of their sin, and acts depressingly on the spirit. When the point of utter helplessness is reached, the prayer suddenly changes into a fervid appeal for restoration (*vv.* 19-22).

The intense spiriual tone of this lament marks an advance on the four earlier poems. When the various sections of the book composed in the first pronoun plural are studied together, it becomes apparent that the last lament indicates a decided advance in the condition of the people. The spirit of the prayer is faultless. No unworthy thought, no questionable motive, no extravagant expression ruffles the course of this meditation. There is not one single jarring note from beginning to end; not one line that falls below the New Testament standard of deportment. The acme of self-possession is in evidence throughout. Direst poverty, cruelty, insult, tyranny, are recounted, yet there is no trace of complaint, not the slightest manifestation of provocation or passion. The vilest outrages are deplored; yet no expression of vindictiveness towards the perpetrators escapes the lips of the mourning people! How is this? Because the great truth enunciated at the close of the fourth lament has been thoroughly assimilated. This is the explanation of the remarkable change in the condition of the people observable in the last lament.

Two questions necessarily arise before those in the circumstances contemplated in our prayer. Are the consequences of sin interminable? Are the perpetrators of the outrages free to work out their pleasure, or are their acts controlled by a higher power? The proclamation of the "voice" answers these questions.

Rejoice and be glad, O daughter of Edom, that dwellest
 in the land of Uz:
 The cup shall pass through unto thee also; thou shalt be
 drunken, and shalt make thyself naked.
 Thine iniquity is ended, O daughter of Zion;
 He will no more remove thee:
 He will visit thine iniquity, O daughter of Edom;
 He will uncover thy sins.

Thine iniquity is finished. This stupendous declaration evidently does not take into account the element of time. It views the problem of sin entirely from God's standpoint. He has decreed that Israel's sin shall end, therefore it shall end at the time appointed. Potentially, Israel's sin is ended. Experimentally, it will end. But though sin is still present with Israel as a standing source of humiliation and sorrow, the certainty that it shall cease stimulates strength and inspires hope.

The termination of sin involves the terminability of judgment. Throughout the book the connection of the captivity with sin has been harped upon. Then since it has been called forth by sin, it will assuredly cease when sin ends. The linking of the terminability of Israel's sin with God's sovereignty over the nations is suggestive. It shows that His government embraces all peoples. His will is as effective outside the covenant as in Israel. This fact changes the whole aspect of the situation. The discovery that our oppressors are under God's control neither removes the shame nor relieves the pain, but it invests their acts with a meaning that compels a change of attitude. If He moves the nations against His people, then they are the rod of His anger; if so a complaint against the rod is really directed against the One who wields it.

The opening sentence of the prayer calls upon God to remember the *reproach* of His people—"Remember, O Lord, what is come upon us: Behold, and see our reproach. . . .

The crown is fallen from our head." The first two sections of the prayer have the "envelope figure," which connects the beginning and the end with all that comes between; thus the full sense implied is, the fallen crown is a standing witness of the sin of Israel. The popular idea of the time was that the defeat of a people was also the defeat of their god. Since Israel sustained a peculiar relationship to God, their ruin would be regarded as derogatory to the honor of their Divine Keeper. For His name's sake He chose and blessed them; therefore their fall cast a shadow upon His character. It seemed to imply that He was both changeable and unable to carry out His intention. The captives are deeply conscious of this. They have awakened to the realization that the honor and glory of God are bound up with their fortunes. They are keenly alive to the fact that they have dishonored His name. They would see His prestige reestablished, His honor vindicated; and that involves the fulfillment of all the promises of national blessing. Therefore the petition for restoration to the former estate is an evidence of their concern for His glory rather than self-seeking. They view the situation wholly from God's standpoint. Herein is evidence of a purged spirit. If under conditions of intense distress the suppliants evince more concern for His glory than they do for their sufferings, then indeed the center of their life has been wholly shifted. They have been regenerated by the fiery judgment. The severe ordeal has not been in vain.

We will now notice certain striking phrases of the prayer—"Remember, O Lord . . . Behold, and see our reproach . . . Wherefore dost thou forget us indefinitely, and forsake us for length of days?" Some have supposed that such language ascribes to God elements of human weak-

ness—that it charges Him with unresponsiveness, indifference, forgetfulness. Such supposition betrays inability to differentiate between the language of reason and imagination. Our writer has previously shown that God never really neglects any of His creatures, and that His attention is the all-sufficient security that deliverance will come. But in practice it is impossible not to speak according to appearances. Neither philosophy nor theology determine the form of earnest prayer. We give ourselves to prayer to unburden our hearts, to give vent to our pent-up feelings; we seek relief from the overwhelming influence of things visible and tangible. Under such circumstances restraint of expression is unthinkable, because phraseology is largely if not altogether inspired by feeling. We state things as they impress our imagination and affect our feelings; in the very nature of things we cannot pause to think whether our statement of the case accords with the spiritual verities which we hold. The firmest belief in Divine omniscience fails to remove the painful impression of feeling. The aspect of affairs is such as to force upon the suppliants the impression that God has forgotten them, and they frame their language accordingly.

The fact of this lament being a prayer accounts for its calm, dignified spirit. Even the feelings of outraged victims must be stilled in the presence of God. These captives stand in His presence, and the calm of the atmosphere communicates itself to them. In drawing near to God they escape the tumults of earth and breathe the still, pure air of heaven. He Himself is so calm and strong, so completely sufficient for every emergency, that they begin to enter His rest as soon as they approach His presence. All unawares, perhaps unsought, the peace of God steals into

their hearts as they cast their cares upon the heavenly Father.

These captives have long been pupils in the school of adversity. No teacher imparts so much to a docile pupil as sorrow. The language represents long reflexion over the ruin of Zion and the distress of its citizens. Protracted reflexion has exerted a clarifying and refining influence in the ideas of the people. Adversity has imparted fresh knowledge and a truer way of looking at life and its fortunes. More than this: it has accomplished the higher work of education—it has developed spiritual culture. This, indeed, is the great advantage that has accrued to the people from the stern discipline of sorrow. They have received grace to use it aright, are purged and pruned, chastened and softened, lifted to higher views, and at the same time brought down from self-esteem to deep humiliation. Here we have the key to the problem of judgment. *This lament throws light on the strange problem by its very existence, by the spirit and character which it exhibits.* The calmness, the self-restraint of the suppliants, enables us to see, as no direct statement would do, the real function of judgment. None can complain of an ordeal that issues in so much good. From this we derive the hint, that we must go through evil to enjoy good; that evil is a contending force necessary to give to goodness life and motion, if not generation.

In presenting the connection of shame with sin the writer reverses the order of antecedent laments. Before he passed from sin to shame, now he proceeds from the thought of shame to that of sin. It is the humiliating condition that awakens in the people the idea of the shocking guilt of which this is the consequence. Pride is a positive hindrance

to the right working of conscience. A false, lofty conception of their own dignity had made it impossible for the Jews to have a due feeling of guilt. So long as they retained a semblance of national independence there was enough to sustain and feed their pride, and thus those humbling thoughts which necessarily accompany the admission of sin were effectually barred out. The collapse of the commonwealth flung down the excess of pride, drove in an entering wedge for humility, and prepared the people to receive the accusations of conscience. Accusing thoughts rushed in and took possession of the heart. Self-examination detected the relation of the present misery to previous misconduct. The scenes of blood and terror are reviewed in a process of heart-searching self-examination, and confession of sin follows.

This is the main result aimed at through the whole course of judgment. Until it has been reached its work is not done. When it is attained judgment has wrought its greatest work. The disgrace of the situation leads to realization of guilt. Humbled and penitent, the chastened people are just in the position where God can meet them in gracious pardon. This confession of sin is quite unlike the formal confession of a public service in which every member of the congregation acknowledges mechanically that he has sinned. The downfall of Jerusalem made the Jews contemptible in the eyes of the nations, drove them to the silent retreat of their own thoughts, and there, calmly and deliberately, with full realization of the meaning of every word, they confess to themselves, "*We have sinned.*" The sinking of heart, the stinging humiliation, the sense of self-contempt which such an admission produces, are the most miserable experiences in life. The misery of it all is that there is no

possibility of escaping the accuser when he is self. We can do nothing but let the shame of the deed burn in the conscience without any mollifying oil—until the healing of Divine forgiveness is received. The condition is one of utter helplessness; and yet out of it rises the dawn of hope; for when man is most empty of self he is most ready to receive God. From the deepest pit of humiliation there springs the prayer of trust and hope with which the Book of Lamentation closes.

The lament takes a turn at the nineteenth verse. At the last moment our eyes are directed upwards. It is not by accident that a new attitude appears at the very close of the book. The course of the thought and the course of experience that underlies it have been preparing for the change.

The thought of the suppliants ascends at one bound from the desolate city to the throne of God in the heavens. In this change of vision the mood which gave rise to the Lamentations disappears. The fleeting things of a season lose their value in view of glory enduring through the ages. The praying people forget themselves and their surroundings in a rapt contemplation of the King of the Ages.

Thou, O Lord, abidest for the ages;
Thy throne is from generation to generation.
Wherefore dost thou forget us indefinitely—
Forsake us for length of days?
Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned;
Renew our days as of old:
Although thou hast rejected us,
And art very wroth against us.

The permanence of God's throne grips the people as they lift their eyes to the glory above. This is borne in upon their consciousness by the transitoriness of things. Men wither and fall like flowers; one generation follows another in the swift march to death; dynasties which outlive many

generations have their day; to be succeeded by others of an equally transient character; kingdoms reach their zenith, decline, and fall. His throne only remains, impregnable, unchangeable, untouched by the fortunes of war and the shocks of revolution which overthrow the thrones of nations. He is invincible and immutable, therefore His sworn purpose concerning Israel is also immutable; their desertion, therefore, can only be temporary. Their fall in no way affects the throne of God; it is even brought about by His will; it could not have occurred unless He had ordered it.

The thought of the stability of God's throne brings with it a recollection of sin. God has not resigned His sovereignty over the earth, though His representative nation has been carried into slavery. The overthrow of the Davidic throne has left the throne of God untouched. Then it was not through inability to aid His people that He did not interpose to avert the disappearance of the national throne. The reason is intimated in the phrase, "Turn thou us unto Thee, O Lord, and we shall be turned." God decreed the captivity to impress upon the people the need of a soul that has drifted into the wrong way, that their case is hopeless until they undergo a process of regeneration.

This remarkable prayer shows that the people perceive that they need something more than revulsion from the old life. They realize that a good wish is not enough of itself to attain its object. Their willingness is not sufficient. There must be an action of God. The people have learned the futility of resolutions. These may be repeated countless times without any result following. The suppliants are confident that when God takes them in hand to turn them to Himself they will be turned. The words suggest that previous efforts had been made, and had failed. They must wait for God to undertake the work, then success is certain.

Next, we see that the return is to be accompanied by an improvement in external conditions. The people pray, "Renew our days as of old." They pray that the crown may be replaced upon their brow. With a return to God the prosperity of former times will be brought back. The memory of a lost blessing makes the prayer for restoration the more intense. Since God is immutable He will surely turn them and renew their days. There is but one thing that might make their hope of renewal vain and fruitless—changeableness in God, and that one thing is impossible, nay, inconceivable. So deep is His love, so boundless His grace, to firm the strength of His fidelity to create unshaken conviction that He will turn them to Himself in filial trust.

With this note of hope terminates the Book of Lamentations. With the introduction of a brighter prospect the writer concludes his work, and the reader follows him—with feelings not unlike those of the traveler who, having long sojourned in dreary, storm-swept regions, at length emerges on some sunlit landscape smiling in tranquillity and peace.

EDITORIAL

A CREED may be nothing more than a doctrinal rut, serving to channel the mental activities of those upon whom the creed is imposed into certain desired directions. Whether it be a rut or a river-bed in either case the result is identical, viz., limitation. Perhaps a better simile would be that of a dam, for a channel, or rut, does not hinder the motion, it merely directs it, whereas a dam is altogether repressive, forbidding motion. The theological dams of Christendom have always acted thus, until at times the flood-tides of thought, or reason, have burst through the barriers.

A creed becomes an evil thing when it is the symbol of an idea that it contains the last word upon or all truth. When credal statements acquire a fixed finality we may gravely question whether such fixity is the immutability of immortal perfection or simply the rigor mortis associated with mental or doctrinal death. Creeds, like their makers, are mortal, and some of them are corrupt. A creed may be the Bethlehem of important truth; but alas! most of them are but the graveyards of Christian thought, in which the faith of millions has interred the questions and doubts of a thousand years.

A creed is mortal, and so liable to death. Let us add, it is also human, and so liable to err. It may be the label of truth. It may be the libel, too. It may possibly be the telescope which brings to my vision facts and truths which, without it, would forever lie unseen on the further

horizons of my faith. Again, it may be an unfocused, or mis-focused glass which but blurs into blindness the nearest objects to my sight.

The danger of a creed lies not so much in itself as in myself; that is to say in my attitude towards it. It is this that determines whether the creed I favor is to be swaddling-clothes or shroud. If my creed to me is but a tentative attempt to formulate consistently and intelligibly the articles of my faith, then it can never represent more than the letter A of future endeavors to formulate them more intelligibly and with greater consistency. If, however, my creed is the "last word" referred to before, then it represents the Z of all past attempts at formulation beyond which all further attempts were needless effort.

And we have all of us, and each of us, a creed. The difference is not in having, or not having, but in how we have it. To some of us our creeds are beginnings, to others they are ends. To the one class they are incentives of effort, to the other of indolence. A large section of the Church is but lazily intelligent on account of its creedal opiates. A parrot can talk, but it cannot think; that is it can talk like a man but it cannot think like one. A man that repeats a formula that he does not understand should have been born a parrot instead of a human. Nature, they say, at times can make mistakes.

But let us come back to the point that we have each one a creed. They exist, though maybe not on paper. For, after all, our creeds are but our doctrinal inventories, more or less consistent tabulations of the certainties of truth, as we see them. So long as my creed is an instrument of expression it fulfills an important function; when it becomes an instrument of repression—that is, the re-

pression of another's self-expression—then it becomes a breeding-centre of doctrinal disease. The great creeds of the centuries, so far as they have been expressions of the formulators views were not, perhaps, without their uses. As instruments of repression, in the dragooning of individual opinion, they not merely dammed but they also damned the activities of Christian intellect.

Any man that writes an article upon any subject is but writing his creed concerning it. Any man that tells you what his opinions are on any matter is but telling you his creed. The article you are reading is the writer's creed about creeds. It is subject to amendments. The only kind of men who are really without a creed are either dead or crazy. The African native has a creed about his pet fetish, as much though not so long as that recited in the Anglican jungle. Even the Atheist has his creed of negations, and his cousin the Agnostic a creed of his ignorance.

A creed is crystallized thought. It is the suggestion of rigor mortis again. Petrified wood has ceased growing long since. Petrified thought is static, immovable and fixed. Neither fruit nor flowers can be picked from the boughs of a petrified tree. All it has is form, and we can say but little more of some of the creeds. But the corpses of today are the living men of yesterday, and the creeds which at present repress, in times gone by expressed the beliefs and misbeliefs of their framers.

But we must have creeds, and each of us must have his own. We must believe, and the sum total of our beliefs is our creed. But my creed is my creed, not yours; and yours is peculiarly your own. The facts of our creeds will never change, facts don't. Our interpretations of those facts are ever changing, interpretations do. We must

be careful to revise our interpretations into greater consonance with facts. Our creed will then be a living thing, adapting itself to the new-found truth; as changeable as life, perhaps, but life-like ever reaching upwards to the sun.

Creed-makers and breakers have cause to imitate the mills of God. Grind slow. The road of Time is littered with the fragments of by-gone dogma. And we who add to the refuse-heap should hesitate before replacing the thing destroyed. Our children may have to scrap their fathers' follies with the rest.

We must have creeds even as we must have beliefs. But let these creeds be fluid and susceptible to truth. Let them be known as attempts rather than attainments, and as indications of truth's direction, rather than statements of its precise location. Modesty is not a dangerous disease—most creedmakers seem immune.

ALAN BURNS.

Paul's Epistle to the Galatians

FOREWORD

Two months ago to-day, the writer was called upon to pass through the bitter experience of bereavement. The tender tie of a companionship stretching over a period of thirteen years was suddenly and rudely snapped. In that dark hour I realized something of the feeling of the Psalmist when he said, "I am so troubled that I cannot speak" (Ps. 77:4). God's comfort came in a peculiar way. While dwelling on her to whom I owed so much in things spiritual, and who first brought to my attention Paul's gospel of grace, my thoughts turned to her favorite epistle—Galatians. Grace shone upon my heart with a fulness unknown before. Thus the death of my devoted helpmate became the means of rendering grace more resplendent. It pleased Him, whose death is the source of all grace, to make the death of one of His precious ones the vehicle of grace.

The light that dawned on me in the hour of sorrow I desire to share with my fellow-members in the Body of Christ. Nothing would have gladdened the heart of my departed companion more than an effort on my part to extol the cross of Christ. I therefore dedicate this exposition of Galatians, born in the hour of her death pangs, as a loving tribute to the memory of her who loved the cross supremely. To make the vision of the cross clearer, and to enhance its delivering virtue, is the sole aim of these studies.

To my readers I take leave to address the Apostle Paul's fraternal benediction: "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit, brethren. Amen."

V. GELESNOFF.

December 31st, 1916.

INTRODUCTION

THE Apostle Paul was "set for the defense of the gospel" (Phil. 1:17). The Epistle to the Galatians reveals the defender in action. It shows the ways and means of his defense, and the attacks which he repelled. The gospel committed to his trust is challenged; his apostleship is called in question. It is the greatest crisis of his ministry, the supreme moment of his life. Paul proves himself worthy of the occasion. He does not dodge the issue. With the full force and resolution of his vigorous, whole-hearted nature he throws himself into the fight. The exigencies of the occasion call into exercise all his human and super-human powers. The breadth and force of his kingly intellect, his boundless devotion to the Savior, the depth and warmth of his love reach the high water mark. We feel that of all mortals the apostle to the nations comes nearest to Him whose name is above every name.

The liberty of Paul's gospel was assailed by "false brethren" nursed in the bosom of the Jewish church at Jerusalem. In the early stage of his ministry the Judaic faction was bent on forcing circumcision (Gal. 2:3-5). The attempt signally failed. Paul carried the issue straight to the enemy's stronghold. He went down to Jerusalem. The verdict of the conference checked the circumcision propaganda. It does not appear that the party ever again openly taught circumcision as essential to salvation. The rescript of the apostles at Jerusalem made this impossible. Defeated in their efforts, the circumcisionists modified their

policy and clothed their doctrine in subtler garb. They now preached circumcision as the prerogative of the Jewish believer in Christ, and as a means of perfection for the Gentile believer (Gal. 3:3).

It is against this subtler type of Judaistic teaching that our epistle is more especially directed. The sum and substance of its burden is summarized in verse two of chapter five:

Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if you receive
circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing.

The Judaists sought to fuse law and gospel. Paul proves such fusion to be impossible. Law and gospel are irreconcilable. Every attempt to combine them strikes equally at the majesty of the law and the power of the gospel, making both of none effect.

The opening epistolary section (1:1-9) looks out upon a battlefield. The cross of Christ dominates the scene. Beneath its sacred shadow Paul grapples with those who would pervert his gospel, while the wavering Galatian churches watch the progress of the struggle. Paul, the divinely appointed bearer of a distinctive message to the nations, champions the cause of the cross. Pitted against him, ever seeking to discredit his apostleship and distort his message, are the circumcisionist teachers. The Galatians oscillate between the influences of these rival gospels. They are readily removing away from the original gospel under which they were called to another of a totally different sort.

The epistolary has introduced the protagonists in a warfare waging around the cross as the storm-center. The bulk of the epistle (1:10—6:10) presents the conflict in its various phases. The personal element naturally comes first (1:10—2:21). Paul solemnly testifies that the gospel he

preached was derived from no human authority, but direct from the ascended Christ. He appeals to the course of his life before and after his call to the apostleship to show the impossibility of other influence. This historic recital is full of action and animation. Paul flinging to the winds the traditions of Judaism; his sojourn in the solitude of the Arabian desert; his visit to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Peter: these momentous happenings engage our attention, while in the distance the churches in Judea eagerly receive news of his labors in distant regions and rejoice at his success (1:13-17). A new figure has entered the arena of apostolic labors; subsequent portions of the narrative watch the widening circle of effect. So far there is no hint of the Pauline movement being a novel departure. It seems as if the activities of the Jewish church were widened by the appointment of an extra apostle.

In the next stage of the recital the situation takes on a different complexion (2:1-10). The rehearsal of the circumstances attending the Jerusalem conference drives home the fact that Paul's gospel differs from that of the older apostles both in point of character and sphere. His doctrine came as a decided shock. His teaching that the gospel has displaced the law of Moses shook the Jewish church to its foundation. Paul insists on freedom from law: his antagonists are equally insistent on pressing the claims of circumcision. Titus, a Greek believer, is a test case for testing the validity of the rival claims. The Judaists want him circumcised, but are successfully resisted by Paul. The "pillars" throw the weight of their authority on Paul's side. They recognize his distinctive mission, extend to him the right hand of fellowship, and issue decrees to safeguard believers among the nations from circumcisionist aggression. But Paul's pronouncement of the law as "waxing

aged and nigh unto vanishing away" drove in a wedge which caused an ever-widening rift between his ministry and that of the apostles at Jerusalem.

The recital finds its climax in Paul's open conflict with Peter at Antioch on the question of the nations conforming with the law of Moses (2:11-21).

The account of this conflict merges in the more general statement of the principles involved. It contains the germinal thoughts which subsequent sections of the epistle are to develop. The impressive fact of the recital is the sustained persistence with which Paul labors to prove the assertion that his gospel is not after man. By appeal to events which at the time must have been matters of common knowledge he establishes the independence of his apostleship. He received his gospel *without* Peter; he proclaimed it on an *equality* with Peter, with the same attestation of Divine approval; he maintained it *in spite* of Peter. The difference between the gospel of the uncircumcision and that of the circumcision is the burning issue. It is a question of Paul versus Peter.

The second section carries us into the region of doctrinal principles (3:1—5:12). Here we have a masterly exposition of God's dealings with mankind from Abraham to Christ. The whole stream of sacred history and prophecy is here, focused in Christ. The cross is prominently to the fore. Grim Sinai, enveloped in the blackness of darkness, flashing fiery bolts and uttering redoubled threats, and Moriah, gilded with the luminous pillar of God's presence, loom in the distance. Israel's past, present, and future is identified with these mountains. Around these two geographical centers is gathered an array of historic characters illustrating the contrasted principles discussed in the epistle. In the semi-darkness enshrouding Mount Sinai

move the shadowy figures of Hagar and Ishmael. Their doleful experiences foreshadow the plight of Jerusalem, which stands with the galling yoke of slavery tightly fastened on her neck. Abraham, Sarah, Isaac and Christ stand around Mount Zion. Jerusalem above, their mother city, beckons them with its kindly ray and heralds the dawn of coming mercy for the Israel of God.

The discussion is poised on the Abrahamic and Sinaitic covenants. Paul shows that these covenants, these contrasted revelations, had different ends in view. They are complementary, not competing institutions. The Abrahamic promise has the right of priority, and looks directly to Christ. Mosaism was an interim institution, obtaining until the time of the "promised seed," ordained not directly by God but indirectly through a mediator. Law and Promise work along different lines. Their functions are distinct. Yet there is a cooperation between them. The design of the law was to mediate between the promise and its fulfilment. It guarded and tutored the infant heirs of the Abrahamic covenant, until the time appointed by God, when they should obtain the promise and be justified by faith. The law cannot give life. That is the prerogative of the Spirit. And yet the law subserved the ends of promise. Its searching enactments render sin "exceeding sinful"; it tears to shreds the rags of pride by which men seek to hide their failure, breaks the heart, renders it humble and contrite, preparing the ground for faith.

"Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness." That cannot mean either that he was recognized as actually being sinless, or that he was at that time by act of God made sinless. Abraham's faith was reckoned unto him for righteousness, not on the ground of his actually being so in life and character, but on the

ground of his, at the time, assuming a right attitude towards God's power and at the same time towards his own conscious impotence. "He considered his body as good as dead (he being about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb; yet looking unto the promise of God, he wavered not through unbelief, but waxed strong through faith, giving glory to God, and being fully assured that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. *Wherefore* it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was reckoned unto him; but for our sake also, unto whom it shall be reckoned, who believe on him that raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification" (Rom. 4:19-25).

The doctrine comes to this: the sinner who realizes his own inability to work righteousness, and God's readiness and ability to grant it, is as truly on the way and as near the end of righteousness as is then possible to him. God accepts the attitude of faith in the sinner as being righteousness, because it is the only act of man which is primarily and supremely right, and is the only righteousness possible for him at that stage. Righteousness in us cannot begin otherwise than as an incipient sense of sin and that pre-vision of God's realized purpose in man which we call faith. Faith is therefore reckoned to us for righteousness because it is the genesis of righteousness in us. When Paul says "it shall be reckoned unto us for righteousness," he does not mean *instead of righteousness*; he does not suggest a legal fiction whereby faith is substituted for a righteousness not forthcoming; but so *as to amount to righteousness, with a view to righteousness*. God gives what He demands, He calls the things that are not as though they were. He sees the fruit in the germ. Faith

does the same. It beholds the matured fruit of righteousness and becomes transformed into its image.

In this discussion of the relation of law and faith the apostle's thought advances in logical order. He first points out the fact that the transitory character of the law renders its removal necessary (3:1—4:20). Next he proceeds to show that the ground of law's removal is the compliance of faith with its just requirement (4:21—5:12). The transient character of the law is supported by two Scriptures—one from the Law, the other from the Prophets. The first quotation, Gen. 15:6, establishes the priority of faith to law.

Abraham was justified by faith four hundred years and more before the giving of the law. If faith lived and wrought for centuries without law, is it not evident that it does not require the prop of the law? It might be urged at this point, that while it is very evident that faith is older than law, yet since the advent of the latter the two principles were intended to be coexistent. Hab. 2:4, the other Scripture on the subject, disposes of the objection.

Apropos of this citation it has been said that Paul, after the fashion of many expositors, seizes upon isolated texts, having little or no bearing on the subject in hand, to prove his point. The charge is utterly unfounded. Even the most casual reader must recognize that the whole situation in Habakkuk brings into striking relevancy the antithesis between law and faith. The starting-point of the "burden" is the complaint regarding the prevalence of strife and violence consequent on the "slackening" of law (Hab. 1:3-4). He knows the penalty will inevitably come. His only question is "How long?" He is directed to watch the horizon. Out the dim border of the heathen world arises the avenger. God stirs against the law-breaking people a "bitter and

hasty nation." The proud Chaldean becomes master of the earth. Kingdom after kingdom is overthrown. Judah is trampled down. The curse of the law has come upon the guilty people; extermination stares them in the face. But the prophet goes back in thought to ancient days and looks beyond the storm and ruin of the time. "Art thou not from of old, O Jehovah, my God, my Holy One? we shall not die" (Hab. 1:12). The faith of Abraham wells up in the breast of Habakkuk and the "remnant." The people in whom dwells that faith cannot die. While empires fall and nations are engulfed in the flood of conquest, "The just shall live by his faith." Faith survives the doom inflicted by outraged law. The land is desolate; the holy city is in ruins; sacrifices have ceased; king and priest have wandered into exile; prophets are silent; the whole fabric of law has broken down entirely. But faith wings its upward flight, soars above the ruin, and obtains deliverance. If faith survived the collapse of law, then righteousness is of faith, and life of righteousness. Such is the doctrine which Paul erects on the impregnable foundation of the Law and the Prophets.

This masterly dissertation incidentally brings out the weighty fact that the cardinal principles of Paul's doctrine are no metaphysical abstractions, depending for their support on a process of arbitrary argumentation; but concrete realities grounded on actual fact and susceptible of proof. The postulate that faith is the only possible ground of righteousness rests on the historic facts of faith antedating and outlasting law. These are demonstrable facts. The documents recording them are available, and any one who cares may verify the matter for himself. More than this: the light of history corroborates the testimony of documentary evidence. Two millennia of accumulated experience

lie behind Paul's doctrine. In the centuries that have elapsed since the fall of Mosaism, the law has been well nigh forgotten, yet faith has not ceased from bearing a rich yield of mighty achievements and fragrant lives. History demonstrates the truth that righteousness is "not through the law."

Having shown the transient character of the law, the apostle turns to the manner of its displacement by the gospel. The transition from the one phase of the question to the other is quite pronounced. "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?" (4:21). *Hear* in the sense of complying. Do ye not comply with law's requirement? In this, as in other epistles, Paul is at pains to make clear that he does not "make void law through faith." He does not override the law in the interests of faith. Quite the contrary, he establishes it. He magnifies the law by putting it in its proper place. But how can the gospel establish the law which it sets aside? The distinction between the requirement and method of the law offers the solution of the problem. Righteousness is the requirement of the law (Rom. 8:4). In Mosaism this requirement was wedded to a set of rites and external precepts. God's Son, born under the law, came not to destroy, but to fulfill it (Matt. 5:17). The key to its fulfillment is His twofold declaration of love to God and our fellow man. "On these two hang the law and the prophets" (Matt. 22:40). In His supreme, unswerving love to God and man our Lord unified the moral code and fulfilled all laws in one. He divorced the requirement from the dead letter of external precept, and the stultifying form of ceremony, and by joining it indissolubly to love, refashioned and transformed it. Allied to love, law's requirement is no longer an exterior yoke, a system of

restraint and penalty; but becomes an inner, sweet constraint. In the men of faith it becomes an inward organic and formative force, a renovating influence changing the springs and directing the streams of life. Evil is no longer met by an opposition from without, but by a revulsion proceeding from within. Love takes possession of the citadel of the heart, fills it with kindly thoughts and feelings, and impels it to sympathetic action. Love works no ill to its neighbor, therefore love is the fulfillment of the law. Thus law's requirement is fulfilled in those who walk after the spirit. Judaistic bondage and gospel liberty; the covenants with Abraham and at Sinai; the circumcision and non-circumcision of the Galatians: these are the contrasts through which the doctrinal polemic advances. These tendencies stand opposed at every point. Each is bent on destroying the ascendancy of the other. Which shall we choose: Christ—or Circumcision?

The third section (5:13-6:10) contemplates the practical effects flowing from the contrasted principles of law and faith. The contention is brought home to the region of morals. Through the personal and doctrinal spheres of antecedent sections we are led into the universal. The vista which unfolds before us is the war of the human spirit against the Spirit of God, a conflict which extends over all ages and over all human life. The law and the gospel bear fruit according to their inherent qualities. The law was *weak* through the flesh. Holy and good in itself, when its authority was challenged by the insurrection of the carnal powers, its excellent rules proved inadequate and ineffective. It could not overcome sin, but only aggravated it. But if the law is powerless to curb the flesh, is it of any value as a life-principle for those in the flesh? The law is the power of sin (1 Cor. 15:56).

To be under it, is to be held consciously in the grasp of sin, to be shut up as hopeless prisoners of our own misdoings. There is no escape from this calamity.

The matter stands otherwise with faith. The gospel, being the *power* of God, can deal effectively with the flesh. Yes, it makes an instrument of the very flesh, which defied the law of God, and betrayed the man to the bondage of sin and death. There is a ring of triumph in the words—"the life I now live *in the flesh*, I live in faith" (2:20). The impossible has been accomplished. The body of death becomes the organ of the spirit of life. The flesh—the despair of law—has become the vessel of grace. "They that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and the lusts thereof" (5:24) is the moral application of Paul's doctrine. The Son of God "gave himself up for me," * * * "I have been crucified with Christ." The death of Christ was no legal subterfuge to carry out a substitutionary compact; it was representative. "He died for all, therefore all died in him" (2 Cor. 5:14). When He died God condemned sin in the flesh. Humanity's sin is already destroyed in principle. Faith unites us to the Crucified One. The scene of the cross is inwardly rehearsed in every believer. The stroke of God's finger which destroyed sin crucifies the flesh. It dies a slow, lingering death, but it dies, slowly, yet surely.

The closing epistolary gathers up the threads (6:11-18). From beginning to end the epistle moves in sight of the cross. We have watched the combatants in action. Now the strife is over, and their characters are revealed. Paul, the faithful herald and defender of the cross, stands before us a living example of its power. "The world has been crucified unto me, and I unto the world" (6:14).

The circumcisionists are unmasked. They are time-servers—traitors to both law and gospel. In theory they acknowledge both. In reality they stultify the one and deny the other. They court the favor of the evil age which crucified our Lord. Since circumcision was in vogue, it afforded them a convenient shield from the persecution which the cross evoked (6:12, 13). As for the Galatians, they cannot long be tossed like a shuttlecock between the rival principles competing for their allegiance. Sooner or later they must pronounce themselves. Will they continue in the freedom of sonship, or go back to the weak and beggarly rudiments? The issue is up to them. Paul has done all he could. He has argued, rebuked, entreated; he has exerted himself to win them; he has spread before them the evidence. One more effort before dropping the pen. He will allure them with the charms of the gospel. "As many as walk by this rule, peace upon them and mercy" (6:16). He is God's "chosen vessel." God's mark is upon him. Whosoever will raise his hand against him does so at his peril. Do you seek further proof of my apostleship? Look at my wounds—these are my credentials. He affixes the Saviour's seal, the sign-manual of *His wounded hand* upon the letter written in His name.

V. G.

The Nephilim

Studies in Genesis 6.1-8

THE NEPHILIM

THE fourth verse of the sixth of Genesis opens up a marvelous disclosure into time past, a disclosure which illumines not a few obscure, puzzling passages, and throws suggestive light on many ethnological and archaeological riddles. Unfortunately, this grand disclosure has been completely obscured in the current versions which, by interpolating several words, have adjusted the teaching of this passage to the requirements of tradition.

To ascertain the actual teaching of this verse it will be necessary to examine it word by word. In parallel columns we reproduce the verse as it stands on the pages of the Authorized and Revised versions, placing in brackets the interpolated words.

A. V.

There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare [children] to them, the same [became] mighty men which [were] of old, men of renown.

R. V.

The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men, and they bare [children] to them: the same [were] the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown.

The first point of inquiry relates to the word "giants" in the A. V. "Giants" is an interpretation rather than a translation of the term. As will be shown in future studies, *some* of these beings actually were of great stature, but the Hebrew word has no reference to size. The Revisers, in this instance, followed a wiser course. Instead of misleading men by importing into the sacred text their private opinions, they transliterated the Hebrew word, leaving the

reader to form his own opinions and draw his own conclusions.

The Hebrew word *nephilim* is a verb-form, the participle in poel of the verb *naphal*, to fall. The subjoined list gives all the passages where the verb occurs in the same construction.

"If one be found slain . . . *lying (nephilim)* in the field" (Deut. 21:1).

"And all *that fell (nephilim)* that day" (Josh. 8:25).

"All the children of the east *lay along (nephilim)* in the valley" (Judg. 7:12).

"For *there fell (nephilim)* an hundred and twenty thousand" (Judg. 8:10).

"So *that all which fell (nephilim)* that day" (Judg. 20:46).

"They found Saul and his three sons *fallen (nephilim)* in Mount Gilboa" (I Sam. 31:8; 1 Chr. 10:8).

"The *fugitives (nephilim)* that fell away to the King of Babylon" (2 Ki. 25:11; Jer. 39:9; 52:15).

"They were dead bodies *fallen (nephilim)* to the earth" (2 Chr. 20:24).

"The Lord upholdeth all *that fall (nephilim)* (Ps. 145:14).

"They shall fall *among them that fall (nephilim)* (Jer. 6:15; 8:12).

"All of them slain, *fallen (nephilim)* by the sword" (Ezek. 32: 22, 23, 24, 27).

It is clear from the context of these occurrences that our participial form *fallen* is the exact equivalent of *nephilim*, and that it denotes invariably the *condition*, not the size, of the persons in question. In Gen. 6:4 the definite article *ha* is prefixed to the participle, which thus acquires the force of an appellative noun—"The Fallen Ones."

Who were the Nephilim? If we read the text carefully, marking well the facts as we proceed, the verse itself will supply the desired answer to the question. Observe, in the first place, the emphatic marks of time connected with the Nephilim.

(1) “The Nephilim were in the earth in days the those.” What days? The demonstrative “those,” to which the definite article lends special emphasis, makes it evident that the writer alludes to a period already referred to. Now the only mention of time is the one expressed by the adverb “when” in the opening sentence of the chapter. “Those days,” then, point back to the days of verse one—the time when Adam’s daughters were born.

(2) “And also after that, when the sons of God went in unto the daughters of the man.” The words “after that” are quite generally detached from the qualifying words that follow, and referred to the time after the flood. But this is a flagrant fallacy. There has been as yet no mention of the flood, therefore the writer can not possibly use as a landmark an unknown event. Furthermore, the connective adverb “when” links “after that” to the going in of the sons of God unto the daughters of Adam. “When the sons of God went in, etc.” is explanatory of “after that.”

The two landmarks lie within the lifetime of Adam. The one refers to the birth of his daughters; the other, to their marriage and motherhood. We have no means to determine the length of time intervening between these events, but it must have been considerable.

“And they bare *children* to them; the same *became* the mighty men which were of old, men of renown.” The italicized words inserted by the translators, “children” and “became,” have thrown a false color over the interpretation of the passage. They make the text convey the idea

that the offspring of the sons of God and the daughters of the man became men of renown. The interpolated word "children" becomes the subject of the sentence and the object of the pronoun "the same." But since children are not *directly* mentioned in the text, but merely *implied* in the verb "bare," the Nephilim are the subject of the passage, and the pronoun "the same" refers to them. The Nephilim, not the offspring of the sons of God, were what our versions call "the mighty men which were of old."

The phrase "daughters of men" we have already spoken of in dealing with the antecedent verse, and requires no further explanation, beyond a reminder that they are the "daughters of the man," that is, the daughters of Adam, and not women in general.

Again, the word "men," which both versions insert after "mighty," is not admissible as a translation. The word *gibbor*, being an adjective, is not to be arbitrarily joined with "men," as it is in our versions (pl. "mighty men"); "mighty ones" is a better translation, or simply "mighty."

"The mighty ones which were of old." *Of old* represents the Hebrew *olam*, which is translated "for ever" in the preceding verse. There is a startling inconsistency here. In one breath the same word, used each time of created beings, is made to denote both finite and infinite duration! In ver. 3 *olam* is joined to the preposition "for" (ל); in ver. 4, to "from" (מ); *there* it points to the future, *here* it looks to the past; in the one case it implies continuance, in the other remoteness; in both instances it expresses terminable duration of unrevealed length.

Enosh cannot be properly translated "men" in the sense of individuals; its true meaning is *mortal*, *i. e.*, a creature with reference to its weakness, as one of a race which is mortal and frail, liable to death and dissolution, pain and

suffering (Job. 4:17; Ps. 90:3; 103:15; Isa. 51:12). The word should be translated *mortal*, as in Job 4:17. Its intent is to emphasize the fact that, though mighty and famous, the Nephilim were nevertheless *mortal*. The translation of the Hebrew words *adam* and *enosh* by "men" is a source of confusion.

Having due regard to the surrounding thoughts of our verse, and disregarding the "improvement" of interpolated italics, the passage stands out in its pristine form and native force:

The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God went in unto the daughters of the man, and they bare to them: the same (the Nephilim) the mighty ones which were from old—mortals of renown.

This text exhibits the "parenthetical" structure. The parenthesis commences after the words "those days," and extends to the pronoun "the same." This long sentence shows a parenthetical remoteness from the context such as in a modern book would be signified by a footnote. For the sake of clearness, we will separate the parenthesis from the main sentence, and present the two in parallel columns.

MAIN SENTENCE

The Nephilim were in the earth in those days*: the same the mighty ones from old—, mortals of renown.

FOOTNOTE

*And also after that, when the sons of God went in unto the daughters of the man, and they bare to them.

By thus removing the footnote to a distance we are able to see its subsidiary function. The main sentence calls attention to the Nephilim being both ancient and famous at the time Adam's daughters were born. The footnote reiterates the fact of their being on earth at a later date in the life-time of Adam's daughters.

In Gen. 6:4 four distinct classes are mentioned: (1) the sons of God—Adam's male children; (2) the daugh-

ters of the man—Adam's female children; (3) the offspring of the sons of God and the daughters of the man—Adam's grandchildren; (4) the Nephilim. The latter are in a class by themselves. The first three classes are *Adamites*, viz., the descendants that sprang from Adam's loins. The Nephilim are clearly not, for they were already on earth (1) when Adam began to multiply; (2) when his daughters were born; (3) when his daughters were married, and (4) when his grandchildren were born.

The fact that the Nephilim were not Adam's progeny, besides being directly stated in our verse, is further emphasized by a series of impressive contrasts. "Adam *began* to multiply . . . the Nephilim were *from old*." Adam was a recent arrival: he was just getting settled and beginning to raise a family. The Nephilim were old settlers. "Adam on the face of the ground (*adamah*) . . . the Nephilim were in the earth (*erets*) in those days." Adam with the few members of his family occupied a small region in the proximity of Eden, where he and his wife dwelt after their expulsion from the garden. The Nephilim, as old settlers, were numerous and occupied the earth at large. "Adam *began* . . . the Nephilim, the mighty ones which were from old—mortals of renown." The Adamic race was in its infancy, which, like the infant state of the individual, was characterized by weakness and mental simplicity. The Nephilim were ancient and had already won fame by their prowess and achievements.

Chronologically, territorially, sociologically, in all these respects the Nephilim stand in sharp contrast to the Adamites. *Chronologically*, the Nephilim were ancient. Their history stretched back into the misty past when the Adamic race was nascent. *Territorially*, the Nephilim spread over a wide area of the earth's surface when the

little family of Adam was farming a small parcel of ground. *Sociologically*, the Nephilim were a mature, developed race, fast becoming decrepit: their achievements lay in the remote past. The Adamites were just beginning community life, and as yet had had no time to unfold their powers and demonstrate their capabilities. It is thus abundantly evident that the Nephilim were a primitive race that peopled the earth centuries before Adam's creation, and were both numerous and powerful when our progenitor began to carry out the charge to multiply.

Such is the teaching of Gen. 6:4. Other parts of the book corroborate its testimony. The dialogue between Jehovah and Cain is a valuable side light on our text. "And Cain said unto Jehovah, Mine iniquity is greater than I can bear. Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the ground; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a wanderer in the earth; and it will come to pass, that whosoever findeth me will slay me. And Jehovah said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold. And Jehovah appointed a sign for Cain, lest any finding him should smite him" (Gen. 4:13-15). The apprehension of Cain, and God's condescension in allaying it by making adequate provision for his safety, prove that the earth was peopled at the time. Who could have slain Cain if there were no inhabitants? Surely Cain was not afraid of his parents. If Cain's fears were but the qualms of a guilty conscience, would God have taken the precautionary measures which He did? Would He have promised to wreak on his murderers sevenfold vengeance? No! Cain's fears were grounded in fact; he spoke words of soberness and truth. He knew that the regions beyond were inhabited by fierce, warlike tribes, and was unwilling to go

among them without some measure of protection. God conceded the justice of Cain's demand, and, in granting it, testified to the truth of his words.

The career of Cain subsequent to his departure from the presence of the Lord affords further proof of the existence of an aboriginal population, and demonstrates the promise-keeping faithfulness of God. "And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch" (Gen. 4:17). The verb *canah* is in the participle—he *was* building. This shows that Enoch was born *while* Cain was building his city, and the fact that he called both by the same name shows that the two were connected in his mind with the same purpose. He was building his city with a definite end in view, and the advent of an heir gave new impetus to its prosecution. Tradition asks us to believe that Cain and his wife, a lone couple in the wide, empty world, were expending their energies in building a city! Credulity may take in such puerilities; but faith and reason must regard them as impositions.

The sacred narrative places no such strain on either faith or reason. On the contrary, it commends itself to them by its cogency and coherence. It has disclosed the reason which prompted Cain to ask for the protection which God graciously vouchsafed. Armed with the sign of Divine protection, Cain went into exile. This hardy man, shrewd, far-sighted, enterprising, of strong personality and settled habits, undertook the task of civilizing the turbulent aborigines. The advent of a stranger is sure to arouse suspicion and excite prejudice. Accordingly, Cain's first move is to disarm hostile feeling. He does this by marrying a native female and settling down among her people. Having thus won her people's confidence and gained a foothold in

the new community, his next move is to strengthen his hold upon the people, consolidate the advantages already won, and render his position more secure. To this intent he builds a city. The advent of an heir made it necessary to provide for the permanence and stability of his house, and must have acted as a powerful incentive and stimulus to effort. The history of the Cainites will be the subject of a separate chapter. So for the present we will bid Cain adieu, and leave him at his strenuous task of city-building.

Let us now turn to the line of Seth. "And to Seth, to him also there was born a son; and he called his name Enosh. Then began men to call upon the name of Jehovah" (Gen. 4:26). The last clause of the verse records the fact that, with Enosh's birth, something began to be done that had not been done before. What was then begun? Let us observe a few things. In the first place, the word "men" is wanting in the Hebrew; and the verb is impersonal—*was begun*. The verb *karah*, the infinitive of which is here rendered "to call" has a wide range of application. Its primary meaning is to call. But when it carries the idea of publicity it is translated "proclaim," as in Lev. 25:10, "*proclaim liberty*," or "preach," as in Jonah 3:2. (See also Isa. 12:4; 61:1; Jer. 3:12; 34:8, 15, 17; 36:9; Joel 3:9; Amos 4:5.)

As to the phrase "upon the name," it is to be noted that it is used when a person acts on behalf of another, as the following examples attest:

Ex. 5:23: "I came to speak *in thy name*."

Deut. 18:20: "Presume to speak *in thy name*."

Deut. 18:20: "Speak *in the name of other gods*."

Deut. 18:22: "Speaketh *in the name of the Lord*."

Deut. 18:5, 7: "Minister *in the name of the Lord*."

Deut. 21:5: "Bless *in the name of the Lord*."

1 Sam. 25:5: "Greet him *in my name*."

Ps. 118:10, 12: "*In the name of the Lord* I will cut them off."

Ps. 118:26: "Blessed is he that cometh *in the name of the Lord*."

Ps. 129:8: "We bless you *in the name of the Lord*."

In all these instances the phrase is the same as in our passage—*be-shem*. There is therefore no mistaking the precise meaning of the phrase before us. The precise language of the passage occurs again in Ex. 33:19—"I will proclaim in the name of the Lord." Here the current versions have "proclaim" instead of "call", and though they leave out the preposition "in" before the noun, yet in the original the reading is *be-shem*, the same as in the text under examination. We are thus driven to read: "*Then to proclaim in the name of the Lord was begun*."

The questions arise, What was the nature of the proclamation? To whom was it addressed? Gen. 1:26-28 declares God's purpose and program for mankind. "And God said, let us make mankind in our image after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every moving thing that moveth upon the earth" (Gen. 1:26). Mankind was to differ from the living souls created on previous days by their divine likeness and rank as rulers. In this lies the preeminence of man above the animals. By reason of their likeness to God, mankind was to rule over the other creatures which dwell with them on earth. They were God's gift to mankind, to be made serviceable to their purposes (Gen. 9:2; Ps. 115:16).

The sphere of mankind's dominion comprises sea, air and land. Their authority was to extend over

- (1) the fish of the sea
- (2) the fowls of the air
- (3) the cattle
- (4) all the earth
- (5) every moving thing that moves upon the earth.

Nos. 3, 4 and 5 enumerate the various kind of land creatures. The "cattle" and "every living thing that moves upon the earth" include *all* sentient creatures. What, then, is the meaning of the middle clause, "and over all the earth"? It is something distinct from the "cattle" and "every living thing." Here, as very frequently in the Old Testament, "the earth" denotes *population* (Gen. 9:13, 19; 10:25; 11:1; 18:25; Isa. 45:22; Hos. 1:2; Hab. 2:20; Zech. 1:11; 2:13). Mankind's dominion was not confined to animals. It embraced intelligences. It is this fact that imparts dignity to their rank.

Next, the sacred writer records the initial step in the enactment of God's purpose and points out the manner of its realization. "And God created the man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them. And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful and become many, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every moving thing that moves upon the earth" (Gen. 1:27-28). Mankind was to spring from one progenitor, and subdue the earth by the slow, gradual process of increase through reproduction. This lordship of mankind, which is a consequence of their possession of the divine image, was conferred by special blessing of God, and is the inheritance of mankind through procreation. It belongs to man in general, not merely to man in the original condition. The verb *mahlah*, the im-

perative of which is here translated replenish, denotes recurrence in Gen. 9:1, and it must have the same force here, for the prophet tells that it was inhabited (Isa. 45:18). By procreation mankind was to displace the aboriginal tribes and reduce them to submission.

Procreation, expansion, subjugation—these are the several phases of the task assigned to mankind. Tradition, in whittling down the charge to “subdue” to mean the taming of wild beasts, has lowered man’s vocation to the level of a circus performer. Those adhering to traditional views should not forget that there is nothing in Scripture to indicate the existence of a ferocious spirit among animals until after the flood (Gen. 9:2).

Gen 6:1 shows what happened when Adam began to carry out the charge to “multiply.” Gen. 4:26 relates under what circumstances the charge to “subdue” was undertaken two hundred and thirty-five years after the giving of the commission to Adam. The birth of Enosh was the signal to begin. Seth was born when Adam was one hundred and thirty years old (Gen. 5:3). In that time Adam and Eve had had three children—Cain, Abel, Seth. Taking this as the average ratio of family increase before the flood, when Enosh was born Adam would have four sons (exclusive of Cain), and the need for more areable land to meet the requirements of the family would make itself felt. So long as Seth was childless he would be content to dwell on his father’s estate. But when his first child was born he would naturally want to branch out and make a home of his own. Thus, impelled by the requirements of an increasing family, men would seek to enlarge their borders. The campaign of expansion was preceded by a promulgation of the Divine decree appointing mankind to rule the earth.

One millennium and a half after the first beginning mankind became completely demoralized and was engulfed in a watery grave. Only eight persons survived the wreck. Failure was complete. The outlook for mankind looked fearfully gloomy. The case seemed altogether hopeless, when God intervened, and by special blessing, conferred on Noah the commission originally given to Adam. This divine act shows that no failure on the part of man can frustrate His purpose or cause Him to deviate from his original intention. Neither the fall of Adam nor the apostasy of the antediluvians could change His mind. "The word is gone forth from my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return" (Isa. 45:23).

Another millennium and a half elapse, and the Spirit of God moves the "sweet singer of Israel" to write an apostrophe on the destiny of mankind. In Psalm eight, David rejoices in God's purpose as revealed to Adam. Jehovah, the unchanging God, is addressed as Adonai, or Supreme Ruler of the universe (v. 1). The ground of praise is the fact of God having "established strength" through means utterly inadequate in themselves. By the lips of "babes and sucklings" the "adversaries" have been reduced to submission; the "enemy and avenger" has been stilled (v. 2). What can be more helpless than suckling babes?—yet by means as helpless God has accomplished mighty effects. This triumph of weakness reveals mankind's exalted rank. "How great is mortal, that thou art mindful of him, and a son of mankind that thou visitest him!" In putting all things "under his feet" man is crowned with "glory and honor"; in fact, his station is seen to be "but little lower than God" (v. 5). The proud "avenger" has found more than a match in a "stripling." And now that the adversaries are reduced to submis-

sion, the whole range of sentient life, to the remotest border of human knowledge, will submit to man's sway (*vv.* 7-8). Thus the excellence of the All-Ruler, who made mankind for such a glorious mission, is published abroad in "all the earth" (*v.* 9).

What occasion called forth this rapturous ode? The Psalm, as the subscript testifies, celebrates David's victory over Goliath. Now Goliath came of the Nephilim, which had instilled such terror in the spies (*Nu.* 13:33), and which were doomed to perish by the sword of Israel. Goliath appears to have been the last exponent of their martial prowess. At Ephes-dammim the Nephilim in Canaan were dealt a crushing blow: they fell to rise no more. With the collapse of the Nephilim power the obstruction in the way of mankind's path to dominion was gone. What could now hinder the attainment of the goal? God's grand purpose for mankind was focused in the encounter of the Adamite David with the Nephilim Goliath. The issue between the "babes and sucklings" and the "adversaries" was decisively settled between David and Goliath. The victory of David testified to the immutability of God's purpose and was a pledge of its consummation. Out of weakness comes forth strength; the last become first. Such is God's way. Muscular strength and ponderous armaments were powerless against God's decree. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts" (*Zech.* 4:6).

The Nephilim appear to have played a very prominent part in the early period of David's reign. David's encounter with Goliath was the first of a series of contests between Nephilim champions and descendants of Adam. No less than four such contests are recorded in *2 Sam.* 21:15-22. All the Nephilim champions met a

like fate with Goliath. All fell by the hand of David and his mighty men. David's song of victory and deliverance, in 2 Sam., twenty-two, sustains an obvious relation to the fall of the Nephilim worthies. The success of David, though national in character, was fraught with racial consequences. It secured the ascendancy of mankind over their competitors.

A feebler echo of God's purpose for mankind comes from the "rivers of Babylon." The horn of Israel is broken down. The crown has fallen from their head. The royal nation is a prisoner in chains. When Nebuchadnezzar was besieging Jerusalem, the Nephilim (in our versions "deserters", "them that fell away") went over to the Chaldeans (2 Ki. 25:11; Jer. 39:9; 52:15). Perhaps they hoped by this move to win recognition and recoup at least a semblance of their former greatness and independence. The attempt failed. Nebuzardan carried the Nephilim to Babylon along with the captive Judeans, and nothing more is heard of them. The headship has departed from Israel, but still remains in the hands of Adam's descendants. The commission originally given to Adam is reiterated to Nebuchadnezzar, "Wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee to rule over them all" (Dan. 2:38). Nor is this all: Daniel goes on to trace the changes in dominion until the Divine purpose is fully realized under the Son of Man. We see the headship changing hands; we see it passing from nation to nation, and reverting back to Israel. But never once does it pass out of the hands of the Adamites. "His gifts and calling are without repentance."

So imperious and supreme, so boundless and unchange-

able is the purpose of God for mankind, that they may know and believe "nothing"—may resolutely refuse to obey the local conditions of their temporal growth, may neglect to bind up the hearts they break, may fail to increase the happiness of their fellows—and yet, with the whips of penalty and self-education folded in their nature, they float forward in miserable darkness upon the life-currents of the universe, or slowly and sadly they sail through the chilly blasts of their own ignorance and evils—away, away, away, toward the far-off era of ultimate perfection and reconciliation—surely, safely, just as if they had known and believed the whole experience in advance. But here is the point: they might have had a pre-realization of the consummation in their heart, might have walked through a serene path, might have diminished other's woes and multiplied the recipients of happiness, by earnest *faith* in God's purpose and by *obedience* to His revealed will. Our faith and obedience *help us* and others in the world; not the One who governs the infinite, with an unerring hand.

We will next turn our attention to the scattered references to the Nephilim, and, by stringing them together, attempt to construct something like a connected outline of this "prehistoric" race.

The Mystery of Babylon

THE SONG OF SONGS

THE Song of Songs is the love song of Jehovah. It celebrates the story of His affection for His people Israel. Other books tell us of their political or ecclesiastical history: this exquisite poem is an impassioned series of pictures portraying their experiences from the tender standpoint of love. In it we can trace the story of Israel and her Lover from the slavery of Egypt until she is seated upon His throne, when she lives and reigns with Him a thousand years.

It is not proposed to give an exposition of this gem of literature. That would take us too far from our course and would be doing a wrong to the song itself, which is worthy of much more attention than can be accorded to it here. All we wish to do is to suggest the true interpretation and give sufficient extracts from the poem itself to confirm it.

So long as the church was thought to be the bride, a few random passages of special beauty were culled from the song as expressive of their affectionate relationship. Just as in the other Scriptures, a lone passage may seem to fit a misplaced truth, but no considerable context will support a false position, so it is with this song. The narrative as a whole cannot be made to fit the circumstances of the present ecclesia, even though isolated texts may seem to present the love which He bears us. On the other hand, the closer we examine its allusions and images, the more does it become apparent that His beloved Israel is in view.

And could it be otherwise? The truth and teaching for the present is founded upon a series of secrets, or "mysteries," which were not revealed to the ancient Hebrews. That the nations should ever have as near a place as is

accorded to the bride in the Song of Songs was not only unknown but unknowable at the time when it was given to His people. Indeed, to one who duly considers the facts, it would be most heartless and cruel to give the beloved nation a song celebrating not only their own rejection, but His unfaithfulness to the vows by which He had bound Himself to her.

If we have the slightest sympathy with Solomon and his times, and the typical import of his reign, we will be unable to force ourselves to imagine him writing anything which celebrates the ascendancy of the alien nations over Israel. How could he write his best composition on a theme which would involve the shame of the nation which, under him, was a type of that future millennial day when a greater Son of David will celebrate His marriage to his people and thus fulfill his sweetest Song?

The figures used concerning the bride are such as are confined to Israel in the prophets and which are used by our Lord and His apostles, who were all ministers of the circumcision.

She keeps the vineyard (1:6) for the nation which was but an empty vine (Hos. 10:1). This vine was brought out of Egypt and displaced the nations in the land (Ps. 80:8-9). Israel should have furnished the wine to cheer God and man (Judges 9:13). She should have been the joy of Jehovah and the benefactor of the nations. But she only brought forth fruit for *herself* (Hos. 10:1).

Our Lord was the true, the genuine Vine. He will furnish the joy, both for God and man, which Israel failed to do. All Israel were branched in Him (Jno. 15:1-11). But all who had no vital connection with him and bore no fruit, have been pruned out.

The accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke deal with the vineyard. In a parable they present the nation which ought to have kept the vineyard, and the treatment which they accorded His servants, the prophets, and His Son

(Mt. 21:33; Mk. 12:1; Lu. 20:9). What does He do with the vineyard? He will give it to a nation *bringing forth its fruits* (Mt. 21:43).

This nation will be composed of those who, in John's gospel, are exhorted to bring forth much fruit.

In the light of these figures we can understand the Brides' solicitude for the vines (2:13; 6:11; 7:8, 12) and why she is made keeper of the vineyard (1:6).

Another allusion, which is most suggestive when considered in the light of our Lord's words to His disciples, is not found in our versions. It so happens that the word *prune* and *make music* are from the same root in Hebrew. *Zahmar* is used of the *pruning* of a vineyard (Lev. 25:3, 4; Isa. 5:6) and of the *playing* on musical instruments (Ps. 98:5; 147:7). But in this case the usage of the verb bids us render it *prune*, rather than *sing*. The Septuagint renders it thus, and Symmachus, one of its editors, insists on this rendering.

If we combine all this evidence with the spiritual import of pruning, by which the dead members of Israel were lopped off from the blessings of the Bride, we will be glad to change.

The time of the singing of birds is come.

to the true reading:

The time for pruning [our vines] has come.

She is a shepherdess. She tended the tender sheep (1:8). Her Lover is a Shepherd, too (1:7). Peter tells us that He is the Chief Shepherd and exhorts those who belong to the Bride to shepherd the little flock (1 Pet. 5:2-4). Indeed, Peter's pastoral ministry consisted in this very thing, for had not his Lord told him to shepherd His sheep and feed His lambs? (John 21:15-17).

As the good Shepherd, He lays down His life for the little flock. As the great Shepherd He will tend *all nations*

with an iron club (Rev. 12:5; 19:15). And with Him will be the Shepherdess of the Song of Songs.

She is a lily of the field (2:1). Perhaps no line in the entire poem so misrepresents the truth as the seeming boast of the bride, "I am the rose of Sharon." True, she calls herself "comely" (1:5), but even the English reader can see that this is misleading, since she is "black." How uncomely it is to hear her vaunt her own charms, as our translators force her to do! Let us hasten to assure ourselves that this unlovely spirit of self adulation finds no place in her breast. In reality she says:

Though black am I, yet meet [for Him]
 [O ye] daughters of Jerusalem,
 As the tents of the dark Kaydawr,
 As the curtains of Solomon.
 O look not at my swarthy hue
 For the sun has stared me so.

And is not this the attitude of the bride of the Lambkin? All unworthy are they, yet meet for Him. In Him she may well boast, even of her own acceptance, for it magnifies His grace. Whatever beauty she has is all from Him. Like the lily of the field, the gorgeous anemone, the commonest of all the wild flowers of the land, or the white anemone, which grows in the lowly valleys, she is clothed with a garment direct from the hand of God.

Did not our Lord have this in His heart when He bade His disciples to consider the lilies of the field? Solomon himself, to whose Song our Lord refers, wore vestments of regal splendor, yet was not arrayed like one of these.

What a lovely simile of God's robe of righteousness! It is as beautiful as the floweret—and as unassuming. Well, indeed, may the bride in modest bashfulness protest:

I am a lily of the field,
 A lily pale of the lowly dale.

And right well may He respond:

As a lily [white] 'twixt a thornbush [black],
 E'en so's my friend the daughters among.

and she retorts in true lover fashion :

As an orange tree in a forest wild
E'en so's my Beloved among the sons.
In its shade I delighted to find a seat
And its fruit to my palate was [lusciously] sweet.

Again and again in our Lord's ministry, especially in John's account, we find Him seeking to engage them with His affections. As the bride expresses it :

He led me into His storehouse of wine
And o'er me unfurled His love's ensign.

Not only are the figures used in the Song of Songs used by our Lord and the apostles of the Circumcision, but the whole action of the Song corresponds with the history of the beloved nation.

First He compares her with Pharaoh's horses—an unmistakable reference to the bondage of Egypt.

I compare and compare thee, O my friend,
To Pharaoh's chariot steeds.
How becoming are thy harnessed cheeks,
Thy neck its collar beneath!

But He is not satisfied with her harness and promises her a new service to Jehovah, adorned with the silver of redemption :

A harness of gold will we make for thee
All set with silver studs.

From Egypt until His advent there was but little in Israel's history to engage His heart. But we will expect to find His meeting with the bride given a prominent place. And so it is. What could equal the following lines as a description of His ministry ?

Then spake my Beloved and said to me,
"Arise, my friend, my perfect one,
And come away.
For see! the winter is over [now,]
The showers are past and gone,
The time for pruning [our vines] has come
And the turtle dove's cooing is heard in our land.

The fig tree seems to ripen its figs
 And the vine with its blossom scents [the air].
 Arise, my friend, my perfect one,
 And come away."

Here we have the Kingdom presented in the fig tree, the pruning of the true Vine of all those who have no part with Him, and the Spirit-taught disciples in the cooing of the doves. Peter, the representative of the disciples, is called by this very name, when, after voicing the spirit-taught truth that his Master was indeed the Messiah, the Son of the living God, our Lord calls him the son of Jonah, which is, interpreted, the "son of a dove."

Since the spirit descended upon our Lord at His baptism in the form of a dove, we need not be at a loss as to its significance. Perhaps nothing was more highly prized by our Lord than some manifestation of its presence in His disciples. How exquisitely is this expressed in the Song of Songs!

My dove, in the cleft of the riven rock,
 In the covert ascent of the precipice,
 A vision of thee I fain would see:
 Cause me to hear thy cooing [clear],
 For thy cooing is sweet and thy countenance meet."

In Him as the Rock, riven for her shelter, the gentle dove breathes forth her gratitude.

The period of His presence with them is thus rapturously described by the bride:

My Beloved is mine, and I am His;
 He feeds [His flock] the lilies among,
 'Till the evening breeze has cooled the day
 And the shadow flees and hies away.

This is followed by the night of His absence. In a single word the bride breathes out the desire of her heart, even as we hear her implore Him in the Apocalypse: "The spirit and the bride say, 'Come!'"

Return!

I compare and compare Thee, Beloved mine,
 To a [swift] gazelle or a fawn of the stags
 Upon the dividing mountain crags.

The persecution of the bride, as viewed by the Bridegroom, during the period of His absence, is inferred in the warning to Jerusalem's daughters.—“Behold, I come quickly!” may be read in the reference to the gazelle and the hind. It stirs His heart to see His bride suffer.

Jerusalem's daughters, I charge you strait,
By the [swift] gazelle or the [fleet] plain hind,
Lest you should stir or rouse my love
Till she be so inclined!

Enough has been given to show the subject of the Song of Songs. It celebrates Jehovah's love for the faithful among His ancient people Israel. They are His Bride and they are the subject of this Song.

The gulf between her and the daughters of Jerusalem, who find no beauty in Him, is best expressed in the words of the Song itself:

BRIDE

Jerusalem's daughters, I charge you strait,
If you should find this Beloved of mine,
Then tell Him that with love I pine.

DAUGHTERS

What is thy Beloved more than any beloved,
Thou fairest of womankind?
What is thy Beloved more than any beloved
That thou dost charge us thus?

BRIDE

My beloved is white with a ruddy [glow],
Conspicuous among a myriad [men].
His head is purest gold refined.
His wavy locks are a raven black.
His eyes are as dove's by a water course,
Which are washed in milk and abide by its flood.
His cheeks as a fragrant garden bed
A bank of aromatic herbs.
His lips, like lilies, drip liquid myrrh.
His hands a gold ring with amber set;
His trunk of bright iv'ry with sapphires o'erlaid;
His limbs are marble columns white,
Securely set on a base of fine gold;
His presence is as Lebanon,
As excellent as the cedars [firm],

Babylon, the False Bride

The roof of His mouth [is filled] with sweets,
 And all of Him is desirable—
 This is my Beloved,
 And this my Friend,
 Ye daughters of Jerusalem!

And has the Song of Songs nothing to say of Babylon, the false bride? In the Revelation we find the sun-clothed woman, the true Israel, in the wilderness (Rev. 12:1-6). Hosea tells us that there He will speak to her heart (Hos. 2:14-20). In the Song we see her coming up out of the wilderness, leaning on her Beloved (8:5). This is the time of Zion's travail and this is the time of Babylon's doom. Hence we read,

Jealousy is as cruel as sheol
 The flashes thereof are flashes of fire
 A very flame of Jah.

Here we have an intimation of the false woman who is "burned with fire" (Rev. 17:16). The title here used is significant. The exhortation, "praise ye Jah" (hallelujah) is always connected with judgment. And when the marriage of the Lambkin arrives their praise is punctuated with "Alleluia!" Jehovah's jealousy has caused Him to deal with Babylon in the character of Jah. And they said "Alleluia! And her smoke rose up for the eons of the eons." All the "substance" (8:7) of Babylon, all her wealth and luxury cannot buy Jehovah's love.

If a man would give all the substance of his house for love
 It would utterly be contemned.

But in that terrible judgment era the bride leans on her Beloved. His heart and hand are her only safety.

Set me as a seal upon thine heart,
 As a seal upon thine arm:

For love is as strong as death;

* * * * *

Many waters cannot quench love's [flame]
 Nor can the floods [affection's fervor] drown.

A. E. K.

SHALL NOT SEE LIFE

THE peculiar excellence of the doctrine of universal reconciliation is the fact that it rests upon the *universal* testimony of the Scriptures. All other theories of human destiny cull their proof texts from such passages as seem to support their contention, but avoid others which refute their positions. So it comes that both endless torment and annihilation can find some shadow of evidence if we restrict our inquiry to the texts which are brought forward to prove them. If we enlarge the scope of the testimony to include *all* Scripture, neither of these theories will stand for a moment.

Perhaps the strongest fortification which the opponents of universal reconciliation have—at least the one on which they most rely and which seems to them the most conclusive and final argument which can be produced—is found in the thirty-sixth verse of the third chapter of John's gospel. With a few changes for consistency's sake, which will be explained as we proceed, the passage reads as follows:

He who is believing in the Son has eonian life:
yet he who is distrusting the Son shall not be seeing
life, but God's indignation is remaining on him.

The main difference between this rendering and the King James version is a very subtle one which may be felt before its elements are seen. The common text puts everything in the indefinite tense and thus makes each statement absolute. "He that believeth" is contrasted with "he that believeth not". The latter class "shall not see life" and God's wrath "abideth" on them.

These words were spoken early in our Lord's ministry. Let us allow, for the moment, the position that this is a final and unalterable pronouncement of the doom of "he that believeth not". We must not allow the possibility of any change on his part. "He that believeth not shall *not* see life under any circumstances.

If, at the time that this was spoken, the die was cast for all, so that no unbeliever could become a believer, how shall we account for the many who afterward believed on his name and were deemed worthy of eonian life? Take, for example, Saul of Tarsus. He was among the distrusting ones. He definitely and intelligently defied the Son. Of him it was spoken that he "shall not see life." But was it true in his case? And was it not false in the case of thousands more?

But, some will say, destiny is settled at *death*. If a man *dies* an unbeliever then he shall not see life. All we need to say to this is that it is mere tradition without a shred of Scriptural support and not worthy of consideration.

Those who are now unbelievers will yet see life. The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they who hear shall live (Jn. 5:25). Death shall be discarded so that all will be made alive in Christ (1 Cor. 15:26). This life will be theirs after death, in resurrection. The idea that death fixes the point at which this passage is effective is disproved by the Lord Himself when speaking on the subject of death and resurrection. This passage says nothing of death and we are wise if we refuse to inject this idea into it.

A careful and candid consideration of the text even as it is given in our common version demands that the words concerning "he that believeth not" be applied to him only so long as he remains in that condition. And, consequently, God's indignation remains only during the term of his distrust.

That this is indeed the truth is notably confirmed by the Apostle Paul when discussing this very point. It should be observed, in passing, that the two phrases "he that believeth" are not identical in the Greek. The second one, which we have rendered, "*distrusting*" is often translated "obey" (Rom. 2:8; 1 Pet. 3:1, 4:17) or "disobedient" (Ro. 10:21; 1 Pet. 2:7, 8; 3:20) in the common version. It occurs as "not believe", and "unbelief" in the closing section of the eleventh of Romans with "disobey" and "disobedience" in the margin (Rom. 11:30-32). Suffice it for us that the words in Romans are identical with the word in John's gospel, which we are studying.

Consider, now, the argument of the apostle. The nations, in time past, distrusted God. Now they obtain mercy because Israel distrusts Him. So these in Israel (who are particularly referred to by our Lord distrust in order that they also *may obtain mercy*. Our Lord was speaking of their condition *during* their distrust. The apostle treats of the *future* outcome of this distrust. The indignation of God was abiding on them, but the mercy of God is the future in store for them.

Why did they distrust? Many explanations may be advanced, but, after all superficial and incidental causes are removed, we come to the real underlying reason: *God locks up all in distrust in order that He may be merciful to all* (Rom. 11:32). Men reason that, if the wrath of God abides on the distrustful, there is no possible hope left. God's logic is better. He sees in the very distrust an occasion for the display of mercy. Men say that such a man is eternally lost. God says that He will have mercy on Him.

What of the word "abides"? Is it ever used of that which is temporary, or does it always demand an eternal and unalterable tenancy? It occurs many times, so we will narrow our quest to the exact form in which it appears in the passage before us. It is found in the thirty-ninth verse of the first chapter. "They came and saw where *He dwelt*. . ."

The question for us to settle is this: Did our Lord continue henceforth to live in that place, or did He leave it for His itinerant ministry and for the right hand of power in the heavens? If He did not continue to abide there why should we insist that God's indignation cannot be removed?

How clear it is that "abiding" is limited when we read "The slave *abideth* not in the house for the eon: the Son *abideth* for the eon." (Jn. 8:35). We read, "Now *abideth* faith, hope, love, these three . . .," and yet we know that only the greatest of these will abide in the consummation. Faith and hope abide *now*, but not forever (1 Cor. 13:13). "Until this day," we are told, "*remaineth* the same vail untaken away" from Israel's heart (2 Cor. 3:14-16). And shall it abide forever? Not so, for the vail "shall be taken away."

These instances are sufficient to prevent us from putting too much stress on the word "abideth" as though it was an irrevocable and settled doom. And we are confirmed in this position by the fact that the grammatical form of the word suggests an action going on at the time and not the indefinite state suggested by "abideth."

The Greek tongue is most admirably adapted to express the distinction between that which is true at any time and that which is merely for the present. This can be expressed in English, too. Consider the two statements: "it abides" and "it is abiding." In the former the element of time is lacking. It is indefinite. "It abides" either in the past, present or future. But when we say "it is abiding" we refer to an act which is going on at present, but give no hint as to the past or future. Now this is the form here used. The Lord confined His statement to the time then present.

But what of "shall not see life"? That surely is in the future. It certainly is. But all such statements must be understood within the limits of their contexts. When our Lord told His disciples "The days will come, when ye shall

desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and *ye shall not see it*”, we do not rush to the conclusion that they will never see one of those days. *In the days spoken of, they shall not see, but afterwards they shall see* (Lu. 17:22).

When the apostle Paul tells the Ephesians “ye . . . shall see my face no more” he certainly did not intend to suggest that they would never meet in the resurrection.

All words are subject to the limitations of their context. They must not be divorced from their surroundings and explained in a sense repugnant to the sentence and the paragraph and the subject in which they appear. It is the bane of theology that texts are driven together from all sorts of surroundings and then lined up in an artificial order which alters their natural and agreeable sense into something quite the opposite to the mind of the spirit of God.

And what is the atmosphere in which we find this text? John the Baptist is testifying to the exalted position which God accords His Son. John must decrease. He must increase. “The Father loveth the Son and hath given all things into His hand.” The Father’s attitude towards John’s disciples and all the Jews hinged upon their attitude towards His Son. Those who believed in (or *into*, as the Greek most aptly puts it) are having eonian life. We may well ask at this point why are they not given “everlasting” life, as our version puts it? For the most appropriate reason that, while the Father has put all into the Son’s hands during the eons, the Son returns all to the Father at their close (1 Cor. 15:28). The place of the Son and the life conferred on those who believe in Him is limited to the eonian times. Why, then, should we stretch the next statement altogether beyond these limits? Up to the consummation all who are distrusting the Son shall not be seeing life. In other words, the eonian life of the believer is denied to them.

It must be noted, in passing, that the negative here employed is not at all the strong combination which would be

employed if the case were as hopeless as some imagine. In Greek, when a thing is denied absolutely it is customary to combine two negatives. This is done in the comforting declaration "All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me; and him that cometh to Me I will *in no wise* cast out." (Jn. 6:37). This double negation denies under all circumstances; the single negative has no such exclusive force.

But perhaps the most serious fault with the current interpretation lies in the fact that it is a total denial of the gospel for today—the Conciliation. There can be no compromise between a "gospel" which insists on the abiding of God's wrath on the unbeliever, and the true gospel of a conciliated God beseeching men to be reconciled on the ground of the sacrifice of Christ and the rejection of Israel in the flesh. God is conciliated to all mankind now. The day of wrath is yet future.

We conclude, then, that the statement, "shall not be seeing life" is confined by the context to the eons; is conditioned upon their remaining in the state which demands this doom, and all this is not in the slightest conflict with God's own assurances that He locks all up in this distrust *in order that He may be merciful to all*. Shall we believe one and deny the other? Let us believe both! A. E. K.

EDITORIAL

ONCE more have we received our beloved brother Gelesnoff back from the brink of death. More than once we were warned that life hung by a thread, yet God in His goodness did not recall his spirit, and we are rejoicing in a remarkable temporary recovery from pain and imminent danger of dissolution. We take it as a sign that He still has work for him to do and that He will provide the strength and weakness necessary for its performance. May many join us in thanksgiving for his recovery and prayer for further grace and strength as His work requires.

We are glad to announce that the articles on Galatians are progressing and that they will be enriched by a special development of all the quotations. An earnest endeavor will be made to rescue these from their present plight by giving a short exposition of each book in the Hebrew Scriptures where they occur. Only thus can their marvelous aptness and precision be fully enjoyed and appreciated. We hope to issue this important work in pamphlet form after it has appeared in the magazine. Its message is sorely needed.

AN important article on "The Basis of Fellowship" is held over for our next issue. We pray that God will prepare hearts for the reception of its message in these days when fellowship is broken on any pretext in spite of the solemn exhortation to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of *peace*. The tendency of the times was well illustrated when, just after this exhortation had been urgently pressed, numerous efforts were launched to break the unity of the spirit by the bitterness of strife. God be gracious to His people.

TO THOSE who so kindly inquire about the progress of the Version we will confide the following plan, which seems to meet with general approval. As the necessary time and funds are not available for any considerable portion of the work, even though done on the most economical basis possible, it is proposed to concentrate on the Revelation and issue it first with notes. There is a growing interest in this book in the present world crisis. This is to be in loose leaf form with a suitable cover large enough for the entire Greek Scriptures. This will be placed on sale and the funds, together with subscriptions for further parts, used in the furtherance of the work, all advance subscriptions being countersigned D. V.—God willing. We hope it is generally understood that all our work is on this basis. All subscriptions to the magazine, etc., are contingent on His will. If, for instance, our Lord should come, the magazine would cease, and we would ask all to look to Him for the value which we had not been able to give. All money received will be used in forwarding the work. The best way to assure returns will be to interest others who will put their shoulders to the wheel as well. When sufficient funds are in hand for the purpose, we propose issuing a prospectus showing the plan and giving a taste of its contents.

WE rejoice that the Lord has opened the heart of another missionary in China to receive and proclaim the universal reconciliation. Henry Christensen first rejected the glorious truth, but now rejoices in it. Not being connected with any church he cannot be excommunicated, yet would welcome the fellowship of those of like precious faith. He may be addressed care of Stanley P. Smith, Tsehchowfu, China.

IN our endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit, we have suffered to pass unnoticed a teaching which we have been hoping would fall to the ground from sheer lack of Scriptural support. But the props of pride and the desire to be

something in which the ordinary ignorant saint had no share has kept the doctrine alive and bids fair to cause division and obscure the truth.

It is a sad fact that every advance in truth, every gain in knowledge, has the tendency to inflate us and make us place ourselves in a class apart. Some are "Philadelphia" even though they know their own lack of brotherly love. Others are the one hundred and forty-four thousand, even though they far exceed this number. The rest are "the great multitude," and now we are asked to make ourselves the "out-resurrection" and leave less favored saints to a lower and less glorious calling.

We have carefully considered this position for many years, and while we grieved over its denial of His transcendent grace, have kept our hearts open to acknowledge any support it may have in the Scriptures. During all this time not a single passage has been produced on which it can rest, not a single word which distinctly teaches it has been found in the inspired Word.

The same motive which prompted us to silence now urges us to speak. We desire that His saints should be one. And while we hope to speak so plainly that the truth may be manifest, we desire grace to speak so lovingly that no bonds of affection will be snapped. And we desire to insist most earnestly that we will not break fellowship with those who may not see with us on this matter. We desire them to bear with us in love: and we shall do the same.

The whole difficulty lies in a misapprehension of what the "mystery" or secret stewardship (Eph. 3:6-9) really is. Those of us who have been taught that it is "the mystical body of Christ" will have difficulty in dismissing this from our minds. But the body was made known *before* the secret was revealed. The secret does not lie in our membership in the body of Christ, but in the *character* of that body. It is now a *joint*-body. The body in Romans (12:4-5) and Corinthians (1 Cor. 12:12-27) was not a *joint*-body.

What is the difference between the body in Corinthians and Ephesians? The former had members of varying rank, just as in the human body; but the latter knows no distinctions between the members—it is a *joint-body*. Every member is the peer of all the rest. Nature knows no such thing: it can only be in the sphere of grace.

And this is entirely *in spirit*. Flesh it was—a physical relationship to Messiah—which gave Jewish members their preeminence in the body in that transitional era. Now, however, in spirit, the Jew no longer has any priority. Every member in the body is of equal rank. It is a *joint-body*.

We are *joint* sharers in the promise in Christ Jesus on the same ground. The body was not a new revelation. Paul had made it known before. The secret consists in a change in its constitution. So, too, with the promise in Christ Jesus. According to Paul's previous ministry the nations shared in this (Rom. 15:27). They shared such blessing as came to a remnant in Israel through Paul's preaching. Now we are *joint*-sharers. The secret is not in the sharing but in the *manner* of it.

If we could only grasp this truth. The mystery or secret is conveyed to us *through the previous ministries of Paul* (Eph. 3:7). The channel of our *faith* is Romans and Corinthians and Galatians, the spring of our *hope* rises in Thesalonians, the fruit of *love* is found in the prison epistles. *Paul's previous ministry, after he was separated by the spirit, still stands.* The mystery has only modified its character, or, rather glorified its message.

We commend the article "Through the Evangel of Which I Became the Dispenser" to the earnest consideration of our readers. It may not be apprehended in an instant. The articles in the first few volumes of the magazine on "The Secret Economy" ought to be digested first. But those who have already mastered these will have no difficulty in apprehending the important truth that *all of Paul's epistles are for us today*, except that the earlier writings have been glorified by the transcendent revelation of the secret economy in the prison epistles.

A. E. K.

Paul's Epistle to the Galatians

INTRODUCTION

(CHAP. 1: 1-9)

THE opening epistolary of Galatians is altogether unlike the epistolaries of other church epistles. Thanksgiving and blessing—the two invariable elements of Pauline salutation—are absent. Two strange elements appear in their place. Instead of giving thanks Paul “marvels” (1:6)); instead of pronouncing blessing he launches a double “anathema” (1:8-9). Even in addressing the Corinthian church, where delinquency was rampant and disorder ruled supreme, the apostle says, “I thank my God always concerning you” (1 Cor. 1:4). If he could give thanks in the face of the flagrant doctrinal error and moral defection prevalent among the Corinthians, then the Galatian “removal” must involve graver matters, and far more serious, than either doctrine or ethics. It must strike at the very vitals. We see at once that a great gulf yawns between Paul’s gospel and the circumcisionist “persuasion.”

The opening sentence strikes at the root of the Galatian apostasy. “*Paul, an apostle (not from men, neither through man, but through Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead).*” Paul’s apostleship is the issue at stake. “Not from men” excludes human derivation; “not through man,” human instrumentality. His authority was not derived from a human source, nor was any human agency employed in its conferment. The transition from the plural (*men*) in the first clause, to the singular (*man*) in the second, is significant, and points to a particular person. What follows makes it clear that Peter is the man in view. The circumcisionists, while not absolutely denying Paul’s

claim to the apostleship, insinuated that, like themselves, he had derived his commission from, and held it subject to, the authority of Peter, the chief apostle, to whom the Christ committed the keys of the kingdom. Hence the special object of the historic recital, extending over the first two chapters, is to furnish proof of his independence from Peter and the "pillars" of the Jerusalem church. Not through the mediation of Peter, but by the personal appearance and sovereign act of the ascended Lord, was he appointed to the ministry. His apostleship flows from God the Father through Jesus Christ. God is the source, and Christ the medium, of his apostolic authority. The Savior's appointment of Paul as a minister to the nations was but the enactment of God's predetermined good pleasure (1:15). The exordium brings out the truth that Jesus Christ ever acts on God's behalf, as His executive. It affords a striking illustration of our Lord's own assertion: "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father doing: for what things soever he doeth, these the Son also doeth in like manner" (Jno. 5:19). He carries out the Father's official appointments (1:1); dispenses His blessings to His people (1:3); renders His will effective through the cross (1:4).

In this definition of his apostleship Paul assigns special prominence to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. That was the starting-point of his experience, the moving energy of his tireless activity, and the corner stone of his doctrine. The manner and place of Christ's initial appearance to Paul imparted to his ministry its distinctive character and moulded its course. Paul's experience became incorporated in his gospel of uncircumcision and constitutes the difference from Peter's gospel of circumcision. The gospels entrusted to the two apostles differ from one another as radically as their experiences. Paul beheld the Risen and Glorified One on alien soil, and his name was ever after

identified with the nations. Beyond the boundary of the holy land, among the benighted heathen, God's Son was revealed to him. A brilliant light from heaven was the first thing he saw; a voice uttering a gentle pleading was the first thing he heard. The question of sin was not mentioned till three days later, when Ananias said to him, "Arise, wash away thy sins, calling on His name" (Act. 22:26). Paul beheld, first the glory, then the cross. He beheld the Savior's cross, not as did the elder apostles, enveloped in utter darkness, the concrete expression of Jewish enmity and Gentile ignorance—he beheld it encircled in the halo of promise, the concrete, universal expression of the Father's benevolent will and gracious purpose, in the blissful effulgence and remoteness of pre-conian times.

The baptism of John was the starting-point of Peter's experience. His first impression of the Christ was that of a Jew among Jews in the land of promise. He was a devout believer looking for the Messiah. One day his brother Andrew brought him the glad news, "We have found the Messiah" (Jno. 1:41). Peter went out to meet Jesus. Their next meeting was on the shores of Galilee. Peter and his brother were casting their nets into the sea. Our Lord said to them, "Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men" (Matt. 4:19). In response to this appeal, Peter gave up his vocation, and followed Him. Later on, our Lord invested him with authority, and sent him out to herald the kingdom to the strayed sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 10:1). Peter followed Christ from the beginning of His public ministry, continued with Him in His temptations, and, step by step, advanced toward the cross. He readily left all for the sake of the King of Israel, and thus came in line for the promised reward, "Blessed all they that take refuge in Him" (Ps. 2:12). Peter's appointment to the apostleship, with the promise to

sit on a throne and rule one of Israel's tribes, is the reward for his loyalty, compensation for the sacrifice he made in the cause of His Sovereign (Matt. 19:27-28).

How different is Paul's case! He was not a disciple of John, but a zealous Pharisee, Messiah's bitter opponent, breathing threatenings and slaughter against His disciples. He was "a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious" (1 Tim. 1:13). For such a one the old Scriptures held out no prospect save wrath. When met by Christ Paul was on an errand of violence and persecution. His appointment to the ministry was wholly uncalled for by his disposition and conduct. The extension of mercy to him was an undeserved favor. His experience is an actual demonstration of the basic truth of his gospel—*unto him that worketh not*. It crystallizes the principle "not of works, lest any man should boast." He was called through grace (1:15). His call inaugurated a new departure in God's dealings with man. In him first Jesus Christ has given an example of them that should thereafter believe on Him unto eonian life (1 Tim. 1:16). The word "first" (*protos*) does not refer to priority in point of time, for there were both apostles and believers before Paul. It qualifies "them that should thereafter," literally "coming ones" (*ton mellonton*). His case was representative. He was first of a coming order, the prototype of a forthcoming body of believers.

The salutation (*vv. 3-5*) sweeps over a wide field of truth. God's benevolent attitude in Christ; the cross of Jesus Christ, grounded in the will of God, with the problems of sin and evil impinging thereon; the present age burdened with evil, and the coming ages rolling their weight of glory at the Father's feet: all these topics are touched upon with marvelous suggestiveness. This apostolic greeting fuses past, present and future into one connected whole; unveils the source, the stream and the end of things; approaches every question of practical consequence; touches every problem of enduring interest.

"Grace to you and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ." This wish reveals the Father's disposition toward those in Christ. Grace is the sum of blessing bestowed by God; peace is the sum of blessing enjoyed by man. Grace is the Father's good will and bounty in Christ toward His children. Peace is the rest, contentment and gladness of the child resting on the Father's bosom. Grace is love in action; peace is the fruit of love's action. The cross of Christ is the channel of grace; deliverance from the present evil age is the basis of peace. The apostle takes us now to the principles behind this attitude of absolute Divine benevolence—the will and glory of God. The will of God is the source of all blessing; the glory of God is the aim of it all. Both grace and glory are poised in the cross. Christ's death has made possible the outflow of grace, and renders the realization of glory certain. Grace is glory begun; glory is grace perfected. Thus the salutation brings us back, with added wealth, to the point from which it started out.

One more feature of the salutation calls for special notice. The way in which the power of the cross operates in individual lives is conveyed in a very graphic and suggestive manner. "Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of the present evil age." The verb rendered "deliver" is first used by our Lord in the gospels, where our versions render it "pluck out." "If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be cast into Gehenna" (Matt. 5:29; 18:9). Next it occurs several times in Acts, twice with reference to the writer of our letter. Both the centurion (Acts 23:27) and our Lord (Act. 26:17) employ it in describing Paul's rescue from the Jews who were about to slay him in the temple. As a diseased organ is removed to safeguard the health of the body; or as the power of Christ, working through the Roman centurion, rescued Paul and

shielded him from the injuries which the Jews would have inflicted—so the will of God, operating through the cross, prevents our being overwhelmed by the forces of evil and preserves us from the noxious influences of the age.

“This present evil age.” Alas! few believe this truth. Fewer still preach it. How many there are in the so-called “holy orders” who sneer at the teaching of the apostle and brand it as old-fashioned “pessimism!” Let us cheerfully concede that the physiognomy of the times has improved since Paul’s day; that there has been a general change for the better, and that great strides have been made toward more equitable conditions. Nevertheless, after almost two thousand years of progress, human life today is little more than a disguised ravening, and, though wit and handicraft take the place of teeth and claw, the fight for bread is as keen and cruel among men as it is among the beasts that tear each other for their prey. Is it not true that governments tax their subjects to the extent of depriving them of the bare necessities of life to support vast organizations of destruction? Is it not true that professedly Christian governments derive substantial revenues from the sale of intoxicants which undermine national health and promote pauperism? Those of us who have been nursed in the sanctity of the home and have tasted its pure affections, we who are blessed with honorable work and refined tastes have known a foretaste of heaven’s joy. But is it not true that the tide of evil surges against the very doors of our little sanctuaries? Is it not true that divorce and immorality are on the increase, and that the degradation of womanhood is commercialized? Is it not true that a host of men and women of pure motives and noble aspirations are ground down and obliged to live in a condition of virtual slavery for the privilege of a bare existence? Is not an age that harbors such gigantic evils, and condones such vices, *evil*? Surely it is evil, and we need the power of the cross to deliver us from it.

In the salutation the apostle has set forth the essence of his gospel and the effects which follow its practical application. Now he turns to remonstrate with the Galatians (vv. 6-9). He is surprised that they should so easily depart from the gospel of grace. He marvels at their fickleness. He is astonished that they are removing from the true gospel to a spurious semblance.

"I marvel that ye are so quickly removing from that which called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel, which is not another—rather there are some that would trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." "Another gospel, which is not another." This translation of the A. V. has caused great embarrassment, by its apparent identification of the spurious gospel with the true. We will therefore examine each several clause. Just as the salutation has set forth the character and effects of the true gospel, so the expostulation lays bare the character and consequences of the rival gospel. The gospel to which the Galatians were removing is first described as "different." The Greek word *heteros*, a word familiar to us in its Anglicised form *heterogenous*, implies *essential* difference. The circumcisionist gospel differed from the one preached by Paul in *kind*. This statement is amplified by the words "which is not another." Here the Greek word is *allos*, whence the English *allotropic*, which points to variation of *form* or *composition*, but not of essence. The circumcisionist gospel was not another of the *same* kind. The point and force of this statement is clear in the light of the context. Farther down (2:7), Paul distinguishes his "gospel of uncircumcision" from the "gospel of circumcision" committed to Peter. Now both these gospels, though differing widely from one another in several respects, are nevertheless *one in kind*. The Galatians were not deserting Paul's gospel to embrace Peter's. If that were the case there could be no room for anathema. No! the Galatians were carried away by agitators who "perverted the gospel of Christ." The intention of this clause is to extend the thought

of the first. The verb "pervert" amplifies the idea previously expressed by "different." It was a difference caused by tampering with the truth, a transmutation brought about by reversal. In every particular the circumcisionist gospel was diametrically opposed to Paul's. It was a garbled, mutilated, emasculated gospel; a travesty and a caricature of the gospel of grace—in a word, a *bastard* gospel in the fullest sense of the word.

To the heralds of the different gospels—whether men or angels—the apostle says, "Let him be anathema." For the sake of clearness, we must divorce this word from its traditional association with hell, and seek to determine its meaning in the light of this epistle as a whole, and by reference to other Scriptures. In the Septuagint this word is used to translate the Hebrew *cherem*, which denotes something devoted to destruction, exposed to judgment, as is clear from such passages as Deut. 7:26 and Josh. 7:1, 11, 12, 13. The circumcisionist gospel in placing its votaries under the law (4:21; 5:4), took them away from grace and severed them from Christ (5:4). The law "works wrath." It can neither justify nor give life (2:21; 3:21). Those depending on law works are under a curse (3:10). Desiring to be under the law the Galatians became "debtors" to it, inviting a transgressor's fate, and exposing themselves to the full sweep of judgment. When the apostle says of the exponents of the bastard gospel, "Let him be anathema," he says, in effect, let them reap the full result of their misguided zeal for law. Thus the "anathema" is the antithesis of the blessing of the gospel, the desert which the law deals out to its devotees. The gospel bestows grace and peace; the law, wrath and tribulation. The one looks forward to "mercy," the other holds out no prospect but "anathema." By which rule shall we walk?

V. G.

The Doctrine of Creation

INTRODUCTION

WHEN taking a glass of water to drink the average man and woman is particular in seeing that the glass is clean. If it has not been carefully cleansed, if the dregs of some previous draught remain within it, the result must be confusion and contamination. The remains of what the glass contained previously will be bound to diffuse itself throughout its new contents. This is but the natural action of a natural law.

It will be agreed, we think, that when we take up a Biblical subject for study we but rarely begin the examination at its true commencement. We are more apt to begin our study in its middle than at its beginning. There is such a thing as a mental atmosphere, surrounding and penetrating the activities of our thoughts. And this atmosphere is neither colorless nor impotent. Consisting as it does of past teaching, the mental deposit of traditional belief imbibed through a thousand different channels, it starts us off on a train of thought with a distinct impetus in a certain direction. We are no more conscious of the determining influence of this mental atmosphere than we are aware of the tremendous physical pressure with which the surrounding air presses upon our bodies and our lungs. The influence of both atmospheres passes unnoticed by us.

The great value of analyzing, if possible, this silent stratum of thought, on which so many of our beliefs are based, is evident. If the atmosphere be stagnant, the air will undoubtedly be superladen with deadly germs of

every kind. And we are not anticipating our subject too much when we say that in this region of thought which we do not think of, and of mind of which we are not sufficiently mindful, lurks the germ of every disease with which Christendom's theologies are afflicted.

When we would seek to quaff the refreshing draught of divine truth, let us be careful that we do not imbibe as well the baleful poison which the dregs of a false philosophy would impart thereto.

CREATION AND DESTINY

PHILOSOPHY is not the exclusive possession of a few. Everyone who thinks philosophizes. Not to do so is not to think. It is as much a law of the mind that it develop ideas, as of fire that it must throw forth sparks. In a sense we are all philosophers. We reason and we imagine, the result being an odd confusion of fact and fancy, rock-ribbed reality and hallucination. Nor is it against philosophy that Scripture inveighs. "Vain philosophy" is the subject of its criticism.

The cause of theological error lies in man's tendency to carry over his philosophical conceits into the realm of Scripture, and to run the language of revelation in the mould of his presumptions. Safety in this respect depends upon whether we allow revelation to guide our reason, or "accommodate" revelation into a forced agreement with our preconceptions. The Word of God must be paramount. It must be granted a despotic authority. Its rule will prove beneficent.

Faith is often considered as an unreasoning and blind thing. On consideration we think it will be found to involve a denial of the immoral, rather than an abrogation of man's rational powers. It is moral rather than mental. It illuminates, and is itself illuminated, by reason. Faith is moral, as reason is mental sight. The misconception of the relation of faith and reason is largely due to the unthinkable follies of the creeds. These heathenish atrocities could only be accepted by a faith which kept its eyelids closed.

We have seen how a vain philosophy has led Christendom astray. Its presumptions as to the eons misled it in its doctrine of the End. In like manner we shall see how its presumption in regard to creation has introduced error into its doctrine of the Beginning. When both errors are compared, the logical relationship between the two will be plainly evident.

The importance of the doctrine of creation need hardly be pointed out. If our knowledge of the alphabet be incomplete, it is bound to affect our orthography. If our notation be false, we may not expect our mathematics to be correct. If the foundation be out of alignment, the structural walls will not be otherwise. Certain assumptions in regard to creation color theological thinking on every other subject. The doctrine of Creation is bound up with the doctrines of destiny, Christ, man, sin, sovereignty, and free-will. Indeed, there is scarcely a doctrine which is not, in some way, affected by our views of creation.

It must be understood, of course, that we are not discussing the *mode* of creation, but its *material*. Not how the world and man were made, but of what. But, first, what of Scripture in regard to this? The Biblical reference to the substance or material of creation is scant, though in the few Scriptures bearing on it the entire subject is involved. We shall come to these Scriptures later on. Suffice it to say, at this point, that the Bible dwells more on the *relationships* of created things than on their *essence*. The activities of life rather than its nature are discussed. But, supposing that Scripture said nothing, or that what it revealed involved nothing as to this subject, would it necessarily follow that, given the choice of two alternative theories, one as rational as the

other is irrational, we must perforce choose the less reasonable? And if, when confronted by the necessity of such choice, we accept the less thinkable proposition, need we wonder if the consequence of such acceptance forces upon us the reception of other unthinkable but related doctrines? The unreasonable dogmas of Christendom as to the Consummation are in perfect keeping with its unthinkable philosophy of Creation. Its views of the latter are as much in opposition to reason, as its doctrine of the former is in conflict with revelation.

The appellation "I AM" is the statement of God's absoluteness in the terms of *necessary being*. If we have unqualifiedly accepted the attributes of God, as revealed and involved in Scripture, then we are prepared to reject every doctrine and theory which is not established in the recognition of God as the Absolute. There are certain views which the mind, when enlightened by the truth of Christianity, seems to instinctively reject as non-possibilities. These views are such as compel a shrinkage in our ideas of God's supremacy: omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience. The mind can conceive of temporary divine limitations, but must insist that these limitations of Deity are self-imposed, and so subject to the action of the divine will. If it were otherwise, then in the degree that the Creator was limited by some external power or circumstance, to that extent would He cease to be God, and would Himself—in degree—become the subject of some alien sovereignty.

When we examine the various theories of creation we shall find, in view of the foregoing, why one of them meets with such little acceptance on the part of thoughtful men. There are three theories of creation, viz.:

- (1) That matter was made out of nothing;
- (2) That matter was made out of spirit; and
- (3) That matter was never made, being eternally self-existent.

The third view of creation is the least acceptable, for the reasons given in the preceding paragraph. To elevate matter to the dignity of Necessary Being is to deify it. The idea of the Absolute is not then the Creator's unique possession, but is shared by the new divinity of Inertia. If such matter could but speak its claims, it, too, could say, "I am." We find such conceptions impossible. To us there is but one God—the Father.

We now turn to the first theory of creation mentioned, viz., creation out of nothing. But let us be sure of the terms we wish to employ. Nothing, in the practical thinking of some, appears to mean not so much the non-existent as the non-apparent, not so much that which is not as that which appears not. To such nothing is merely a description of invisible substance. Correctly defined, it is the absolute negation of Being—the impossible opposite of Jehovah. If God the All be thought of as the great I AM, nothing can only be spoken of as that which is NOT. Someone has aptly said that to truly think of nothing is not to think; or, to put it in paradox, in order to think of nothing we must cease thinking. Thinking is a positive process which annihilates itself when it seeks to comprehend the nothingness of nothing. We shall leave the task of reconciling the thoughts of Omnipresence and nothingness to those who are skilled in the language of theological evasion.

In the blind thinking of Christendom the substance of creation has found its source in this thing which is not a thing. The average person, when inquired of, will

readily reply that "God made the world *out of nothing*." The effort to think such an unthinkable thing can result in nothing less than the massacre of thought. Here, in unreason, we find the source of much that is unreasonable in man's interpretation of divine revelation. Here is the source of error in regard to God, Christ, man, and destiny. Is it to be wondered at that an illogical premise, at the starting point of all thought, should prejudice every subsequent train of deduction? It has vitiated nearly every Christian truth, and introduced an element of weakness into every line of Christian thought.

No wonder, if this theory be true, that preachers should declaim on the insignificance of man in the eyes of Deity. No wonder that they should tell us that, to God, man is no more than a mere bubble on the passing stream. The littleness and unworthiness of man is a truth in its own place. Man's unworthiness is not, however, an *essential* thing. It consists more in his moral, or immoral, character, than in anything else. We do not necessarily glorify God by degrading man. Indeed, if man were made in the divine image, the degradation of the one would also involve the degradation of the other, as his glorification would be but to reflect the glory of his infinite Source.

We must attempt once more to rivet our readers' attention to the unthinkable of creation out of nothing. Two undeniable facts would we put in prominent display, viz.,

First: Human reason cannot *Think* it; and,

Second: Human faith is not required to *Believe* it.

Yet it is the initial movement of orthodox thought, and orthodox faith. The first act of orthodoxy is to put its own eyes out. No wonder if the doctrines which are spelled in the alphabet of unreason are as devoid of logic as they are lacking in Scripture proof.

“But,” someone will suggest, “as God is omnipotent is He not therefore equal to the task, however it may defy our reasoning powers to comprehend it?” To which we may only reply that God can neither contradict Himself nor do that which is self-contradictory. He cannot lie. Neither can He do in physics that which would answer to a lie in morals. When we can think of God’s omnipotence as involving the power to make square circles, or round squares, then we may accept the suggested interpretation of what divine omnipotence means. To create something out of nothing would be to perform a physical untruth, and it is impossible for God to lie.

ALAN BURNS.

The Nephilim

Studies in Genesis 6.1-8

THE NEPHILIM

(Continued)

The Revised Version contains one more mention of the Nephilim, in Nu. 13:33. From this fact the idea has gained currency that the Old Testament contains but two references to the Nephilim. But such is by no means the case. The exact form of the word used in Gen. 6:4 and Nu. 13:33 occurs repeatedly in Scripture.

As has been shown, the word *nephilim* is the participial form of the verb *naphal*, to fall. It is used in two ways—with and without the definite article *ha*. The subjoined is a list of the occurrences of the word.

With the definite article

Josh. 8:25.
Judg. 8:10; 20:46.
2 Ki. 25:11.
Ps. 145:14.
Jer. 39:9; 52:15.
Ezek. 32:22, 24.

Without the definite article

Deut. 21:1.
Judg. 7:12.
1 Sam. 31:8.
1 Chr. 10:8.
2 Chr. 20:24.
Jer. 6:15; 8:12.
Ezek. 32:23, 27.

A study of the passages where the definite article is absent reveals the fact that the participle *nephilim* invariably denotes *posture*. But, in those passages where the definite article is prefixed, the participle becomes, as in Gen. 6:4 and Nu. 13:33, a proper noun, the appellative of a race—The Nephilim. But, unfortunately, instead of preserving this, their proper name, the translators have variously rendered it as “lost,” “deserters,” “fugitives” and by their capricious renderings have expunged from the sacred records all reference to this ancient race, to the detriment of Scripture truth and historic research.

Nu. 13:27-33 contains the report of the spies who were sent out to survey the land. The concluding paragraph of their address is particularly interesting. "All the people that we saw in it are mortals of great stature, and there we saw the Nephilim, sons of Anak, who come of the Nephilim: and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight" (Nu. 13:32-33).

We shall return to this passage later on. Meanwhile, let us take in the fact that these sons of Anak—called elsewhere Anakim—came of the Nephilim. We learned from Genesis that the Nephilim were old settlers, having inhabited the earth from the age at the time Adam began to multiply. Now we find the descendants of the antediluvian Nephilim, under various names, inhabiting Palestine in the days of Moses. The great stature and prodigious strength of the Anakim is in itself conclusive proof that they were not Adamites. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that while Scripture frequently mentions the Anakim and other Nephilim tribes, their names never appear in the genealogies of Adam's descendants.

From the fact that the Nephilim inhabited the promised land and that the report of their presence there threw the congregation into a state of wild panic it is natural to infer that this aboriginal race would play a conspicuous part in the future fortunes of Israel. Such inference is fully justified by the facts. From the day Israel crossed the Jordan to take possession of the land down to the time of their removal to Babylon, the sinister influence of the degenerate Nephilim races was felt in Israel.

After the fall of Jericho, Joshua decided to undertake the reduction of Ai. The first attempt to take the stronghold resulted in failure. Underestimating the strength of the place, the invading host was temporarily halted. Dis-

covering the mistake, Joshua threw his whole force into the attack, and carried the place by storm. The city was set on fire, and its inhabitants were put to the sword. The account is summarized as follows: "And all the Nephilim, males and females, were twelve thousand, even all the mortals of Ai" (Josh. 8:25). The first armed encounter of Israel with the Nephilim ended in victory for the former and sounded the death-knell of Nephilim domination in Canaan.

The next passage carries us to the era of the Judges. In the days of Gideon, the host of the Midianite kings Zeba and Zalmunna, assembled at Karkor, consisted of about fifteen thousand men, "all that remained of the children of the east, and the Nephilim a hundred and twenty thousand (20,100) males that drew the sword." (Judg. 8:10). This incident shows that Israel's neighbors had made considerable progress in the task of subjugating the Nephilim. They had established their ascendancy over this ancient race and were able to force it into their service. But the Nephilim were still numerous and strong. The Nephilim contingent in the Midianite army outnumbered the native element, and so long as this remained the case the Adamite peoples must have felt their position precarious and insecure.

Israel followed the example of her neighbors in pressing the subject Nephilim into military service, for we find them in the army of Benjamin during the civil war. The Benjamite army of 26,700 men was facing the army of the federated tribes 400,000 strong. (Judg. 20:16). In the early stage of the battle Benjamin lost 18,000 males (v. 44). The remainder endeavored to make their way to the rock of Rimmon, losing 7,000 men in the attempt (v. 45). Only 600 men succeeded in reaching the rock of Rimmon, the rest were slain (v. 48). The losses of Benjamin were as follows:

Total strength of Benjamin army (<i>v.</i> 16).....	26,700
Survivors (<i>v.</i> 47).....	600
	<hr/>
Total loss.....	26,100

Losses:

(1) In pitched battle (<i>v.</i> 44).....	18,000
(2) In retreat to Rimmon (<i>v.</i> 45).....	5,000
(3) At Gidom (<i>v.</i> 45).....	2,000
(4) When Israel turned upon Benjamin again (<i>v.</i> 48).....	1,100
	<hr/>
Total loss.....	26,100

Verse 46 tells us that there was in the Benjamite army a Nephilim contingent of 5,020 males. "And all the Nephilim of Benjamin in that day were twenty and five thousand (5,020) males that drew the sword; all these were mortals of valor." It is clear that *v.* 46 does not represent the total losses of Benjamin, for, according to *vv.* 44 and 45, these amounted to twenty-five thousand exclusive of those "slain" in verse 48.

Our next scripture brings us to the time of David. We have seen, in the preceding paper, how prominently the Nephilim figured in the career of David, and that the eighth Psalm commemorates this victory over their champion Goliath. The downfall of the "mighty ones which were of old" furnishes the theme of another Psalm—the 145th. Unfortunately, this fact is obscured in our versions which render the fourteenth verse "Jehovah upholdeth all that fall, and raiseth all that are bowed down" (Ps. 145:14). The Psalm, which bears the title "Praise of David," is in two parts. The first part (1-14) celebrates God's goodness in giving dominion to "the sons of the man." The second

part (15-21) shows the world-wide benefits flowing from that dominion—every living thing is satisfied with favor.

The opening sentence of the Psalm, where God is addressed as King, gives direction to the train of thought. *Dominion* is the vibrant chord. God's greatness, wondrous works, and the might of His terrible acts are the factors eliciting praise and moving the saints to declare to the "sons of the man" the permanence of His Kingdom and the continuance of His dominion throughout the ages (*vv.* 12-14). The next verse sets forth the twofold aspect—the adverse and the favorable—of His ways:

Jehovah is a layer for all the Nephilim,
And a raiser for all the bowed ones.

The verb *sumak*, the participle of which is rendered "uphold," means to "lay" (Lev. 3:2, 8:13, Nu. 8:10, etc.), and is here used in an adverse sense, as in Ps. 88:7. It indicates an action opposite to the one expressed by the verb "raise" in the second line. The two lines stand in sharp antithesis to each other: they describe acts of an opposite nature. God lays low the Nephilim, or mighty ones, and lifts up the Kappupim, or low ones, viz., the Adamites.

Psalms 8 and 145 treat the common topic of dominion. Both find their inspiration in the overthrow of the ancient and mighty Nephilim race. Both view the collapse of the Nephilim power as a token of God's immutable counsel that mankind should have dominion over all the earth.

From the time of David, when Israel's political sun rose above the horizon, we are transported to the time of its sunset—the era of the captivity. The account of Jerusalem's fall is brought to a conclusion by the following significant statement: "And the residue of the people that were left in the city, and the Nephilim, that fell to the king

of Babylon, and the residue of the multitude did Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard carry away captive" (2 Ki.25:11; Jer. 39:9; 52:15). Those carried away to Babylon included three distinct classes:

- (1) The residue of the people in the city.
- (2) The Nephilim.
- (3) The residue of the people of the land.

The Nephilim are here distinguished from both the citizens of Jerusalem and the Jews in the land. The wholesale desertion of the Nephilim to the king of Babylon throws an interesting light on their existence under Israelitish domination. For more than nine centuries they had borne the yoke of Israel. But the long centuries of bondage had failed to extinguish the national spirit. They cherished memories of their former greatness. The love of independence still lived in their breast. The strait of Judah revived their hopes. When it became evident that Jerusalem could not long resist the Chaldeans, the Nephilim thought that the psychological moment to throw off the yoke of Israel had arrived. They unanimously arose and deserted in a body to the Babylonian monarch. But their hopes were doomed to disappointment. Their desertion gave them an opportunity to show their hatred for their former masters, but secured no material advantages. The Babylonian commander carried them to Babylon along with the captive Judeans.

The last reference to the Nephilim is found in Ezekiel's lamentation over the multitude of Egypt (Ezek. 32:18-31). Jehovah will direct the sword of Babylon against Egypt, and its multitude will go down to the nether parts of the earth to join other offending nations. "Ashur is there and all her company; her graves are round about her; all of them Nephilim slain in desolation; whose graves are in the utter-

most part of the pit, and her company round about her grave; all of them slain, fallen by the sword, who caused terror in the land of the living" (Ezek. 32:22). The same language is used of Elam in verse twenty-four. Ezekiel seems to supply the reason why the desertion of the Nephilim failed to obtain recognition from the king of Babylon. We know that two parties had found themselves in Judah: one leaning to Babylon, the other to Egypt. It is natural to suppose that Nephilim opinion was similarly divided, some looking for help to Egypt or Babylon. If they had formerly leaned toward Egypt, the king of Babylon would naturally view their action with suspicion and treat them as emissaries of Egypt. This interesting passage will receive further consideration on another occasion. Meanwhile, let the reader bear in mind the linking of the Nephilim with Egypt and Elam.

From the report of the spies we learned that the descendants of the antediluvian Nephilim occupied a large area of Palestine at the time of Moses (Nu. 13:22, 28, 33). The book of Deuteronomy supplies other valuable information relative to the Nephilim. Moses declares that Israel's relatives and neighbors—Edom, Moab, Ammon—no less than Israel herself, carried out the mission of subduing the aboriginal inhabitants of the earth. The lands of Edom, Moab and Ammon were originally inhabited by aboriginal tribes, but they destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead, just as Israel did unto the land of his possession (Deut. 2:11-12; 21-22). This shows how the command to "subdue" the earth was carried out by Adam's descendants. The commission to rule and subdue the earth, which was conferred by special blessing of God, is the inheritance of mankind through procreation. It belongs to man in general, not merely to man in the original condition. "The earth

has he given to the sons of Adam" (Ps. 115:16). There is nothing in Scripture to sustain the theological notion that this dominion was lost through the fall.

Another important item furnished by the book of Deuteronomy is the existence of another powerful Nephilim branch—the Rephaim. Reviewing the events that had transpired on the Moabite border, Moses says: "The Emim dwelt therein aforetime, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakim: they (the Emim) are accounted Rephaim, as the Anakim; but the Moabites call them Emim" (Deut. 2:10-11). Here we are told that the Rephaim were like the Anakim in two particulars: (1) might, number and stature, and (2) descent. Like the Anakim, they came of the Nephilim. Again, speaking of the land of Ammon, Moses says: "That also is accounted a land of Rephaim: the Rephaim dwelt there aforetime; but the Ammonites call them Zamzummim; a people great, many, and tall, as the Anakim" (Deut. 2:20-21). The Rephaim branch of the Nephilim was called by various names by the different nations—Horim, Emim, Zamzummim.

Our next paper will be devoted to a study of the two great branches of the Nephilim race.

V. G.

Tsechowfu Chinese Mission

MISSIONARY LABORS

OUR band of seven left England, February 5, 1885, and arrived at Shanghai, March 18. We held revival meetings there, then separated into two parties; one going to the far West of China, and ours to the North. We held revival meetings in Tientsin and Peking, which were blessed of God, and then traveled by cart and pack-mule to Taiyuen, the capital of Shansi Province, in those days a journey of two weeks, now of days, owing to the railway. From there we went South to Pingyangfu. This city is sometimes called the cradle of China, for it was here that the celebrated Emperor Yao had his capital about 2300 B. C. A very grand temple has been built in his honor to the south of the city. This hoary antiquity of over 4000 years ago is looked upon as China's "Golden Age," and Yao is a model to the Chinese, much as Abraham is to the Jews.

The next year, 1886, the celebrated Pastor Hsi asked if he might join me in opening a station in Hungtung, a flourishing city twenty miles to the north, and let him carry on opium refuge work in one of the courts. Of course I gladly agreed to his request. God had much used Mr. Hsi before our arrival. His opium refuge work extended to four Provinces afterwards, and it was estimated that 30,000 cases were treated, of whom 1000 became church members.

I stayed at Hungtung till December, 1887. Mr. Hoste, now general director of the China Inland Mission, joined me about half a year after I went there. During that time there were great additions to the church and and on one

day over 200 were baptized; but the standard required for baptism was not so high as experience has since taught me it should have been.

In the end of 1887 I left Hungtung for a new prefecture of virgin soil, Luan Fu, and was joined there soon after by Mr. and Mrs. C. T. Studd. Shortly after I married, and opened another station fifteen miles to the north—Luchenghsien; but my dear wife, a devoted Christian, was taken in 1891. I then went to England for a furlough. Next year I returned to China, married my second wife on February 1, 1893, and started the next day with her for over a year's tour, sent by the C. I. M. to visit and report upon all the C. I. M. stations in the three great Provinces of Szechwan, Kweichow, and Yunnan, in the extreme west and southwest. The tour was blessed of God, and we arrived back at Shanghai March 24, 1894. It was during that tour, especially when in the Province of Kweichow, that I became exercised about the subject of future punishment, though the particular line which my mind then leaned to was the final extinction of being of the wicked. However, I came to no final decision. Early in April we went to Japan and there met Mr. Hudson Taylor, who had been much exercised over my raising this point. We had talk together and then the subject was dropped. My wife had a brother in Japan, a missionary in the C. M. S. Early in May we returned to Tientsin; and June 8 found me back again at Luan Fu, where we rejoined Mr. and Mrs. C. T. Studd, with a view to carrying on their work, when they should go on furlough.

STANLEY P. SMITH.

The Mystery of Babylon

BABYLON

The first kingdom among men was begun at Babel, in the land of Shinar, by Nimrod (Gen. 10:9, 10). Ancient histories, as a rule, place the first monarchies in Egypt or Assyria. Historians have discredited this primitive empire on the ground that Nimrod was an Ethiopian, the son of Cush, who was a son of Ham. But the earliest inscriptions (which have lately come to light) fully bear out the Scriptural account of this, the primeval monarchy among mankind. The language of these inscriptions bears a very remarkable resemblance to that still used among the aboriginal tribes of Abyssinia. It was an Ethiopian tongue and the earliest empire was founded by the sons of Ham.

Babel, or Babylon, the beginning of this kingdom, seems to have been a city even before this, for it is not said that Nimrod *built* it as he did Nineveh and the Assyrian cities. It was in the plain of Shinar that the descendants of Noah congregated after the flood. Here they built a city and a tower, with its head in the heavens, and made themselves a name in case they should disperse to other lands. Here we have the germ of all future world empires. Its essence is the concentration and exaltation and perpetuation of human power and achievement. God's name and glory must be banished to give place to human self-adulation. How this operates is well illustrated in the case of Babel. It is probable that the name was originally given to signify "The Gate of God." But the Hebrew for Babel changes it to "In confusion." It is not that God wishes them ill, but that He wishes to become their Blessor Himself. So He takes up Abram the Hebrew and proposes to make a nation

out of him, through whom He can bless the whole earth in such a style that they will not only enjoy the blessing but the Blessor too. Happiness with its Source unknown and unacknowledged is a traitor to its very nature, for it is intended to draw the creature to the One who finds His blessedness in making others happy.

The supremacy of Babylon does not seem to have lasted more than a few hundred years, for in Abraham's day Amraphel, king of Shinar, is a subordinate to Chedorlaomer, king of Elam (Gen. 14:1). From that time until Babylon reappears in the sacred records the Cushite character of the kingdom seems to have been completely banished by the inroads of the Arabians and Assyrians. The rise of Assyria between the land of promise and the plain of Shinar kept them from contact with each other, so that the sacred historians give us no account of Babylon in this interval.

When, however, the God of heaven determines to punish the nation He has chosen for Himself, and to turn over the world empire which He purposes for them into the hands of the other nations while they are apostate, He chooses the king of Babylon as the first great head of world dominion. Thus, in Nebuchadnezzar, Babylon, the first of the kingdoms in order of time, becomes once more the first in rank. Not since its earlier days had there been a ruler whose sway extended over the whole earth, for Babylon, and Babylon alone, is the seat of world empire.

It is remarkable to find how exactly the ancient inscriptions tally with the Scriptures in their account of this Kingdom. Nebuchadnezzar's boast, "Is not this great Babylon, *which I have built?*" is fully borne out by the immense preponderance of his bricks over all the other kings on the site of Babylon. He was the great builder, or founder or restorer of almost all the temples and public buildings in the country. His dominion extended over the whole known earth.

How much more trustworthy God's history is than the

works of secular historians and their modern followers is well illustrated by the account of the fall of Babylon as recorded by the prophet Daniel. Were it not for the discovery of a small fragment of stone on which we are informed that "Nabu-nahed, king of Babylon," in his later years reigned conjointly with his eldest son, Bil-shar-uzar, we would still be gravely informed by modern "scholars" that Daniel cannot be taken as authentic, that it teems with "historical inaccuracies" and contradicts "trustworthy profane writers." If modern destructive criticism ever received a rebuke, it was when that fragment of clay fell upon its blasphemous words against the God of Daniel. The account of Babylon's fall was found to be far more accurate than they knew how to be, for Belshazzar offers Daniel, not the *second* place in the kingdom (which he assuredly would have done if he had occupied the first) but he says that "whosoever should read the writing . . . should be . . . the *third* ruler in the kingdom." (Dan. 5:9). Nabonedus, his father, though not a descendant of Nebuchadnezzar himself, had probably married into his family so that Belshazzar *was* a "son" of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 5:13), and Nabonedus was probably in Borsippa, away from Babylon, and probably lived some time longer, but Belshazzar was slain the night the city was taken and the capital of the kingdom fell into the hands of Darius the Median, and Daniel, instead of being slain, as the *third* ruler in the Chaldean kingdom, is exalted to the *second* place in the conquered realm.

The image of world dominion seen by Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 2:31-35) and the vision of the ram and the he-goat (Dan. 8:22) assure us that the Babylonian supremacy was succeeded by the Medo-Persian, and this by Javan, or the Grecian. Darius conquered Babylon and thus made himself master of the world. Alexander, in his turn, bore rule over all the earth by making Babylon his capital.

It is thus probable that each of the sons of Noah has had

the helm of human government. The descendants of Ham first founded the kingdom. The Babylonians and Medo-Persians probably sprang from Shem. The Grecian, as Javan, their Hebrew name, indicates, came from Japheth (Gen. 10:2). As each, in turn, enters Babylon in triumph, the banner of earth's sovereignty is unfurled, so it will be in the coming conquest of the world. A city will have a "kingdom over the kings of the earth" (Rev. 17:18), and the city is no other than Babylon, once more the Mistress of Kingdoms.

Before enlarging upon the future dominion of Babylon it will be well to pause and consider the oft-repeated objection that Babylon has been destroyed "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah" never more to be inhabited nor dwelt in from generation to generation, and that the Arabian shall never again pitch his tent there, nor shepherds make their fold there. It would be well for each one to turn to the Burden of Babylon as detailed by Isaiah in his thirteenth chapter, and the humiliation of the city described in his forty-seventh chapter, as well as the judgments pronounced upon Babylon by Jeremiah in his fiftieth and fifty-first chapters and note especially the *suddenness* of Babylon's destruction and desolation. It is a matter of history that, until recent years the city gradually fell into decay so that only the central portion has been continuously inhabited. It certainly was a city in the days of the apostles, for Peter sent his first epistle from Babylon (1 Pet. 5:13). A half a century later the Babylonian Talmud originated from the colony of Jews which still inhabited the place. Indeed, it has *always* been inhabited and in the present day has a population which probably exceeds ten thousand souls. Its "desolation" may be imagined when the Turkish government was able to collect as much as seventeen thousand dollars in taxes from its inhabitants. In the days preceding the war it showed every sign of once more becoming a great and flourishing city.

From these few facts it is clear that the prophecies concerning it have not yet been fulfilled. Indeed its destruction is in the Day of Jehovah (Isa. 13:6), when there are signs in the heavens (v. 10; Mt. 24:29; Rev. 6:12). It *has* been inhabited through all the years (see v. 20), the Arabians *do* pitch their tents within the boundaries of the ancient city and the shepherds continue to make their folds there. Does this look as though the prophecy has been *fulfilled*? By no means. There is not a single item in these definite predictions which will fit the city at any time in her history.

No desolation has come upon Babylon suddenly (Is. 47:11), but her decadence has been gradual hitherto, while her rejuvenation promises to be a speedy one.

Jeremiah tells us that "In those days and at that time, saith Jehovah, the sons of Israel shall come . . . and seek the Lord their God."

Babylon's doom and Israel's restoration are to occur together. If one is future, so is the other (Jer. 50:4-5). He confirms Isaiah's words that "it shall no more be inhabited for the eon, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation." (Jer. 50:39). He assures us that "every purpose of Jehovah shall be performed against Babylon, to make the land of Babylon a desolation without inhabitant." (Jer. 51:29). In view of all these solemn words it is ours to bow before them and acknowledge that they have never yet found fulfillment but will find it in the day of Jehovah, even as it is described to us in the Apocalypse. Jeremiah tells Seraiah to tie a stone to the scroll which contained the evils which should come upon Babylon, and to cast it into the midst of the Euphrates. Thus will Babylon sink and not rise from the evil which shall destroy her. (Jer. 51:60-65). But now, she *is* rising from the dust, and no city in the world has such prospects of regaining its former greatness. If God be true, then Babylon must be

rebuilt. Until recent years such an idea was likely to rouse ridicule, but now it is rapidly becoming a matter of course.

All the near eastern nations are being exploited by the more progressive people of the west. The building of the great dams on the upper Nile is placing Egypt among the kingdoms of the world once more. Sir William Willcox, whose work in Egypt was of such great value, undertook to do as much and more for the Euphrates and Tigris valleys. These once supported a dense population and can easily do so again. By means of irrigation the desert may be made to blossom as the rose. The work of restoration is comparatively simple. The ancient canals, by which the water was distributed over the land, are in ruins but the levels still exist, making it an easy task to restore them. The diversion of the river water into these canals is to be accomplished by barrages at various points which raise the water to the desired level. One of these was finished before the war and a large tract of land was brought under irrigation. The intensely fertile soil and the tropical heat of summer combined with the life-giving stream of water will transform the barren waste into a veritable garden. And, indeed, a part of this land was once the garden of Eden itself. Since the war began it is probable that this work has been hindered if not temporarily abandoned.

The war, on the other hand, has greatly hastened the building of the Bagdad railway and thus completed the only remaining factor which was needed before capital could be interested. In modern life commerce plays so great a part that transportation facilities are essential to the growth of a city.

But railroads alone are not sufficient for the needs of a modern metropolis. They must also have access to the sea. At first glance Babylon will be classed as an inland city rather than a seaport. Yet it is a notable fact that great commercial cities are not usually built near the open sea, but at some protected point at a distance from the ocean,

accessible by means of a river or inlet. London is on the Thames. New York is surrounded by land, and is approached through a narrow sound. Hamburg is far from the shore line. Antwerp is many miles up the Scheldt. These examples make it evident that the greatest maritime cities prefer sheltered inland waterways to nearness to the open sea.

So will it be with Babylon. The river which flows through it is navigable for light draught vessels as it is. It can easily be dredged for ocean going craft when the trade of the city demands it. That this will be the case seems certain from the description of her doom found in the Apocalypse.

“And every navigator, and everyone who is sailing at the place, and mariners, and as many as are seafaring, stand afar off, and, observing the smoke of her conflagration, they cry, saying, “Is there any like this great city?” And they cast dust on their heads and cry, lamenting and mourning, saying, “Woe, woe, that great city, in which were all who have ships on the sea, who were rich by its opulence, seeing that she is devastated in a single hour.” (Rev. 18:17-19).

Those whose hearts are stirred within them at sound of His approaching footsteps will do well to mark the progress of events as they cluster around two cities, Jerusalem and Babylon. As this is being written armies are not far from each of these two centers, and, temporarily, both are stepping backward rather than forward. But the plans for their revival will not long be hindered, once the war has come to a close.

It seems almost certain that the Jews will have a free hand in Palestine after hostilities cease. Both sides promise it and the Jews will do their utmost to recover their ancient heritage when peace reapportions the lands among the nations. One wealthy Hebrew has promised to provide funds for the transportation of all Jews in the United States who wish to return to the land of their fathers when the war is

over. The following condensed extract from *The American Hebrew* speaks eloquently of one of the many efforts to repatriate the people in the land of their fathers.

The Jews of New York last night appealed to the United States and the Allied powers to establish a Jewish republic in Palestine.

The plea was embodied in a resolution read at the convention of the Kehillah, or Jewish community, representing 1,500,000 Jews of this city, in the Hebrew Technical School for Girls, Fifteenth street and Second avenue. All day the 500 delegates had waited while a variety of resolutions had been read. Then Professor Israel Friedlander, of the Jewish Theological Seminary, stepped to the front of the platform. A deep silence fell over the audience.

A minute later the 500 delegates were on their feet. Shouting, cheering, laughing and crying, they gave vent to a feeling that had been slumbering in the breasts of Jews for 2,000 years. With one accord the audience burst into "Hatikvah," the song of Jewish hope for the restoration of the Holy Land. The old men and women were shaking their bodies to and fro, keeping time with the music.

"Our Palestine!" shouted one of the delegates. "At last, at last, are we to return to the land of our prophets!"

Across the stage had been draped a large American flag. Nearby was the flag of the Jews—a white and light blue banner with a double star of David in the centre. A man in the audience brushed his lips against its folds. The act was the signal for a cheer that shook the auditorium.

Ex-Assemblyman Solomon Sufrin introduced an amendment to the resolution. It was not enough, he said, to reaffirm faith in the restoration of the Holy Land to the Jews.

"Enough have we wandered," he cried. "Why should not the Jews have the backbone to come out before the entire world and demand Palestine for a Jewish republic? Come out publicly, you fellow Jews. Demand Zion! We want, we must have a Jewish republic in Palestine."

Mr. Sufrin's speech was followed by several minutes' cheering. Dr. Judah L. Magnes, who presided, then gave the floor to Joseph Barondess, Commissioner of Education, who introduced a second amendment. Finally Professor Friedlander, Mr. Barondess and Mr. Sufrin compromised on the following resolution:

"Whereas, Our country is now at war fighting with the democracies of the world for the triumph of freedom and justice and for the protection of the rights of the smaller nationalities, be it

"Resolved, That we, the delegates of the Jewish community of New York, in convention assembled, affirm our faith in the triumph of the cause for which this country now stands, and has always stood, and that we re-affirm our faith in the speedy redemption of Zion, and express our full confidence that the United States,

but will Desert Her for the Lucre of Shinar 231

of America, together with its Allies, will use efforts toward the realization of the hope and aspiration of the Jewish people for the reestablishment of a free and publicly recognized Homeland in Palestine."

The crowd left the auditorium singing the "Hatikvah."—*From The American Hebrew.*

Babylon may wait a little longer, but soon her time will also come. How the rehabilitation of Palestine will bring this about is set forth in Zechariah's vision of the Ephah, which will occupy our thoughts in the next chapter.

A. E. K.

IN SPIRIT

THE NATIONS ARE TO BE

Joint ENJOYERS

OF THE ALLOTMENT

AND A

Joint BODY

AND

Joint SHARERS

OF THE PROMISE

IN CHRIST JESUS

*THROUGH THE EVANGEL OF WHICH
I BECAME THE DISPENSER*

(Eph. 8:6-7)

“THROUGH THE EVANGEL OF WHICH I BECAME THE DISPENSER”

TO PAUL was given this grace: “to illuminate all us to what the secret stewardship is which has been concealed from the eons in God” (Eph. 3:9). He prays that the Father glorious may give us a wise and revealing spirit in its appreciation, the eyes of our heart being illumined to perceive what it consists of (Eph. 1:16-18). It becomes us, then, to consider most carefully what he has to say concerning it.

No one can be clear on present truth who has a hazy conception of the secret economy and of its one vital point which is summed up in our word JOINT. Read the accompanying statement of the mystery, leaving out this thrice repeated, emphatic term, and all of the secret has vanished. In fact, without the word JOINT it is a statement of what the nations had *before* the secret was made known. Reading it with and without this word will help to fix this point.

The categorical statement of the secret stewardship or economy should be engraved upon the tablet of memory so deeply that not one letter will be overlooked.

The *character* of blessing for the nation is strictly *spiritual*, as it had been before, for the nations were partakers of Israel’s spiritual things (Rom. 15:27). The *channel* of blessing also remains the *same*, for it comes to us *through the evangel which Paul had previously dispensed*.

Spiritual blessing for the nations was not hidden. They had already been raised from the place of a puppy picking up the superfluous crumbs (Mk. 7:27-28) to the place of a guest at Israel’s board (Eph. 2:12). Now, however, we are no longer guests, but members of God’s family, and partake of His spiritual store in unstinted and equal degree

with the hitherto favored Jew. The secret lies, not in the spiritual character of the blessing, but in its fullness. The nations partook of Israel's store; now we are blessed with *every* spiritual blessedness among the celestials in Christ. The allotment of which we are joint enjoyers has been transferred to celestial realms where Israel's priority needs no acknowledgment. The joint body of which we are members is not physically related to Christ, but a *spiritual* organism in which Israel needs no special recognition. The present celestial exaltation of our Lord, as revealed in His title, Christ Jesus, has no direct relation to the nation which rejected Him, hence those of the other nations may share His exaltation without in the least infringing on their prerogatives. Though the earthly temple is desolate, we have the introduction, in *one* spirit (with the circumcision) to the Father. We are being built together for God's habitation *in spirit* (Eph. 2:18, 22).

The Epistles of Paul, written after Acts twenty-eight, do *not* "contain a complete system of doctrine and instruction for the Church of the present dispensation," but, "where anything that obtained under the previous dispensation was to be repeated, we are *told so*."

"Where a modification or alteration was to be made, we are *told so*. The specific statement as to *one* baptism (Eph. 4:5) definitely sets aside the *two* baptisms (water *and* spirit) which obtained during the Pentecostal period covered by the Acts, and gives us today *one* baptism—that of the spirit."

Let us freely acknowledge, however, that we *are* told, in the very revelation of "the mystery" that the evangel of which Paul became the dispenser, which he delighted to call "his," and which he defended against all the encroachments of the circumcisionists, *that* gospel is *still* the channel through which the gracious blessings of "the mystery" flow. If we reject the great truths of justification by faith and conciliation by favor, we are destroying the very foundations of the mystery which we seek to defend.

It will be noted that the fact that present blessing is *in spirit*, is *not* a part of "the mystery." It was not a secret. It *limits* the mystery to the sphere of spirit. The joint enjoyment is not concerned with the physical allotment of Israel in the land, but a spiritual allotment among the celestials. "The mystery" itself is confined to the threefold statement which follows.

The same may be said of the closing sentence: "through the evangel of which I became the dispenser." The gospel which Paul had preached is not the secret here revealed, but it bears a very definite relation to the mystery. It is the *channel*, the *medium*, *through* which it comes to us. The failure to recognize this fact has caused so much confusion and misapprehension that we beg our readers to bear with us if we demonstrate its truth by many proofs and examples.

The question has arisen, if "the mystery" was an absolute secret, hid in God, what relation do we sustain to Paul's previous ministry? What part have we in Paul's previous epistles? Are they no longer for us? Do they apply to a "different dispensation"?

The answer to these important questions depends upon our apprehension of what "the mystery" is. If we believe that "the church" is the mystery we shall soon find ourselves in difficulties, for the church or ecclesia at Ephesus existed long before the secret was made known to them. If we take "the body," "Christ mystical" to be "the mystery," we are again in a quandary, for the body of Christ also antedates the revelation of the secret. We are asked, for instance, what has "the Church of the Mystery" to do with the covenant? The answer is quite clear. The church which is *now* under the secret economy once had much to do with the covenant. They were *guests* of the promissory covenants (Eph. 2:12; 2 Co. 11:25). Jehovah's covenant is with the nation of Israel (Jer. 31). Through that covenant blessing came to the churches at Rome and Corinth and Galatia and

236 Paul's Previous Ministry is the Channel

Thessalonica and Ephesus and Philippi and Colossae. After the mystery was revealed these same churches, which once were connected to the covenant by Paul's preaching, are connected by the same channel to the uncovenanted yet transcendent celestial blessings which it brings.

It is vital to our comprehension of the present secret economy or stewardship to apprehend that it comes to us by way of the evangel which Paul had previously dispensed. Those who do not grasp the spiritual character of present grace have been led into many hurtful errors. They import Israel's promises of physical blessing (which was shared in measure by the other nations so long as they drew their supplies of grace through Israel) into an economy where grace is sufficient. The apostle Paul went through the change and learned it by experience. He had healed others, but latterly, when he wished healing himself, it was denied, and replaced by spiritual grace.

On the other hand, if we repudiate Paul's previous evangel, *which is specifically and categorically asserted to be the channel by which the blessings of "the mystery" reach us*, we will plunge into the opposite extreme of error. The mystery is *not* the promulgation of an *entirely new* set or body of doctrine, but the modification, or rather *glorification*, of Paul's previous teaching. It comes through the evangel which he had been dispensing.

Let us instance one example. The conciliation of mankind (Rom. 11) depends on the repudiation of Israel until the fullness of the nations has come in. Very little is said of this in Ephesians, because the relation between mankind and God are not its subject. Yet Paul still wishes to make known "the mystery of the gospel" (Eph. 6:19-20), which can be no other than the secret evangel of Romans five and eleven. And has this, too, been modified? Perhaps we ought rather to say that it has been glorified. The conciliation deals with God's attitude towards mankind, but still left a measure of discord between the recipients of its

grace. The Jews and aliens, even though both reconciled to God, were not in perfect accord with one another. The superior place of the circumcision made this impossible. And so conciliation is perfected by the removal of all barriers between believers and by the reconciliation of the circumcision with the uncircumcision. There is reconciliation, not only with God, but with His favored people. This is the burden of the second chapter of Ephesians.

Again, in the sixth of Ephesians, we are exhorted to put on the breastplate of righteousness. In the third of Philipians, Paul speaks of a righteousness not his own but through the faith of Christ. Where, indeed, shall we learn about this righteousness, if we discard Romans and Galatians? Is it not the very same?

If, then, righteousness and conciliation are carried over into the present, practically the entire epistles of Romans, Galatians and Corinthians must likewise be acknowledged, for these subjects are the burden which they bear.

How, then, does "the mystery" affect them? It modifies, or glorifies, their message. For instance, "to the Jew *first*" (Rom. 1:16; 2:9, 10) is no longer true after the secret is revealed that the nations are *joint*-partakers in Paul's evangel (Eph. 3:6-7). The Jew no longer has any advantage (Rom. 3:1-2). The nations are no longer *debtors* to them for *their* spiritual things, for our blessedness is in a region to which they have no claim (Rom. 15:27; Eph. 2:13-22).

In Corinthians the body is no longer composed of members "less honorable" and "uncomely," but is a *joint*-body, in which each member is peer of all the rest. The gifts are specifically limited to the period before the revelation of the secret. "When that which is perfect (or *maturity*) is come, then that which is in part shall be done away" (I Cor. 13:8-14). Ephesians puts before us the mature humanity (Eph. 4:13), Philipians speaks of some who attained it (Phil. 3:15), and Colossians expresses Paul's desire to present *every* man mature (Col. 1:28; 4:12).

But, we are asked, "If we are right to introduce upon our own initiative the Lord's Supper into this present dispensation, why not spiritual gifts, tongues, miracles? Why not be thorough?"

That is exactly the point. Let us be thorough. Let us be exact. Of tongues we read, "*they shall cease*"—when maturity comes. Of the Lord's Supper we read that it is to last *till He come*. The Corinthian epistle itself tells us to make a distinction and defines it for us.

"Why do we pick out one item from this epistle and seek to perpetuate *that*, when we are compelled to confess that the very next verses are written concerning that to which we can lay no claim?" This question has already been answered. The instructions to do this are included in the teaching itself. It may, however, be answered in another way. If we acknowledge that the gifts have ceased, why do we still cling to the teaching concerning the one body (I Cor. 12:12-31)? These gifts were in that body. No doubt we will be told that the body is mentioned in the prison epistles: indeed, its change to a joint-body is a vital part of "the mystery" itself. Just so. In reading Corinthians, then (bearing in mind "the mystery"), we note that the gifts have *ceased*: we read of the body and find that it has *changed*: we read of the supper and find that it is to continue "*till He come*," and that our cup is no longer filled by the new covenant, but by the transcendent grace not then revealed. The effort to put baptism in water in the same category with the Lord's Supper can only be done if we deliberately shut our eyes to the setting of each. Paul was *not* sent to baptize: the supper was given him by a *special revelation*. It is said that "the Apostle Paul received no further teaching regarding it than could be gathered from the records in the gospels." But Paul never saw "the gospels." Then he must have received it from the apostles, we will be told. But such pleading only displays the weakness of the position. *He said he received it*

from the Lord, and it is an unqualified perversion of truth for us to say that he received it elsewhere. He adds items which are not contained in the gospels. What gospel tells us about the very point in question? Where is it said that it was to continue "till He come"? The "gospels" connect it with the passover, a yearly festival. The Lord, through Paul, changes its time to an indefinite "whenever," which our translators render "as oft as." Paul received revelation after revelation which brought him from glory to glory. All his teaching began with a "Jewish" tinge. Take justification, for instance. It was simply a supplement to the pardon of sins, and for those things in which the law of Moses failed to provide relief (Acts 13:38-39). Is it therefore a "Jewish" doctrine, confined to the circumcision? It seems thus at first, but when the apostle unfolds it in Romans it loses much of this bias, though still extended to them on slightly different grounds from the circumcision (Rom. 3:30). The revelation of the secret destroys even this distinction, for now we both have the introduction, by *one* spirit, to the Father (Eph. 2:18).

As it was with justification, so also with all the truth for the present time. God graciously granted it in gradually increasing measure and continually enhanced glory until it attained its full meridian in the Roman jail, after Israel was fully and fatally apostate.

It is evident, then, that Romans and Corinthians and Galatians are vital elements of present truth, especially as they are illuminated and glorified by the ranking revelation contained in the prison epistles. But what of Thessalonians? Is the hope there set forth—the obtaining of the glory of our Lord, Jesus Christ (2 Thess. 2:14)—our hope? Is the descent of the Lord Himself from heaven and the catching up in clouds a distinct and different occasion from the ardent expectation of *our* hearts? There can be no doubt that the apostle refers to this when he reminds the Colossians of the hope laid up for them in the heavens, *which*

they heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel (Col. 1:5). Before the secret was revealed this hope was given in Paul's gospel. When and where is the record of this if it is not in Thessalonians? When we rid ourselves of the idea that the revelation of the secret annihilated everything which preceded it, and grasp the true thought that it put the believers among the nations on an equal footing with a remnant out of Israel in a new sphere of blessing, then there is no necessity or desire to do away with Paul's previous ministry, to which he was separated from the other disciples. Indeed, of all the doctrines which he had preached, which one is in such sympathy with a heavenly destiny as this? The saints were to meet Him in the air, and so ever be with their Lord. When the mystery of Christ is fully revealed and we find that Christ is not confined to an earthly throne, but has a heavenly domain, it almost follows of necessity that our blessings should be in the heavens where He is. Only thus can we be *ever with the Lord*.

To be Concluded in our Next Number

[**UNSEARCHABLE RICHES FOR AUGUST, 1917**]
[**BEING THE SIXTH NUMBER OF VOLUME EIGHT**]

EDITORIAL

By the grace of our Lord, this is the last number of volume VIII. That we should be suffered to continue during this period of stress and trial is sufficient evidence of His favor. But we are bound to give thanks for far more than this, for it is possible that more hearts have been reached during this distressing year than all of the previous seven.

The experiences of the past and the extraordinary character of the times, call for some modification in the conduct of the magazine. There is an insistent call for something "simple" which we can no longer ignore. While it will be our endeavor to simplify the deeper studies of the Word, we shall make a special effort to provide helpful and elementary articles suited to those less mature. A series of articles on "The Outside of the Envelope" will point out to whom and for whom each part of the Scriptures is written. This has been found helpful in rightly dividing the Word of truth.

The articles on "Creation" will grow in interest as we advance. It is surprising how tradition has blinded us to the plain teaching of certain Scriptures. So long as we look at them through our preconceptions their message is lost to us: when we see the lack of support accorded our views by revelation, then we will be ready to acknowledge that, indeed "all is out of God" and "in Him we live and move and have our being."

The articles on the mystery of Babylon have reached their most interesting stage. We are about to consider the subject as set forth in the Apocalypse. First, however, we will seek to "open" the book by pointing out the remarkable series of "openings" which give us a clew to each section of this marvellous prophecy.

The coming year is bound to be crammed with events of intensest interest to the student of prophecy. It is possible that it will see the organization of the nondescript monster of Daniel's vision under the mask of a world federation for enforcing peace. The Jews, too, may return to the possession of their own land in the next twelve months. In view of this extraordinary crisis in human affairs we will have a special department in each issue on the Signs of the Times, or Seasons, confining ourselves, of course, to their bearing on prophecy and our Lord's return. We never intended to have news in our magazine, but the time has come when Jehovah is about to inaugurate the most momentous epoch in human history, and it is of the utmost importance that we should be clear as to the true character of the movements which the adversary has commenced with a view to deceive the whole world, so that we may not be deluded by their deceptive snares. Peace and federation are in the air. We cannot deny that, in themselves, these are much to be desired. But when our eyes are opened to the fact that all this is to culminate in man's grand effort to blot out God's name from the earth and to defeat His purposes in Christ, peace becomes unpalatable and confederation a crime. We trust none of our readers will become infatuated with this false confederacy.

May we ask the earnest cooperation of all our readers with the plans of the publishing office to further reduce our expenses in the present crisis? We trust it will help towards a larger and better magazine. The notice appears on another page.

THE TRUE BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP

God founds fellowship on conduct: man makes it a matter of doctrine. So settled is the supposition that creed is the basis of communion that no one seems to think it necessary to consult the Scriptures on the subject. Their plain directions, both in precept and practice, find no response even among those who are intelligent students and ardent champions of truth. A man may be perfect in his moral record, yet, if he hold aught of unorthodox truth, his company is shunned, he is an outcast much more obnoxious than the moral leper. How has man changed God's ways! In Corinth it was found necessary to exclude one of their members from fellowship. What heresy did he hold? There were those in that communion who held "fundamental" error. They denied the resurrection. If there is no resurrection, all is false and futile. Christ is still dead. We are still in our sins. All depends upon the truth of resurrection. Was he the ringleader of this delusion? Surely such ought to be put out! So we may reason, but not so is God's way. The heretics are kept in fellowship: the immoral man (whatever his doctrines may have been) is excluded, with a view to his restoration. This example alone should teach us that *fellowship is not based on doctrine, but on deportment*. Should we not search our hearts as to this matter and see if we have been guilty of breaking the bonds which bound us to one of our brethren on the ground that he embraced some doctrine which we decided was unorthodox? Should we not haste to repair any such breach and acknowledge our departure from the path of peace?

As a result of this case in Corinth we are given a list of the crimes which exclude from fellowship. Railing, drunkenness and extortion are among them. Alas! how often do those who excommunicate others on the ground of doctrine do so with words and expressions which might well bring upon themselves the ban they seek to place upon a heretic!

How this flares up in Paul's Galatian protest! Why did he not clear the church of the Judaizing teachers who were perverting the gospel he had preached? Did he wish them to continue their destructive work among them? Not at all. So he vents his feelings in the suppressed exclamation, "I would they would even cut *themselves* off who trouble you" (Gal. 5:12, margin). He could not cut them off. But so sorely was his heart tried by their denial of God's grace that he could not bear to see any further effects of their work. Today Galatian error is Christian orthodoxy. Everywhere are those who ought to cut themselves off. But let us beware of doing it for them.

But what is the true foundation of fellowship? In the Scriptures it is set forth in a two-fold fashion. In its divine aspect it is based on unity of spirit; in its human side it depends on deportment.

It is ours to assiduously keep the unity formed by the spirit of God, which includes all who are His. On the other hand, we do not know who these are. "The Lord knoweth them that are His" (2 Tim. 2:19). All we can tell by is their actions. "Let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." There is a practical side to fellowship which has been made dependent on doctrine which should be founded on life and conduct.

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT

God has made a unity. It is a spiritual unity. We should make it our business to *preserve* it. In the opening exhortation, after that most marvelous manifestation of Divine grace contained in the earlier chapters of the epistle to the Ephesians, we are entreated by the prisoner of the Lord, to walk worthy of the calling with which we are called, with all humility and meekness, with patience, bearing with one another in love, being diligent to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace (Eph. 3:1-3).

Most "movements" are marked by the opposite of this. The discovery, perhaps, of fresh truth leads to exaltation and pride, impatience with error, a lack of bearing with one another, and a diligence in forming a new, man-made unity in the bonds of doctrine. Every such "unity" is a fresh *division*. Even the attempts to form a unity which will not shut cut any of God's saints have all failed, and, however sincere their purpose, they have all degenerated into another schism. A number of bodies which we have today began with the laudable desire of affording a common ground upon which all saints could fellowship with one another.

The moment man *makes* a unity he *breaks* the one which God has made. *We are not called upon to make a unity; we are exhorted to keep the one already made.* There is not the least excuse for forming a fresh unity; there is every reason why we should acknowledge the unity of the spirit and refuse all others which infringe upon it. Doctrines, however they may attract those like minded, must never be allowed to mar this unity. Peace is the true bond which binds us together, not a common creed.

Some have supposed that the use of Scriptural names,

such as Disciples, Brethren, Christians, Believers, Church of God, etc., is sufficient recognition of the unity of the spirit. In the same way there were those in Corinth who sought to avoid partisanship by calling themselves the party of Christ. But a name alone, however good it may be, is no index of an unsectarian position. Some of the narrowest sects have the broadest names. All the saints are not brethren. There are sisters in the Lord as well. But when both are called Brethren, the name no longer is a true use of sound words. It is the badge of a party. On the other hand, there are names which are admittedly to be applied to only a part of God's people which need not infringe in the least on the unity of the spirit. The church of the Thessalonians was the local body. The name simply records a physical separation which need not interfere at all with the most ample recognition of the spirit's unity. Today the problem is more difficult. There are many "churches" in a town the size of Thessalonica. And not only so, but they are allied with churches in other towns. In moving amongst these it is inevitable that some descriptive term be applied, even to those who disown all barriers and desire to keep the spirit's unity. This usually refers to some prominent doctrine and thus forms the nucleus of a new sect. For if certain people are called "Reconciliationists" the inference is that only those who hold that doctrine are welcome to their fellowship. On the other hand, if they describe themselves with some term which should be common to all believers in the present distress, and which gives the ground and source of their doctrine, there is no need for schism. When the ignorant heathen calls the missionaries "Bible men" no one can complain that the name is not apt, or that it creates division. All saints *ought* to be "Bible men."

It was in this spirit that we suggested "Standard Scripture Students." This involves no sore point of doctrine, such as "Reconciliationist," erects no barrier, but is simply a statement of fact. All God's saints are not students, yet this does not divide them. All do not seek to go beyond the versions to the original, yet this does not create schism. All do not use a consistent standard, yet those who do study the original by this method will be found the most earnest proponents of spiritual unity. On the other hand, we ask none to use this descriptive appellation who have the least conscience on the matter. Let this sink into our hearts: It is not a question of *names*; it is a question of *heart*. The best and most scriptural of names may only cover the most uncompromising sectarianism. Is not "Catholic" a good name? "Brethren" is not bad. But where shall we find the unity of *spirit* amongst these, even if they are so diverse in their doctrines?

On the other hand, there are doubtless those in all communions who have been taught by God to acknowledge a unity which will not fit within the narrow confines of their own fellowship.

Let us, then, ignore man's unities: let us sedulously regard and cultivate the unity of the spirit.

In these days of wrongly dividing the word of truth the confusion has become so confounded that it is indeed difficult to know with whom to have fellowship. Doctrines based on the Bible, but contrary to present truth, are so taught that we are perplexed at times whether those who hold them belong to the Lord or not. In the midst of this perplexity we are much relieved by the assurance, "The Lord knoweth them that are His" (2 Tim. 2:19). *We* may not know, but *He* does.

Truth wrongly divided is the most malignant and mis-

chievous error, because it masquerades in the livery of truth. Hymenæus and Philetus were not like the Corinthians. They believed in the resurrection. They taught it. What they taught concerning it is one of the most glorious truths which we shall ever come to. What would it not mean for us who will participate in it to have the resurrection "past already"! The doctrine itself is grand, but the "dividing" or apportioning of it is fatal. They did not deny the doctrine; they simply misplaced it.

How much Bible truth today is working havoc by its misapplication! What God limits to the eons our translators have made everlasting. The doctrine of judgment and sin in the eons, like a torch, lightens up the glory of our God: outside the eons it is a devastating flame reducing His glory to ashes. Keep them in the eons and we behold a God who compels our adoration: deport them beyond the eons and we have a fiend far more ferocious than the foulest of mankind.

The Fatherhood of God is another truth which, when prematurely placed, is positively baneful. *We*, who believe, know Him as *our* Father; but what claim has the world upon Him whom they hate? He is *not* their Father now. But this does not preclude his *ever* becoming such. Indeed, who can deny, with the word of God in their hearts, that, when all are made alive, at the consummation, and the Son abdicates the throne, that He will deliver it to the *Father*, that God may be All in *all*?

The same is true of the various eons themselves. Truth for one eon is rank error in another. Anarchy or the lack of human government was God's order before the flood: now we must be subject to His ministers, who do not bear the sword in vain (Rom. 13:4). In the next eon the saints will take the Kingdom and reign: now they must be subject

(1 Cor. 4:8). Vegetarianism, too, was right for the antediluvians: now it is a sign of apostasy to abstain from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and appreciate the truth, “for every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused . . .” (2 Tim. 4:3-4).

In the various economies this is still more marked. To “mind earthly things” is a mark of apostasy now, but in the past, as in the future, it will be the precious privilege of the saints to be concerned with the earth and its restoration.

And in the matter of fellowship a right division is vital. The epistles of John in particular, written in view of Israel’s trials in the great tribulation, make doctrine the touchstone of communion. “If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed . . . (2 Jn. 10). If anyone is not convinced that the Apostle John’s message was confined to the circumcision, who acknowledged Christ after the flesh (1 Jn. 1:1) in contrast with Paul, who would no longer know him thus (2 Cor. 5:16), let him act upon the following simple statement: “*taking nothing of the Gentiles.*” Ask almost any minister in these days if he believes in apportioning John’s epistles to the circumcision, and he will deny such a monstrous thing. Ask him *if he receives nothing from the Gentiles*, and confines his collections to the Jews, and he will insist on rightly dividing that *one* passage at any rate. But if we are so keen on money matters, why should we not act with equal consistency on matters of fellowship?

FELLOWSHIP FOR THE LAST DAYS

The epistles of Paul to Timothy deal with the “latter

eras" and the "last days." The second letter is especially applicable to the difficult times in which we find ourselves. In the first epistle the church is presented as "the pillar and ground of the truth" (3:15). In the second the figure changes to a "great house" (2:20). This is what the church is today. It no longer upholds the truth. It is a great house full of all sorts of vessels, some to be shunned and some to be sought.

The basis of practical fellowship remains just as it was in the beginning. While the Lord knows those who are His, we are not called upon to determine this. All that we can decide and act upon is the conduct of those who take the name of Christ. "Let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (2 Tim. 2:19). Even if we feel that a man is a true member of Christ's body, we may not have fellowship with him if he is involved in moral evil.

In service, the same rule applies. Some in the great house are vessels of gold and of silver, serving up the truths of Christ's redemptive sufferings and present glory: others are vessels of wood and of earth, concerned with the cleansing and sanitation of mankind. In which class do we find ourselves? How can we change? The process is most simple. Let the vessel to dishonor but purge *itself* and, lo! it is transformed from an earthen jar to a golden vase, or from a wooden bucket to a silver dish! We are not called upon to cleanse one another. We must purge *ourselves*. All that our Owner requires is cleanliness: that will prepare us for every good deed.

This is our preparation for service and fellowship. But just as we are required to diligently seek to preserve the spirit's unity, so we are also required to seek the fellowship of those who call upon the Lord out of a pure heart.

THE CLEAN HEART

The *clean heart*—this is the basis of practical fellowship in these dark, declining days of apostasy. Not doctrine, not knowledge, but an unmixed motive and clean life. The heart in Scripture is the center and core of a man's life. Out of it are the issues of life. It is not, as with us, the seat of the affections, but the spring of every action, the source of every deed. Sincerity should characterize those who attract our fellowship.

“Follow righteousness, faith, love, peace, with those who call upon the Lord out of a clean heart” (2 Tim. 2:22). This is the basis of fellowship for these last dark days. What stress is laid upon our walk! Righteousness and love and peace have no direct relation to doctrine at all, and faith, in this company, refers rather to its practical working in life.

But, some will retort, does it not matter what doctrine we hold? Is teaching of no account whatever? No one who has read our magazine or who has grasped our teaching in this article on fellowship will fail to see the intense stress which we put upon right doctrine. Nothing, unless it be love, is more important today. But our subject is not the necessity of doctrine, but the basis of fellowship. It has no place in that basis. We rejoice that God in His wisdom has made it so, for if we fellowshipped only with those who held identical doctrines it would soon come to pass that everyone who exercised some intelligence in the study of God's word would be a little sect all by himself. Some minute truth or error would effectually bar him from all others.

Associations based on doctrine are most baneful in destroying individual study and faith. All who are inclosed within a common creed are either callous on the subject of

doctrine or galled by the bands that hold them. It takes a pope, Protestant or Catholic, to hold such a company together with the dictum of infallibility. What havoc has this ungodly course wrought among God's servants! It is practically impossible for any of them to conscientiously study the Scriptures for fear that they may discover some truth which will disqualify them for their place and perhaps cause the loss of prestige and position, if not suffering and destitution. Truth is at a discount. Venerable error alone can claim recognition and recompense under the present man-made foundation of doctrinal delusions. Here is a godly servant of Christ who learns the blessed truth of his Lord's return. False doctrine! Out with him! Or he hears of the reconciliation of the universe. Even if he has not fully made up his mind, but is willing to inquire, he must be ready to sacrifice all for the privilege. What slaves we have become!

Here is a missionary. Every Scriptural test which can be brought to bear pleads for his support in the field for which he has given his life. He is esteemed and honored for his labors and sacrifices. He is in full accord with the teaching of his associates on the vast body of doctrine which is their creed. But he, too, is illuminated by the spirit of God and learns more than the creed contains. What shall be done? Out with him! Let him go back if he has means or let him starve in the midst of the heathen! Thus they may learn something of the love of Christ as it is exemplified by His professed followers and accredited ministers!

On the other hand, witness the beneficial effects of fellowship based on a common desire to glorify God and a generous spirit of love and forbearance! The very differences of doctrine are a blessing, for mutual and loving discussion cannot fail to edify and instruct all who preserve the proper

spirit. All those finer graces which otherwise would be dormant are brought into full exercise. Love blossoms into lowliness and meekness and longsuffering and forbearance. These are not only a blessing in themselves, but yield a harvest of most precious and desirable fruit for His delectation.

Were the true basis of fellowship recognized, truth would flourish instead of fading from the earth. It would be welcomed, not dreaded. Error, robbed of its emoluments, would find its popularity decreased. But we are reminded that these are the last days. We can only hope to reach a few with clean hearts who will pursue this path of peace with us till He comes.

But even where the true foundation of fellowship is allowed, some things must be avoided. "Foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes, and the servant of the Lord *must not strive*, but be gentle to all, apt to teach, patient under evil, in meekness correcting those who oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." In view of the present inaccurate and misleading versions it is very easy for God's saints to engage in insipid questions, which are not worth the storm they brew, and those which arise from a lack of education in divine lore. Many a bitter quarrel has had no basis in fact. If the contending parties had only had access to the facts, their differences would have disappeared. If training or education was so important for the Lord's servant in days when the original was within his reach, how much more today when he must rake the truth out of the rubbish heap of decayed and destructive doctrine?

It is the business of our little magazine to help at this point. We hope to present *facts*—which can be verified

by anyone of average intelligence—which will greatly minimize the prevailing danger of discussing truth without a knowledge of the facts which underlie it. Those who do not appreciate our message are those who do not investigate carefully and accurately, preferring to ignore or pervert the facts to suit the doctrine which they hold.

Let us all take this home to our hearts: *The servant of the Lord must not strive.* Under the severest provocation he must be gentle; under the most provoking and insistent ignorance he must teach; under the most exasperating and long-continued opposition he must be patient. His business is not to strive, but to correct; and to do this with all the meekness which God's grace alone can impart. The rest he must leave to God, for He alone can give the change of mind which will acknowledge the truth. May He graciously stand by His servants in such a ministry!

To sum up: Doctrine is not the basis of fellowship; that is founded on deportment. There is a divine unity which we should preserve; and the best way to break this unity is to try to make it. In the midst of the present trying times we look for a clean heart in those whom we admit to our communion, and seek to keep ourselves clean for His service.

May the Lord graciously anoint the eyes of His people and prepare their hearts to follow His own guidance in these difficult and dangerous days, till He come!

A. E. K.

The Nephilim

THE REPHAIM

IN the previous paper we noted that Scripture mentions two great branches of Nephilim—the Anakim and the Rephaim. Each branch had its own distinctive and peculiar characteristics.

The Anakim took their name from one Anak, whose father Arba was the greatest among the Anakim* (Josh. 14:15). Hebron was his city, and its former name was Kiriath-arba, city of Arba (Gen. 23:2). When the spies went to search the land three descendants of Arba—Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai—dwelt there (Nu. 13:22). They were expelled thence by Caleb (Josh. 15:13-14), who also drove the Anakim out from all the hill country of Judah (Josh. 11:21). Joshua drove them out from the hill country of Israel, and they took refuge in the Philistine cities of Gaza, Gath and Ashdod (Josh. 11:22). Thus, from Joshua to David, Philistia became the last stronghold of Nephilim power in Canaan. Philistia evidently was a strong Nephilim center, a fact which accounts for the deep-seated hostility of the Philistines toward Israel.

The Anakim were warriors. They were famed for their military achievements. They were the standard specimen of martial prowess. Moses quotes the saying well known to the Israelites, "Who can stand before the sons of Anak?" (Deut. 9:2). This, and the previously noted fact that Philistia was their great center, explains why, in leading

* They are called *Anakim* in Deut. 1:28; 2:10, 11, 21; 9:2; Josh. 11:21, 22; 13:21, 22; 14:12, 15; 21:10; and *sons of Anak* in Nu 13:22, 28, 23; Deut. 9:2; Josh. 15:13, 14; Judg. 1:20.

Israel out of Egypt, God did not lead them by the short route through Philistia, but led them by a round about way lest they become discouraged by warfare (Ex. 13:17).

We will now turn to the Nephilim branch which acquired fame in other fields than warfare, and which continued to exert a potent and sinister influence long after the Anakim power had collapsed—the Rephaim.

The Rephaim are often mentioned in Scripture, but unfortunately the capricious renderings of the current versions, which translate this proper name as “dead,” “deceased,” “giants,” “embalmers” and “physicians,” have put the Rephaim as a tribe out of sight. Scripture speaks of them as a people (Gen. 15:20), and none has the right to denationalize them. The Rephaim were known as a people as early as the days of Abraham, when they dwelt at Ashteroth-Karnaim, and were conquered by Chedorlaomer and the kings under him (Gen. 14:5). Moab, Ammon and Edom drove out the Rephaim and dwelt in their stead. Thus they were gradually reduced in number, for we read of “the *remnant* of the Rephaim” (Deut. 3:11). In the days of Moses, the kingdom of Bashan would seem to have been the only remains of the Rephaim, for after the conquest of Bashan the survivors dwelt at Ashtaroth and Edrei (Josh. 13:12). Like their kinsmen the Anakim, they repaired to Philistia, and here, in the days of David, produced a crop of powerful warriors. (2 Sam. 21:15-22).

The question now occurs, Whence did the Rephaim get their name? It could not have been derived from an ancestor, for Rapha lived about the time of David (1 Chr. 28:8), whereas we have seen that they were already known by the name Rephaim as early as the days of Abraham. Hence we must turn for light to other sources than ancestry. The word *Rephaim* is the participial form of the

verb *raphah*, to heal (Ex. 15:26, Ps. 103:3). From this verb come the derivatives *riphuth*, "health" (Prov. 3:8), and *riphuoth*, "medicines" (Jer. 30:13; 46:11; Ezek. 30:21). This fact is in itself sufficient proof that the renderings "dead" and "deceased" of the current versions are unfounded and misleading.

A weather-vane shows which way the wind blows. So the marginal note of the English Revisers to the passages where Rephaim is rendered "dead" shows the spirit of their translation. In the text they leave the word "dead" of the Authorized, and in the margin they say "*shades*, Heb. *Rephaim*." Now they acknowledge that the Hebrew has *Rephaim*, yet they perpetuate the false and misleading rendering of the older version. More than that, their marginal suggestion "*shades*" pushes the reader further into error. It imports into the word of God the barbarous notions of idolatrous cults. We insist that what the Hebrew has is decisive, and that therefore the word Rephaim always has a national application.

The participle of *raphah* is sometimes vocalized *rephaim*, sometimes *rophaïm*, but the consonants—which are the only essential part of a Hebrew word—are the same. Rephaim means healing ones, or simply healers. It designates profession. In their professional capacity, as exercising the art of medicine, they were called *rophaïm*—*healers*. In the course of time the professional designation acquired the force of an appellation—*The Rephaim*.

In ancient times, the practice of medicine was associated with religion on the one hand, and with magic on the other. We know that the Rephaim embalmed the dead (Gen. 50:2). They had to do with religion. They claimed knowledge of the occult; they were initiates, claiming insight into the mysteries of the past and future. Through

magic and medicine they professed to control the present; through assumed knowledge of the mysteries of the hereafter, they claimed power to influence the beyond. In a word, the Rephaim were priests, and their sinister influence was felt in Israel long after the temporal power of the Anakim collapsed.

The concordance has rescued the pre-adamic race of Rephaim from oblivion, and their reappearance on the page of Scripture sheds a flood of light on many otherwise obscure and meaningless passages. We proceed to review these.

The career of the good king Asa had a pathetic ending. Toward the close of his life he forsook the ways of the Lord. The chronicler sums up his failure in one brief sentence—"his disease was exceeding great: yet in his disease he sought not to Jehovah, but to the Rephaim" (2 Chr. 16:12). This passage has been the sport of "faith healers," who have used it to bolster up their healing fads. The passage, as it stands in the current versions, is simply incomprehensible. If Asa had sought medical aid, he would have done the only proper and sensible thing under the circumstances, and there could have been no possible cause for Divine displeasure. But in the light of the truth here advanced Asa's sin was a lapse into idolatry. The Rephaim were the initiates of the Egyptian mysteries, and to turn to them meant to invoke the help of false gods.

The book of Job contains the two most interesting references to the Rephaim. Job 13:4 reads as follows: "But ye are forgers of lies, physicians of no value." With regard to this rendering it must be observed, first, that the noun rendered "value" is the same which the translators themselves render "idols" in every other instance; and, second, the negative "no" is wanting in the original. The passage

simply reads—"But ye—forgers of lies, Rephaim's idols—all of you." Job is answering the dogmatist Zophar. He tells him that his words, and those of his friends, are empty and futile. To emphasize the ineffectiveness of their arguments he uses a comparison. He tells them that their views are as incapable of carrying conviction as the idols of the Rephaim were powerless to protect their devotees.

The statement in Job 26:5 is still more striking. Unfortunately our versions rob this passage of its simplicity and force. This is not to be wondered at, for, having denationalized the Rephaim, the translators naturally would not understand a passage founded on their experience of national decline. In their straits they turned to heathenish conjecture, and turned a most impressive passage into a fool's gabble—"Dead things are formed from under the waters." Literally, the Rephaim, can they do anything beneath their watery abode? To perceive the force of Job's words we have only to recall the fact that the Rephaim once inhabited the region of the Dead Sea, viz., the sites which in his time were under the waters of the Dead Sea; and the point of his word is, can the Rephaim do anything in their watery grave? So your words, Bildad, are just as impotent and ineffective.

We now come to the Psalm in which the sufferings of Job are echoed in the language as a whole. The writer, Heman the Ezrahite, was a wise man of the time of Solomon (1 Ki. 4:31). The psalm is the wail of a man nigh unto death; and it expresses with great force and precision the personal experience of our Lord. The thoughts of the wise who is brought nigh unto death turn to God's purposes for the huge army of those who have entered the domain of the king of terrors.

Wilt thou show wonders to the dead?

Shall the Rephaim arise and praise thee?

Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave?

Or thy faithfulness in destruction?

Shall thy wonders be known in the dark?

And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?

The question raised by Heman, whether or not the Rephaim shall rise, we shall see farther on, is answered in Isaiah.

The three references to the Rephaim in Proverbs are, like those in Job, founded on the fate which befell the Rephaim. The wise men draw instruction in righteousness from the national experience of their predecessors in the land. The first two references (2:18 and 9:18) are found in that part of the collection (chh. 1-9) which was specifically designed for the guidance of the prince, in the spirit of Deut. 17:14-20. The wise men unweariedly remind the prince of the grave responsibility resting upon his shoulders. As the agent of Jehovah on the throne of Israel, his acts are representative, and therefore fraught with gravest consequences to the nation. The two references to the Rephaim are associated with the sin of unchastity. The prince is warned against becoming infatuated with the strange woman. The "strange woman," whether answering to the Hebrew word *zarah* or *nokriah*, is not an erring daughter of Abraham, but an *alien* woman, to consort with whom would inevitably lead to declension from the Lord. Since God called Israel to be separate from the nations, consorting with "strange women" implied contempt of the purpose of God for the elect family of Abraham. The "strange" woman is guilty of double treason—"she forsaketh the friend of her youth, and forgetteth the covenant of her god"—that is, she is untrue to her husband and unfaithful to her god (2:17). The reference here is not to

Jehovah, but to the national "god," or "gods" of the "alien woman." The aim of the sentence is to bring out her audacity: leaving her own people, she has assumed the part of an adventuress, and come into a community of whose god she knows nothing. To traffic with her is to invite the fate of the Rephaim.

The linking of the Rephaim with unchastity is suggestive. It shows that prostitution played a prominent part in the religious system of the Nephilim. The order of "holy women," or professional prostitutes, which is integral part of every pagan system, was adopted by Adam's descendants from the Nephilim. Lev. 18:6-23 enumerates the abominations that were commonly practiced among the Nephilim in Canaan. The recital of Nephilim abominations is followed by warning: "Defile ye not yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are defiled which I cast out from before you: and the land is defiled; therefore I do visit the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land vomiteth out her inhabitants. Ye therefore shall keep my statutes and my judgments, and shall not do any of these abominations; neither the homeborn nor the stranger that sojourneth among you: (for all these abominations have the mortals of the land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;) that the land vomit not out you also, when ye defile it, as it vomited out the nation that was before you. For whosoever shall do any of these abominations, even the souls that do them shall be cut off from among their people." (Lev 18:24-29).

The last reference to the Rephaim in Proverbs takes the lesson emphasized in the two preceding passages and applies it to mankind in general. "Mankind wandering from the way of understanding shall join the congregation of the Rephaim" (Prov. 21:16). The antecedent verse has spoken

of the rewards of righteousness and iniquity. Our verse illustrates the fate awaiting the workers of iniquity by instancing the well-known case of the once powerful but now almost extinct Rephaim. Such nations as forsake righteousness are doomed to experience the fortunes of the Rephaim, who were dispossessed by other peoples and ceased to be a nation for non-adherence to righteousness.

We now pass on to consider the passages in Isaiah. "Sheol from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the Rephaim for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth" (Isa. 14:9). The word *attud*, which our English versions render "chief ones," is in every other instance rendered "he-goat." In Ezek. 34:17 the word designates the "leaders" of Israel. It is used in the same sense here, for the passage speaks of intelligent beings. Isaiah's assertion that the Rephaim were leaders corroborates the testimony of Genesis 6:4 which declares that they were "mighty ones." But besides this general reference to the might of the Nephilim, the passage applies more especially to the Rephaim, who, as priests, were leaders of their people, and therefore directly responsible for the abominations practiced among the people.

Heman the Ezrahite, a contemporary of Solomon, asked "Shall the Rephaim arise and praise thee?" (Ps. 88:10). This mooted question was answered generations later by Isaiah. "The dead shall not live: the Rephaim shall not rise; for thou hast so visited and destroyed them to cause all memory of them to perish . . . Thy dead will live, my corpses will rise again! Awake and rejoice, ye dwellers in the dust, for a dew of the lights is thy dew, and the earth shall yield up the Rephaim" (Isa. 26:14, 19). The section of Isaiah comprising Chh. 24-27 is known among students as "The Apocalypse of Isaiah." It contains the

book of Revelation in embryo. These chapters depict the grand finale, in which the several strains of judgment and consolation harmonize in a description of the establishment of God's kingdom on earth. A brief review of these chapters will aid us materially in viewing our texts in their proper setting.

The starting point of this grand disclosure is the disordered condition of the earth during the time of trouble. The inhabitants of the earth have violated every law of God and man (*v.* 1-4). Thus the earth, burdened with the curse of sin, presents a terrible picture of devastation, barrenness, depopulation (*v.* 5). Where it looked most fertile, everything has died; where most merriment went on, silence reigns (*vv.* 7-9, 11); the centre of the world's departed prosperity is an actual desert (*v.* 10). This world-wide judgment has a bright side, a positive aim. From the ends of the unhappy earth the seer hears sounding the triumphal song of Israel's redeemed outcasts (*vv.* 14-16). The ruin is depicted as a universal catastrophe, similar to the flood which once swept mankind away, but still more fearful: the earth has utterly lost its balance and collapsed under the burden of sin; and the judgment not merely falls on the kings of the earth, but extends also to the heavenly powers (10:21). These are not spotless before God (Job 4:18), and a connection exists between them and the sinful life and grace, and taste how good he is to those who submit to His majesty. By a second, just as wonderful, act of power and love, he restrains death for an age, so that the powers of the earth, as the Book of Daniel expressly teaches. This is confirmed here by their being judged together. These chief rulers are imprisoned like common malefactors to receive their doom after long waiting.

This fearful world-judgment is followed, in ch. 25, by

the triumphal song of redeemed Israel. The judgment over, the heathen congratulate the people of the Lord and do homage to its God, who wondrously rescued it from the universal overthrow. The Lord will then graciously receive and entertain those nations who go to Mount Zion to do sacrifice there. The banquet of peace will be one prepared and wondrously enriched by the Lord Himself. When the Lord removes the covering that has so long veiled the eyes of the nation, the result will be a truly divine surprise. They will behold Him, the dispenser of all woe that wrings countless tears from men vanishes.

The triumphal songs, heard already from afar in 24:14-16, and next intoned to the nations from Zion (25:1), do not end yet. In 26:1 redeemed Israel strikes up a new one, in which it publishes and justifies the ways of God. The "lofty city"—Babylon—has been laid low; and Jerusalem, whose shield and defense is God's salvation, is girded with indestructible strength. Through its experience Israel becomes a teacher of righteousness to the nations (*vv.* 7-10). From *ver.* 11 onwards is a recital of Israel's experience. Whereas the enemies of God have fallen a prey to death (*v.* 14), Israel has experienced an enrichment of its existence, a widening of its limits. It is true, its own efforts in that direction proved abortive; no one received life from them, no increase came (*v.* 18). But the Lord vouchsafes this to it in an unexpected manner (*v.* 19). Not merely will its ranks no longer be thinned by death (25:8), but even the faithful ones who have died during the tribulation are brought back to life.

We have already learned, from Isa. 14:9, that during the age of Israel's restoration the Rephaim will be in the subterranean prison to which, according to ch. 24:22, will also be consigned the kings of the earth and the fallen

angels. Hence, the assertion in ver. 14 simply asserts that the Rephaim do not arise at the time when Israel's saints are raised. It does not mean that there is no resurrection for them at all, as ver. 19 distinctly declares that the earth shall cast them forth. The teaching of Isaiah 24:14, 19 is in perfect accord with the teaching of Rev. 20:4-6. From this passage we learn that the resurrection which is to take place at the Lord's descent to earth is limited to Israel's saints, and that the rest of the dead will not arise until after the thousand years are finished. "And I saw the dead, the great and the small, standing before the throne" (Rev. 20:12). The judgment of the great white throne proceeds on the principle of "works." It is moral principles that are involved in that solemn scrutiny. To suppose, as does orthodox theology, that the words refer to size is absurd, for stature has nothing whatever to do with questions of right and wrong. But the "great" are the Nephilim, the "mighty" ones of renown, the "small" are the Adamites. John beholds both "great" and "small"—the Nephilim and the Adamites—arraigned before the throne.

* * *

To assist the reader in the study of this subject, we subjoin a list of the occurrences of the word "Rephaim" and the various renderings of the current versions. The A. V. retains it as a proper name "Rephaim" in Gen. 14:5; 15:20; Isa. 17:5.

(1) It is rendered "physicians"—Gen. 50:2; 2 Chr. 16:12; Job 13:4.

(2) It is rendered "dead"—Job 26:5; Ps. 88:10; Prov. 2:18; 9:18; 21:16; Isa. 14:8; 26:19.

(3) It is rendered "deceased"—Isa. 26:14.

(4) It is rendered "giants"—Deut. 2:11, 20; 3:11, 13;

Josh. 12:4; 13:12; 15:8; 17:15; 18:16; 2 Sam. 21:16, 18, 20, 21; 1 Chr. 20:4, 6, 8.

The R. V. renders it as a proper name "Rephaim" in the following passages: Deut. 2:11, 20; 3:11, 13; Josh. 12:4; 13:12; 15:8; 17:15; 18:16. In all these places the A. V. has "giants."

In the passages where the rendering "dead" of the A. V. has been retained, the Revisers have the marginal note "*shades, Heb. Rephaim.*"

V. G.

The Doctrine of Creation

CREATION OUT OF NOTHING

THE alternative to creation out of nothing we shall look at later, but we must first look at some of the doctrinal consequences of this illogical premise.

And, first of all, let us see how it lays, in part at least, a foundation for the dogma of endless sin. Between the creature—made by divine power from out of the abyss of nothingness—and the Creator there can be no *essential* relationship. The artist's feeling toward the subject of his skill, the picture he paints, will have a certain warmth altogether lacking from his feeling towards the canvas on which he displays his art. The picture itself, enshrining his ideal, into which he has put his best efforts, seems a part of his very being. But the canvas and the colors, viewed in themselves, are something "other" to him. To his child, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, the fruit of his body, his relationship will be inestimably higher than that between him and his picture. The one is the fruit of his love; the other the product of his power. The picture will be *his*; but the child will be *him*. The one relationship is essential—that is, a relationship in essence—the other not. We repeat then, between man—as made out of nothing—and his Maker there is no *essential* relationship. This theory makes man the product of divine power—God's work of art, so to speak—and though, as such, he is the subject of divine love, he cannot be considered as its child. We might hesitate to employ such illustrations were we not

empowered to do so by the manner in which the Master of men pointed the analogies between the human and the divine parentage. "For we are also his *offspring*" was the dictum of a heathen poet's instinct approvingly quoted by the great Apostle Paul.

The product of nothing may hardly be said to have a nature of its own, in the strict sense of the word. What inherent moral tendency can there be in that which in its essence is nothing? It has no *natural* upward gravitation, no more than it has a downward one. There is no moral pull within it by reason of its essence. It has no *natural* appetite for either good or evil, however it may acquire one. The possibility of external sin, and its necessary accompaniment eternal punishment, lie dormant in this colorless, natureless creation. The origin of sin in that which has an essential character of its own will be dealt with in its right place. The reader will, however, understand that, in handling so difficult a subject, words sometimes trip each other; they are at best but the crutches on which our thoughts hobble into expression, and what we think is often crippled by what we say.

The folly of the orthodox creed in this respect is apparent when we consider what is implied in its belief. In short, it teaches that while divine omnipotence can make nothing into a human soul, having thus performed the miracle, it has no power, should occasion arise, to resolve that soul back again into its primal state. In other words, it can make nothing into something, but cannot make something into nothing! The soul, whose origin is in unreality, possesses the property of indestructibility! Consequently the indestructible, unreconcilable soul must find an eternal portion somewhere in the universe of God. Endless torment finds its place here. An illogical doctrine of destiny must

flow as a logical consequence from the premise of an illogical doctrine of creation.

The dogma of the creeds, in regard to human destiny, contradicts what we know from Scripture and experience of the divine love, as their dogma in regard to human origin is in opposition to what we know, or can think, of the divine power. The God of the Bible is neither magical nor malevolent.

The gratuitous dogma of creation out of nothing is also a necessity in the theory of Annihilation. Conclusions opposed to reason naturally flow from premises which are repugnant to thought. Should we wonder if theologies that defy Scripture should have unholy partnership with philosophies that deny Reason?

And, in drawing this section of our study to a close, let us again impress upon our readers that the dogma before us is not only one which we cannot think, but is one which God nowhere asks us to believe. Its authority is entirely human. However absurd, it is an absolutely necessary premise to the workings of a false system of belief. It illustrates the precarious basis on which human ideas of how the universe ought to have been run rest. The conception which such a theory gives us of God is twofold: as to the future of the race it imagines a God of unthinkable weakness, unable to carry His own designs to completion; and, as to the genesis of the race, it imagines a Deity of unthinkable power whose creative process can only be described in mutually destructive terms. Faith is not necessarily born on the death-bed of Reason, though Reason has often been smothered to death in the cradle of such beliefs.

The Publishing Office

We regret that all our plans for the enlargement of the magazine and reissue of publications out of print and of some new ones have been made impossible by the high prices and the consequent suffering among our subscribers. It is our wish to reduce our operating expenses as much as possible and we ask the earnest cooperation of our readers. We plan to do our addressing six at a time, on a typewriter, and so save considerable labor, which is fast becoming a burden. We shall appreciate a line from anyone whose address, on the next issue, is not correct.

Besides this we plan to accommodate our subscribers, who do not wish the trouble of keeping track of their subscription, by typing the date of expiration along with the address. It will be greatly appreciated if those whose subscription is due will send as soon as this reaches them that we may not have the labor of rewriting their address slips in order to correct the date of expiration. At the end of this issue will be found an order form. The date to which your subscription is paid is noted on it. If any mistake has been made we will gladly rectify it.

This order form with date of expiration is in the nature of a statement of account, so that there may be a mutual understanding. It will be sent to those who have paid as well as those who are in arrears. As the date on this envelope is not for our use, but for our subscribers' benefit, to save them the necessity of inquiring, as many have had to do in the past, we trust they will appreciate it. It will also act as a receipt. When you pay see that the date is changed accordingly on your next magazine.

We hope further to improve the magazine by providing an exceedingly strong and durable cover, all of one color, hereafter. We find that the copies must endure much handling and severe usage and some must travel half way round the world in the mails before they reach their destination. We also hope soon to announce a special binder to file away the numbers as they come.

“THE EVANGEL OF WHICH I BECAME THE SERVITOR”

(Continued)

The term “*parousia*,” which means *presence*, has been shunted back and forth so often that it is difficult to follow its changes. Once we are assured it simply means *presence*, then we are asked to make it a “*parousia coming*”—that is a definite instantaneous event—usually connected with His manifestation to Israel. But we are not told what the difference between a “*parousia coming*” and an ordinary coming is. In fact, the term is lost in the word “coming.” “‘Till He come,’ we are told, must refer to this *parousia coming*. . . . It has absolutely nothing to do with the members of the body.” Let us acknowledge that the *coming* spoken of has close connection with His *presence*, as revealed in Thessalonians. But let us not imagine that, with the “one body” in the very next chapter, this divorces it from any connection with that body. The coming here spoken of cannot be got rid of without, at the same time doing away with the one body, for while the one body is *not* distinctly said to continue till He come, the supper *is*.

The whole matter is extremely simple. The Greek word *parousia* means, literally, *being-beside, presence*. It does not refer to an act, but to a *position*. The key to its understanding is found in 1 Cor. 15:23. During the presence of Christ, all who are His are made alive. No matter if there were a separate “up” calling, it, too, would needs be in His *parousia*. All the dead who are raised at His presence are part of the out-resurrection, for the rest of the dead do not live until the thousand years are finished.

When the Lord descends from heaven to the air, then He must be present—this is the beginning of His *parousia*. This presence continues until the vivification of Israel’s

saints at the beginning of the thousand years. About that time He descends to the earth and His feet stand upon the Mount of Olives. Then He will be *present* on earth. This, too, is His *parousia*. The natural meaning of the term is most agreeable to the contexts and obviates the difficulties created by making it the proper name of an event. Its usage in connection with Paul, Titus, Timothy, Stephanas and the Lawless One (1 Cor. 16:17; 2 Cor. 7:6-7; 10:10; Phil. 1:26; 2:12; 2 Thess. 2:9) bears this out. Let us not be misled by "the complete cessation of the dispensation in which 1 Cor. 11 found its place." Many things pass from one economy to the next. The Scriptures never present us with such a thought as the "complete cessation" of a dispensation. The period was a transitional era in which God was preparing His saints for the revelation of the secret. We may rest assured that what was specially revealed to Paul, after his separation, when he could have received it from the twelve, cannot lightly be set aside. We submit that all which was revealed to him at that time abides, while that which he had *not* received, but which were relics of his earlier ministries, vanishes.

Perhaps the most telling passage of all is found in Colossians: "Wherefore, if ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?" "What place can these have on resurrection ground?" The connection (in the A. V.) between the "ordinance" of the Lord's supper and the "ordinances" here decried seems fatal. But, as a matter of fact, in neither passage is it a question of "ordinances," that is, ceremonial observances. In Corinthians the apostle is speaking of *traditions*—instructions handed down by word of mouth. In Colossians he refers to *decrees*—the decrees issued from Jerusalem by the twelve apostles and sent to the churches among the nations. The decree of Caesar (Lu. 2:1) and that of the council (Acts 16:4; 17:7), where the same word is used, will convince anyone of this fact.

There is nothing in the prison epistles against the Lord's Supper.

In the Philippian epistle (which is a development of Ephesian truth and contains no new items of doctrine) we are told of a "high calling" or "up" calling of God in Christ Jesus. It should be noted that the theme is *conduct*. It is not the revelation of a new truth, but conformity to an old one, which the apostle is seeking to impress upon us here. But what is there in this distinct from Thessalonians? Both are *up*. "In the air" is up, even though "caught-up" may be a free translation. This phrase should be simply "the calling *above* in Christ Jesus. The Greek word, indeed, is *up*, when used without the article (Jn. 11:41; Heb. 12:15). But when used with the article, as here, it should be rendered *above*. "I am out of *the up*" (Jn. 8:23) is good Greek, but poor English. "I am from *above*" is better. "Jerusalem *the up*" (Gal. 4:26); "seek *the up*"; "mind *the up*" (Col. 3:1, 2) is better rendered "Jerusalem *above*," be seeking or regarding that which is *above*. So in Philip-pians, we should not read "*the up* calling" but "the calling *above*" in Christ Jesus.

The first Corinthian epistle deals with the secret of the resurrection. The kernel of this secret lies in the word CHANGE. Terrestrial bodies, such as we now possess, are to be changed to celestial bodies in the semi-twinkle of an eye. But why are we to be caught up to the air and have celestial bodies if our destiny is on the earth?

Then comes the mystery of Christ, which gives Him His heavenly headship. If we are to be "forever with the Lord," who will be in heaven, and have bodies suited to that sphere, what can keep us from the place and grace assigned to us in the prison epistles?

The Thessalonian letters are perhaps the earliest of Paul's epistles. If his ministry was "from glory to glory" (2 Cor. 3:18); if the revelation of "the mystery" glorifies Paul's previous teaching, then we must expect this grand truth to

Our Glorious Transfiguration

be robed in richer garb when we meet it in his latest epistles. And so, indeed, it is. For, soon after referring to our upward call, the apostle turns our looks to heaven (whence our Lord descends—1 Thess. 4:16) and, giving Him His full title, tells us that thence will come the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transfigure the body of our humiliation to conform it to His body glorious.

This is our hope! This is our expectation! Then we shall be with Him, and like Him, and for Him, in ineffable bliss and transcendent glory. Oh, for that day of days, that hour of hours, that instant which will find us face to face with Him, our Saviour, our Lord, and our God!

Beloved, suffer a word of exhortation. The adversary will do his utmost to rob the saints of the enjoyment of all that the marvelous "mystery" has brought to us. Almost as soon as this truth was recovered, it suffered at the hands of those who had not fully digested its message. It has been tossed hither and thither until we are almost ashamed to speak of a right division of the word of truth. Great damage has been done and dishonor brought to His beloved name through the rash and ill considered and inaccurate statements concerning "the mystery." Instead of a delicious secret, it has become a misty mystery.

May we affectionately urge each one to pray the prayer of the apostle—for a spirit of wisdom and revelation—so that they may enjoy its riches? And may we solemnly charge all who teach it to others to make absolutely sure that they comprehend it themselves? God expects His stewards to be faithful. Let us sit at His feet and hear His word before we try to tell it to others. His grace is sufficient for all the failures of the past and all the efforts of the future.

A. E. K.

A Tribute to God's Love

O Love of God, how sweet Thy name!
How can I write of Thee,
Since words cannot express Thy grace,
Nor thought Thine image see?
Yet fain would I some homage pay,
Though ill portrayed it be,
For Thou canst not but glorify,
A tribute wrought of Thee.
What mortal thought cannot reveal,
Nor mortal mind may see,
The mind of Christ can comprehend;
Which mind I have in me.
And so by faith I take my pen,
Nor can myself deny,
To write of Thee, O Love of God,
Though Thou dost dwell on high.
Of old Thou art, yet age but lends
New beauties to Thy charm,
For eon doth to eon show
Fresh triumphs of Thine arm.
'Twas Thou, before creation's birth,
That formed the eons' mighty span,
To bring salvation to the earth,
And life to fallen man.
From Thee sprang Justice, Mercy, Truth;
In Thee all virtues lie:
Thou art the spring of everything;
Both good and ill flow from Thy will,
The souls of men to try.
O mother Love, Thou didst conceive
Redemption's wondrous thought:
Of Thee the Son of Love was born,
From highest heavenly glory shorn,
When grace to earth was brought.
Since Love revealed could not be
Except to worlds undone,
Nor God fulfill His purpose grand,
Concerning His dear Son,
Dire ill must come, as well as good,
Ere grace could well be shown,
Or God's great Love exemplified,
In His beloved One.

A Tribute to God's Love

So, as in Adam all shall die,
The new creation's Head
Shall make them all alive again,
And raise them from the dead.
Though evil has cost mankind much,
To Thee the cost was more,
When from above Thy Son, O Love,
Was wounded, sick and sore,
He Who no evil knew Himself,
Yet sin was made for us:
By Thee was yielded up to die,
For us He suffered thus.
What anguish smote Thy tender heart!
What awful grief there lay!
When Christ, Thy Son, for love of us,
The fearful price did pay!
The earth did quake, the veil was rent,
A dreadful darkness doomed the day
When Thy dear Son His life had spent,
And 'neath death's power lay.
'Tis when we see what there was wrought—
What mighty issues lie,
Within the cross of Christ our Lord,
And why He came to die—
We faintly grasp Thy thought, O Love,
And feebly understand:
The heights and depths of Love Divine,
That sacrifice so grand.
'Twas there a long offended God,
Offended ceased to be:
'Twas there love laid aside dislike
And banished enmity.
'Twas there the claims of Justice stern
Were fully satisfied:
And law's demand on every hand,
Was met when He had died.
'Twas there long pent up human wrath,
Its hideous hate displayed:
Malicious, vengeful, unabashed,
It stands forth unafraid.
Yet love supreme, yet love divine,
In graciousness sublime
Pleads with the Father, high in heaven—
Forgive them for this time!

A Tribute to God's Love

'Twas there that God was justified,
In justifying me.
From judgment sore forevermore
Believers are set free.
'Twas there the righteousness of God,
To sinners now is given:
In which when dressed, the saints are blessed,
And fit to enter heaven.
'Twas there that peace was made for all,
And enmities laid low:
There Jew and Gentile both may meet,
And sweet salvation know.
And now secure in boundless Grace,
Elected by Thy love
Thy body finds its favored place
And destiny above.
To angel hosts we now display
His wisdom manifold,
Who makes sin serve His purposes,
Who turns the dross to gold.
He has the firm foundation laid,
In all-redeeming love:
To reconcile all things to Him
Yea, e'en the heavens above.
And when at last the eons end,
And Thou art All in all;
Then death's abolished, sin is gone,
Thou'rt Victor o'er the fall.
When Christ His loving trophies lays
At God, His Father's feet
With every enemy put down,
Thy triumph is complete.
*Then shall Thy vindication come,
And every knee shall bow,*
All tongues in harmony proclaim,
A God of love art Thou.
O Love of God, and God of Love,
For surely thou art one:
Accept the meed of heartfelt praise
For Thy Beloved Son.
Accept a tribute to Thy grace
Which binds us in Thy love's embrace.

F. L. T.

THE GREEK COURSE

THE Greek Course was based upon Bagster's Analytical Lexicon. This work served quite well in studying nouns and adjectives, but failed when the verb came to be studied.

In the preparation of the course every form of every Greek verb was put upon slips and assembled in a reverse index according to its form. All of these forms were exhaustively studied and analyzed and segregated. To each was given a standard English equivalent. When this was consistently done it discovered so many palpable errors in the Lexicon that it became a serious question whether it would not hinder more than help. Hence it was withdrawn and with it the course is temporarily postponed.

When the Standard text has been issued, with its Inter-linear and its Elements and Concordance, the Course will be resumed and the study of Greek will become thrice as easy and profitable and pleasant.

The Greek verb is really far more simple than the grammars make it. For those who have studied or intend to study it, a few hints will help more than the elaborate tables usually given.

—⊙— is the sign of the true *passive* and very seldom is absent. Most of the forms called "passive" are middle.

—MEN— is the sign of the middle participle.

E— before a root denotes the *past*, unless it combines with other vowels to lengthen them.

—Σ— between the root and the ending stands for the *future*.

E—Σ— is the true aorist, or *indefinite*. It has both the past and future signs and includes all time. The so called "second" aorist is usually a *past*. There is no "second" aorist.

These and a few more facts will be safer guides than any grammar at present published.

Paul's Epistle to the Galatians

THE ORIGIN OF PAUL'S GOSPEL

HERE Paul begins the dominant theme of the epistle—the defense of his apostleship and gospel. What has gone before is prefatory. The terse, pointed sentences of *vv.* 1-9 have intimated, without formally stating, the radical differences between Paul's gospel and that preached by the Judaic agitators. The nature and the contents of these will be made clear in the course of the epistle. The defense begins in the *personal* realm, traverses the region of *doctrine*, and finds its consummation in the sphere of *ethics*. There is nothing visionary or volatile about Paul. His doctrine is removed as far as possible from being the result of abstract deductions, or any mere combination of external data. Its origin lies not in a flight of imagination, but in actual experience; it rests not on plausible theory, but on God's dealings with the race recorded in sacred Scripture; its issues are not problematical, but sound morals which have stood the test of time. His doctrine is condensed in his experience and demonstrated in his career.

The aim of the personal defense is to substantiate the assertion of the opening sentence—"Paul, an apostle not from men, neither through man" (1:1). The process of demonstration is logical and cogent. The apostle begins by stating the motive prompting him to relate his story (1:10). Next he makes known the special object of his testimony—to establish the fact that the gospel he preached came from no human authority, but direct from Jesus Christ himself (1:11-12). Lastly he proceeds to marshal

and deploy his facts to dispel the false allegations of his traducers, vindicate his independent authority as an apostle of Christ, and to unfold the terms of his gospel. Accordingly he reviews his career from the days of his Judaistic zeal, when he persecuted the faith, till the well-known occasion on which he became its champion against Peter himself, the chief of the Twelve (1:13-2:21).

The outstanding feature of the recital are the *three meetings* of Paul with Peter. Each successive meeting accentuates the mutual independence of the two apostleships, while their wide and widening divergence in character and scope becomes increasingly pronounced. In each instance Paul assumes the initiative. His first journey to Jerusalem was undertaken for the express purpose of "historicising" Peter (1:18). Listening to the story of his erstwhile persecutor, the Jewish apostle could not fail to observe how radically his call to the ministry differed from his own and that of his fellow apostles. But what would impress him most was the fact that, in conferring on Paul the apostleship for the nations, Jesus Christ had acted wholly independently of those who were His "chosen witnesses unto the people." And this fact would become the more significant when he recalled how his mediation had been the medium of extending to the proselytes "repentance unto life" (Act. 11:18).

The first meeting of the two apostles had been of a *private* character. Its aim was to establish a basis of mutual understanding. The second meeting wears all the aspects of an *official* public function (2:1-10). Paul was apprised by revelation that the time had come to make his gospel known to the twelve. Accordingly he went up to Jerusalem and formally laid the gospel which he preached among the nations before "those of repute." The "apostles and elders" convened to pass upon the status of Paul's apostleship and

of those who received his ministry. The conference issued in formal recognition by the Jewish church of Paul's doctrine and plenary apostleship. The twelve recognized the special character of Paul's mission to the nations, and did not seek to bring it under their patronage. The action of the "pillars"—Peter, James and John—does not legitimize Paul's apostleship, that is the exclusive prerogative of Him who said, "he is a chosen vessel unto me to bear my name." God had already legitimized it by His Spirit and by His blessing upon his work. The pillars could only *publicly recognize* this Divine choice and accord it equal footing. A brotherly relation was thus established between the Pauline and the Jewish churches.

At the third meeting the two apostles are at open variance over this very question of the nations conforming to Jewish life (2:11-21). The Jerusalem conference had recognized the status of the Pauline believers, and safeguarded their freedom from the law by decrees (Act. 15:19-20). Long before the conference the Spirit bade Peter to "make no distinction" between Jews and uncircumcised proselytes and to "eat" with them. But now, *fearing the circumcisionists*, Peter belies his known convictions, publicly expressed and acted on for years, and refuses to "eat" with the Gentiles. His conduct was an act of "dissimulation." Paul rebukes the Jewish apostle and reminds him that, in withdrawing from the Gentile table, he virtually re-erects what he had pulled down, and thus constitutes himself a transgressor and makes Christ a minister of sin. Paul's address to Peter is a pointed outline of the gospel of grace and paves the way for the doctrinal argument which is to follow, and which forms the heart of the epistle.

We will now proceed to a closer study of Paul's Personal Defense.

PAUL'S MOTIVE

Public reference to personal matters is disagreeable and trying to any person with the least sense of modesty. To a nature so intensely spiritual and keenly sensitive as Paul's they are extremely obnoxious and intolerable. The assumption of glorying he esteems to be "foolishness" not in accord with the Lord (2 Cor. 11:17). He condescends to such foolishness after strong remonstrance, and only because the carnality of his children in the faith "compels" him to it. But even then he never loses sight of the fact that he is "nothing" (2 Cor. 12:11).

The falsehoods circulated by the circumcisionist agitators impelled him to vindicate his apostleship. Before recounting his story he would have the Galatians thoroughly understand his motive. "For am I now persuading men or God? or am I seeking to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ" (1:10). This explanatory sentence draws a sharp line between the exordium and the epistle proper. The apostle has just anathematized the mutilators of his gospel and is about to magnify his ministry. What prompts him to do this? Is his anathema actuated by personal spite? Is the recital of his career inspired by sordid motives? He wards off both insinuations at one stroke. "Am I persuading men or God? if I were still pleasing men I should not be a servant of Christ." He is not moved by spite or egotism, nor is he seeking popularity: he is obeying a Divine impulse. The august manner in which he received his apostleship (1:1) makes it impossible for him to temporize with its impugn-ers. Should he shirk his duty, he would dishonor his Divine Master, and prove himself unworthy of trust.

The apologetic statement brings into bold relief the apostle's moral physiognomy. It throws a penetrating light on his spiritual state at the time of the greatest crisis in

his life. It envelopes the whole epistle in an air of solemnity. It throws its light backwards and forwards: it shows both the antecedent anathema and the forthcoming defense to have their origin in the will of God, and so prepares us to listen to the recital in a reverent, receptive frame of mind.

THE REVELATION OF THE GOSPEL

The starting-point of Paul's defense is the assertion that his gospel came from no human source, but was conveyed to him directly by Jesus Christ. In the opening sentence he affirmed his apostleship to be neither of human origin nor derivation. Now he makes a like claim for his gospel. "For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel that was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but through revelation of Jesus Christ" (1:11-12). My gospel is not after *man*, neither from *man* did I receive it. The word *man* is in the singular, as the second time in 1:1. The marginal reading of the R. V. at both these places, *a man*, is very suggestive and accords with the tenor of the narrative. The reference is to a particular man. It points unmistakably to Peter who figures so prominently in this recital. The circumcisionists asserted Paul's dependence on the elder apostles and the Jerusalem church. They insinuated that he had received his gospel from Peter. Whence, said they, could Paul have derived his knowledge of Christ, but from this fountain-head? This was the fulcrum of the argument which Paul foils.

The gospel which he had preached in Galatia was not *after man*. The proposition *after* (*kata*), preceded by the negative "not," points to disagreement. Paul's gospel does not accord with, but radically differs from, the gospel of the circumcision committed to Peter. It runs along different lines. "Neither *from a man* did I receive it." The

proposition *from* (*para*), governed by the genitive, has the force of *along*. This gives a sense pertinent to the matter in hand. Paul did not acquire his gospel by prolonged personal contact with Peter. The apostle returns to this point in *ver.* 18, where he points out that the brevity of their first interview precluded the possibility of such a thing. "Nor was I *taught it*." He did not get a knowledge of his gospel through the regular process of indoctrination.

The apostle has stated the negative side of the question; he proceeds to affirm the positive. "But *it came to me* through revelation of Jesus Christ." There is here an ellipsis, or omission, of the verb, which the Revisers supply by the italicized phrase *it came to me*. Their suggestion, while true in a general sense, falls decidedly below the mark. To supply the omission we must fall back on the passage itself. The sentence consists of two complementary members: the negative, naming the sources whence the apostle did *not* get his gospel, and the positive, naming the source whence he *did* get it. Therefore we must supply, in the positive part of the sentence, the verbs "received" and "taught" from the corresponding negative member. The two verbs cover the entire field. "Receive" points to the *act* of imparting the gospel; "taught" refers to the *process* of its deepening in the apostle's consciousness. One excludes human *communication*, the other, human *education*. Not man, but Christ, conveyed the gospel to Paul; not man, but Christ, was his teacher. Both these points are taken up again and amplified in verses 16 and 17.

The Signs of the Season

“THE WORLD FOR DEMOCRACY”

The course of the revolution in Russia is helpful in understanding the course of human events in the crisis into the vortex of which we are rushing. “The world for democracy” is the cry of today, just as it was the clamor of Russia’s millions. They raised the red flag of revolt and overthrew the autocracy, making the people supreme, and acknowledging no will but their own. But how soon is the dream shattered! As we write the people, by means of their representatives, have voluntarily handed over absolute control to one man who has perhaps more power for the moment than the czar himself had. Thus it will be in the climax of this eon. Democracy will dethrone itself and hand over its authority to the Beast, who will be the autocrat of autocrats, a despot such as the world has never seen. Democracy is the seed bed of despotism.

In each issue henceforth we hope to give an account of one of the numerous peace plans, which are being formulated on all sides, with the purpose of preventing future wars. Practically all of them advocate a federation of the nations. That this will be accomplished and that it will result in the appearance of the ten horned nondescript beast of Daniel seems beyond denial. That their authors have not the slightest idea of organizing such a monster goes without saying. To them it is the only way to bring about the millennium. Christ and God are not needed or wanted.

The following is a synopsis of a plan which was promulgated even before the present war began:

“AFTER THE GREAT WAR—WHAT?”

WORLD-EMBRACING PLANS TO END WARS

Heart and Core of the Peace Plan

ARTICLES

Section I:	Fundamental Powers of the Peace Pact.
Sec. II:	Proposed Organization.
Sec. III:	The Great Pledge of Peace.
Sec. IV:	Scope of the Proposed World Government.
Sec. IVa:	Powers of the World Government.
Sec. V:	Officials of the World Government.
Sec. VI:	Ways and Means.
Sec. VII:	In Case of Possible War.
Sec. VIII:	Necessary Military Contributions.
Sec. IX:	Requisitions Upon the Different Countries.
Sec. IXa:	Reliance Upon the Nations.
Sec. X:	Looking to Partial Disarmament.
Sec. XI:	Adjustment of Quarrels.
Sec. XII:	Warnings, Investigations and Decisions.
Sec. XIII:	A Court of Appeals.
Sec. XIV:	Seat of the World Government.
Sec. XV:	The World Flag.
Sec. XVI:	A Universal Seaport.
Sec. XVII:	A Field Marshal.
Sec. XVIII:	Enforcement of Neutrality Laws.
Sec. XIX:	Flags and Uniforms.
Sec. XIXa:	Assembling the World Army.
Sec. XX:	Retention of Military Reserves.
Sec. XXa:	Reliance by the Nations Upon the World Government.
Sec. XXI:	Supreme Control of the Seas and of the Air.
Sec. XXII:	Independence of Each of the Nations.
Sec. XXIII:	Throwing Off National Burdens.

Among the declared aims and intentions of the Alliance is its determined purpose to make it possible for its members—the different nations composing the supreme body—to ultimately so reduce the present heavy cost of their respective military and naval establishments as to lift from the shoulders of all the peoples concerned the insufferable financial burdens (and more important still, the frightful destruction of life) so long borne by them, and at the same time to enable the different states to jointly support and maintain, without seriously feeling the lightened load, a World Government having as its chief aim the securing of the priceless blessings of Universal Peace. [!]

In its scope it is coextensive with the confines of the known world.

It provides a Universal Peace Pact—"a government of governments"—which shall be in name and in fact a World Government.

It has for its base and primary plan of union a simple, fundamental, straightforward agreement between the nations joining in the Universal Peace Pact, viz., that each pledges to the others not to go to war among themselves nor with other nations, and that they will not permit any nation or group of nations to go to war with the Pact nor to assail any member of it; and further, that no nation, whether within or without the Pact, shall go to war with any other nation.

It contemplates a World Capital, a World Congress, a World Supreme Court, a World Army and a World Navy.

It preserves, and does not destroy, the national existence, the territorial integrity or the independent autonomy of any of the individual nations.

The World Government is designed to be protective and (almost) benevolent, not oppressive, destructive, or a menace to the nations.

The Pledge of Peace ends wars for all time, and is a lasting guarantee against their recurrence.

A suitable seat for the World Government, an International Flag and a Universal Seaport are provided for; and also the effective organization of the World Army and the World Navy, to give them the necessary mastery, should force ever be invoked.

The World Government will take control of the navigation of the seas and of the air, make rules for the same, and thus prevent wasting conflicts between rival commercial powers and the starting of wars.

The author of the plan himself adds the following significant comment:

At first glance the Plan may give the appearance of creating a colossal military establishment the like of which civilization never saw, and of making war the main and dominant business of the globe. The contrary is the object sought. The Plan, worked out, will end wars forever.

NOT YET

But the psychological moment for formally, unitedly and practically effecting such a plan of peace as the one here again in substance presented to the public has not yet come, and no effort is being made to press the Plan upon the minds of men and nations concerned until they shall have been drawn away from the fields of battle to the forums of peace. Men and nations are wont to act decisively, not before extreme suffering, but

only after it has been visited upon them—only after they have been actually overtaken by insupportable evils which can be no longer endured.

For these controlling reasons the author of this "World-embracing Plan to End Wars" recognizes the fact that the Plan must bide its time and wait for the coming of the psychological moment when it can be considered upon its merits by nations and peoples through their chosen representatives in a world-wide conference, and adopted (if adoption be possible) by a world-wide Congress of Nations, made up of representatives of each of the still warring nations, with participation by all neutral nations upon the invitation of the former fighters and the concurrence of the neutrals.

THE POSSIBILITIES

Once set on foot, a World Government, originated along these broad and unexampled lines by six, eight or TEN [!] of the most powerful nations, together capable of commanding the peace of the world, would ultimately be joined by all the remaining nations, both great and small, for the all-powerful world organization here provided for—if created and maintained—would be able to guarantee, beyond the possibility of a doubt, world-wide and enduring peace.

What have we here but the iron-toothed, copper-clawed monster which appears at the beginning of act one, of the final tragedy of humankind? Some plans favor total disarmament, but we know that that will not be, or, at most, be temporary. But this plan reads like a commentary on Daniel, as indeed it is.

INDEX

Assumptions, The Divine.....	25
Babylon, The Mystery of.....	37, 85, 121, 179, 223
Creation, The Doctrine of—	
Introduction, 205; Creation and Destiny, 207; Creation out of Nothing, 267.	
Death, The Second.....	63
Eternal and Everlasting.....	32
Fellowship, The True Basis of.....	243
Galatians, Paul's Epistle to the—	
Foreword, 149; Introduction, 151, 197; The Origin of Paul's Gospel, 279.	
John's Gospel, The Unexpected in	109
Lamentations, the Book of.....	15, 71, 133
Mission, Tsehchoufu Chinese—	
The Call to China, 82; "The Cambridge Seven," 119; Missionary Labors, 221.	
Life, Shall Not See.....	187
Mystery of Babylon, The—	
Foreword, 37; Prelude, 41; The Wooing and the Win- ning, 43; His Jealousy, 85; The Ten Tribes, 88; The Promise of Reception, 91; Judah, 93; The Law of Jealousy, 95; The Bride of the Lambkin, 121; The Song of Songs, 179; Babylon, 223.	
Nephilim, The—	
Adams' Family, 5; The Sons of God, 51; The Death Sentence, 99; The Nephilim, 163, 213; The Rephaim, 255.	
Paul's Early Ministries.....	232, 271
Translation of Phil. 1 :23.....	47
Question Box—Paul's Stay at Tyre (Acts 21:4).....	47
Signs of the Season, The.....	285
Tribute to God's Love.....	275
Unexpected, The, in John's Gospel.....	109
Unsearchable Judgments of our God, The—	
Intercession, 15; Correction, 71; Restoration, 133.	