

Unsearchable Riches

A BI-MONTHLY MAGAZINE
FOR GOD AND HIS
WORD

VOLUME XXXIV

A. E. KNOCH
EDITOR

CONTENTS OF THE FIRST NUMBER

SOME TRUTHS concerning: The Scriptures, God, Christ, God's Eonian Purpose, The Circumcision and the Nations, 2.

EXPLANATION, 3; Specimen pages of the C. V., 4, 5.

REPLY TO THE *Bible League Quarterly*, 6-18.

HUMAN AUTHORITY vs. GOD'S WORD: The Moral Issue, 19; Correspondence, 27-29.

PITIFUL PERSONALITIES: Spare Time, 32; Laziness, 36.

THE CONCORDANT VERSION GREEK TEXT: Additions Rare, Omissions Frequent, 39; Corrections, 40; External Evidence, 41.

PREPARATION AND CLAIMS: Principles, 44; The Revisions, 46; Moses and Saul, 47.

UNIFORMITY AND CONSISTENCY: Sublinear and Version, 48; Meaning and Usage, 49; Man, 51; Apostle, Sin, Cross, 53; Boy, 54; Emit, 55; Caravansary, 56; Doctor, 57; Exalt, 48; Rouse, 59; Dative Case (*for* grace), 60; Oblation, 61; Guest and Host, Unseen or Hades, 62; Lambkin, Orient, 63; Sublinear, 64.

MISLEADING RENDERINGS: Good for Christ if Judas Not Born, 64; Messenger (not Angel), 66; Guest, Opportunity, 67; Age and Eonian, 69; Have and Enjoy, 70; Salvation, 71; "Eternal" Life, 72

VOICE, MODE AND TENSE: Voice, 75; Mode, 77; Tense, 78; Indefinite Fact, 79; Action, Fact, State, 86.

HETERODOX DOCTRINE: Bias, 87; Birth vs. Creation, 89; Eternal Punishment, 90; The Trinity, 91; God and Christ, 92; Nirvana, 93; Back to God's Word, 95.



CONCORDANT PUBLISHING CONCERN

2823 EAST SIXTH STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, U. S. A.

SOME OF THE SPECIAL TRUTHS FOR WHICH WE STAND

Concerning the Sacred Scriptures: All scripture is inspired by God, and is beneficial for teaching, for exposure, for correction, for discipline in righteousness . . . (2 Tim. 3:16, 1 Th. 2:13). The pattern of sound words must be preserved as given in the Originals (2 Tim. 1:13). The word of truth must be correctly cut (2 Tim. 2:15) and each part applied to those to whom it was written: our Lord's ministry (Rom. 15:8) and the twelve apostles to the Circumcision, and Paul to the nations (Eph. 3:8, 1 Tim. 2:7). All scripture is for us, but it is not all *about* us.

Concerning the Deity: . . . there is no other God except One . . . God, the Father, *out of Whom* all is . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ, *through Whom* all is . . . (1 Cor. 8:4-6; Gal. 3:20). All is *out of Him*, *through* and *for Him* (Rom. 1:36). God creates evil (Isa. 45:7), but never sins, and gives the experience of evil to humanity to humble them (Eccl. 1:13). Even when contrary to His *will*, evil carries out His *intention* (Rom. 9:19) to publish His name in the earth (Rom. 9:17), and to reveal His love to His creatures. Apart from evil and sin God could not unveil His heart. These are justified from His standpoint, for they will bring untold blessing to His creatures, through the sacrifice of Christ.

Concerning the Lord Jesus Christ: He is the Son of the Most High, generated by His holy spirit (Luke 1:32-35), and in Him the entire complement of the Deity is dwelling bodily (Col. 2:9). He is the Effulgence of His glory and Emblem of His assumption (Heb. 1:3), the Image of the invisible God, Firstborn of every creature (Col. 1:15, Rev. 3:14), Who, subsisting in the form of God, deems it not pillaging to be equal to God, nevertheless empties Himself, taking the form of a slave, coming to be in the likeness of humanity, and, being found in fashion as a man, He humbles Himself, becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross (Phil. 2:6-8). He was apart from sin (Heb. 4:15), does no sin (1 Pet. 2:22), could not be exposed concerning sin (John 8:46), nevertheless He was made sin that we might become the righteousness of God, in Him (2 Cor. 5:21). . . . There is one Mediator of God and mankind, a Man, Christ Jesus, the One giving Himself a correspondent Ransom for all (1 Tim. 2:5, 6).

Concerning God's Eonian Purpose: The Scriptures speak of God's wisdom, in a secret, designated *before* the eons (1 Cor. 2:7). His own purpose and grace *before* eonian times (2 Tim. 1:9), and life promised *before* eonian times (Titus 1:2). Each eon (*aiōn*) has its own world (*kosmos*, system), and they synchronize (Eph. 2:2). God is King of the eons and made them through Christ (Heb. 1:2). Five eons can be found. The first two eons are not mentioned but their corresponding worlds are. Two eons are impending (Eph. 2:7), and we are living in the present wicked eon (Gal. 1:4). They have consummations (1 Cor. 10:11) and a conclusion (Heb. 9:26). God is the Saviour of all mankind at the consummation, but especially of believers during the eons (1 Tim. 2:4; 4:10). At the consummation we find all saved, justified (Rom. 5:18), vivified (1 Cor. 15:22, 1 Tim. 6:13), and all the estranged reconciled (Col. 1:20). Death will be abolished (2 Tim. 1:9; 1 Cor. 15:26), and sin repudiated at the conclusion of the eons (Heb. 9:26), and God will be All in all (1 Cor. 15:28).

Concerning the Circumcision and the Nations: God, before Israel was cast away (Rom. 11:15), had the Circumcision near while the nations were far off (Eph. 2:12). But now, in Christ Jesus, He is conciliated and friendly toward them and the world (2 Cor. 5:18, 19). The invitation of the evangel for today is "Be conciliated to God" (2 Cor. 5:20). When we obtain the conciliation, and are conciliated to God (Rom. 5:10, 11), then we are reconciled. We are no longer at enmity with Him, and there is mutual reconciliation. Through the blood of Christ's cross all the estranged on earth or in heaven shall be reconciled, at the consummation. The blood of the cross is for all creation (Col. 1:16-20), for creation and reconciliation have the same scope.

UNSEARCHABLE RICHES, JANUARY, 1943
BEING THE FIRST NUMBER OF VOLUME THIRTY-FOUR

EXPLANATION

THE PRESENT OPPOSITION to the CONCORDANT VERSION is based largely on some articles which appeared in the *Bible League Quarterly* several years ago. All of my pleadings with the editor of that publication failed to get more than a semblance of justice, so I bowed my head in humble submission to my God, from Whose hand I took it, and left the matter entirely in His keeping.

Now a criticism of the Version has appeared which is based mainly on the earlier one. I find that the type of my reply is still standing. There is just room enough in this booklet to include the letter I sent in answer to the earlier criticism. I take this as God's leading. I hope to keep others from being led astray by the miserable and malicious misrepresentations it contains.

I will not change anything in it, even though some of it is out of date. I now wish that I had written in a much more gracious spirit. I would humbly acknowledge my utter failure in this regard. I would now take a much lower place and plead, not for justice, but for *grace*. I realize that all my efforts to do *right* fall short of God's high standard, and do not demand my *rights*, but rather plead with my brethren to be *gracious* with me, as God Himself, in Christ, has been gracious (Eph. 4:32). I appeal to their hearts, as well as to their heads. I do not desire to condemn them but to win them. May the God of all grace touch their hearts and open their eyes to His own glorious grace, which it is my special mission to unfold!

THE EMPHASIS OF THE ORIGINAL emphasis of the Greek is indicated by the CONCORDANT VERSION by the use of *is* (see No, verse 25), double lettering (as "aware"), and single (as in "making") in the second line. Besides, the order of the words shows the stress.

THE MEANING PUT INTO ENGLISH THE *Idiomatic Version* turns the literal rendering in the sublinear, on the opposite page, into readable English, and uniformity is impossible, the renderings are consistent. It stresses sense, sound, truth, not euphony.

EDITORIAL NOTES

28

PAUL TO THE ROMANS

60

JUSTIFICATION

INDIVIDUAL

In the previous section found no one who had attained to God Himself. No one has been able to attain God's standard by good or keeping the law. How can we become just before God? By becoming partakers of His righteousness.

The channel through which we may obtain this righteousness is the faith in Christ. He alone of all mankind not only did good and kept the law, but He believed God even when He was charged with our sins. It is our faith in Him for our faith (1¹⁷).

He hated Him *without a cause*—unjustly. Such is the meaning of the precious word. Justification on other ground than the free, unforced favor of God is impossible, for none deserve it. But now Jesus has effected a deliverance from judgment which is absolutely free for all who believe.

An important point in this passage, however, is not *our* justification, but *His*, for it is *His* righteousness we receive. In Israel He had no provision for atonement, or a sacrifice for sins. This was not strictly the penalty of these sins was death. The answer to this, as well as the answer to His present work, is in the blood of Christ. *That* He died for sins, past, present and future, *That* vindicates God's justice and makes it possible for Him to be the Justifier of all who are of the faith.

By a deliverance, entirely on the basis of grace, bars all boasting, unless we are in Christ and in His God, we cannot become our Justifier.

19 Now we are aware that, as much as the law is saying, it is speaking to those under the law, that every mouth may be barred, and the entire world may be becoming subject to the just verdict of God, because, by works of law, no flesh shall be justified before Him, for through law is the recognition of sin.

21 Yet now, apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested (being testified to by the law and the prophets), yet a righteousness of God, through Jesus Christ by faith, for all and on all who are believing, for there is no distinction. for all sinned and are wanting of the glory of God.

24 Being justified gratuitously by His grace, through the deliverance which is in Christ Jesus (Whom God purposed for a Propitiatory through faith in His blood, for a display of His righteousness because of the passing over of the penalty of sins which occurred before in the forbearance of God) toward the display of His righteousness in the current era, for Him to be just and a Justifier of them one who is of the faith of Jesus.

27 Where, then, is boasting? It is debarred! Through what law? Of works? *No!* but through faith in law. For we are reckoning mankind to be justified by faith apart from works of law.

THE ANCIENT, ORIGINAL GREEK is how the Scriptures were first written, without any human additions or omissions. It combines every letter of the three most ancient texts, one of which was recently bought by the British Museum for the sum of \$500,000.

DIFFERENCES IN THE MSS. The three most ancient manuscripts, in remarkable agreement as a whole, they differ in minor points. These are given above the line, with the English explanation so that anyone may easily see just how each manuscript reads.

EXACT EQUIVALENT

PAUL TO THE ROMANS

ΜΕΝΔΕΟΤΙΣΑΝΟΜΟΣΑ 60
-PERCEIVED YET ^{as-much-as} THE LAW IS-

ΕΙΤΟΙΣΕΝΤΩΝΟΜΦΑΛΛΕ 80
TO-THE-ONES IN THE LAW it-IS-TALKING

ΠΑΝΑΝΤΟΜΑΦΡΑΓΗΚΑΙ 200
T EVERY MOUTH MAY-BE-BEING-BARRIED AND

ΔΙΚΟΣΓΕΝΗΤΑΙΠΑΣΟΚ 20
R-JUST SH'D-BE-BECOMING EVERY THE SYS-

ΜΟΣΤΩΘΕΩΔΙΟΤΙΕΞΕΡΓ 40
to-THE God THRU-that OUT OF-ACTS

ΝΟΜΟΥΟΥΔΙΚΑΙΩΘΗΣΕΤ 60
OF-LAW NOT. WILL-BE-BEING-JUSTIFIED

ΠΑΣΑΚΑΡΞΕΝΩΠΙΟΝΑΥΤ 80
EVERY FLESH IN-VIEW OF-Him

ΔΙΑΓΑΡΝΟΜΟΥΕΠΙΓΝΩΣ 300
THRU for LAW ON-KNOWLEDGE

ΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΣΝΥΝΙΔΕΧΩΡΙ 20
OF-missing NOW YET apart-from

ΝΟΜΟΥΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΘΕΟΥ 40
LAW JUSTICE OF-God

ΦΑΝΕΡΩΤΑΙΜΑΡΤΥΡΟΥΜ 60
been-made-APPEAR being-witnessED

ΗΥΠΟΤΟΥΝΟΜΟΥΚΑΙΤΩΝ 80
by THE LAW AND THE

ΟΦΗΤΩΝΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΔΕ 400
OBE-AVERERS JUSTICE YET

ΟΥΔΙΑΠΙΣΤΕΩΣΙΝΣΟΥΧ 20
d THRU BELIEF OF-JESUS AN-

ΟΥΙΝΑΝΟΙΤΕΣΙΣΟΥΧ 40
ED IN ANOINTED JESUS ABS1 omit AND ON ALL (s2)

ΑΝΤΑΣΤΟΥΣΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤ 60
THE ones-BELIEVING

ΟΥΓΑΡΕΣΤΙΝΔΙΑΣΤΟΛΗ 80
NOT for IS distinction

ΑΝΤΕΣΓΑΡΗΜΑΡΤΟΝΚΑΙΥ 500
for missed AND ARE-

ΕΡΟΥΝΤΑΙΤΗΣΔΟΣΗΣΤΟ 20
ING OF-THE esteem OF-THE

ΟΥΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΜΕΝΟΙΔΩΡ 40
being justified gratuitously

ΕΑΝΘΑΥΤΟΥΧΡΙΤΙΑ 10
to-THE OF-Him grace

ΗΣΑΠΟΛΥΤΡΕΨΕΩΣΤΗΣ 20
FROM-Loosening OF-THE

ΡΙΣΤΩΙΝΣΟΥΟΝΠΡΟΕΒ 30
POINTED JESUS WHOM purposed

ΘΕΟΣΙΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝΑ 40
THE God PROPITIATORY THR

ΣΠΙΣΤΕΩΣΕΝΤΩΑΥΤΟ 50
BELIEF IN THE OF-Him

ΑΤΙΕΙΣΕΝΔΕΙΞΙΝΤΗΣ 60
INTO IN-SHOWING OF-THE

ΔΙΟΣΥΝΗΣΑΥΤΟΥΔΙΑΤ 70
OF-Him THRU TH

ΑΡΕΣΙΝΤΩΝΠΡΟΓΕΓΟΝ 80
SIDE-LETTING OF-THE BEFORE-HAVING-BECOM

ΝΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑΤΩΝΕΝΤΗΣ 90
miss-effects IN THE t

ΗΤΟΥΘΕΟΥΠΡΟΚΤΗΝΕ 100
26 OF-THE God TOWARD THE IN-I

ΞΙΝΤΗΣΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗΣ 110
OF-THE JUSTICE

ΟΥΕΝΤΩΝΥΝΚΑΙΡΩΕΙ 120
IN THE NOW SEASON INTO

ΙΝΑΙΑΥΤΟΝΔΙΚΑΙΟΝΗ 130
BE Him JUST AI

ΙΚΑΙΟΥΝΤΑΤΟΝΕΚΠΙΣ 140
JUSTIFYING THE-ONE OUT OF-BELI

ΣΙΝΣΟΥΠΟΥΟΥΝΗΚΑΥ 150
27 OF-JESUS ?-where THEN THE BOASTIN,

ΣΕΞΕΚΛΕΙΣΘΗΔΙΑΠΟ 160
it-IS-OUT-LOCKED THRU ?-THE-

ΟΜΟΥΤΩΝΕΡΓΩΝΟΥΧΙ 170
OF-THE ACTS NOT emph.

ΔΙΑΝΟΜΟΥΠΙΣΤΕΩΣΑ 180
28 THRU LAW OF-BELIEF WE

ΟΜΕΘΑΓΑΡΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΣ 190
counting for TO-BE-JUSTIFIED

ΙΣΤΕΙΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΝΧΩΡ 200
BELIEF human

AN OPEN LETTER

To the Secretary and Council of the Bible League:

My Dear Brethren in Christ Jesus: The article entitled "The Concordant Version of the Sacred Scriptures" in the April-June, 1932, *Bible League Quarterly* is so utterly unloving, unjust, and untrue, and so diametrically opposed to your principles and aims, that I protest against its publication in your *Quarterly*, and suggest that it has so sullied your honour that you should publicly repudiate its methods and its morals. To fully correct the false impression it creates would take too much of your valuable space, but I deem it the barest justice that I be granted room to point out the actual falsehoods and give the real facts to correct its misrepresentations. Additional information will be freely furnished to further correct this "pitiable story" by application to The Concordant Publishing Concern, 2823 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, California, U. S. A.,

At the present time I will confine myself to righting what is wrong in the article. I will first deal with the actual falsehoods. Some of these are not vital, but they show how irresponsible it all is. There are six false statements of fact.

1. *The Spurious Words in 1 John 5:7 are NOT in the Concordant Version.*

the words about the Trinity, in 1 John v. 7 . . . were . . . only a mistake . . . and the Concordant Version re-inserts it in the text, as it does in many other cases (p. 60).

This is vital, for the whole argument against the CONCORDANT VERSION Greek text is based on it, yet *this text never was, is not, and never will be in the Concordant Greek Text*. I demand that this statement be publicly

disavowed and the "many other cases" be specifically named, or the charge withdrawn.

2. The Concordant Version is NOT Based on One Editor.

And what is this marvellous feat based on? On the three codices Aleph, A and B, but it is largely influenced by "that school of criticism of which Scrivener is the representative" (p. 38). Three out of thirteen thousand MSS. and one editor of 1881! (p. 60).

I have sent you an actual leaf out of my "pasted books" on which Weymouth's Resultant Greek appears, with the variants of all the editors he used at the foot of the page. Hence I used all of the evidence presented in Weymouth. It is impractical to give the variants of "thirteen thousand" manuscripts. But three of these are generally acknowledged as of superlative worth. Hence *every letter* of these three is given, in the Super-linear, if not in the text itself. What I actually said follows. Note how my words have been distorted. Page 38 (34) actually reads:

A TOTALLY NEW TEXT

The CONCORDANT GREEK TEXT is entirely original in its methods and results. It is not allied with any of the conflicting schools of criticism. Because it is based on the most ancient evidence it *seems* to be built on the work of the greatest recognized "authorities", such as Tischendorf, Lachmann, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, Nestle, etc. But it also agrees, on important points, with that school of criticism of which Scrivener is the representative, especially in the admission of much which is discarded in some quarters. We have aimed to construct, not to destroy. But, above all, we have given *all* the evidence of the texts on which the work is based. This makes the CONCORDANT the equivalent of four texts, three most ancient, and one most modern.

3. The Concordant Version Contains 2140 Pages, NOT 800.

a vast volume of about 800 pages (p. 59).

The CONCORDANT VERSION contains about 2140 pages. As published in 1926, without the Concordance, etc., it contained about 800 *leaves*, not pages.

“Let Each be Speaking the Truth”

4. The Term “Doctor” is NOT Left Without Explanation.

there is no explanation of how the ordinary word for chief or leader becomes technicalized into “doctor”

There is an explanation, as follows:

ΕΠΙΣΤΑΤΗΣ *epi st a't ês 1m*

ON-STANDER, in classical and Septuagint Greek it is used literally of one standing over, a superintendent, but in the Scriptures it seems to correspond rather to the mental phase which appears in the corresponding verb, hence, an adept, corresponding to our title, doctor.

v Lu55 824 24 45 933 49 1713

This word occurs only seven times. The ordinary word for *chief* is *archōn*, which occurs thirty-seven times. *Leader* is *hêgemōn*, which occurs twenty-one times.

5. The Concordant Version Does NOT Translate the Aorist as a Past.

the Concordant Version is driven in many cases to put the aorist into the past in order to drag in any meaning at all!

The word “aorist” is used with great lack of precision in Greek text books. Therefore, the CONCORDANT VERSION defines what are true aorists—verbs with both the sign of the past and of the future—and such are *always* rendered indefinite in the Sublinear. Possibly there may be a case where English idiom does not allow this in the version. I do not recall any. The so-called “second aorist” has the *form* of a *past*, and is usually so rendered.

6. Sometimes does NOT mean Never!

“printers, who are the copyists of today” (p. 39), sometimes omit, but never add anything by oversight, . . . (p. 60).

Instead of quoting all of what I said, the quotation is deliberately broken off, and I am made to appear ridiculous. I did *not* say *never*. I said

It is found that present day printers, in “following copy” leave out a word or a phrase or a sentence much more fre-

quently than they put anything in. In fact, an insertion is a rare thing. It is more than likely that the ancient copyists did the same thing. In fact any one who will take the trouble to look over the Sinaitic text of the last book of scripture will come to the conclusion that it was written by one who made a habit of omission. Many a sentence has been supplied by the ancient corrector and even he failed to catch a few palpable omissions, which may have been lacking in the copy he had. Hence we may deduce this rule:

Omissions are easily made: restore them.

Additions are rare: weigh them.

MISREPRESENTATIONS

1. *Weymouth and the Concordant Version are Misrepresented.*

But the argument goes on (quoting Weymouth), "This aorist is often used where our idiom demands the present," and this Editor exclaims, "this is precisely the point for which we contend"! But, unfortunately, this is pure misrepresentation of Weymouth, because every student is familiar with what Weymouth meant when he said this regarding the Gnostic and Epistolary use of the aorist . . ." (p. 62).

This is a deliberate misrepresentation of both Weymouth and the CONCORDANT VERSION, as the following from the Introduction shows:

AORIST MEANS INDEFINITE

Weymouth then makes the welcome admission that "*aorist* mean *indefinite*, and we must bow to the authority of the Greek grammarians who held that name to be a suitable one . . .". This is precisely the point for which we contend.

. . . "*The Aorist is often used where our idiom demands the Present . . . but this Gnostic Aorist (as in Jas. 1:11, "for the sun rises", etc.) and the Epistolary Aorist (2 Cor. 8:18, "we send with him the brother") need not here be enlarged upon.*"

2. *Our Attitude Misrepresented.*

[the lack of] humility! As when Weymouth says, "it may be that the Translation here offered will contribute some materials that may be built into that far grander edifice" . . . compared with (p. 1 of) the Introduction to this volume—"The Concordant method places the work of translation on a permanent systematic and scientific basis," etc.

What shall we say when we find that the "etc.", on the very next line, contains the very same thought voiced by Weymouth? The paragraph reads as follows:

The facilities for further revision and correction are correspondingly increased.

3. *Our Last Edition Misrepresented.*

But besides distorting the truth, as Dr. Weymouth prophesied, it totally obscures it, as he also said, e. g. (Acts v. 42), "they ceased not teaching and evangelising Christ Jesus"!

It is the duty of a reviewer to secure the latest edition of the work he presumes to criticise. We agree that English idiom will not bear this form, so we corrected it years ago. It now reads, "they ceased not teaching and preaching the evangel of Christ Jesus".

4. *Our Methods Misrepresented.*

... "I have deliberately rejected the principle of trying to translate the same Greek word by the same word in English, and, where circumstances seemed to call for it, I have sometimes used two English words to represent one word of the Greek."

This is supposed to be contrary to the *practise* of the CONCORDANT VERSION. While we do not reject the principle [of trying!], we yield to the demands of English idiom, so that *katargeō* is rendered by *eight* different terms. The Lexicon reads as follows:

DOWN-UN-ACT, DOWN-*idle*, abolish *death* 2 Tim. 1:10, abrogate *laws or promises* 1 Cor. 15:24, discard *things* 1 Cor. 13:11, exempt *persons* Rom. 7:6, become inert, *of sin*, Rom. 6:6, nullify *faith* Rom. 3:3, *middle* vanish 2 Cor. 3:7, waste *land* Luke 13:7.

We use synonyms to accord with English usage, but we do not use antonyms, such as *yea* and *nay*, for one expression, or *pour out* and *fill* for the same Greek word, as the Authorized Version does. We also use two words for one Greek expression, as, for instance, *thêrion*, wild beast (p. 369, Concordance). Why quote this *against* the CONCORDANT VERSION when it goes even further in the same direction?

5. *Our Principles of Translation Misrepresented.*

it is simply not possible to subject usage to etymological construction, for if we do we attack the foundation principles of language and find ourselves floundering in chaos.

The CONCORDANT VERSION *never subordinates usage to etymology*. In a very few instances it happens that both coincide, as in the case of DOWN-CASTING. The Greek word for "foundation" is *themelios*. In an effort to distinguish this from *katabolê*, also so rendered, all of the contexts were critically examined with the result that not only did the literal sense, DOWN-CASTING, suit each connection, but it gave a far more vigorous sense, and opened up new vistas of truth.

6. *Our Staff of Workers Misrepresented.*

. . . a company of translators and printers in Los Angeles, . . .

. . . he had a retired lady-doctor . . . besides "two painstaking assistants," his own wife, and a son, all helping him in the manual work! (p. 59).

Besides many who helped in minor capacities, there was only *one* printer and translator. One was a pastor, three were bankers, one a steel superintendent, one a retired physician, one a retired post office official, all mature, capable, trained workers, who probably put in fifty thousand hours in collating, checking, etc. (p. 59).

The work is not confined to Los Angeles. Much work was done by an assistant in Edinburgh, and in Sheffield, and in Long Beach. At present assistants on CONCORDANT VERSION are located in several places in Germany, in Denmark, in Holland, in New York, in Mexico, in Arizona, in Burmah, and other places. The Editor lived in Palestine in order to avoid giving a false background to his renderings. Now, like Tyndale, he is in Germany, working on a translation of the Hebrew into English and the Greek into German, and superintending concordant translations in Danish, Dutch, Italian, and Spanish.

REASONINGS

1. Reasoning by Altering the Premises!

... If it is not too utterly ludicrous, is Moses still "exalting" the serpent? ... even if it were true that God still "dispatches His Son" ... The Lord Christ is *not* abolishing death, ...

Here we have the three examples given against the use of the so-called English "present" tense for the aorist. We concede that, in *very rare* instances, such as "Moses exalts the serpent", English idiom is strained. "Still dispatches" is also unidiomatic. It should be "is still dispatching", for an action still going on demands the participle. But it is utterly illogical and reprehensible to *quote* "exalting", to *add still*, and to *distort abolish* to *abolishing*, as if we had used these words, when we say the opposite. The aorist states a *fact, apart from time*, not an incomplete action. To be logical, the questions should read, Does Moses *exalt* the serpent? Does God *dispatch* His Son? Does Christ *abolish* death? *No better proof that the Concordant Version is correct in using the indefinite English for the Greek aorist can be given than the fact that it is necessary to twist the argument by using other forms.*

2. The Truth is Always Persecuted.

... "Erasmus was attacked in Britain and on the Continent. Stephanus, who took up his work, had to flee from the wrath of the doctors of the Sorbonne to Protestant Geneva; Whitney assailed Mill, Middleton condemned Bentley, Wettstein opposed Bengel, Matthaei abused Griesbach; and worse, England allowed Tregelles almost to starve and he went blind in deciphering manuscripts. Simonides slandered Tischendorf": and Burgon wrote of Westcott and Hort with great severity. As Dr. A. T. Robertson goes on to say, "It was a pitiable story, but truth was to win in the end," ...

When Jerome made his translation in 405 A.D. he met such bitter opposition that he lost his temper and called his enemies *bipedes asellos!* When

the King James Version came out in 1611, it was accused of atheism and popery; and when the Revisers published their work in 1881, many called these scholars Unitarians.

The fact that every advance in the cause of truth has been opposed in the past does not prove the CONCORDANT VERSION wrong, but rather that it is probably right. Possibly in no case has the opposition been so false to facts, so misleading, or so illogical as in this article. If reasoning is to rule, the CONCORDANT VERSION is correct. These facts may be used in *favor* of the Version, not against it.

3. *A Version Cannot be Both Literal and Idiomatic.*

. . . Now is it possible to give uniformly, or even consistently, "one English equivalent for every Greek element"? In other words, is it possible to translate "literally"?

These are two entirely different matters. The CONCORDANT VERSION recognizes the value of literal translations and the necessity for idiomatic renderings, so gives *both*. It has divided the words of the whole divine vocabulary into their significant parts, or "elements". To each is assigned a STANDARD English equivalent. For example, one of the words rendered "foundation" is made up of two Greek elements (*kata* and *bal*) which literally mean DOWN-CASTING. Whether this is its true idiomatic sense can only be determined by examining every context in which it occurs. The verb is rendered *cast down* in 2 Corinthians 4:9 and Revelation 12:10. In this case it fits, and means *disruption*. Thus every *element* (not *word*) *has been* given in the Elements or the Sublinear, but usually it is changed in the *Version*, to accord with English idiom. Thus *hupo-stasis* is UNDERSTANDING, for *hupo* undoubtedly means UNDER, and *sta* means STAND in hundreds of instances. But this does not at all accord with its *usage*. The CONCORDANT VERSION finds a term which accords with *all* of the occurrences. The Authorized Version renderings are as follows:

A. V., *hupostasis*

- 2 Cor. 9: 4 in this same *confident* boasting
 11:17 in this *confidence* of boasting
 Heb. 1: 3 and the express image of His *person*
 3:14 if we hold the beginning of our *confidence*
 11: 1 faith is the *substance* of things hoped for

C. V., *hupostasis*, UNDER-STANDING, assumption

- 2 Cor. 9: 4 in this *assumption* of boasting
 11:17 in this *assumption* of boasting
 Heb. 1: 3 and the Emblem of His *assumption*
 3:14 retaining the beginning of the *assumption*
 11: 1 faith is an *assumption* of what is being expected

Assumption not only fits *every* passage, but illuminates and explains the difficult ones. Faith is emphatically *not* a "title-deed", for that gives actual possession, which faith particularly does *not* do.

4. *Blind Blundering is Not Reason.*

... This is the literalism that we object to, and are we not right? Or take Heb. i. 3, "Who, being the ... and Emblem of His as[s]umption," and the sublinear—"carving of the under-standing of-Him"! Which surely needs a re-translation to bring it near ordinary folk!

"Emblem of His assumption" is *not literal*. The sub-linear is. The "ordinary person" mistakenly imagines that the *charaktêr*, the "express image" of the Authorized Version, is related to the word *eikōn*, *image*, as "the *image* of the beast" (Rev. 13:15) whereas it is really related to *charagma*, "the *mark* of the beast" (Rev. 19:20). The CONCORDANT VERSION does not deceive them thus, but renders both *emblem*. Some Bibles put "substance" in the margin for "person" to connect it with Hebrews 11:1, where the same word occurs.

The CONCORDANT VERSION is the only version we know which usès a single term which does not merely satisfy every context in which it occurs, but opens up a new vision of God, Who *assumes* various characters, such as Father, Lord, Jehovah, etc., and it is these of which Christ is the emblem, or characteristic presentation.

5. *A Concordance Differs from a Dictionary.*

... "an utterly ignorant or utterly lazy man, if possessed of a little ingenuity, can with the help of a dictionary and grammar give a word-for-word rendering, whether intelligible or not, and print 'Translation' on his title-page" (p. 10, op. cit.). This is a truly mordant warning when we recall that our Editor is at pains to point out that his main work was done by means of concordances!

As I did *not* use a dictionary and made my own grammar, I feel that Weymouth did not do me the honor of writing about me. And as the long, patient toil of studying each word in its contexts in a concordance is not done by a lazy man, and will soon cure him of ignorance, I submit that the implication is irrational and insulting.

6. *Irrelevant Irrational Reasoning.*

... The whole of codex Bezae, for instance, is spoiled by frequent additions, and yet it is the next oldest to the three above referred to.

As the codex is *not* given in the CONCORDANT VERSION and influences it only through the work of other editors, who are approved, it has no bearing on the question at issue, and proves only a paucity of real arguments against the CONCORDANT VERSION.

UNFOUNDED INSINUATIONS

1. *False Accusers (2 Tim. 3:3; Titus 2:3).*

... the "word of God" (which does not appear to include the Old Testament) (p. 59).

I am well aware how serious such a charge is in the eyes of the readers of the Bible League Quarterly. Nothing could be more false. The Introduction says, "It is limited to the so-called 'New Testament' at present. Much work has been done on the Hebrew text, also, and it may be published later" (p. 5). The Editor has spent nearly a year in Palestine making investigations for this portion of God's Word, has studied every Hebrew word concordantly, has assigned almost all an English stand-

ard, and holds implicitly to the absolute literal inspiration of the Hebrew text.

2. *"Let Each Esteem Other Better than Themselves!"*

... is it too much to have expected rather regeneration and something of a message-mastered man?

It is quite out of place. I am not speaking of myself, but of my work. In the introduction to Romans I say, "The writer of these words became acquainted with God through a study of this epistle." I especially desire to keep my own opinions out of the version. That I have a message is evident from the fact that I have furnished notes throughout, and have published a magazine, UNSEARCHABLE RICHES, for over twenty years, and now have one in German, UNAUSFORSCHLICHER REICHTUM, which is published in Switzerland. A concordant version is no place to inject a message.

3. *The Laborer is Worthy of ———?*

... What does American spare time amount to?

This is beside the point, as my work consisted largely in directing others, who put more than 50,000 hours of time on the work. If the heart is in it and the work is done systematically it amounts to nearly as much as the time actually devoted to study in some universities. I studied in the early morning, in the noon hour, and at night. I gave up a Bible class to get more time, and resigned a superintendency, taking a menial position, to spare my nerves for my real work.

4. *The Concordant Version gives Every Letter of the Three Most Ancient Manuscripts.*

... the claim to present a "Restored Greek Text" is just a foolish vanity with a strong tinge of guilt in it, because the version so emphatically makes itself responsible for the "uneducated" (p. 1).

In the Introduction we say that the CONCORDANT VERSION *aims* to be *simple* enough for the uneducated" (p.

5). We actually give every single letter of the three most ancient texts in so simple a form that an uneducated man can determine for himself just how any passage reads in any one of them. We do not intrude with our "scholarship". We give the evidence for and against our own readings, but this is necessarily limited to these three manuscripts and the latest papyri. If any actual instance can be found where we are in error we can easily correct it, for the work has not been stereotyped, so that corrections may be easily made. After five years of revision, only three Greek letters, out of about 689,900, were found to be wrong.

5. *Another False Accusation.*

... stark irreverence results from the false principles thus adopted, as when the divine voice is represented as saying (Matt. xii. 18), "Lo! My Boy, Whom I prefer." It is true that the word "Boy" is quite correct in some contexts, but it is false and unseemly here. The Septuagint often translates the Hebrew "servant" by this word; indeed, the word itself frequently means attendant, etc., and the New Testament writers almost invariably use the Septuagint. What a contrast with Weymouth's correct translation, with its definite dignity, "This is My Servant, Whom I have chosen"!

Anticipating such a criticism, we wrote as follows:

The term "Boy" is used here with all reverence, for want of a better. The difficulties encountered in its translation are apparent from the variety of renderings in the common version, all of which are better fitted to some other Greek word. They use *child*, *son*, *servant*, *young man*, *maid*, etc. It is used of the boys under two years of age in Bethlehem (Mat. 2:16). It is used of Jesus when He was twelve years old (Luke 2:43). It is quoted from Isaiah when he spoke of Him (Mat. 12:18). It is applied to Him four times in this book [Acts] (3:13; 4:27-30). It is a word like our "boy" or "girl" which may be applied either to a child or a young servant.

If the term "Servant" is better, why was not the Greek word *diakonos*, the usual word, used? In early California days the Chinese servant was called a house boy. It is so in China and South Africa today. Every

good dictionary gives this definition of "Boy". If the Authorized Version can use *child* without irreverence, why cannot the CONCORDANT VERSION use Boy?

6. A Real Case of Irreverence.

... "only capital letters . . .", "iota subscript . . . cannot be added now," . . . "we dare not inject our own judgment by introducing human divisions . . . [which are] not inspired . . . This is surely the lowest order of obscurantism.

The charge that the text of Holy Writ, as originally given by God, is obscure, reflects upon Him, and not on the Compiler of the CONCORDANT VERSION. *We have kept ourselves out of it entirely.* We leave it to the Bible League, whether He is an *obscurantist*, and whether modern additions and alterations have succeeded in clarifying His obscure method of revealing Himself. We are for God.

CONCLUSION

It would be too tedious to point out every departure from rectitude in this article. Enough has been said to show that it is untruthful, deceptive, illogical, and irrational, as well as insulting and profane. If it is necessary to use such means against the CONCORDANT VERSION, we may be sure that the Slanderer is against it, for no servant of God could be guilty of such practises. Surely it devolves upon the reader of these lines to investigate *for himself*, and not allow self-constituted "scholarship" to rob him of God's Word! We have toiled and prayed, and God has marvelously blessed our efforts to many. Satan does not wish our work to become known and is using those who take upon themselves the name of Christ, to ridicule and traduce us. We not only suffer it but rejoice in it. We pray you simply to ignore all human authority — ours included — and investigate this work, which will enable you to break through human superstition and pseudo-scholarship to the actual revelation of our gracious and loving God and Father.

In Defense of the Faith

THE CONCORDANT VERSION IN THE CRITICS' DEN

OUR LORD, in dealing with the scholars of His day, asked them a question that fits the scholars of today equally well. He said, "How can you believe, getting glory from one another, and are not seeking the glory which is from the only God?" (Jn. 5:44). I freely confess that, if I had gone through the mill, and had a number of degrees after my name, I would be impotent to accept new light if I wished to preserve my self-respect, my reputation, and my salary. There is much concern about the state of our theological schools today, but the downward trend cannot be stopped so long as the underlying conditions remain as they are. Those who receive glory from men are subservient to men, and cannot believe God as can those who have the high privilege of receiving shame and contempt from the religious leaders of the present apostasy. Only when symbols of human pride are repugnant to us are we in a place where faith in God's Word is practicable. All honor to those great spirits who, notwithstanding this handicap, are enabled to accept God's Word by *faith*, and who refresh His saints with new manna direct from the Word of God! I am tempted to envy them!

These thoughts were called forth by the title page of a new pamphlet: "THE CONCORDANT VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, *How Should We Regard It?*" We are not acquainted with the writer, either personally or through his works. As he writes as one who belongs to Christ, we desire to show all kindness and grace to him personally, hence will not even mention his name. We wish to confine our references to him to his character as *critic*. In other relations he may show qualities quite the reverse of those revealed in this booklet. We know how it hurts to be personally reviled, for this booklet is replete with personal insults, so we will not retaliate. We do *not* insinuate that he is "utterly ignorant," "utterly lazy," "absurd," "ridiculous," "misleading," and "hypocritically pious" (all of which charges he lays against us), but we seek rather to excuse his shortcomings. For how can he believe *God*, when he publicly displays the honors he has received from men, and bases his whole criticism on the "*authority*" with which the degrees B.D., Ph.D., D.D. clothe him? The only degree given me by my friends is D. D., *Daily Drudge*. And it is only from the college of painful experience!

Not only is this criticism based upon the frail foundation of human merit, but it *ignores*, yea, *denies*, God's declarations concerning the coming apostasy, especially in the last days. *Acceptance by men does not imply approval by God, but the contrary.* An appeal to the leaders in anything connected with God's truth is the most dangerous error of these days. Did the chiefs or Pharisees believe in Him (Jn.7:48)? Did not all in the province of Asia turn from Paul, even in that early day (2 Ti.1:15)? Is it not so today? Only yesterday I received a printed postcard, which probably was sent to thousands, urging me to leave Paul for "Jesus." Why not go the whole length, and "accept" the pope of Rome because he is "accepted" by millions all over the earth?

Quite a little of this criticism is a mere repetition of the vicious vilifications, prevarications, misrepresentations and inanities which appeared some time ago in an English publication. These are taken as truth without the least effort or desire on the part of the author to verify them. However he may translate 1 Co.13:4-6 into English, in *practice* he renders it: "love . . . is *unkind*," "rejoicing . . . in *injustice*." I pointed out the flagrant moral delinquencies to the editor of the publication from which he takes his inspiration. They were never openly acknowledged, but only covered over by the holy hypocrisy which is assumed by most who imagine that the acceptance of the popular traditions of men is the same as faith in God. I seldom pay attention to such criticisms any more, knowing the depraved character of those who think they serve God when they slander His servants. Indeed, it takes too much of my time to pat the hornets on the back, and I have no desire to retaliate. God will be gracious to them!

The impression conveyed by this criticism—that all scholars are agreed, and that no one questions the current renderings of the Greek verb—is totally false. In Europe, when I mentioned Dr. Robertson's name, DeBrunner, then the ranking Greek scholar of the continent, would have none of him. Dr. Weymouth's pamphlet on the Aorist is a protest against what our critic, in a quotation, calls "the ripest scholarship of Great Britain and America," the makers of the Revised Version. Really great scholars are not tied to the apron strings of "accepted scholarship," when not dependent on it for a living. They protest against many things in our Bible, but, so far as I know, no one approached the subject scientifically as a whole. They only sought to patch matters up where the breaks were too bad.

Let no one imagine that I am alone in my estimate of modern scholarship. Henry Adams, the grandson and great grandson of presidents, says of Harvard College in his day: "It taught little, and that little ill." In this part of the state of California the newspapers contain many contributions, not

only from business men, but from educators, condemning modern trends in education. Graduates of high schools cannot read, write, or reckon properly. The schools, tested by the impartial rule of efficiency, have been advancing swiftly to the rear. Those students who do *independent* work surge ahead. Now there is a great uproar and clamor for reform. Alas, the tests which show how pathetically little a *theological* education does to fit a man for the service of God are not heeded. Theology is little more than a fossiliferous deposit of dead creeds, except when it is exposed. Then the monsters of the past come to life and threaten to demolish all who do not bow down to them!

We are not ignorant of the devices of the Adversary in regard to our work. We hope soon to send copies of the international edition of the Concordant Version to various biblical periodicals, and request a review. Before they arrive, the Adversary proposes to prejudice these periodicals against us, so that the reviewers will be suspicious and hostile. He prepared for Paul's reception in Rome in the same way. The foremost of the Jews knew that Paul's message was being contradicted everywhere (Ac.28:22). We seem to be following in his steps.

The campaign against us is conducted by the leaders of Fundamentalism without any regard for truth or justice. Whenever they can find anything damaging, without the least investigation they spread abroad the scandal. A Moody professor once gave out the rumor that I had been seen with a strange woman in Chicago at a time when I was in Los Angeles. Dr. Robertson was very sarcastic about the version, and was quoted by others. In our correspondence with Dr. Robertson it developed that he thought the Emphatic Diaglott, sponsored by Pastor Russell, was the Concordant Version!!! He promised to correct his published statement in *The Expositor*, but to this day the story is being spread that he considered it "Pish and Piffle." Even the highest in Fundamental circles delight in repeating this slander by an "authority" who thought he was talking about another book! When the present criticism was favorably reviewed in Prophecy, the evidence was sent to Dr. Brooks showing that some of the statements were false. Instead of righting the wrong, the next issue had a longer denunciation, and he actually acknowledged that the previous commendation was made *before he had read the criticism!* The *Moody Monthly* also commended it. When the evidence was sent, instead of correcting the false statements, the reviewer wrote that he did not feel that a reply to my letter was necessary! I do not look for replies to my letters but *honesty* in criticisms and reviews by the slaves of Christ. May God be gracious to these hateful haters for Christ's sake!

The *spirit* shown in this matter exceeds all else in im-

portance. Those who have the spirit of Christ should instinctively detect that which is filled with the spirit of the Adversary. Knowledge puffs up, hate destroys; but love builds up. There is hardly a single constructive criticism in this whole denunciation. Helpful suggestions would enable us to correct our errors and improve our work. Instead, this criticism is written in the character of an adversary, not a friend. We wish to make this clear, so we will insert here the correspondence which followed our first glance into this booklet. At the same time, it will serve as a part of the introduction. We limited our appeal strictly to the *moral* issue, concerning which there is no possibility of any difference of opinion. We wished to know the reaction to this, so that we may learn what *spirit* is at work. As I write this I have not yet received a reply from the author of the booklet, and I fondly hope and pray that he will be given grace to acknowledge his *moral* lapse before he seeks to defend his scholarship. We sent the following protest. That this may be understood, we reprint herewith that part of his criticism to which we refer. Then follows what was sent to him.

The title-page of this volume of about 800 pages reads as follows: "Concordant Version: The Sacred Scriptures designed to put the English reader in possession of all the vital facts of Divine revelation without a former knowledge of Greek by means of A Restored Greek Text, with various readings conforming, as far as possible, to the inspired autographs: A Uniformed Subliniar based upon an exclusive English equivalent for each Greek element. A Consistent Emphasized English Version with notes which are linked together and correlated for the English reader by means of an English Concordance and Lexicon and a complementary list of the Greek Elements."

There are in reality nine features to this work: (1) A lengthy introduction, giving the history of the translation and defending the principles on which it rests; (2) a Greek text of the New Testament in Uncials; (3) a subliniar translation of this text; (4) superlinear variations in the Greek manuscripts used; (5) a translation of the Greek into English; (6) "expository notes" on selected passages; (7) a Lexical Concordance; (8) the Greek Elements; and (9) a "Greek Course."

It is unfortunate for the public that because of the methods of the author and the nature of his finished product, New Testament Greek scholars either totally ignore the work or dismiss it with a general note of disapprobation. True, there have been replies to certain renderings and "notes" in the volume, as also to certain teachings in the literature created by sympathizers with this movement, both in America and in England; but there has not appeared, to the knowledge of the writer, an examination of the fundamental principles on which the work rests. This is to be deplored. All the while, the influence of the volume continues, and the readers unfamiliar with the Greek language are left at the mercy of the "translation," and since there is also a Pocket Edition containing only the translation, the ordinary reader has no recourse whatever to the original.

In view of this situation the writer has felt constrained to examine the version carefully and to evaluate it in the light of the character and language of the Greek New Testament.

I. UNSCIENTIFIC METHODS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM. The author rejects all the existing Greek texts and prepares "a totally new text" of his own (p. 34). This in spite of the fact that the present-

day critical texts of Westcott and Hort, Weymouth, Eberhard Nestle, B. Weiss, E. Palmer, A. Souter, Von Soden, Erwin Nestle, differ but little, and Modernists and Fundamentalists alike use these texts. The Seventh-day Adventists and some others still use the *Textus Receptus*. The scientific study of the text has progressed so far that Hort could say (*Introduction*, p. 4): "With regard to the great bulk of the words of the New Testament, as of most other ancient writings, there is no variation or other ground of doubt, and therefore no room for textual criticism." He continues: "The amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text." Gregory, referring to his own Greek Testament of 560 pages, says, "A thousandth part of that would then after all be in the neighborhood of half a page or fifteen or sixteen of these small lines. Really that is not very much" (*The Canon and Text of the New Testament*, p. 528). And yet this author disregards all the existing texts and prepares his own.

In preparing his own text the author disregards most of the commonly accepted principles of textual criticism. Even Bengel and Tregelles, men whose jealousy for the verbal accuracy of the Scriptures cannot be called in question, agree in all essentials with the principles of Westcott and Hort and other more recent textual critics. Let us note the principles of the Concordant Version:

First, the author confines himself to four manuscripts in the preparation of his text: Aleph, B, and A, using B² for the Apocalypse. He claims that he has made some use of the papyri fragments, listing p⁵, p¹³, and p¹⁵ as agreeing closely with Aleph and B. Now in the light of the fact that Dobschutz (in Nestle's *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament* (1923)) said that there are 32 papyri, 170 uncials, 2320 minuscules, and 1561 lectionaries of the Greek Testament, 4,083 in all (Tischendorf in 1912 gave 4,105 in all), this is an amazing indifference to the evidence for the text. Not even all of the six greatest Uncials (Aleph, A, B, C, D, and W) are used; nor the *Koridethi Gospels* of about the ninth century; nor many of the thirty *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* fragments; nor the *Chester Beatty Papyri* of the New Testament of the third century. Furthermore, there seems to have been no consultation of ancient versions, some of which are fully two hundred years older than our oldest Greek manuscripts, and little, if any, use of the Fathers. Gregory says concerning the duty of the textual critic, that it would be "a crime to fail to approach the last witness, to omit the last question that could be put, in order to gain a ray of light upon its history, in order to solve a problem touching the form of its original text" (*Canon and Text of the New Testament*, p. 419).

Secondly, the principles of textual criticism are not those usually recognized. Having limited himself to four Greek manuscripts the author henceforth has use for little external evidence, the most important kind of evidence. For him it is after that largely a matter of internal evidence. Three principles governing his selection of a reading may be noted.

The first is known as *conflation*. Assuming that an ancient copyist resembled a modern compositor in a printing establishment and, therefore, holding that a copyist was more likely to omit words, phrases, and clauses than insert them, the author provides what he calls a "full" text (p. 36). He "seeks to restore all readings which have any good claim to a place in it on the assumption that deliberate insertions are much more improbable and unforgivable than are unintentional omissions" (*ib.*). In other words, he endeavors to give us the combined readings of the manuscripts he uses. Now it is an accepted canon of textual criticism that just the opposite is the case, *viz.*, that scribes were more apt to insert things than to omit them. There were differing degrees of culture in the copyists, scripts at their disposal. It is far more likely that a copyist would insert *all* the readings he knew of than that he should omit any differences of theological bias, as well as differences in the unintentionally. This is not to ignore the fact that there are also unintentional omissions, but they are comparatively few in a time

when copying was a profession and the Scriptures were regarded as sacred.

The second is that of *preference for the corrections* in the manuscripts. Aleph has seven correctors, B has two, and A only one of importance. The author says that the copyists correspond to our compositors and the correctors to our proof-readers. On the basis of this assumption the author says: "Hence the corrector's marks should supersede the text" (p. 35). This we might grant in case of the simplest changes, but when the changes involve doctrinal differences the problem becomes complex. In that case it becomes necessary to study the corrector's doctrinal bias and external evidence generally. It is clear also that when there are more than one corrector for a passage this principle cannot hold. Which one of the several correctors is preferable?

The third is that the author's *judgment based on internal evidence* determines in the case of differences in the readings. Now all textual critics recognize the fact that sometimes only internal evidence can decide between variant readings; but recourse to this canon should be strictly confined to passages that have first been tested by every scrap of external evidence. There is always danger that the textual critic will resort to an "it seems to me" (*dokei moi*) before he has exhausted all the objective lines of investigation. With our author this danger is especially great, since he so arbitrarily limits himself to four manuscripts. It is perhaps impossible to keep all subjective considerations out of textual criticism, but the objective do not seem to receive anything like the proper recognition in this Version. The versions and the Fathers often help to decide when an *impasse* is reached.

So far, therefore, as textual criticism is concerned, the work is unreliable and unsatisfactory. While we grant that the four manuscripts used by the author are the best as a whole, they are not the best in every single instance. A study of all the evidence and proper canons of textual criticism will lead to very different results in a good many cases.

We wrote as follows:

HOW SHOULD WE REGARD IT?

A Criticism Criticised

THE MORAL TURPITUDE displayed in the latest criticism of the CONCORDANT VERSION almost compels us to refrain from making any reply. We do not desire to hurt the feelings of anyone or expose their misdeeds, but it is impossible to avoid this in reviewing "THE CONCORDANT VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, *How Should We Regard It?*" We will not mention the writer's name, for personalities should have no place in such a matter. I deplore the vicious attack upon myself, and will reply only so far as it affects the version. The following headings will give a general idea of the contents of the criticism: I. Unscientific Methods of Textual Criticism. II. Meager Preparation and Boastful Claims. III. Erroneous Conception of Uniformity in the Translation of Words. IV. Erroneous Conceptions of Voice, Mode and Tense. V. Heterodox Doctrine. It is a pamphlet of thirty-two pages. We shall give extracts, in small type, of the charges against the version.

METHODS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

[This is what the critic says:] The author rejects all the existing Greek texts and prepares . . . his own . . . the author confines himself to four manuscripts in the preparation of his text . . . papyri . . . an amazing indifference to the evidence

for the text . . . seems to have been no consultation of ancient versions . . . and little, if any, use of the Fathers . . . Having limited himself to four Greek manuscripts the author henceforth has little use for external evidence. (*Pages 5 and 6.*)

I would gladly have spared myself the labor of making a new text, for I had an inkling of the long labor it would demand. But the work before me would probably take many years, and even the Resultant Text would be out of date before it would be finished. Besides, the whole aim of my undertaking was to present actual *evidence*, not the findings of mortals. So I determined to use the Resultant Greek text only as a basis, and to record above the line every variation from the three most ancient manuscripts. Every line of the Resultant text was pasted in a book, with sufficient space above to record the readings of the manuscripts. At the bottom of each page Weymouth's margin was also pasted, so that I had continually before me what Alford, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, the Revisers, and others considered the best reading. The accompanying line at the bottom of the page of John's evangel with the margin below it will illustrate this. [In this B¹ omits humans.]

1Lo Tr Ti A B WH R 200	KATA IOANNHN: 8' m ¹ 60	80	92
Greek Text	ἡ ἀνθρωπίνων. καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ		
Grammar	humans	AND THE IN THE 15- AND THE (100 H. nls. Q.) LIGHT DARKNESS ARIING also.	
Standard			
Version	of men. And the light is appearing in the darkness, and the		
Concordance	5		
Editors	KATA IOANNHN: pe ewayyeliou LoTrA:st 3 8 γέγονεν.) . 6 γέγονεν snLoTrWH(n.m.) Rn		
Manuscripts	WELL-MESSAGE evangel		
Standard			
Editors	... & by pri.] ioter Lo(s m.) TrnTiB(n.m.) Wilm		
Manuscripts	- 15		
Standard			

Other copies of the Resultant text were used by my assistants, who compared it, letter for letter, with photographic copies of the most ancient manuscripts, and recorded their findings in them. These findings I transferred to the pasted book, above the line, as shown in the illustration, where the corrector of s omits "and" on the second line. (The numbers refer to the letters, for these were all counted, and each letter has its number in the Concordant Text, to make sure that not one of them would be lost). *With all of this evidence before me*, as well as the critical works of previous editors,

I sought to determine the original reading, by methods which will be discussed later.

No one man could possibly consult every word in the "32 papyri, 170 uncials, 2320 minuscules, and 1561 lectionaries," and *not a single editor of the Greek text ever did so*. It is not probable that anyone before Weymouth summarized the results of so many editors who had spent so much time at this task. These editors, and those whom they consulted, examined this vast mass of evidence, including the ancient versions and the Fathers, and embodied their findings in their published texts. Weymouth gathered these together. *I used the fruit of these labors continually in editing the text*. I intended, at first, to add to my text every word or letter confirmed by these which was not found in any of the three (or four) ancient manuscripts and papyri which I used, but the remarkable fact emerged that one or more of these documents contained every letter which was properly authenticated, so there was no need to do this. Long experience taught me the value of the corrections in the texts, and so I included these also.

So it will be seen that the Concordant Greek text does *not* "reject" all the existing Greek texts. *It makes use of them*. It does *not* "confine" itself to four manuscripts in the preparation of the text. It is *not* indifferent to the external evidence, but consults it constantly, not only through the readings of previous editors, but as published in their other published works, notably Dr. Hort's notes. It even broadens the base of the evidence by including a school of criticism which other editors usually neglected, and pays more attention to the ancient editors' alterations than any other edition, so far as known. No source of evidence was rejected or neglected. Finds discovered since it was published have been considered. Moreover, to make assurance doubly sure, not only were *photographic* copies used, but journeys were made to Rome and London, and a page of the text compared directly with the original manuscript, so that there could be no mistake even on this score. Some of the books used so many years ago can still be shown as evidence of the truth of our assertions.

Being convinced that this work, though carried on in much weakness and weariness, and without the support of men, yea, in spite of their constant scorn and opposition, *is of God*, we leave it in His hands, for He is able to guard that which He has committed to us, despite the fiery arrows of the adversary or his human helpers. Nevertheless we beseech those who are led to do the Slanderer's work, to consider the evidence which we present, and, *for their own sakes, in view of His presence*, to retract their slanders and use the same zeal in spreading the truth as to this matter as they used to publish the falsehoods.

Along with this we sent the following letter, accompanied by whole pages of the pasted book of which we show only one line and the lower margin herewith. A copy of the letter and other pages from "THE CONCORDANT VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES" were sent to the publishers also.

My Dear Brother in the Lord:

A friend has just sent me your booklet, "THE CONCORDANT VERSION OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES, *How Should We Regard It?*" I feel sure that, if you were aware of the fearful *moral lapse* which its opening pages contain, you would immediately withdraw it from circulation. Although I had resolved to pay no more attention to such attacks, I feel that I owe it to you to let you know without delay how utterly you misrepresent me and my work on pages five and six, so that you may take steps to save yourself from further guilt.

You evidently have been misled by the vicious articles which were published in the *Bible League Quarterly*, but you had ample opportunity to check their statements. Our literature clearly shows how the work was done. Our appeal is only to the *facts* of the originals, and we do not stress the testimony of men, yet that is no grounds for the false statements in which you indulge.

I enclose pages of the pasted books as evidence to substantiate my assertions. You may keep them as long as you wish, but they represent much work and remain our property, to be returned when you are through with them.

We will send copies of this letter and a few pages of the pasted books to your publishers, that they may know on what dangerous ground they are treading. I am sure that the old members of the firm, one of whom I met about forty years ago, would never have published any such criminal libel as this knowingly.

I may publish this letter, and my full reply in my magazine and as a pamphlet later, depending upon your reaction in the matter.

I enclose my reply to your false statements regarding my work on the Greek text. I will not wait until the rest is finished so that you may right this wrong without delay.

You may rest assured, my dear brother, that I will not drag you before any earthly court, but, if you continue to circulate this slander, I will put my case in the hands of my Lord, Christ Jesus, Who is well able to deal with you, and you will hear from Him, in due time.

Yours in His blessed service, A. E. KNOCH.

The following is a photographic reproduction of the publisher's reply. The false twist given to my mention of criminal libel is deplorable, for I had given definite assurance that I would *not* drag the critic before an earthly court. How can I "infer" that I might take the matter to court when I had said that I would *not* do so? It will not be necessary for me to bring him before the dais of Christ! I prefer that my Lord deal with him *now*, so that he will not need to suffer loss for this grave ungodliness in that day.

In the United States it is both unlawful and immoral to publish a malicious falsehood, and it is classed as criminal libel. To show that he intended to create a false impression concerning the version when saying that the author *confines* himself to four manuscripts in the preparation of his text, he complements this by saying elsewhere, "The author rejects all the existing Greek texts." Again he says "he limits himself to four manuscripts." The fact that my copy, which (God

LOIZEAUX BROTHERS

BIBLE TRUTH DEPOT

19 WEST 21st STREET
NEW YORK, N. Y.

GRamercy 5-3952

S. Agents for: PICKERING & INGLIS, Glasgow, Scotland • OLIPHANTS, Ltd., London, Eng. • HENRY COLEMAN & Co., Ltd., London, Eng.

Publishers and Importers of Christian Literature

Mr A. E. Knoch,

August 26, 1942

Dear Sir:-

I am returning herewith the pages sent me with a copy of your letter to Dr. Thiessen.

Your letter has led me to read again Dr Thiessen's pamphlet and confirms me in the opinion that he has rendered a valuable service in exposing your false and shameful handling of the Sacred Scriptures. The old members of the firm to which you refer would have repudiated with horror your work and would have welcomed the honor of exposing it by publishing such a book as Dr Thiessen has written. To call this a libel and to infer that you might drag the author before a court, as you do, only shows that it has hit the mark and I can only hope that it may lead you to repentance for in my judgment what you have done puts you in the category of Second Peter 3:16 (last part).

Yours sincerely


P. D. Loizeaux

be thanked) I still have, consists of the Resultant Greek text, which combines the Editors which I am supposed to "reject," and that I even had the variants of the dissenting editors before me when I prepared the text, shows that his statement could hardly be further from the truth. His mention of my qualifications, or lack of them, is only an evasion. In these passages he deliberately states what is not only UNTRUE, but does it with malice aforethought, in order to defame me and my work, and deceive his friends, who doubtless consider him incapable of such a deed. If, in this defense, I tell factual lies about him, I hope to be given grace to confess them publicly. To avoid this, I will send him a copy before I publish this article.

It was so long before an answer to my article was received that I had given it up. The accompanying is a photographic reprint of his reply. I had sent him my working copy of John 1:35 to 49. In the lower margin are the readings of Ti (Tischendorf), WH (Westcott and Hort), B (Bale edition), Ln (Lachman), A (Alford), and the Received Text. The super-linear of the Concordant Version records almost every one of these variants, and gives the *manuscript evidence* of A, B and s for them. The fact that I seldom agreed with the

Wheaton, Ill., Sept. 24, 1942.

Dear Mr. Knoch:

Enclosed I am returning the pages of copy you sent me. They have absolutely no value in proving that your "Version" is worthy of recognition, for it is not mere work that counts, but the kind of work that is trustworthy.

I have debated a long time whether or not to reply to your letter of Aug. 20th, for I know how people that hold your views persist in forcing their beliefs upon others. But I have finally decided to say this much:

You accuse me of "moral lapse"; but since when has the right to review another man's book been abrogated in these United States? And since when has it become unlawful or immoral to point out the qualifications or lack of qualifications of an author in the review? You try to intimidate me, but you do not have a leg to stand upon. You yourself say in the "Version" that "if it is false it should be condemned unspairingly" (p. 33).

I am one of a great many who thinks that it is positively false. You yourself would probably at one time have opposed the main teachings which it sponsors as distinguished from the usually accepted orthodox doctrines. However that may be, as one who took his Ph.D. in the Greek New Testament, who has taught the Greek Testament for many years, going repeatedly through every book in the Greek Testament in class, who has read the Greek Testament through consecutively nineteen times, apart from the study of it in class, I know that your "grammar" in its original aspects is fantastic; your translations of the Greek idiom are in many cases absurd and false; your theory that each Greek word has always the same meaning is ridiculous (your own violations of this rule help to prove this); and your denunciation of scholarship in textual and grammatical study is pure hypocrisy. You merely denounce others to set yourself up as an authority, with this fatal disadvantage that you have no fundamental scholar on your side of the argument. This, in spite of the fact, that you try to convert fundamental believers to your views. Your feigned jealousy for the exact original text, as indicated in your reproduction of the uncial form of the Greek letters, is a good psychological stunt to catch those ignorant of the Greek language, but has absolutely no value in determining the intent of the Holy Spirit, whom you dishonor.

Don't talk to me about "moral lapse" until you confess your own sins! You may have the eternal damnation of many a soul misled through your work to answer for! You do not need "proof" that you are wrong, - you would only meet it with new evasions and justifications of your views, - you need the humility of submission to the Word of God! Can you go on appealing to the ignorance of the people and their love for the exact meaning of the original, and giving them a scorpion for an egg, a poisonous concoction of your unbiblical doctrines, and expect to escape the judgment of God? You are either merely deceived and cannot see the truth, or you are a deliberate deceiver who lacks common honesty.

I trust that you may yet repent of your sins and retract all that you have done in this "Version," but, I confess, I do not have much hope that you will. It seems all too clear that the "Version" was prepared to propagate the peculiar views that you hold. You want us to keep still who believe that you teach damaging error, but you demand unhindered freedom to propagate your errors. As man, is this even fair? Your cry of persecution will sound plausible to those who accept your views; the rest will continue to ask that a strong voice be raised against you. May God in His mercy still deliver you from the error of your way.

You are not allowed to quote or publish this letter unless you quote publish it in its entirety.

Sincerely yours,

H.C. Shuman

30 Only the CONCORDANT VERSION gives the

small minority of the editors in the margin shows that I *did* agree with the majority in the text. This evidence (like that reproduced elsewhere) proves beyond all contradiction that it is NOT TRUE that "the author confines himself to four manuscripts in the preparation of its text" (fourth and fifth line of page 6 of this criticism). If he is so utterly callous in regard to facts as simple as this, there is little hope of anyone but God reaching his conscience. May He be gracious to him!

The charge that "readers unfamiliar with the Greek language are left at the mercy of the 'translation,'" would be true if the negative *not* had been inserted. How many other versions supply their readers with the Greek text on which they are based? What other version gives a uniform sub-linear, in which each Greek word or element has an exclusive standard? What other adheres to such necessarily impersonal renderings wherever possible in its idiomatic version? The charge is a boomerang. Almost all *other* versions may be open to this charge, but *not* the Concordant! The further charge that "since there is a Pocket Edition containing only the translation, the ordinary reader has no recourse whatever to the original" only makes matters worse. This is the cry of the thief: "Stop thief!" The Pocket Edition (now out of print) is based on the Concordant Greek text, which is available to all. But neither the Authorized nor the Revised Versions are based on any Greek text, so that even scholars must guess at that which is presumed to underlie them! The new international edition will have more than a hundred thousand marks right in the English, to tell the ordinary reader what is in the Greek. Is there any other to compare with it?

What version *does* give the ordinary reader access to the original? Does the Authorized Version? The Revised? These do not follow any of the texts deemed so essential by this critic. Their compilers never formulated their own texts, but followed their own sweet will, so that their readers actually are "left to [at is not English] the mercy of the translators [the translation has no mercy]." *All* of their editions are like our dangerous Pocket Edition [now out of print]! Nay, they are far worse, for there is no Greek text nor superlinear, to show the source of their evidence, for scholars, nor any sublinear for ordinary readers. ["The readers" is not English. It should be "*these* readers," or *the reader*.] The translators of our popular versions were far more accomplished criminals than the compiler of the Concordant Version, if tried by the laws of our critics!

Few readers of our accepted versions know aught of the relation of these works to the original. Unless they have such books as Wigram's concordances, or even Young's or Strong's, they actually are "at the mercy of the translation."

If, however, these translators had published their Greek text, showing just what manuscripts they followed in each case, and had made public their vocabulary, together with a concordance giving the occurrences, so that each rendering could be verified and tested, if they had done this with the grammar also, with grammatical tables, segregating all of the occurrences accordingly, *who would dare to say that they had left their readers at the mercy of their translation?* It would be a criminal libel of the most outrageous and deceptive sort, punishable by both fine and imprisonment, or, perhaps, the stake. Yet, alas, if a lowly, obscure, despised slave of Christ does all this, he should be charged with the crimes of others, though *he alone is not guilty!*

Has this dear brother no *real* friends? If the reader is one, or even if he is a fundamentalist, or connected in any way with the organizations or the school to which this critic belongs, we implore him to plead with the professor not to spoil his escutcheon with this bar sinister. Do not let him evade the point by side-stepping the issue. The pages of copy were not sent to him to prove that the version is worthy of recognition, nor to show the quantity or quality of the work done. They were sent to prove that his statements of fact concerning it are UNTRUE. If I had made them, I would not hesitate to acknowledge that they are malicious lies. Plead with him to acknowledge *this*, and to take steps to correct it, and repair the damage he has done. Otherwise he will only earn the contempt of honest men and suffer loss in *that* day. I wish to be most gracious in such matters. I am ready to forgive and forget, to show him the love of Christ. If you are a real friend, plead with him to put a stop to his proven falsehoods by recalling his booklet and publishing broadcast his recantation.

The false assertion that we confined ourselves to four manuscripts in preparing the Concordant Greek text is not the only case of this kind. It is only a sample. To show this we call attention to another, equally glaring. The two most important terms in the version are *eon* and *eonian*, which stand for the Greek *aiōn* and *aiōnion*. This is in full accord with the principle of consistency which underlies it. These are used uniformly and exactly throughout. The noun and adjective agree. Why, then, "carefully" mislead the saints by saying that *aiōn* is rendered as "age" (page 16, line 12)? I have asked quite a few who use the version. No one has ever seen such a rendering. I have a concordance of this word as it appears in my version. It is never "age." As many are acquainted with the term "age," and I use *eon* to replace it, I often connect the two in my writings, but I never use *age* in the version. I certainly would not put my name on a "careful" criticism with such a palpable misstatement. He says that the work has 800 pages. But it has over 2000 pages!

PITIFUL PERSONALITIES

The bankruptcy of a theological cause is most clearly evidenced when it descends from the impersonal realm of fact and evidence to attack the person of one who differs by the use of depreciation, detraction, reflection, insinuation, sarcasm, sneer, and reviling. The latter, in the literal Greek, is "say-spearing," stabbing another with a word. With such a one we are not even to eat (1 Cor. 5:11-12). Such shall not be enjoying the allotment of God's kingdom (1 Cor. 6:10). It is the last resort of the desperate, the final effort of the defeated. No just cause needs such a defense. The truth spurns it. Love deplores it. Grace alone bears with it and forgives it. Even if it could be settled beyond a doubt that I am the most ignorant and ignoble of all God's creatures, *that* would not discredit a single letter in the Concordant Greek Text, or the shortest element in the sublinear, or the most insignificant word in the Version. They do not rest on my acknowledged depravity, but on the *evidence* I furnish—which *other versions do not supply*. This evidence is not dependent on my ability, character, or morals.

The apostle Paul was driven to foolish boasting by his detractors. He did it for their sakes. So will I do it this time, but I hope I will never be compelled to do such a silly thing again. As it is a question of learning quickly, I will confine myself to that side of my life. As the son of a janitor, I had to help sweep the rooms after school, and dust them in the morning, and clean the yards on Saturdays. Even then I managed to find time to read through a small library in the school. I already had years of such spare-time toil behind me when, at the age of ten, we emigrated to California, where I worked only on school holidays in the printing office. It is true that I did do some work after school out of doors but that we will not count. As my folks were poor, and the prospect of getting any more schooling was very slim, I completed my last *two* years in the grammar school at West Vernon in *half* a year, standing at the head of two classes. However, I did manage to attend high school, but I had to earn my tuition, for we lived outside the city, and county pupils had to pay for their schooling. I worked Saturdays and during vacation. Nevertheless, I stood at the head of my section of the class at graduation. I did these things not because I was superior, but because I was desperately eager to get an education, and everything seemed to be against me.

SPARE TIME

When we remember that the author prepared this volume while maintaining a printing establishment, and, as another reviewer points out, with the help of a retired lady-doctor, "a beloved assistant," besides "two painstaking assistants," his own wife, and a son (*Bible League Quarterly*, p. 59, April-June, 1932), and without any technical training in the Greek language, the above claims for the

Version become truly stupendous! Professor Thomas C. Innes, M.A., of Cambridge University, remarks: "On the question of literary competence, if sparetime study is sufficient to equip this man for so gigantic a task as is said to be accomplished in this volume, are we not entitled to ask, either, What does American spare-time amount to? or, What manner of man is this?" He adds: "To anyone acquainted with the rapid and revolutionary progress of New Testament Research in the last fifty years this claim is astounding!" (*ib.*).

Millions of students in America and other countries are studying in spare time, and some of them are learning far more than any college course can teach in a few years to the average inmate. Many of these are earnest, mature, self-sacrificing students, whose heart is in their work, and who wish to make practical use of what they learn. God pity the arrogant alumnus who sneers at them! *Much more can be done in American spare time during the course of a decade than can be crowded into a college or university course of three or four years, with all its athletic and social obligations.*

In America many men who have accomplished much in original research have lacked a formal education. Indeed, the question whether it helps or hinders is a subject of debate. Wherever tradition still reigns, especially in theology, many keen minds are convinced that a "cemetery" (as some facetiously call a seminary) is almost an insuperable barrier to progress in many cases. Thousands of young men have buried their faith in these institutions. Only men of exceptional ability are able to overcome the handicap to any perceptible degree. Many a time I have thanked God that I did not study Greek in the public school to which I went. I did not take the classical course, or even the literary, but the scientific, for I knew that I would have to make my own way in the world.

Even before He called me by His grace, God gave me a stubborn, skeptical mind, which got me into trouble by its refusal to swallow everything whole. In physics, for instance, the text book asserted that light always goes in a straight line, although it consisted of vibrations, like sound. I could understand that it *appeared* to do this because of its speed, but the theory, that it, like sound, consisted of vibrations, seemed to contradict the statement we were supposed to believe. I foolishly brought it up in class and was referred to the text book. When I tried to explain, saying that it had not been proven, I was asked, "Can you prove that grass is green?" I saw that I was up against superior scholarship, so apologized. This made a profound impression on my attitude toward all book learning, which time has confirmed. No one today would insist that light always travels in a straight line. In fact, the latest fad insists that it doesn't. Schools are still teaching much that makes mimics of men. In theology, especially, even fundamental institutions teach the traditions

of men in place of the revelation of God to a degree that is appalling. This booklet is sufficient proof, for it appeals throughout to the opinions of men, seldom to the Word of the living God.

I learned Greek in this way: Griesbach's Greek text with lexicon was in my coat pocket at all times, and many were the opportunities for referring to it. In fact I had to stop using it on the street cars (trams), to and from work, because it affected my eyesight. Much was accomplished in the early morning, between five and six o'clock, but even more time was found in the evening after seven. For years I conducted a Bible reading in a neighbor's home, but the load became so heavy that I had to give it up. My duties as superintendent of a printing plant, which at one time employed as many as forty people, also became more than I could manage. By three o'clock in the afternoon I was worn out. So I determined to demote myself and take more mechanical work in the same establishment. This brought down the scorn and derision of some of my fellow workers, who deemed me "cracked." They thought that no man in his senses would deliberately take lower pay and a subordinate position in the same shop where he had been boss. Where was my pride? Finally I lost my position when the plant was sold into the hands of men who despised my "religion," and I rejoiced that now all my time was "spare time." Thus it has been for many years.

My formal study of Greek pursued the usual lines at first. After attending a class in the Los Angeles' Bible Institute, I bought a number of school text books and devoured them. Then I began to publish a series of Greek lessons for my friends and taught what was said to be the largest Greek class ever held in the Y. M. C. A. up to that time. But when I came to the verb, I dropped both lines of teaching. I could not conscientiously teach what seemed to be wrong, and I could not set it right without time for investigation. Then, for a year or two, I worked on the verb. I made a card index of every form, sorted them according to their grammatical elements, and studied the significance of each. Finally I set English STANDARDS for each element. This cleared up my difficulties, but it brought me into conflict with traditional teaching, and utterly destroyed the commercial value of my lessons. No money could be made by it. A young man came to me, saying that he would like to learn Greek according to my findings, as he wished to earn his living by teaching Greek in colleges. In order to test him, I told him that my findings would be an obstacle to his ambition. Alas, he put living first, instead of dying.

I was foolish enough to gather this good-size class in Greek before I had thoroughly tested my own knowledge of the verb. My conscience would not allow me to continue when I was

convinced that the text books were unsatisfactory on some points. *Then it was that I ceased to be a scholar* and became a drudge. God gives to the drudges (2 Co. 9:9). For some years, with the help of friends, I made a card index of every single Greek word in the Sacred Scriptures, with all their variations, and segregated these strictly according to their form, in order to be able to study *the facts themselves, scientifically*. I have this index yet, if anyone wishes to verify my story. The results are published in the complete edition of the Concordant Version.

Which is the better way to get a real grasp of the Greek verb—memorize the traditions of men, or laboriously, patiently, build up an apparatus for its investigation on truly scientific lines, segregated according to the actual forms, and then test every occurrence? As *scholê* means *leisure*, this method is not "*scholarship*," for it demands *work*. It is a tedious, toilsome, trying task.

When I came to publish my Greek text, I found that my working days were not over. There was not nearly enough money to have the printing of the version done in the usual way. The factory refused to make the matrices for the Greek type, so I toiled and sweated over these. The printers wanted twenty-five dollars for the composition of a single page of Greek, with super- and sublinear. That would come to nearly twenty thousand dollars for this part alone. So I started to set it myself, by hand. But it proved too much, so I hired an old-time compositor to do part of the work. Yet I set every line of the superlinear and made up every page, doing all the correcting. I figure that we saved more than ten thousand dollars in this way. So, even after I stopped working for others, I had to do much of my studying in spare time. I found my new boss a hard taskmaster, until the work was completed. When the last edition was put through the press, I had worked so hard before, in preparing the concordance for printing, that I was unable to work more than half a day at a time, and felt so utterly spent that I considered my end had come. Not till then did I take a long rest, making a trip to Palestine, to check my work on the ground.

It is news to me that I was ever guilty of "maintaining a printing establishment." On the contrary, I made up my mind to keep out of business, as this would distract from my real work. With the exception of one job which I did in a friend's establishment, I worked for wages or a salary, not for myself. Only when it became necessary to do the composition of the version and such work, did I buy my own material, thus saving the work many thousands of dollars. But that was not in my *spare* time. That was after I gave *all* my time to the work.

I have examined the "revolutionary progress" which is being made in "New Testament Research" by scholars in the last fifty years. The reason that it is so "rapid" is that it is

down hill. The greater part of it is destructive and deadly. My spiritual instinct is enough to keep me at a distance from it. The smell of it nauseates me. On the other hand I have been in close touch with those movements which have recovered much evidence, such as Deissmann's studies in the *Koiné*, and those which have advanced in the correct cutting or partitioning of the Word of truth. Many of my friends have made tremendous advances in the knowledge of God.

"AN UTTERLY LAZY MAN"

This admission should be noted, although we do not consider the "sublinear" any solution to the problem. Many words in the English language have more than one meaning. Thus we speak of a library table, a multiplication table, a time table, a table of contents, of setting a good table, etc. Webster's *New International Dictionary* gives seventeen meanings for the noun "man," and ten for the verb "man." It is ridiculous to think that the same word always meant the same thing in the Greek language. Weymouth says in the Introduction to his translation of the New Testament: "An utterly ignorant or utterly lazy man, if possessed of a little ingenuity, can, with the help of a dictionary and grammar give a word-for-word rendering, whether intelligible or not, and print 'Translation' on his title-page" (p. 10). And again: "Obviously any *literal translation* cannot but carry idioms of the earlier language into the later, where they will *probably not be understood* . . . and a *literal rendering* into English cannot but *partly veil*, and in some degree *distort*, even if it does not *totally obscure* . . . it follows that the reader who is bent upon getting a *literal rendering* . . . should always be on his guard against its strong *tendency to mislead*" (p. 11, *op. cit.*). We shall show the wisdom of these words from the Concordant Version.

I have just told a neighbor, who was once in my Greek class, that it has been intimated that I must be an "utterly lazy man," despite the fact that I could find so little time to have fellowship with him. He laughed and said, "Send 'em to me! I'll tell them whether you're a lazy man or not!" I am so busy that I write such things as this in the wakeful hours of the night. It is now sixteen minutes past four A. M. Besides the daily duties that I cannot evade, I must read proof and check the proof reading of five or six assistants who are working on the new international edition of the version. I also insert the corrections, and the corrections of the corrections, and the corrections of the corrections of the corrections in the type, and "make up" the pages. Some of the twenty-five thousand or so typographical corrections demand special work, and some I correct in the type myself, by hand, to save expense. True, I cannot work as long as I once could, but I keep going until I am exhausted almost every day. Yet I have arrived at an age when it is not considered a disgrace to be "utterly lazy."

When I was superintendent of the manufacturing department of a printing plant I "broke in" new "hands." The usual way was to commence as the "devil" and learn the business the dirty and drudging way. This made good workmen as a rule. But they began to teach printing in the schools

later on, so I tried one of these "scholars." Never again! The young fellow had learned so much impracticable theory, and it had made him so superior to his fellows, that he was a liability, and was dismissed. I understand that they are much more practical now. A printing plant must produce *results* to exist. I fear if this test were applied to other branches of learning, our colleges would have to shut up shop. Theory is good; so is knowledge (if it is good!); but a ton of it is not as productive as an ounce of practice. Knowledge inflates; work flattens. One makes you marvel at how much you know: the other makes you amazed at your ignorance. My experience compels me to discount all second-hand scholarship.

I work when I sleep! That sounds too silly to seriously consider, yet it is the secret of many of my discoveries. In the evening I am usually too tired to do any original thinking, so I only gather the material together in my mind, and make no effort to arrange it or think it through. But, in the morning, a miracle seems to have taken place. It is all arranged in order, and the answer to the problem is plain. While we sleep and are unconscious, life does not cease. The heart, the lungs, the digestive and other organs function as before. And, strange as it may seem, the mind functions better than when we are conscious, perhaps because we are not distracted and do not interfere with its normal operation. At any rate, I have found this of great value, and feel especially pleased with it, because I really should not claim any credit, for, as we say, "it comes to me." Indeed, all that we have which is really worth while is graciously granted to us by God. I have taken special pleasure in His assurance that He gives to the *drudges* (2 Cor. 9:9). My progress has been by means of Daily Drudgery. That is the only claim I have to the degree of D. D.

We make tools such as card indexes, concordances, loose leaf books, especially for our work. A properly equipped manufacturing plant can accomplish ten times as much as one without such advantages, and do better work. A lame man can get ten times as far in an automobile as an athlete on foot. He doesn't take any credit to himself for doing it. Neither do we, although we have made much of our apparatus ourselves, even as I helped build the first motor truck on the Pacific coast for my own use. Indeed, it would be a disgrace if we did not make exceptional progress with such helps. Samples of the actual apparatus used will be available when our portfolios are ready. Transparent pockets will contain a specimen of each kind of apparatus used. The process of producing the Concordant Version will be shown by samples of the actual tools used during its compilation.

I have many assistants. I do only a fraction of the drudgery myself. Indeed, it has come to the point where I avoid

doing anything that can be done by another. And often it can be done better by someone else than I could do it. Right now I have seven assistants reading proof on a new edition of the version. One reads by copy. Another compares the proof with the sublinear. A third checks the verse numbers, the references, the figures of speech, and the grammatical signs. A fourth takes the other signs. A fifth sees that the emphasis is properly marked. A sixth looks after the words not in the Greek. A seventh reads from the outsider's viewpoint. There may be an eighth to see that the wording and punctuation is clear. I read by copy, see that the lines to be corrected are again marked for emphasis and light-face type, (this involves at least 100,000 operations), examine the work of all the others, investigate suggestions for improvement, and help with the mechanical work, to reduce the cost. Most of my helpers are specialists, engaged on only one or more details. Why shouldn't we be able to accomplish more than one man by himself? Of course I must see that my magazines also appear on time. I pay very little attention to the Swiss magazine.

In order to test my version I had a complete concordance typewritten, in which every form of every word is segregated, so that I could check my renderings for future editions. Everyone who sees this work, and considers the magnitude of the task, is convinced that my *assistants*, at any rate, were not lazy. Those who see the Hebrew text with its sublinear are astonished at the tremendous labor involved. And it was no small job to go over the concordance and check each rendering by its remote contexts. What other version has gone to this length? Concordances of the Authorized Version have been made, but they expose its inconsistencies, though few scholars dare to point them out. *I made mine in order to expose my errors and to improve wherever possible*, even, though I knew that those who did not possess this tool would misunderstand my efforts and belittle the results.

But the "utterly lazy" man to whom reference is made, as I understand it, pays no attention to the idioms of language. So I will need to give facts on that subject. I have spent months of my main time on the idiom of the Greek article alone, classifying the various usages. This has been published. A long period was principally devoted to the investigation of every occurrence of the genitive and dative cases also, and their consistent rendering into English. I marked almost all occurrences in my own concordance and made a card index of the idiomatic usages, which I have in my possession. I also checked and revised the middle voice and the complete state ("perfect tense"). These have been improved a little in the international edition, as a result of these studies. In its introduction I discuss idiom at greater length than anything else, and more comprehensively than any other version I have come across. I could have translated the whole work with

less effort (by Weymouth's lazy man's method) than I have devoted to English idiom alone. And I have investigated the idiom in another language as well, in order to safeguard the English version. May God forgive me for this boasting! Although it seems necessary, I am ashamed of it. Those who understand the Version do not need it. I pray that God will use it to help those who are prejudiced against it, and muzzle the mouths of those who ignorantly or maliciously attack it. In the pages that follow I would like to avoid further reference to my drudgery, but, as the personalities are scattered throughout the criticism being criticised, this will not always be possible. If the reader is disgusted with this chapter he may rest assured that the worst is over. We will try to confine ourselves to the subject and forget the abject instrument that God has used to work His will.

THE CONCORDANT GREEK TEXT

It was an accepted canon before the days of Galileo that, the heavier the weight, the faster it will fall. But that did not make it so. A single experiment exploded the canon. I wonder if any professor has ever put *conflation* to the test? I have spent a large part of my life doing practically the same work as the scribes, and I have had many men under me doing this very work. Just now I am correcting proofs on a new edition of the version. Of about 25,000 typographical errors, there were probably a hundred times as many omissions as additions. Would not such a wealth of experience give me the right to my own opinion? I am not convinced by what the theorists say, when I am daily confronted with facts that prove the opposite. All my assistants, likewise, consider the theory absurd. Can I not be forgiven if I lose faith in "canons of criticism" which have a show of wisdom, but which utterly fail in actual experience? I have carefully considered the arguments of a number of scholars whose theory is that the transcribers of the text were inclined to add to it from outside sources. There are some scholars, however, who do not subscribe to this. There is one fact that seems to have escaped them all. There are two classes of manuscripts, those written by private persons and those made by professional scribes. The former think of what they are writing and may give their copy a turn to suit their ideas, even though they do not mean to do so. Those that I have examined were very inferior, especially as to spelling. But the public texts, such as are used by us, were written by men whose *business* was to *copy*, not by theologians who were interested in the sense. Their errors are mechanical rather than intentional. Prolonged acquaintance with their work, especially during the compilation of the Concordant text, has confirmed this. The public letter writers of the East are in another class. They must furnish many of the ideas and the embellishments, not

merely copy what is already written. I have received letters from them. They first told me that I was "well-born"! I know that one cannot be too careful in the choice of parents, but I was not aware that I had done so. The copyists were very different. My neighbor, who copies legal documents, assures me that he agrees with my position. He would not think of adding to them, but it is impossible to avoid an omission once in a while.

I make no claim to special scholarship along this line, but I do insist that, during half a century, I have had *practical experience* in copying manuscripts and in correcting copies made by others. This utterly contradicts the theory of the scholars. Others in my trade are also convinced that additions are rare, omissions (commonly called "outs") are frequent. Possibly the additions in modern practice are not more than one per cent. No one with my experience can accept a theory of scholars which is so contrary to the very trying impression which an "out" produces on a printer. If a single word, or even a letter, is omitted near the beginning of a paragraph, it may be necessary to reset all the rest of it. I have spent many hours during the last few weeks trying to make such adjustments as will obviate this. An addition, on the contrary, can easily be corrected, as a rule, by putting more space between the words, or, in this edition, by inserting a reference.

PREFERENCE FOR CORRECTIONS

In this case the critic practically admits that my principle is correct. Only in those comparatively rare cases where I *did not apply it*, he insists that I am wrong! All of the major readings, which involve a difference in doctrine, were given special study. They are discussed at length by scholars, such as Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener, who often disagree, and by critics such as Dean Burgon, who is sometimes disagreeable, so that I had a wealth of evidence, and could consider the arguments of both sides.

As already explained, I carried a copy of Griesbach's Greek text in my pocket for years, in a special leather binding of my own, so that I could refer to it whenever occasion arose, at meals, on the street car, as well as in my study. Later I bought other texts, several of Westcott and Hort's, and studied their critical notes. To avoid being one-sided, I bought Scrivener's Introduction. I discovered even at that early date that scholars disagree, and that the "assured results" of one school differed from those of another. Of making texts there seemed to be no end, for new ones continued to appear. Later Weymouth came out with his "Resultant Text," which combines the results of most of the scholars before him, for he unites them into one, and records their variations in the margin. This text became the basis of my studies for years.

Although the Concordant Greek text has been under con-

stant fire for more than a decade, I have not found it necessary to make as many changes as would fill a single line. In Europe, because it gives a record of every letter of the ancient manuscripts, and the accepted Greek does not, it was challenged. In disputed passages, we made tracings of the photographic copies, and, in every case, convinced its critics of its correctness. Westcott and Hort's text, on which I first intended to base my work, is now out of date. Rotherham used Tregelles' text first, then changed to another later. Were he living, he would probably change again to the latest "accepted" text. How thankful am I that I did not build upon the shifting sand of purely human judgment and conjecture! I give more than my text. I give sufficient evidence that each reader may use his *own* judgment, and form his *own* text, in case he thinks he is justified in doing so.

Little does the public realize how unsafe is popular acclaim. During the decade I was in Europe, Nestle's Greek text was the last court of appeal. Nestle was a great man, whose labors in this field probably exceeded those of any other scholar, yet he was treated like a hack. In making "his" text, he was given no liberty to exercise his judgment. He was compelled to combine Tischendorf with Westcott and Hort. When these disagree, then Weiss decides. Where all three disagree, one of the two nearest readings was to be chosen. Later it was compared with the Resultant text, like the Concordant Version. He had to comply with the rules laid down for him by his employers. He, himself, complained and insisted that the result was contrary to his own judgment. Counting noses does not settle Greek texts. Yet, because of his reputation, and because the edition was very handy and cheap, it soon displaced others, especially in the schools in which the next generation was being trained.

INTERNAL EVIDENCE ALONE

Once more we are in practical agreement, and the Concordant Version Greek text would have been commended by a critic who was not actuated by the basest of motives. Once more the criticism is founded on deliberate and malicious falsehood. I did exactly what he claims is correct. Having the readings of many editors before me, in most cases I deferred to *their judgment*, based on many manuscripts, the versions and the writings of early ecclesiastics, when they agreed and there was nothing in the manuscript to hinder. This took care of most of the readings. In no case did I ignore the judgment of an editor, even when I could not accept it. On the contrary, the *critic* ignores all but the "commonly accepted," or popular, school of criticism. This is fatal. Christ is not commonly "accepted" today. Shall we, therefore, reject Him? The best scholarship is not popular because Christendom is apostate. Shall we reject unpopular scholars? The

42 The CONCORDANT VERSION Greek Text is

spirit of truth demands that nothing be based on popular acceptance. The critic is on a false and fatal road. I *consider* what is "accepted," but that does not influence my decisions, though I know very well that allowing it to do so might fatten my pocket-book.

The *criticism* is not only unreliable, but false and malevolent. It is not only unsatisfactory, but detestable. In other spheres his misrepresentations would lead to a long jail sentence and a large fine. I submit this to the candid considerations of all concerned: *If it is necessary to utterly falsify the facts before condemning the Concordant Greek text, is not this the highest commendation it can get from a critic?* Thanks for his help! May he be used to introduce the version to many whose spirits will burn within them when they learn of his perfidy, and examine the work for themselves!

Elsewhere, the critic practically throws cold water on his own fiery accusations by insisting that "the present-day critical texts . . . differ but little"! The "whole residuary variation . . . can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text." In that case, why pick upon the Concordant Version for a mere peccadillo? It also differs but little. But other translators did not think these differences negligible. Weymouth, a criminal like ourselves, put much labor into a text of his own, and then, more depraved than ourselves, published his English Version without the Greek in all his editions in order to leave his readers "at the mercy of his translation"! Rotherham not only committed this crime, but changed the textual base of his work at the cost of much labor. First he followed Tregelles, a man, as our critic justly remarks, "whose jealousy for the verbal accuracy of the Scriptures cannot be called into question," who, moreover, "agrees in all essentials with the principles of Westcott and Hort." Then he, in his ignorance (?) changed over to Westcott and Hort. He, also, published editions without the Greek text (which he might have pirated) in order to deceive the ordinary reader! And so with other translators. I am pleased to have such companions in crime!

Absolutely no evidence is given to support the charge that "the author's *judgment based on internal evidence* determines in the case of differences in the readings." *This is not true*, and I, as the one who did the work, ought to know far better than a hostile critic in a matter so intimate. But I will not put my word against his. *I will produce evidence.* In 2 Cor. 6:11 my Greek text reads THE MOUTH OF-US HAS-UP-OPENED TOWARD YOU^p CORINTHIANS THE HEART-OF-YOUP HAS-BEEN-BROAD-ENED NOT YE-ARE-BEING CRAMP-SPACED IN US YET IN THE COM-PASSIONS OF-YOUP. The internal evidence seems so strong that OF-YOUP ([h]umōn) should be OF-US that, in my version, I print it as follows: your our, showing that the "our" is not in the Greek. which has "your." I am convinced that my Gr-ek

text is wrong, judged by internal evidence, *but I do not change it because I cannot find sufficient external evidence!* I am much more insistent on this point than Westcott and Hort, for they have no rule of precedence, except that "documentary attestation has been in most cases allowed to confer the place of honor as against internal evidence." (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, page 17) *I pass on this evidence to the reader, not only in my Greek text, but in my International Editions also.*

Westcott and Hort laid so much stress on one point that they printed it in small capitals: KNOWLEDGE OF DOCUMENTS SHOULD PRECEDE FINAL JUDGEMENT UPON READINGS. No one man can be thoroughly familiar with thousands of documents like those of the Greek text. A number of men can. Westcott and Hort were hindered by "engrossing occupations of other kinds," so had only their spare time to devote to such work. (This was, of course, not *American* spare time!) We may be sure that they did not personally examine all the sources of the evidence that they used. They depended upon others for this. Their judgment as to the worth of all these is recorded in their text, margin and notes on select readings. I had profited by their labors, and the actual collations of others before I began my text. I determined to become thoroughly familiar with the very best texts, so that I could form a correct judgment as to their value. No one who has seen what I have *done* with these can doubt my acquaintance with them. In compiling my own text I first entered above each line of the Resultant *every single letter* in Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus which differed from it. Later I studied these, comparing with this evidence that of the editors. I went further than anyone else, so far as I am aware, in my studies of the correctors of Sinaiticus, for one of them seemed to be an *editor*, rather than a mere corrector. If so, then the Concordant Version has profited by the work of an editor ever so much earlier and more reliable than any other edition of the Greek text yet produced!

MEAGER PREPARATION AND BOASTFUL CLAIMS

II. MEAGER PREPARATION AND BOASTFUL CLAIMS. A man who undertakes such a stupendous and superlatively important task as the preparation of a text of the Greek New Testament and the translation of it would presumably be a highly-educated man. Is that the case with the author of the Concordant Version?

We have already referred to his own statement that he studied New Testament Greek for a short time with Mr. Stiles in Los Angeles. According to his own testimony, this is all the training he has had in the Greek language except what he learned by private study. There is no sign that he is acquainted with the Greek language as a whole, nor that he thinks it important to have such a knowledge for his task. Indeed, the author claims that his work is not based on "the authority of scholars" (p. 7), but rather on

"a method of translation based on the denial of human ability to sound its depths or scale its heights" (*ib.*).

Now there is abroad today an exaggerated regard for "scholarship" in the field of Biblical interpretation. Multitudes of unlearned people bow unquestioningly to the "conclusions" of modern scholarship when the conclusions do not at all depend upon scholarship, but on the doctrinal presuppositions of the scholar. This fact we heartily deplore. But there are tasks, nevertheless, that require adequate educational preparation. When God wanted leaders for the most outstanding places in the Old Testament period. He chose Moses, a man learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and in the New Testament period He chose Paul, who had sat at the feet of the greatest teacher of his nation. It would seem that the selection of a Greek text and the translation of that text is one of the tasks for which a man should be adequately trained. How unfavorably this author compares in this respect with the twenty-four greatest scholars of Great Britain who prepared the English Revised New Testament, and with the scholarship that gave us the American Revised Version! A recent scholar says that the latter "embodies the ripest scholarship of Great Britain and America" (Price, *The Ancestry of Our English Bible*, pp. 289, 304).

In spite of these limitations the author sets out to make his own "standards for the Greek verb." For this purpose the "accepted grammars would not work" (p. 59). We shall show later that they evidently *did not* work to any large extent in the preparation of this volume. Not only so, but the lexicons also did not *work*, for the author very radically departs from the meanings of words in both classical and New Testament Greek in some instances. So confident is he of the importance of his work that he says, "If true, it should be welcomed with open arms and published in every periodical, our grammars should be corrected, and our versions revised" (p. 33). But since he also says that "if it is false, it should be condemned unsparingly," we have his permission (!) to examine it minutely. We may summarize this point by asking. What shall we think of a man who dares to set aside all the accumulated knowledge of Greek scholars, classical and New Testament alike, as to both grammar and lexicography, and presumes to be able to attain to assured results by his own independent study?

Notice the boastful claims concerning this work. We read: "The Concordant method places the work of translation on a permanent systematic and scientific basis" (p. 5). Again: "This plan gives the Scriptures to the people, and removes the necessity of relying on human learning or authority in matters of the gravest moment, where it is of supreme importance that they procure the counsel of God, unclouded by the creeds and traditions which corrupt the current texts" (*ib.*). And again: "That the English reader may rest assured and the student be satisfied that he is enjoying the pure word of God, precisely as He has been pleased to reveal it, the Concordant Version proposes to provide him with all the essential facts so that every point can easily be tested and the translation of any passage verified" (p. 7). And once again: "It redounds to the glory of God and conveys and displays the surpassing excellencies of His holy word as no other version has even assayed to do" (p. 60).

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

Our critic's main object is to expose the fundamental principles on which the Concordant Version rests. He not only does *this* here, but also exposes the fundamental principles on which *his criticism* is based. We found all upon the fact that God's Word is inspired and far beyond the capacity of any mortal (including ourselves) to fully comprehend. But our critic bases all on the fiction that scholars are fully com-

petent to understand God's revelation and are unanimous in their interpretation of it. *He would interpret and translate accordingly. We translate first and interpret accordingly.* He insists on human omniscience; we acknowledge human ignorance. He supports his position by the fetish of "authority," just as if almost all past authorities had not been superseded, and as if the present authorities did not disagree, and as if the popularity of "acceptance" of authorities makes them infallible, when God's purpose demands that the majority be opposed to Him and therefore wrong. We build upon the *evidence* supplied by God Himself in His Word.

There are quite a few versions made according to his plan. Almost all the "modern" versions are like that. I will not mention or refer to any in English, as that might give offense. There is one on the continent of Europe, made by a very learned man, recognized as far above a mere university professor, seeing that his large lexicon of the Greek is considered the very latest and best. I know, for I used it frequently. His version was very popular when I went over in 1931. Indeed, when I visited my sister, the first book she showed me was this new translation. I glanced at the first few verses of Ephesians and said: "This is not a translation at all!" Later, whenever I said this, people replied, "But it is so easy to understand!" For them, it *was*. Without bothering with his own lexicon, this man had simply restated everything in everyday language in line with the teaching and tradition of the church! No wonder they could understand and appreciate his work! It was inspired by the church and the scholars. Yet he seemed to be a sincere believer in Christ.

"The doctrinal presupposition of the scholar" would be a good summary of this whole criticism. Real learning is another matter. Those who are influenced by this criticism will not be moved by the actual knowledge displayed, but by the B.D., Ph.D., D.D., after the author's name, and by his reputation for orthodoxy, or the traditions of that part of the church to which they belong. As we will see later, his scholarship vanishes when confronted with simple facts. He turns the dative case into a genitive when his interpretation calls for it. I have persistently denied all title to "scholarship" because I do not wish to be reckoned with a class which, like those learned in the law in our Lord's day, refuse to enter the door of knowledge themselves and hinder those who wish to enter. The scholars of those days opposed Him and sneered at His disciples.

I do not pit my ignorance against the scholarship of the ages, but introduce a scientific *method* in place of chance. I make rules to regulate and guide my mental processes. I refused to deceive myself into thinking that I had "defined" five different words when I used only one word to do so. And I do not blind myself into accepting a "definition" of one

word by giving it a dozen English equivalents. Anyone who will use a real concordance like Wigram's, or even the "disconcordances" of Young and Strong, will see that our popular version is made by rule of thumb. The same word is rendered "pour out" and "fill" (*kerannumi* Rv.14:10, 18:6). The same word *loose* and *bind* (*rthq* Ecc.12:6, Nah.3:10). The same animal is a *dragon*, a *sea monster* and a *serpent* (*thnim*). Another is a *mole* and a *swan* (*thnshmt*)! Hundreds of words with five or more unnecessary English equivalents, each of which are used again for as many Greek or Hebrew words! Confusion confounded! I am merely doing a job of dirty housecleaning! I am merely clearing away the wire entanglements which impede our progress in the knowledge of God.

It takes no "scholarship" at all to see that the accepted grammars and lexicons are quite inadequate for the compilation of a consistent translation, which seeks to carry over into English all the distinctions of the original. It takes a grain of common sense and a good concordance. On a train in Denmark I had a talk with a professor of theology, and he assured me that each Greek word had at least twenty different meanings. I have seen words "defined" in continental lexicons by whole columns of equivalents, yet these same words were used elsewhere to "define" dozens of other words. Such definitions do not define. They make you dizzy. They do not distinguish between *meaning* and *usage* and *figures*. They are not nearly so good as Webster. The best of them does not draw a clear line between each Greek term such as is imperatively necessary in a concordant version.

THE REVISIONS

Far be it from me to disparage the work of the British and American revisers! On the contrary, I have not only used it myself and commended it to others, but, in an examination of a test passage (Ro.3:19-28—see our pamphlet, "Seventy and Seven") I have acknowledged that the American Revision has anticipated about half of the improvements in the Concordant rendering. Yet how many heart-aches have been caused by this monument to modern scholarship! Men like Dean Burgon, whose scholarship cannot be questioned, denounced them scathingly in his book entitled *The Revision Revised*. Today scholars acknowledge its practical failure, and are busy preparing new revisions. If anyone wishes to compare the Concordant Version with the Revision, he will get to the heart of the matter if he will test their attitude toward the inspiration of the Scriptures as expressed in 2 Tim.3:16. The Revisers question it by their discordant rendering, "Every scripture inspired by God is also profitable." Why should they go out of their way to translate this construction so absurdly different here from elsewhere? To be consistent they should have

rendered Heb. 4:13 "all things, naked, are also open." That would show that some things are not naked and open in the sight of God. Learned men make themselves ridiculous when they seek to destroy faith in the Word of God. The answer is that their *hearts* were not right with God. Their scholarship, like most of it today, was rotten at the core. Genuine believers feel this, hence have little heart for their work. I thank God that He has preserved me from this sad fate!

MOSES AND SAUL IN GOD'S SCHOOL

The examples chosen to show that educated men are needed by God are most unfortunate! Both Moses and Saul of Tarsus were sent to the back side of the desert in order to get their real education, and to rid themselves of the wisdom of the world and the traditions of religion. Did the training he received in Egypt fit Moses to deliver Jehovah's people from bondage? It equipped him to murder one of the Egyptians! It took forty years in the university of loneliness and isolation to sweat the pride out of him before he was fit to be God's man. Saul's scholarship taught him to reject Christ and murder His disciples. He was not put into God's service until he had spent three years in Arabia, in the school of God. Can it be that our critic has never been to this "finishing" school? He acts like Saul in this criticism, not like Paul, and he seems to commend the wisdom of Egypt, by which Jannes and Jambres *withstood* Moses after he became a man of God. How Darby and Grant would suffer to see one of their publishing houses, devoted to the dissemination of the truths they recovered, backslide and advocate the wisdom of Egypt and of the Jewish rabbis who crucified Christ; turn back to help in the murder of the reputation of a slave of God who, like themselves, will have none of this world's wisdom!

What is *real* scholarship? Does it consist in learning by rote the opinions of other scholars? That, alas, is the depth to which "scholarship" has sunk. In this criticism we are continually reminded that so-and-so (a great "authority") says this, and such-a-one ("an accepted scholar") says that. We do not dispute this. What of it? If this scholarship were a bit broader it could, in almost every case, quote still another scholar, equally authoritative, who insists that the reverse is true. A Fundamentalist says this, and a Modernist says that. And, as a matter of fact, even candid Fundamentalists acknowledge that the Modernist usually excels in scholarship. Pseudo-scholarship, more and more, is opposing the knowledge of God. My principle task, at present, is the restoration of the Hebrew text. If I were a "scholar" I would rip it all to pieces according to the "sources" and make a profound fool of myself. As it is, I know the Source Who inspired it, so I am constantly marveling at the literary excellence of His handiwork, instead of exposing its imaginary mistakes and pitiable patchwork. Not long since this very critic registered

his opinion that another scholar, who claims to be far above him in scholarship, was mistaken in an elementary question of Greek grammar. How dare he disagree with an older and more experienced scholar? Yet he gave conclusive evidence that he is right.

Scholarship is no longer the same thing as knowledge. It is only the camouflage. Had I spent a few years in my youth in a theological "cemetery" (as my friends miscall it), I would have been a scholar, and would probably have buried in it the dead body of my faith in God and His Word. As it is, I thank God that, when attending high school, I did not take the classical course which included Greek. I was a religious unbeliever then, so was not much interested in God's Word. Soon after, when I came to a knowledge of God, I wished, for a while, that I had taken Greek. But I thank God that He kept me from it. When I did attend classes, I soon saw how shallow the instruction was. Just memorize the textbook. The only real benefit I derived was learning to "sing" the endings of the verbs. I can hear the class yet:

ō, eis, ei, omen, ete ousi!

Subjunctive, *ō, ēs, ē; ō men, ête, ōsi!*

Future, *sō, sēs, sē, sōmen, sēte, sōsi!*

And so forth. This helped me to memorize where memory is almost indispensable.

UNIFORMITY AND CONSISTENCY

III. ERRONEOUS CONCEPTION OF UNIFORMITY IN THE TRANSLATION OF WORDS. We have considered the author's text and his boastful claims for his work. Let us examine the finished product and see how it commends itself to good common sense. We begin by noting his insistence that "wherever possible, each word in the original should be represented in translation by only one English word" (p. 8). This we would grant in a general way, but the author carries this principle to ridiculous lengths. Sometimes he makes it he says: "Every word in the original should have its own English appear as if that can and ought always to be done. For instance, equivalent" (p. 12). And: "With the slight exception of occasional idiomatic usages, each English word in the Concordant Version does exclusive duty for a single Greek word. Hence, a word absorbs no false nuances, no deceptive coloring from alien context, but stores up the evidence of each passage to enrich the thought in all the others" (*Lexicon and Concordance*, p. 4).

1. Admitted impossibility of always adhering to this principle. It is almost surprising to note, after such a statement of principle, that the author says: "There is one case where English usage demands as many as eight synonyms for a single Greek word" and concerning another instance: "English uses five specific terms where Greek is content with one" (p. 47). An examination of the Version shows that there are other words that have not always been rendered by the same English word. And concerning connectives he says: "As the Greek connectives cannot be consistently rendered into idiomatic English, the student should always consult the sublinear" (*Lexicon and Concordance*, p. 10).

Never have I made it appear that a uniform rendering *can* be used in a *version*. It *has* been done in the *sublinear*,

where it belongs. Both by word and example, I have insisted that what *should* be done *could not* be accomplished. There has been more criticism because I did *not* carry this to ridiculous lengths than from those who think I have. After misrepresenting our position, no wonder our critic is surprised to note that we distinctly state otherwise and even give extreme examples. Instead of acknowledging his false charges against us, and *his practical agreement with our procedure*, he viciously continues to drive home his attacks as if he had not disproved his own assertions. This he continues in his correspondence.

A Greek word may demand many English equivalents in a *version*, but this does not prove that it has many *meanings*. It may simply be a matter of *usage*. The Greek word BESIDE-CALL (*parakaleō*) will illustrate this. No single English word seems to serve for all of the occurrences. The Concordant Version uses *entreat* and *console*. In Mt. 18:29 the slave *entreated* (not *consoled*) saying, "Be patient with me, and I will pay you all." Certainly it does not "mean" *console* here! In 2 Co. 1:4, however, the God of pities and *consolation consoles* in every affliction. Here we could not use *entreat*. But, when we were commencing on the vocabulary of the German version, a Swiss brother called my attention to the word *zusprechen* (*to-speak*) as an equivalent for this word. We tested it and found that it covered every case where we use *both entreat and console*! If we "reason" from the English language, an Englishman can prove that this Greek word has two or three "meanings," but a Swiss would deduce the opposite, for his language has a single word whose *usage*, as well as sense, corresponds with the Greek.

Let us set forth the actual facts as to this word. The literal "meaning" of BESIDE-CALL is to *call* so as to be *beside* (Ac. 28:20). Paul sent out a call for the Jews in Rome to come to his room. Only this should be called its *meaning*. *Figurative usages* arise from this meaning. If we wish to entreat or console or speak with anyone we may call them to our side, hence this action is used to suggest what we say. In Switzerland the same kind of a figure is used, but there the action is *speaking*, not *calling*. In fact we use this in English also. We may say, "I will *speak* to him about his duty," when we mean that we will *entreat* him to *do* his duty. So we may conclude that the literal *meaning* is always CALL BESIDE, the figurative usage is always entreat-console (*Zusprechen*). The fact that it is used literally and figuratively does not prove that the Greek word has more than one *meaning*. The use of several English words by no means proves that the word has many meanings.

English dictionaries and Greek lexicons have the same fatal failings. They do not distinguish between the *meaning* and the *usage* of words. They do not segregate the *figurative*

from the *literal*. As a result, the definitions are sometimes so indefinite that their meaning is lost in a London fog. This may be true also of those who seek to derive the meaning from the contexts in a concordance, under the mistaken notion that this is the concordant method employed by us. A case came up recently. An earnest student, studying the word *dead*, found that, in one case, it was applied to the living. She who lives in pleasure is dead (1 Ti. 5:6). He came to the conclusion that death is a form of life! The metaphor mislead him. This passage is a *figure*. She is *like* the dead *in some respects*. is the *literal*. What would we think of a farmer who feeds his stock with human flesh because the Bible says that "all flesh is grass"? He would starve if he reasoned like a theologian.

In reasoning against the principle that each Greek word has a uniform meaning we are told:

Many words in the English language have more than one meaning. Thus, we speak of a library table, a multiplication table, a table of contents, of setting a good table, etc.

May we suggest that this reasoning is utterly irrational? What is true in the English language is *not* necessarily true in the Greek, for these differ greatly, especially in their vocabulary. We call it the "English" language, but, in fact, it is composed, not only of words used by the Angles, but also by the Latins, the Greeks, the Normans, the Scandinavians, and some others.

The various *usages* of the word *table* which are given are all bound together by the literal sense of a raised flat surface. This is common to them all. By the figure of association, (synechdoche) we use this meaning for all and depend on the context to determine what kind of table is meant. When the word stands alone it has only one meaning, a flat surface properly supported. This also is a faded figure, for legs are not an essential part of a table. Some have none. Leave out the words *library*, *multiplication*, *time*, *contents*, *setting*, and the word itself reverts to its common usage.

If the Greek word *table* has so many meanings, why does the Authorized Version use only three English words to express them? They translate *trapeza* (FOUR-FOOTER) by *table*, *bank*, and *meat*. The Concordant Version uses only *table* and *bank*. Should we use *meat*? The Authorized Version used this only once, in Acts 16:34, where the Philippian jailor is said to set *meat* before Paul and Silas. Now, when the Authorized Version was translated (or rather revised), the word *meat* meant any kind of *food*. They used *meat* to translate *brōma*, *brōsimos*, FOOD; *brōsis*, FEEDING; *prosphagion*, TOWARD-EATING, viand; *trophē*, NURTURE; *phagō*, EAT; as well as *trapeza*, TABLE. They translated *kreas*, which means the carcass of animals slaughtered for food, by *flesh*, the same as *sarx*, the tissue of animal bodies. We distinguish between all these as the Greek does and do not use *meat* for food and drink as figured by the word *table*.

Table does not mean "meat," but it may figure the food and drink which is set upon it. I also had a "table" set before me in Greece. I did not eat the table, as I did not know at that time that a table was meat! I am not even sure that there was meat on the table. But there was food and drink. I cannot recall a meal there without the musty wine which tasted as if it had been flavored richly with cobwebs. I had to swallow it, as the water was dangerous. If the jailor set *meat* before Paul and Silas, to the exclusion of other food (which I doubt), then the record would certainly have used *kreas*, the word for meat. Paul used it when he meant flesh sold by the butcher, which had been offered to idols (Ro. 14:21, 1 Co. 8:13). So do we, despite the vilifications of a decadent scholarship.

"Man" has not seventeen meanings in Webster's dictionary. The meaning "devil" is merely a mistaken inference. The meaning "suitor" is obsolete. The meaning "anyone" is loose language. Almost all the rest are figurative usages, in which the figure actually depends on the noun retaining its literal meaning. "Mankind" uses a part for the whole, just as, when we use the word *sail* we mean the *ship* of which the sail is a part. But a sail does not mean a ship. One human does not mean *humanity*. It is the context which contributes the change in scope, not the word. So, the exhortation to a man to be a man does not change the meaning of man to manly, or we could say "be a *manly*." Expanded, we say, be *like* a man. So the so-called meanings, "person of consequence," "married man," "vassal," "adult male servant," all depend on the literal meaning to express a related idea by means of its setting. In a different way this is true of a chess "man," a "merchant-man" (his ship), and the obverse of a coin. Change the literal meaning of man and the proper sense goes with it. If the Greek word *anthrōpos* (a human), which occurs over five hundred times in the Greek text, has seventeen different meanings, the "translators" (they were only revisers, really) of the Authorized Version were very incompetent indeed, for they used only two, *certain* and *man*. Why, the Concordant Version is more than twice as scholarly, for it uses five words! These are *hman*, *mankind*, *humanity*, *hperson*, *hpeople*! How long would our critic hold his job if he insisted that the Authorized Version is ridiculous, made by "utterly ignorant and lazy men," or, to stick to the evidence, men more than twice as ridiculous, ignorant and lazy as the Concordant Version staff?

ABSURD CRITICISMS

2. Absurd renderings. First, we note some absurd renderings to which our author is driven. And while we consider these, we should remember that he is exercising some restraint, for fear that he will have too much opposition. He expresses the hope that in future editions it may be possible to render *human* instead of *man*,

commissioner instead of *apostle*, *miss* instead of *sin*, *stake* instead of *cross* (p. 54). But to note some actual renderings:

Our critic now gives examples of thirteen words which he considers "absurd," and mentions five others which he would have included if we had used them. This is most revealing. *He is utterly out of sympathy with the injunction to use a form of sound words* (2 Ti. 1:13), *and derides the necessity of distinguishing between things that differ*. There is sound and sufficient reason for each one of these exclusive renderings, and we shall show why we cannot alter them without very seriously lowering the accuracy and correctness of the version. His objections are all due to superficial, unscholarly prejudice. He deems that absurd which he cannot understand or is unable to appreciate. Those who have examined the version and used it, commend us for these very "absurdities." We anticipate this human failing by postponing some desirable changes until this absurd and lazy spirit should have had time to see its own silliness.

MAN DISTINCT FROM HUMAN

English, with its tremendous vocabulary, lacks a noun to express a *human being*. Instead of being ashamed of this serious and awkward deficiency, and seeking to remedy such a grave defect, we persecute anyone who even attempts to cure this eyesore. I am not seeking a martyr's crown by pressing minor improvements which may cause the rejection of far more important betterments, so I am trying to lead up to them gradually. In this case, I have distinguished the word *man* (a human being, not an animal or a spirit, including women and children as well as men) by putting a small, high *h* before *man*, in the latest edition, in order to suggest the word *human* (being). The word *man*, *not a woman or child*, is left without this mark. It is absurd to cling to one term to express both. Women are almost excluded from divine revelation in our popular versions if we hold *man* to its strict significance. Other languages, even cognate ones like Dutch, have two terms, as in the Greek. If it is absurd to clear up this confusion in our popular versions, then sound sense is insanity.

The choice of the word "man" to show that Greek words have many "meanings" is most unfortunate. I will use it to show the reverse. "Man," in English, *has* two "meanings," (1) an adult male of the human species and (2) a human being. But the Greeks have *two words* for these *two meanings*: (1) *anēr*, an adult male, (2) *anthrōpos*, a human being. English is defective here. Greek is not. I have found it necessary to put a small high *h* before *hman* when it stands for *anthrōpos* in my International Edition, to distinguish it from *anēr*. What English needs is another word for a human being, not an animal or a spirit. I have suggested and used *human*, and *humanity* or *mankind*, when it is used figuratively for

all. (I have just received another criticism by one who thinks I am doing wrong not to use *human* for man always, when it is *anthrōpos* in Greek. I can only plead guilty and hope that I will be allowed to do this after Goliath has been dealt with.)

APOSTLES ARE COMMISSIONERS

For years I was mistaken as to the meaning of the word *apostle*, and I argued that it denoted *one sent*, according to the leading scholars, so that anyone *sent* was an *apostle*. I was shaken in this idea when I analyzed sacred Greek into its elements, and found that it was *not* composed of the element SEND, but PUT. Then I found that the verb differs from mere sending in that it includes authority for the execution of a task, which we express best by our word *commission*. *Apostle* is a transliteration of the Greek *apostolos*. It has gathered many a theological barnacle of which we were well rid. But we can only prepare the ground for this improvement.

SIN DENOTES MISS

The word *sin* imparts a confused and erroneous idea to most minds. Very few can distinguish clearly between it and *evil*, *wrong*, *transgression*, *trespass* and *offense*, distinctions which are vital to an apprehension of God's revelation. Sin means *miss* the mark, *mistake*. In the Greek Scriptures the Authorized Version uses sin for two stems. Besides *hamartia* (miss or sin) and *hamartēma* (miss-effect, penalty of sin), it represents *paraptōma* (BESIDE-FALL, offense), which suggests quite a different thought and has a very special usage, corresponding to our word *offense*. In the Hebrew Scriptures the Authorized Version *sin* represents at least four distinct stems, *ashm* and *ashme* (GUILT), *oun* (DEPRAVITY), *phsho* (TRESPASS), as well as *chta*, Chaldee *chti* (MISS, sin). This is not only absurd, but a *sin*, for three of these words have closer English equivalents than *sin*, even though they are related to it in signification. We were taught that a good author always uses synonyms with nice discrimination. Surely the best of all Authors has done this, and His distinctions should not be ignored and despised.

THE "CROSS" WAS A STAKE

When I first discovered that the word *stauros* stood for a plain stake without a cross piece or any other fancy addition, I used *stake* in the version and submitted it to a friend who was somewhat in sympathy with my work. But this change so incensed him that I withdrew the rendering. He seemed to think that I was cutting out the great truth of the cross, although I was only clarifying and emphasizing it. The "cross," with its ornamental shapes, its artistic forms, especially when made of precious metal and adorned with gems, suggests the exact reverse of the shameful ignominious stake. To me the word is spoiled by association with false religion. It

is a symbol of apostasy, of pride, in place of a degrading and dreadful death which puts an end to the flesh and prepares us for the uttermost grace of Paul's epistles. But I bear with it, and point out the better rendering to those who have been initiated into the deep lesson of their own shameful end and their glorious place in Christ.

BOY

Matt. 12:18: "Lo, My Boy, Whom I prefer." Jesus is called "Boy" many times, as in Acts 3:26: "To you first God, raising His Boy, commissioned Him to bless you"; Acts 4:27: "For of a truth, in this city, were assembled against Thy holy Boy Jesus," etc.; Acts 4:30. The Greek word (*he, ho pais*) is either masculine or feminine. In Luke 8:51 the Concordant Version itself uses the word "girl."

One of the weaknesses of the English language and all its versions of the Scriptures, is the failure to distinguish between five different Greek stems, all of which are rendered by *child* occasionally in the Authorized Version. These are *brepheos*, *BABE*, *nēpios*, *YOUNG-sayer*, *minor*; *pais*, *paidion*, *paidarion* (from the stem *HIT*) *boy*, *girl* or *page*, *little boy* or *girl*, *lad*; *teknon* (from the stem *BRING-FORTH*), *offspring*, *child*; and [*h*]*uios*, *SON*. The most absurd, perhaps, are such phrases as "the children of Israel," yet who objects to it? The word *son* involves position, maturity and dignity, as distinct from *child*, and need never be confused with it. The word *minor*, as opposed to *mature*, can always be distinguished. The Authorized Version obscures this by rendering it *babe*, *child*, or *childish*. The word *babe* the Authorized Version unnecessarily renders *child*, *infant*, and *young child* as well. But it seems impossible to maintain the distinction between *child*, considered on *offspring*. and *boy*, *girl*, as old enough to be *disciplined* and to *serve*. The Authorized Version seeks to do this at times by using *servant* and *maid*, although these clearly suggest other Greek terms. They use *servant* for five other stems, *slave*, *attendant*, *domestic*, *boy*, and *deputy*. David is called a *servant* (Lu. 1:69, Ac. 4:25), but our Lord is called a *Son* once (Ac. 3:26) and a *child* twice (Ac. 4:27, 30). I was quite shocked to find that they referred to Him as a *child* when He stood before Herod and Pilate. I would never use the phrase "Thy holy *child* Jesus." It smacks of irreverence and sacerdotalism. Now that I am older I sympathize with the translators. In their day the word *child*, or *childe*, was used also as a kind of title for a youth of noble birth, as *Childe Harold*, *Childe Rowland*, so gave quite the opposite impression to that which I received.

But the Greek does not suggest either childishness or nobility, but was used of the centurion's *slave* (Lu. 7:2, 3, 7). To this day officers in some armies have body-servants who are called the equivalent of our *boy*, though they are mature men. I have met them in Europe and in Iraq. *Boy* is used for grown men frequently in English. A friend of mine is continually addressing a company of elderly people as "boy."

When I came to California in 1885, the Chinese house servants were all "boys" up to the day of their death. In China a "number one boy" has other "boys" under him to do all the housework. In Africa the negro laborers are all "boys." The word occurs frequently with precisely the same *usage* which it has in Greek. We know of no other which is nearly so good, and which, at the same time, has the other usages of the word in the Scriptures. If a better can be found we will gratefully accept it. Just what our critic intends by saying that it has the feminine form also, is very vague. Surely he does not wish us to translate "Thy holy *girl* Jesus"! Would that be less "absurd"? But what else can be meant by his comment?

In the complete edition I have the following note: (Acts 3:26) The term "Boy" is used here with all reverence, for want of a better. The difficulties encountered in its translation are apparent from the variety of renderings in the common versions, all of which are better fitted to some other Greek word. They use *child*, son, servant, young man, maid, etc. It is used of the boys under two years of age in Bethlehem (Mt. 2:16). It is used of Jesus when he was twelve years old (Lu. 2:43). It is quoted from Isaiah when he spoke of Him (Mt. 12:18). It is applied to Him four times in this book (3:13, 4:27-30). It is a word like our "boy" or "girl" which may be applied to a child or a young servant.

Does not this call for loving sympathy instead of caustic comment?

EMIT OR UTTER

Matt 13:35: "I shall be opening My mouth in parables, I shall be emitting what has been hid from the disruption." Thayer rejects the classical meaning of *ereugomai*, "to spit or spue out," and defines it as "to pour forth words, to speak out, utter."

The Septuagint uses *ereugō* for three Hebrew words, two of which are *not* confined to the emission of sound. It stands for EMIT (*nbo* Ps. 19:2 "day uttereth speech," which is also used in Pr. 1:23 for "pour out my spirit," and Pr. 15:28, "evil things," and in Ecc. 10:1 "ointment . . . sends forth a stinking savor"); for ROAR (*shag*); and for TEEM (*shrtz* Lv. 11:10 "all that move in the waters"). Here there is no suggestion of sound at all. The word *emit* or BELCH is used in the inspired text with the figurative force which it possesses in the Septuagint and elsewhere. It is a *sudden, forcible* utterance, an *eruption*. The word occurs only once.

Here is how this word should be criticised *constructively*: "Emit" is right so far as it goes, but it is not sufficiently violent and sudden, as is shown by its elements and usage in the Septuagint. Therefore it should be changed to *erupt* or the like, as it is in the German Concordant Version. Then I would have the pleasure of replying, A thousand thanks! I will be delighted to make the improvement. You will get your reward in that day!

For several years I bowed at Thayer's shrine, but I finally came to the conclusion that he was not inspired. He, in common with almost all scholars and lexicons, confuses the *meaning* of words with their *usage*, especially in figures of speech. This is a case in point. The *meaning* of *ereugō* is BELCH FORTH, without regard to that which is erupted. Literally it applies to food, vomit. But figuratively it may apply to anything which is violently ejected, even sound. The word *utter*, like *emit*, fails to cover the explosive character of the discharge. It intrudes into the realm of another Greek word, *phthe(n)igomai*, which is an exact equivalent of *utter*, as in 2 Pt. 2:16: "A voiceless yokebeast *uttering* with a human voice." See also verse 18: "*uttering* pompous vanities and Acts 4:18: "not to *utter* aught." It, not *ereugō*, is limited to the emission of sound.

CARAVANSARY OR DINING ROOM

Mark 14:14: "And wherever he should be entering, say to the householder that 'The Teacher is saying, 'Where is My caravan-sary, where I may be eating the passover with My disciples?'" The word *kataluma* means, on the one hand, "an inn, lodging-place"; on the other hand, "an eating-room, dining-room."

There is something incongruous in this passage in the usual rendering. First it is called a *guest chamber*, then a *large upper room*. By suggesting that it should read "eating room" here, the popular versions are also criticised. But the word literally means a DOWN-LOOSE (*kataluma*), the place where travelers loosed their gear in order to rest and refresh themselves, a *khan*, but quite different from an English inn or hostelry, with all its association with food and drink. It was probably used also of that part of a great house where guests were received. But the most important point is totally eclipsed in these versions. *Our Lord ended His career in the same sort of place outside of which He began it. He was homeless to the last.* He was born in a manger because there was no room (not in the "dining room!"—but) in the caravansary. Babies are not supposed to be born in a dining room. There is absolutely no necessity for giving this word two different meanings. Every caravansary would have a place to eat. In modern language, our Lord was born in a stable connected with a hotel. He ate his last supper in a hotel with a dining room, or in the guest room of a great house.

The word caravansary (*kataluma*) occurs only in connection with the entrance and exit of our Lord from this world (Mk. 14:14, Lu. 2:7. 22:11) in the inspired record. In the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures, it is loosely used to translate five different Hebrew terms. It stands for TENT (*auel*, 2 Sa. 7:6, once out of more than 400 occurrences), for LODGE (*lun*, Jer. 14:8, "tarry for a night"), and LODGING (*mlun*, "inn"), for ROOM (*lshke* 1 Sa. 9:22, "parlour"), for TABERNACLE (*mshkn*, 1 Chr. 17:5, once out of more than a

hundred occurrences), for HOMESTEAD (*nue*, 1 Chr. 17:7, "sheepcote"), for booth (OVERSHADOW, *suke*, Jer. 25:38, "cover" once out of about thirty occurrences). In these, diffuse as they are, there is no suggestion of eating. The only basis for this idea seems to be the single context of our Lord's last dinner. But that is no more than in all of these cases, for probably eating was also done in the tent, the lodging, the room, the tabernacle, the homestead and the booth, for which it stands in the Septuagint. Shall we therefore change all these to dining room also? The dining room of a hotel is not the hotel, and most owners of a hotel would resent calling their establishment by such a name.

DOCTOR, NOT MASTER

Luke 9:33: "Doctor, it is ideal for us to be here." The word here translated "doctor" means "a superintendent or overseer; a master."

This time we will put the "authorities" in a ring and let them fight it out themselves. Bagster's Analytical Lexicon says that, in the N. T., *epistatês* is the equivalent of *teacher*, or *Rabbi*, and means *master* or *doctor*. *The critic loses this round.*

Grove's Greek and English Dictionary gives the usual equivalents and adds, "Or, (Fr. *epistamai* to be expert) *expert*, skilful." *The second round is in our favor.*

Liddell and Scott also give two distinct usages, including skilful, well versed. *The third round is ours.*

Funk and Wagnall's College Standard Dictionary, 1941, a modern work, says: "A person of great learning, and qualified to instruct." *The fourth is ours.*

The Expositor's Greek Testament says: "A Greek term for Gentile readers instead of Rabbi." *Five!*

Now for the knockout! A Greek Lexicon to the New Testament, by T. S. Green, should settle the matter for all scholars who want "authority." He says it is "*equivalent to didaskale, or rabbi*, MASTER, DOCTOR. Take the count, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10! Our hand is raised by the referee in token of our victory! But this doesn't seem right, as I have no hand in the slugging! So I must forego the victory! I won't go in the ring, for they always hit me below the belt.

The fact is that the verb ON-*STAND*, in its middle form, took on a different figurative meaning than it has in the active. Actively, it denotes *stand by*, as, in Lu. 2:9, "a messenger of the Lord *stood by* them." The noun derived from this means *one who stands by*, figuratively an *overseer*. But in the middle voice, *epistamai*, the figure takes a different turn. It denotes *be adept, be versed* in anything, as in Acts 26:3 (C.V.), where King Agrippa is called "an expert," *versed* in all, "both the customs and questions of the Jews." See also Ac. 10:28, 15:7, 18:25, 20:18, 22:19, 24:10, 26:3, 26, 1 Ti.

6:4, Ja. 4:14, etc. So the noun may take this sense also. We might address our Lord as *adept*, if this title had not been ruined by association with false philosophies.

We have never seen a prize fight, so we apologize in advance for any mistake in the description. But we did see a "free for all" on board the Leviathan on our way to the Holy Land. The contestants were all blindfolded and struck at each other unmercifully. No decision was reached. All were damaged. I took no part. So, I stand at the side lines when scholars disagree disagreeably. They have no right to injure me, for I am not qualified to fight. This is the privilege of "doctors," D.D.'s and other D.'s.

We, today, use the title "doctor" in the same way. Like the Greek, it has more than one usage, and, though most often applied to a doctor of *medicine*, a physician, it is popularly used for anyone who has this degree in the learned professions. Our critic is a triune "doctor," for he puts B.D., Ph.D., and D.D. after his name. I have difficulty in preventing some of my friends from fastening it on me. It is used only by Luke, who was himself a "doctor," or physician, so he records this special term of honor and respect accorded to our Lord. The English word *master* gives an entirely different thought, which is expressed by the Greek *kurios*, and usually rendered *Lord* when applied to Him. When "master" is used as a learned title, it is one degree lower than "doctor." It is an insult to call our Lord a "Master" in this sense, as though He were inferior to other learned men of His day. Our critic places himself above Him, in refusing to accord Him the degree *Doctor* (which he has) and giving our Lord the degree *Master*, which is lower.

THE MEANING OF EXALT

John 3:14: "And, according as Moses exalts the serpent in the wilderness, thus must the Son of Mankind be exalted." Surely the words "exalts the serpent" give a very erroneous idea as to what Moses did.

Webster's dictionary defines *exalt* as follows: 1. To raise high; to elevate; to lift up. I also was taught that this refers to the cross and, at first, rendered this "raise on high," because its stem denotes *HIGH*, and thought that *exalt* was limited to figurative elevation. But I found that all the other occurrences (Mt. 11:23, 23:12, 12, Lu. 1:52, 10:15, 4:11, Lu. 18:14, 14, Jn. 3:14, 14, 8:28, 12:32, 34, Ac. 2:33, 5:31, 13:17, 2 Co. 11:7, Ja. 4:10, 1 Pt. 5:6), with the exception of Jn. 8:28 and 12:32, 34, which also speak of the elevation of the Son of Mankind, were best rendered by the word *exalt*. Indeed, they are so rendered in the Authorized Version, except Ja. 4:10, which is discordant, for God will certainly not *literally* "lift up" the humble! Not far from where I lived for a long time, was Rattlesnake canyon. We used to carry a stout stick

with us when we went walking in order to kill any poisonous reptile that crossed our path. We certainly did not "lift up" any serpents until they were dead! To us this would savor of a foolhardy act. It is a thought that should not intrude into this context. Besides, the Authorized Version translates six other words by *lift up*; *airō*, LIFT, hoist; *anakuptō*, unbend; *anistēmi*, rise; *anorthōō*, erect again; *egeirō*, ROUSE, raise; *epairō*, ON-LIFT, elevate. The last of these would be more appropriate if Moses merely put the serpent on a pole. But even "elevate" can be used in a figurative sense like "exalt," as when every height *elevates* itself against the knowledge of God (2 Co. 10:15). With these facts before me, I studied the contexts of those passages which seemed to suggest that the Son of Mankind would hang on a cross.

The context concerned with the Son of Mankind's exaltation is as follows (Jn. 3:13): "And no one has ascended into heaven except He Who descends out of heaven . . ." This is the thought that introduces the verses that follow. *This should govern our interpretation of the sign of the brazen serpent.* Long have we allowed the similarity between the pole of Moses and the stake on which our Lord was crucified to mislead our thoughts in this passage. Now we have difficulty in returning to the true trend. God gives His Son *from heaven*, not *to* the cross, though that is wonderously true as well. In John 3:14-16 they are directed to the *ascended* Saviour for eonian life. The Son of Mankind must be *exalted to heaven*, after He was *abased* on the cross. The same is true of John 8:28: "Whenever you should exalt the Son of Mankind, then you will know that I am, and from Myself I am doing nothing, but, according as My Father teaches Me, thus I am speaking." The Jews did *not* come to this knowledge when they *crucified* Him, but will know Him when they *exalt* Him. Only once, in John 12:32, is His death spoken of as an exaltation. But even here it is viewed as a step toward heaven, "out of the earth." This should not intrude into the other contexts. *Exalt* is the correct meaning and usage of this word.

ROUSE, NOT RISE

I Cor. 15:14-16: "Now if Christ has not been roused, consequently our proclamation is for naught; your faith also is for naught; Now we are being found false witnesses also of God, seeing that we testify in accord with God, that He rouses Christ, Whom, consequently, He rouses not, if so be that the dead are not being roused. For if the dead are not being roused, neither has Christ been roused."

It is difficult to find anything that even *seems* to be absurd in this passage, so we guess that the one notable change from the Authorized Version, the use of *rouse* for the usual *rise* is criticised. As usual, it ought to be commended. The Authorized Version itself acknowledges that *egeirō*, the word used here, means *awake*, for they are forced to be more accurate when it occurs in the same context as the *real* word for *arise*.

In Ephesians 5:14 they translate, "*Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead. . .*" We render it practically the same. "*Rouse, O drowsy one, and rise from among the dead . . .*" This shows the difference between the concordant method and others. We *always* keep in mind that there is another word for arise, not only when it comes so close that it does not sound well to repeat it. Anyone whose eyes have been opened to see that *rise* refers especially to the *body*, *vivify* to the *spirit*, and *rouse* to their combination, the *soul*, in the return from death, will *demand* that rouse be used correctly, as in the Greek, and will *denounce* any departure from it. The subjects with which it is associated, death and its return, have been effectively camouflaged by our discordant versions, so that the light of the Scriptures has become darkness. Those who use these versions have grave difficulty in finding the truth. If this rendering is deemed "absurd," we hope that there are many more like it!

THE DATIVE CASE IN GREEK

Eph. 2:8, 9: "For you have been saved through faith for grace, and this is naught of yours: it is God's oblation." The phrase "for grace" is unjustified in this context; for Paul is here stating the source and condition of our salvation and not the aim. The words rendered "God's oblation" (*theou to dōron*) mean, "as the A. V. renders them, 'gift of God.'" The word "oblation" means "anything offered or presented in worship or sacred service; an offering; a sacrifice."

The Greek word here (*chariti*) is in the dative case. Webster is reliable authority that, in English, the dative is expressed by *to* or *for*. We use *to* for our standard, so that our sublinear is TO—[THE] GRACE. It tells *where*. Examples are: persuaded them to remain in the grace of God (Ac. 13:43); given over to the grace of God (Ac. 14:26, see 15:40; thanking . . . for the grace of God (1 Co. 1:4).

See also 2 Co. 1:12, 8:7, 19, 2 Th. 2:16, 2 Pt. 3:18. These make it very clear that the dative is *not* used of the *source*. All of the "authorities" I have ever seen give the *genitive* as denoting the source, *never* the dative. I would never let a pupil of mine pass out of his first year in Greek, who made the dative the source. This mistranslation arises from false teaching based on faulty versions. It is a vicious circle. We are taught what a passage means, then we force this into the Greek and enforce it with our "authorities," even if it is ridiculously absurd. I freely admit that I also was once mistaken as to this passage, for I was misled by what had been drilled into me by the "Plymouth Brethren." But gradually light has come. It first dawned on me while studying this very passage, and gave me one of the great thrills of my life. We are all taught that we are saved by faith, which is quite true. But it is not the special truth in Paul's epistles. In fact a part of the darkness of many believers who have merely tasted of God's grace arises from this perversion, which gives them the

idea that grace is the *source*, but not the *sphere* of salvation, that is, we *were* saved *by* (genitive) grace in the past, but we are not at present saved *in* grace, but must supplement the former grace by present works. My complete concordance fully opened my eyes to this. There, while I had translated the dative correctly in some cases, I had changed to *by* when justification (Ro. 3:24, Tit. 3:7), God's gratuity (Ro. 5:15), and salvation (Ro. 11:6) were in view. Only Ephesians 2:8 *was free from this error!* There I had *for*. As *in* is the only connective which is always in the dative, I now have made a rule to use it in such cases. This is a real improvement in the latest revision. We are justified and saved, not only *by*, but *in* grace. May God enable His saints to revel in this grand and glorious revelation!

OBLATION, NOT GIFT

Nine distinct terms are translated *gift* in the Authorized Version. If it is not scholarly to discriminate between them, then we are not scholars. and we apologize for our temerity. These words are, according to our vocabulary, votive offering (*anathema*, UP-PLACE), gift (*dōma*, GIVE-EFFECT), giving (*dōsis*, giving), gratuity (*dōrea*, GIVE-GUSH), gratuity (*dōrēma*, GIVE-GUSH-EFFECT), oblation (*dōron*, GIVE-GUSH), parting (*merismos*), grace (*charis*), and gracious gift (*charisma*). It will be seen that *oblation* has an added element beside that for GIVE. It is a special kind of gift. The key to the meaning and usage of *oblation* is found in the Septuagint. It is, indeed, used there for sixteen Hebrew words, but much oftener for *qr̄bn* than any other, that is, over sixty times. Now *qr̄b* means NEAR, and the *qr̄bn* ("corban") is the *near-gift*. A talented Jew has made a very literal, yet fascinating German translation out of the Hebrew, and he calls this the *near-offering*. On several occasions the Authorized Version renders it oblation (Lev. 2:4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 3:1, 7:14, 29, 38, 22:18, Nu. 18:9, 31:50). There can be no doubt that this particular offering is intended. The "corban" of the Hebrew is the *dōron* of the Greek, and both should have the same English name in order to tie them together, I would rather call them the *nearing-gift*, as we have done in another language. But English has the term *oblation*, which has been used of this offering in the Authorized Version for hundreds of years, so it seemed wisest to take advantage of these facts. To call it "gift," seems flat, stale, and unprofitable. It robs this passage of its point. Elsewhere the oblation is offered to God. Here God seeks to impress us with the transcendence of His grace by turning the tables. Salvation is *God's* near-gift, the present He showers upon us in order to be near us! What magnificent grace! Our critic would hide it from us. To him it seems absurd!

GUEST AND HOST

Eph. 2:12: "That in that era you were apart from Christ, being

alienated from the citizenship of Israel and guests of the promise covenants." In Romans 16:23 the Concordant Version is forced to render the word here translated "guests" as "host," i.e., "Gaius, my host."

If we had translated "Gaius, my guest" our critic would have cause to complain. Are there so few faulty renderings that, in a list of thirteen, the only thing wrong with one of them is that it is right? This is, indeed, absurd! It arises from the lack of discrimination between *meaning* and *usage*. The stem *xen* means LODGE. The noun *xenos* is one who is LODGED (a *guest*) or one who LODGES others (a *host*), according to the context. As a matter of fact the word *lodger*, in English, is both "one that lodges" and "one that provides lodging" according to Webster's dictionary, and so is just like the Greek word. The latter sense is now obsolete. This should show us that, even if we must use several words to make an idiomatic rendering in English, that does not prove that the Greek word has more than one meaning. In making a version in another language, we found cases where one word would do where English uses two. In Hebrew learn and teach are only variations of one word, which changes its form slightly, but *means* to impart knowledge, whether to get it or give it.

UNSEEN OR HADES

Rev. 1:18: "And I have the keys of death and of the unseen." Luke 16:23: "And in the unseen, lifting up his eyes, existing in torments." Matt. 16:18: "The gates of the unseen shall not be prevailing against it." It seems strange that "the unseen" has "gates" and is opened by "keys." The Greek word is *hades* in all these cases.

According to Webster's dictionary, *hades* is the place of departed spirits. According to the Scriptures, at death, the spirit returns to God Who gave it (Ecc. 12:7). Consequently *hades* must be with God! When our Lord died He committed His *spirit* into the hands of His Father (Lu. 23:46). It was not His spirit, but His *soul* that went to *hades*, or *hell* (Ac. 2:27). His body was preserved uncorrupted in the tomb. So, scripturally, His *body* was in the *earth*, His *soul* was in *hades*, and His *spirit* was with *God*, His Father. We once challenged anyone in an audience to show us a single place in the Bible where the *spirit* is associated with *hades*. To my consternation a brother found it in the introduction to the Revised Version! I hadn't counted on that. But it was nowhere else. The word *hades* has become absurd. Ancient mythology and modern theology have so corrupted its usage that it no longer is a sound word. In Greek it has to do with the soul. In English it is connected with the spirit.

The only satisfactory and scientific way to recover its meaning is to combine the equivalent Hebrew *shaul* with the Greek *hades*, get their basic significance and study their usage in every single passage in which they occur. As this is fully

discussed in our pamphlet, "What is the Soul?" and other works, we will merely state our conclusions briefly. *Shaul* ("sheol") comes from the stem *shal*, ASK. *Hades* comes from UN-PERCEIVED. Their general sense is the same, though looked at from different standpoints. They denote that part of the universe with which we are not acquainted (ASK) and which we cannot see, feel, or hear (UNPERCEIVED). Our term *unseen* is the best equivalent for both. It is not limited to the soul before life and after death (the wicked shall return to "hell" Ps. 9:17), but includes the invisible powers which are beyond our ken. In a figure it is used of the wicked forces of evil which seek to destroy the "church." The "gates" are another figure for the leaders of the unseen hosts, for in the gates the judges and governors had their seats. *Unseen solves* all the difficulties which *hades introduces*. Is that absurd?

LAMB OR LAMBKIN

Rev. 5:6: "A Lambkin standing, as though slain." The word "Lambkin" occurs a good many times in the Revelation and in John 21:15. He translates the latter, "Be grazing my lambkins."

The regular word for LAMB in Greek is *amnos*, as will be seen by consulting the occurrences: Lu.10:3, Jn.1:29,36, Ac. 8:32, 1 Pt.1:19. There is another word *arnion*, which Bagster's Analytical Lexicon defines as "*a young lamb, lambkin, lamb.*" The last name is a concession to the Authorized Version, which never distinguishes between it and *amnos*. Another lexicon, which includes classical Greek, has "(dim. of *ars* a lamb) *a young lamb, lambkin, kid.*" What shall we use? Shall we hide from our readers that it is *not* a lamb merely, but a *young* lamb? Shall we call our Lord "young Lamb" or "Kid"? In what way are we *misleading* the saints by this rendering? What makes it "*absurd*"? On the contrary, it is full of significance and spiritual value. Just as the *wife* of Jehova is rejuvenated into the bride, so the Lamb is transformed into the LAMBKIN. He does not age and decay, but renews His youth in the days of His future glory!

ORIENT OR RISING SUN

Rev. 7:2: "And I perceived another messenger ascending from the orient, having the seal of the living God." The word translated "orient" is literally "the rising of the sun."

That the words (plural) translated "orient" literally read "RISING OF-SUN" is clearly stated in the sublinear, so cannot deceive anyone. Again, an "authority" defines the first word as "*the east; the eastern parts of the world*, which is the orient." [I hastily accepted this change, altering my records accordingly, and heartily thanked my critic for calling my attention to this "absurdity." But, when I altered Rev.16:12 to agree with it, I found that my *correction*, rather than the version, was in error.] A study of the parallel passage, Rev.

16:12, where we have "rising of-sun" again, makes it plain that the word orient is correct, and that sunrise might be misleading since Japan uses this symbol today and is called the sunrise kingdom. In the past all kingdoms in the direction of the rising sun, that is the East, were known by this phrase. Japan has only one "king," but this includes all kings east of the Euphrates. If this phrase should be rendered orient in 16:12, then it should be the same in 7:2. That it does not include kings west of the Euphrates is self-evident from the context.

DISMISSED FOR LACK OF EVIDENCE

Rev. 17:5: "And on her forehead is written a name:

Secret

BABYLON THE GREAT
THE MOTHER OF THE PROSTITUTES
AND THE ABOMINATIONS
OF THE EARTH

Is it not "absurd" to quote this and not indicate what is the matter with it? That, indeed, is the only absurdity we can discover.

THE SUBLINEAR

Note also a few samples of the sublinear renderings:

Acts 10:47: "No-any the water is-able to-forbid any of-the no to-be-dipized these."

1 Cor. 15:17: "If yet anointed, not has-been-roused vain the belief of-you is still ye-are in the misses of-you."

Eph. 5:26: "That her He-should-be-holyizing."

2 Tim. 1:10: Yet now thru the on-appearance of-the saviour of-us anointed Jesus down-un-acting indeed the death enlightening yet life and un-corruption thru the well-message."

So many consider the sublinear of the C.V. as far beyond anything else as a help in studying the Scriptures that it is hardly worthwhile to defend it. A few lines like this may be held up to ridicule, but just the opposite effect is produced on those who use it intelligently. If the reader of these lines will only examine it (not this mutilated reprint), he may find the same delight that it has brought to others. In it the words are English, but the expression is exactly like the Greek. Why does the critic spell "saviour" with a small s, and "Jesus" with a capital? In the sublinear it is SAVIOUR and JESUS. Is this another subtle attempt to injure us by giving the impression that we are lacking in reverence for our Saviour? Why is anointed put for our ANOINTED?

MISLEADING RENDERINGS

3. Misleading and erroneous renderings. Many of the preceding examples are not only absurd but also misleading. But we desire to point out a few renderings that are particularly so.

Mark 14:21: "Ideal were it for Him (note the capital, i.e., Jesus) if that man were not born." Exactly the same words occur in Matt. 26:24. Such a thought as this is absolutely foreign to the context.

The "context" referred to is, we fear, the "doctrinal pre-suppositions" of the critic. It needs no Greek scholarship,

but only a snip of sanctified sense to connect "that man" (*tō anthrōpō ekeinō* to-THE human that) in one sentence with "that man" (*[h]o anthrōpos ekeinos* THE human that) in the next. Translators who have been caught off their guard have rendered it correctly. Luther actually translates it one way in Matthew and the other in Mark! So do Schlachter (Miniatur Bibel), and Van Ess, the first a continental Protestant and the other a Roman Catholic. Elberfeld, representing "Brethren" theology, and Menge, for the state church, change to suit their confessions. Schmoller, the compiler of a Greek concordance and the Parallel Bible, gives it "Good were it for Him if that man were not born," practically as in the C.V.

The American Revision recognized this error of the A. V., but dared not correct it in their version, for they feared to face the consequences. Nevertheless they were courageous enough to put in their margin, "Gr. for him if that man." Of course for him if that man is not Greek. It is English. In fact it is exactly like the C. V.! The great "authority" of the American Revision Committee, which many place above that of the British, is back of our rendering of the Greek! *They must be "misleading and erroneous"*! I have no hesitancy, therefore, on the ground taken by the critic himself (that of an authority) in exposing him as not only erroneous and misleading, but as a deliberate and malicious corrupter of God's Word, who will not have the truth when it is put before him, who misuses the confidence of the people in order to keep them from the truth. He knows, or ought to know, how the Greek reads.

A favorite distortion, with those versions which translate *that man* correctly, is to change for *Him* to *he*. Thus the Emphatic Diaglott, although it has an interlinear "good it was to HIM, if not was born the man that," changes this to "Good were it for that MAN if HE were not born." The Greek *auto* (to-Him) cannot be the subject of *born*. We cannot say "to him was born." If we do, we change the sense entirely, as if Judas had a child. So, also, the Greek *[h]o anthrōpos ekeinos* (that man) must be the subject of *was* [not] *born*, for its form in Greek demands this, being in the nominative case.

The word *that* alone should settle the matter, for it denotes *another* person, not the same. The usual rendering demands that the Greek have *autos* (SAME, or he) in place of *ekeinos* (that). Anyone, no matter what his reputation for scholarship, or the number of degrees to his name, who seeks to force this false rendering on his dupes automatically brands himself as utterly untrustworthy and apostate. May God deal with him in His grace!

This rendering is foreign only to the context of tradition and is a deliberate falsification of the divine records due to the hardness of men's hearts. Here some of the scholars (not

all) show the spirit that is in them and give us an example of those of whom it is written: "The venom of asps is under their lips" (Ro.3:13). They insist on kicking a man when he is down. Any "scholar" who is able to check this by the Greek, and yet clings to the false rendering, places himself outside the pale of humanity. This text is a test of all who claim to believe God or the inspiration of the Scriptures. To make it as clear as possible we repeat the facts already given, in different words. The usual rendering reverses the grammar. It alters to *Him*, to *he*, and *that man* (nominative, the subject) to *for that man* (the dative, or indirect object). The Greek is very clear. Literally it reads: Ideal were it *to Him* (not *he*) if not were generated the human *that* (not *for that*). Have you had a little Greek? Check it for yourself, unless you are afraid of being cast out of the synagogue. If you are, leave it alone, and do not commit the worst of all sins, the deliberate falsification of the divine records. This may qualify you for a professor's place in the theological schools of the day—even in that of the fundamentalists—but it will go hard with you in that day when you give account in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ. This passage is a test. If a translation has this wrong it trades in tradition, and is not a transcript of the Word of the living, loving God. We hereby implore all teachers of Greek, who have hitherto corrupted this text in order to cater to tradition or to hold their place and influence, to *fear God, not man*, and refuse to further countenance this fearful fraud.

INTERPRETATION IS NOT TRANSLATION

John 5:4: "A messenger of the Lord at a certain season bathed in the pool and disturbed the water." Matt. 1:20: "A messenger of the Lord appeared to him in a trance." Matt. 4:11: "Then the Slanderer is leaving Him, and lo! messengers approached and waited on Him." Matt. 24:31: "And He shall be dispatching His messengers with a loud sounding trumpet, and they shall be assembling His chosen ones from among the four winds." Mark 12:25: "But are as the messengers which are in the heavens." The rendering in Matt. 4:11 can easily be interpreted to mean that certain human beings came and waited on Christ. The same kind of interpretation can be put on a number of the others also. See Hebrews 2:5.

A "misleading and erroneous" practice is to *interpret* instead of *translate*. This the Authorized Version and others do when they render the Greek *aggelos* both *angel* and *messenger*. The ordinary reader thinks that they are distinct terms in the Greek, and that an angel is a heavenly being having a different *nature* (Hb. 2:16, A.V.) from mankind. But one who thinks keenly will wonder if the "angels of the . . . churches" (Rev. 1:20) are really such beings. He will be puzzled by such scriptures as "the word spoken by *angels* was steadfast" (Hb. 2:2). What words are these? If he consults a concordance he will probably come to the conclusion

that these “angels” are *men*, for the word *aggelos* is used of men just as well as of “angels.” John the Baptist is called an “angel” (Mt. 11:10. Mk. 1:2, Lu. 7:27). So are his messengers (Lu. 7:24). Our Lord sent “angels” before His face (Lu. 9:52). We humbly acknowledge that we are *not always certain* when this word refers to angels and when to men. We once thought we did, but about forty years of constant activity in translation and interpretation (our English magazine is over a third of a century old) has gradually changed our interpretation, so that we are now certain that we were once mistaken in some passages where we had followed the *interpretations* of our venerable Authorized Version. *They (not we) are misleading and erroneous. We do not interpret, we translate.* If others misinterpret our rendering, that is because they have been misled before, by reading other versions, not by reading ours. They would have the same problem if they used the original Greek. It is evident that the “messengers of the churches,” John the Baptist and his messengers, and others, were *not* “angels.” The Authorized Version is wrong. My interpretation and God’s revelation make it clear that in these and all other occurrences *messengers* are meant, so the Concordant Version is correct.

GUEST AND OPPORTUNITY

Act 17:21: “Now all the Athenians and the repatriated guests had opportunity for no other thing than to be telling something or hearing something newer.” Both words, “guests” and “opportunity,” misrepresent the thought of the context.

The Greek word for repatriated is practically ignored in the Authorized Version. The Revisers add *sojourning*. But the word means “*to be at home among one’s own people*” (Bagster’s Analytical Lexicon). Scholars have tried to reverse this sense in what they call the “New Testament,” but that is unwarranted, and due to ignorance of the situation in Athens. As is the case in England today, many of the Athenians went abroad to the Greek colonies for a large part of their career, but later came home to end their days. They were *repatriated*, or resumed their citizenship in the fatherland. As they were either pensioned or had sufficient means to live, they had nothing much to do except to hunt for news, much like what was called the “Spit and Argue Club” of Long Beach, in Southern California. The word “guests” may not be the best rendering here. We may change to lodgers, which is the primary meaning of the term which was used for strangers, guests, and hosts.

That *have opportunity* is the meaning of *eukaireō* is clear from its other occurrences. Our Lord’s disciples were so busy at one time that “they had not even an *opportunity* to eat” (Mk. 6:31). Apollos, Paul said, would come to the Corinthians “whenever he should *have an opportunity*” (1 Co. 16:12). This is the *sense* in Acts. Literally it is a WELL-SEASON. The

idiomatic rendering into English has caused translators considerable difficulty. The Authorized Version has "spent their time," which is a very loose rendering. That the Revisers were not satisfied with it is shown by their margin *had leisure*. But this is just as free. The word *SEASON* means more than mere time. It includes circumstance. These men not only took the *time*, but they took advantage of Paul's presence and led him to the Areopagus to hear the latest. Paul's sojourn was their opportunity to learn about this novel doctrine. We have not expressed it well, but at least we have indicated the true thought. We will try to improve the idiom.

THE RECONCILIATION OF ALL

Col. 1:20: "And through Him to reconcile the universe to Him (making peace through the blood of His cross), through Him, whether on the earth or in the heavens." A note here reads as follows: "The universal reconciliation cannot be fully accomplished until the close of the eonian times, when all sovereignty and authority and power and even death are rendered inoperative 1 Cor. 15:24-27) and when all mankind are saved (1 Tim. 4:10) and justified (Rom. 5:18). This takes us far beyond the new earth portrayed at the end of the Unveiling of Jesus Christ, for there He still reigns, many of mankind are still lost, and death is not yet abolished." Here the author teaches the restoration of all the lost.

What utter disregard for the meaning of words! I have always opposed "the *restoration* of all the lost." I believe in "the *restoration* of all which God speaks through the mouth of His holy prophets from the eon" (Ac. 3:21). God says nothing about this in Colossians 1:20. Neither do I. Paul teaches plainly that all that is estranged, whether in heaven or on earth, shall be *reconciled* to God. Thus *peace* is made through the blood of Christ's cross. Years ago a noted Bible teacher came to the Bible Institute in Los Angeles, and, after reading this passage, informed his astonished hearers that there were people in the city who believed Colossians 1:20 *just as it stands!* Then he warned them against me, and "explained" it, lest they also should commit the atrocious crime of *believing it as it stands*. God does not say that He is going to *restore* the universe. He is going to *reconcile* all who are at enmity with Him. God does not say that He will *restore* all mankind. He says that He will *save* them (1 Ti. 4:10). He will *justify* them (Ro. 5:18). This is far, far more than *restoration*, which is limited to the promises in the Hebrew prophets, and to the eonian times. This salvation, justification, and reconciliation does not take place until after the eons—after the misleading "forever" of the Bible. As there seems to be no criticism of the version here, but only a distortion of the marginal note, which appears only in the Complete edition, we take it that the version is correct. To avoid the prejudice aroused by the word "universe," later editions will have the word "all," which means the same in

this context, but cannot be criticised on any grounds whatsoever.

AGE AND EONIAN

This leads us naturally to one of the major errors of the Version, namely, the rendering of the Greek words *aion* as "age" and of *aiōnios* as "eonian." It is needless to give the many references in which these words occur. The author's meaning is perfectly clear from his comments on John 6:47. He renders the verse thus: "Verily, verily, I am saying to you, he who is believing into Me has eonian life." He comments as follows: "This passage should be studied carefully in order to correct the erroneous impression that believers have 'eternal' or 'everlasting' life. Eternal may be applied only to that which had no beginning and will have no end. No one but God has eternal life. Everlasting should be used only of that which continues without intermission endlessly. Not a single one of the Lord's personal followers is alive today. None of them received 'everlasting' life. They are dead. If everlasting life permits of interruption by death now, why not in the resurrection also? All of these expressions denote definite periods of time, measured by eons, or ages. Eonian life begins in the next eon.

"Now it is evident that the Lord had no thought of a life lasting for ever. In that case how could He be *raising* him in the last day? The life here spoken of was to be bestowed in resurrection. There could be no resurrection apart from a previous death. In short, our Lord spoke in such a way that we are sure that 'everlasting' life, so-called, does not commence until He calls His own from the grave.

"As this life has a definite beginning, it also has an end. But as the end does not come until death is abolished, it changes from 'eonian' life into actual 'everlasting' life. This will be the portion of all. It is not the special privilege of the believer. The peculiar kind of life promised to faith begins at Christ's presence, when those who are His will be vivified, and continues through the last two eons, embracing the millennium and the succeeding eon in the new earth, until the eons end, and the last enemy, death, is abolished. Hence the life received in vivification is actually 'everlasting,' though never so called in the Word of God."

No exhaustive reply to the author's renderings and comments can here be attempted, but we would call attention to the following: If these words do not refer to a *present* possession, then why the repeated statement that this life is a present possession? Take the author's rendering in John 6:47 above. Verse 54 he translates: "He who is masticating My flesh and drinking My blood has eonian life, and I shall be raising him at the last day." John 5:24 he renders thus: "Verily, verily, I am saying to you that he who is hearing My word and believing in Him Who sends Me has eonian life, and is not coming into judgment, but has proceeded out of death into life." His comment is inadequate: "Belief is followed by eonian life, or vivification. For such there is no judgment possible, for they receive much more than is right in the gift of life for the eons." John 3:36 he translates: "He who is believing into the Son has eonian life, yet he who is stubborn as to the Son, shall not be seeing life, but the indignation of God is remaining on him." I John 5:11-13 he renders thus: "And this is the testimony that God gives us eonian life, and this life is in His Son. He who has the Son has the life. He who has not the Son of God has not the life. These things I write to you that you who are believing into the name of the Son of God may be perceiving that you have eonian life." However inadequate these translations are, they are correct in asserting that the believer *already* has this life.

This leads us to a major error of the criticism. Not once does the Concordant Version render *aion* as "age"! What

shall we say to the moral and mental state which could concoct this false accusation? Shall we excuse it as Ivan Panin once did, saying that it came out of his head backward? Ordinarily such a slip could be considered a careless oversight, liable to occur at any time to mortals. But here it is admittedly a major matter. It would be an "error" utterly inexcusable in a concordant version, whose major principle is consistency. One of the most distinctive and valuable features of the Concordant Version is the use of the *same* word for the noun and adjective when feasible. I might have used age if it had a satisfactory adjective. Others have tried to make one, such as age-abiding, without success. Because of the extreme importance of the term and the utterly false teaching derived from the usual translations, as well as the fierce opposition of traditional "orthodoxy," I determined to take an impregnable position by using *the Greek word itself* in its English form in *every occurrence*. Now the *Adversary* (not the critic really) seeks to oust me from it by this contemptible trick!

The word *age* has been confined by current English usage to periods much shorter than a scriptural eon, and suggests nebulous, indefinite time in the future. hence it is not well qualified to represent the Greek *aiōn*. It would fit the Hebrew *olam* much better, for the clear conception of the *eonian* times presented in the Greek Scriptures was not revealed until our Lord came. *Our critic accuses us of using a word that we reject*, and of using an adjective quite distinct from it. Concordant! I know not! But why waste words? If our critic is a saint, he will do his utmost to undo the damage he has done by this false accusation. If not, I hereby turn him over (not to Satan, for he is already doing the Adversary's work, but) to Christ, for such discipline, in grace, as may lead to repentance and godly regret.

What dullards we seem to be! We translate correctly even when we evidently do not believe our own translation! That is an admission worthy of attention. It gives us intense satisfaction to know that, however mistaken we may be in our belief, *we have not altered the version to conform*. The critic does what he condemns. He changes to suit the "context." We are thankful for this commendation, for it must be sincere in such a situation.

If the critic would make a slight distinction between *having* and *enjoying*, he would never have tried to find fault. Just now, for instance, I "have" my breakfast. It has been bought and paid for, and is my property. It is all dished up, ready for me. Nevertheless I am not enjoying it. It is not yet four o'clock in the morning, and I do not breakfast until six. So I am hungry, even if I have food. Simple, isn't it! I *have* eonian life. I have not, indeed, paid for it, for the Son of God has overpaid its price on Golgotha's cross. *It is mine!* I *have* it! Why, then, am I so often weary and worn, infirm

and ill, dying, until my Lord shall come? Is *this* "eternal" life? I remember how this used to puzzle me when I was associated with the "Brethren," who made a speciality of *having* eternal life. One of my friends met a drunkard draped around a lamp post and recognized him as one of his converts. He remonstrated with him, and said, "I thought you had eternal life; and now look at you!" The drunkard retained enough of his senses to reply, "I *had* eternal life *yesterday*, but *now*—!" We knew very well that we were not so very much better than the poor inebriate. Our eternal life was not up to the standard claimed for it. Of course we kept these doubts to ourselves. The elders did not countenance anything except "the truth"! Preachers who sell salvation with a guarantee of "everlasting" life should be arrested for willful deception when any of their followers die. When the doctor and the undertaker pronounce a man dead, no preacher should be allowed to clinch his swindle by pronouncing him alive.

EONIAN SALVATION

Then also, if *aion* and *aionios* have a definite time limitation in these redemptive texts, how do we know that our salvation will extend beyond the "eons"? Heb. 5:9 he renders thus: "And being perfected, He became the cause of eonian salvation to all who are obeying Him;" Heb. 9:12 thus: "Entered once into the holy places, not through the blood of he-goats and calves, but through His own blood, finding eonian redemption;" and 1 John 2:17 thus: "And the world is passing by, and its desire, yet he who is doing the will of God is remaining for the eon."

Again, if the author's assumption is right, then how can we prove even that Christ will abide forever? Rev. 1:18, in the C. V., puts these words into His own mouth: "I became dead, and lo! I am living for the eons of the eons." Heb. 7:28: "For the law is constituting men chief priests who have infirmity, yet the word sworn in the oath which is after the law, the Son, perfected for the eon." Cf. 1 Cor. 15:23-28.

Indeed, how can we prove that even God lives forever? This Version renders Rom. 16:28 thus: "Yet manifested now, through prophetic scriptures as well, according to the injunction of the eonian God;" and Rev. 5:9 thus: "And whenever the animals should be giving glory and honor and thanks to Him Who is sitting on the throne, Who is living for the eons of the eons." The same expression occurs also in vs. 10; 10:6; 15:7. Are these great facts mere assumptions?

Over against this Thayer defines *aion* in Greek authors thus: 1. age; 2. an unbroken age, perpetuity of time, eternity. In the New Testament: 1. a. universal; in the phrase *eis ton aiona*, for ever; strengthened, *eis ton aiona tou aionos*. b. In hyperbolic and popular usage, *apo tou aionos*, from the most ancient time down, from of old. 2. By meton., of container for contained, *hoi aiones* denotes the worlds, the universe. 3. As Jews distinguished between time before and after the Advent, so most New Testament writers between *ho aion houtos* and *aion mellon*.

Thayer defines the word *aionios* as, 1. without beginning or end, that which always has been and always will be; 2. without beginning; 3. without end, never to cease, everlasting. *Aionios* (fr. Plato on) gives prominence to the immeasurableness of eternity. *Aidios* covers the complete philosophic idea—without beginning and without end; also *either* without beginning or without end; as respects the past, it is applied to what has existed *time*,

out of mind (*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, s.v.*).

Likewise Robinson says that *aion* with *eis* always implies duration without end (*Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament, s.v.*). Liddell and Scott likewise define the word as meaning in the New Testament, for ever; *aiōnios* they define as everlasting, eternal (*Greek-English Lexicon, s.v.*).

The author does not believe in eternal punishment, as we shall show under his theological views. One is impressed that the wish is father to the thought in the rendering of these two words, indeed, if not in the invention of the whole system. We have either the adjective or the noun applied to the punishment of the wicked in a number of places. For example, Matt. 25:41, 46; 2 Thess. 1:9; Jude 7; Rev. 14:11; 19:3; 20:10. Dr. Strong says concerning these two words. "If, when used to describe the future punishment of the wicked, they do not declare the endlessness of that punishment, there are no words in the Greek language which could express that meaning" (*Systematic Theology*, p. 1045). S. W. Cowley says: "Dean Inge could hardly be described as a fundamentalist, but it is interesting to note that he says, 'The doom of the rejected in explicitly stated to be eternal punishment.' No sound Greek scholar can pretend that 'aiōnios' means anything less than eternal'" (*Bible League Quarterly*, Oct.-Dec., 1933, p. 170).

Hebrews speaks of the salvation of Israel, which is the result of obedience. But we are saved in grace, through faith, apart from works (Ro.4:5. Ep.2:5, 8-9). Hence the passages quoted are not in point when we selfishly seek to settle our own personal safety. The interminability of our salvation is not expressed in positive terms of time for the very reason that mortals cannot comprehend infinity. It is expressed by the negative. The very word infinity means that which is not finite. I, personally, knowing God, do not need, do not crave, do not want any assurance as to the future, especially when sin is to be repudiated (Heb.9:26), death abolished (1 Cor.15:26), all humanity justified (Ro.5:18), all estranged creation reconciled (Col. 1:20), when God is All in all (1 Cor. 15:28). But God has graciously given us assurances that more than suffice.

At the last trump, when Christ comes for me, He will give me a body immortal, if I am alive; incorruptible, if I have fallen asleep (1 Cor.15:51-55). Here is real "eternal" life! Then, and not till then, will death be swallowed up by victory. Even if I did not have this passage, I know that Christ is going to reign until He places all enemies under His feet. The last enemy is death. Death is going to be abolished! (1 Cor.15:26). The word abolished denotes make idle, inoperative. Not dying, the process, but death, the state, will cease, in order that God may be All in all. God is not the God of the dead (Mt.22:32). He will not be All in the corrupt carcasses of our cemeteries. Even as, in Adam, all are dying, thus also, in Christ, shall all be vivified (1 Cor.15:22). Here is eternal life! Not only for the saint, but for all! The saint gets *eonian* life. The sinner gets "eternal" life in the far future.

I am not anxious to prove that water is wet, or that fire is hot, or that Christ, Who abolishes death, will "abide for-

ever." If God gives me immortality, He probably has it Himself. What I am concerned about is that particular part of time, during which sin ravages and death reigns, that is, the eons. If Christ and God live during the eons while sin and death do their utmost to destroy, will They not be able to keep Themselves alive when there are no enemies, not even death? Is it not the summit of silliness to prove that the Giver of all life will continue to live after He has done away with death? Is it not the pinnacle of prudence to assure us that They will live during the dreadful devastations of the day of death? The rendering "eons" makes sound satisfying sense. The rendering "forever" is needless nonsense.

I remember well when I bought my copy of *Thayer's Lexicon*. I was eager to possess every possible help in my studies. But I was very young and had very little money to spare. I went to a second-hand book store and discovered *Thayer's Lexicon*. Just the book I needed! I asked the price. Seven or eight dollars, I think it was. Far beyond my means at that time. But I could not resist it. Later I scraped together the money and went back to the store. Another clerk sold it to me for about one-third the previous price! How thankful I was for it! How I studied it! But, gradually, as I studied *God's Word itself*, by means of concordances, I began to neglect it, and finally dropped it altogether, as nearly *useless* for anyone who *deals directly with the original*. The same is true of most lexicons. It is well to know what others think, but never wise to lean on human opinions, to the neglect of the divine oracles themselves.

But, if you have never learned to stand alone, and *must* lean on others, why not be sensible about it? Why not get the latest and the best? A friend of mine spoke to Dr. Deissmann about the meaning of *aion*. This learned man is the leading authority on the *koinê*. He expressed his approval of our position. As he died soon after, he probably did not put his opinion into print. Another friend tells me that the *latest* Greek lexicon on the Continent has taken a stand for *aion* as a limited time period. It may take decades before the works of these advanced scholars are translated into English, so the American followers of "authorities" may not find it possible to take up with the newer light in their lifetime. But, my dear reader, why hold on to a discredited delusion? Most of these "authorities" simply copied others. Get back to God's Word by the use of a concordance, and cease believing men! Probably many teachers of Greek are only waiting until it is safe to take a stand. We cannot expect them to risk their livelihood by coming out prematurely.

The "author" of the Concordant Version is God. My little grandson began telling it about that his grandfather "wrote the Bible." We had to correct him. A *translator* is not an author. Was Tyndale the "author" of the English Bible? Was

Luther of the German? Yet *they could bring in much more of their own than I*. I do not believe in doctrines. I believe God and what He says, but not theological formulas, couched in phrases He has never used, or which misrepresent what He said. To say that my views on this matter have determined my translation is not only an insidious slander, as false as it can be, but it is a boomerang. I regret with all my heart that, when I began my work on the version, I still held to the strictest teaching of the "Brethren," to whom eternal punishment was vital and fundamental. That anyone could *wish* to see his fellows suffer intolerable torment endlessly seems so inhuman, so utterly depraved, so diabolic, that I do not see how I could have been guilty of it. But I was. If I had injected *this* into the version, then the charge against me would be justified. As I did not, it is utterly vapid and vicious. The phrase "punishment of the wicked" is a wicked perversion of the facts. It conveys two false thoughts. In English, "*the wicked*" denotes *all* who are not saved. But only the nations who survive the terrible judgments that open the Day of Jehovah will stand before the Son of Mankind to be judged, *not for their sins*, but for their treatment of our Lord's brethren at that crisis. They are not "punished," but undergo *chastening* (*kolasís*) for one eon. The Greek word which really corresponds with the English "punishment" (*timōria*) is not used in any of these passages. The *chastening of some living nations for a single eon* is altogether different from the punishment of *all the wicked for eternity*. The passage in Thessalonians (2 Th.1:7-10) also refers to the vengeance, dealt out to living persons at the coming of our Lord from heaven. Jude seven speaks of the eonian (eternal) fire that destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah. I have been there and saw no one tormented, though it does get hot down there in summer. There is no reference here to all "the wicked" or their punishment.

Rev.14:11 concerns the worshipers of the wild beast alone. Not a single one of "the wicked" today, or of the past, are included in this doom. And it is the *fumes* of their torment that ascend for the eons of the eons. They themselves are *having* (not *have*, the indefinite) no rest day or night in the time then present.

Rev.19:3 refers to Babylon, apostate Judaism, at the time of the end. It will not include a thousandth part of "the wicked." Most of them never heard of Babylon. Why should they partake of her doom? Rev. 20:10 is limited to two or three individuals, the greatest sinners of all time. God will not "punish" all "the wicked" for what these have done. Thanks be to Him that the scholars will not be able to do it, even if they do seem to enjoy tormenting their fellows so much. I sometimes wonder why He does not soften their hearts by giving them a few seconds' taste of it. Then they

would not want to wrest His revelation to damn billions of creatures who have never sinned as seriously as they have themselves, and whose hearts are not nearly so callous as the defenders of "orthodoxy" seem to be.

Dr. Strong is mistaken. There are other words in the Greek language which could be used to express endlessness. Here are some: *aperantos*, endless; *akatahutos*, indissoluble; besides *aphthartos*, INCORRUPTIBLE; *athanasia*, UN-DEATHNESS, immortality, which imply endless life. The best example occurs in Lu.1:33: Our Lord shall reign over the house of Jacob for the eons. At their end, when He has subjected all, He Himself becomes subject to God, and His reign ends. But the kingdom continues in God's hands, so that "of His Kingdom there shall be no consummation." This is the Scriptural, inspired formula for endlessness. No mortal can grasp the abstract idea of "eternity." Every explanation of it must be made by means of a negative. This is the only sensible way to speak to men. Some scholars, contrary to Dr. Strong, claim that *this* phrase must mean endless, and use it to "prove" that "for the eons" means the same. The parallel here is not synonymous, but contrastive. Christ reigns for the eons. The Father reigns endlessly.

If Dean Inge is "sound," we prefer to be otherwise. "Sound" should read *bound by tradition*. Why should they "pretend" against their own interests? Men don't pretend to have unpopular leanings.

CLOUDY CONCEPTIONS OF VOICE, MODE AND TENSE

IV. ERRONEOUS CONCEPTIONS OF VOICE, MODE, AND TENSE. The author recognizes the fact that his treatment of the verb is a great departure from accepted facts. He says: "To the casual critic, the renderings of the verbs in the Concordant Version sometimes seem erratic and pedantic" (p. 23). This is even more true of the thorough-going critic than of the casual. Here again he attempts uniformity. He says: "Uniformity in rendering Greek grammatical elements into English is even more important than present exactness, for it is the way to eventual exactitude" (p. 10). We shall show to what absurdities and perversions of truth his principles lead him.

VOICE

1. Voice. Historical grammar shows that in the earliest remains of the Indo-European languages, to which family the Greek belongs, there was practically no passive. The Sanskrit had it only in the present tense system (Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 798). Strictly speaking, there was no passive voice in the Greek, the language employing various devices by means of which to express passive relationships. Finally, it developed two distinct passive tenses (*ib.*, p. 815). For a long time one of the devices was, and continued to be, to use the middle forms for both middle and passive meanings, something like our use of the same forms in English to express both nominative

and objective cases. Yet this man sets himself up over against all the grammarians of the past and declares: "It is common, in Greek grammars, to list many verbs which have the form of the Middle, as Passive. After a thorough investigation, we have fully satisfied ourselves that the form of a Greek verb determines its voice, and those which are Middle in form are actually Middle in usage. To call them Passive has no warrant and is unnecessarily confusing" (p. 22; cf. 39 in *Greek Elements*, which limits the passive to those with *th*, its characteristic link letter, except it is lacking for euphonic reasons, which is usually the case after the letters *g i k l v r ph*).

Over against this we would say that the middle is breaking down in the Koine, and we have plenty of evidence of that fact in the New Testament. Some of the functions of the middle are taken over by the passive, and some by the active with a reflexive. The modern Greek has only the active and passive voice, the middle is gone.

Once again we are bludgeoned with an appeal to an "authority." I supposed that Robertson was "accepted" as such, so I once made the blunder of referring to him, while in Europe, and found that a far greater and more generally "accepted" authority rejected him altogether. I had wasted weary hours over his book under the "erroneous" impression that it was gospel truth, just like my critic. I no longer swallow all the pills that scholars prepare for me. I build on a sure foundation, *the evidence in God's inspired Word*. As English has no grammatical elements to express the middle voice, I find that very few of our scholars have a clear conception of its force. As I not only speak a language that can express the middle, but have used it in common conversation for years, and we have translated the Scriptures into it, and thus tested out my reclassification of the Greek verb, I have far more right to speak on this subject than one who merely appeals to the ignorance of others. I once checked and marked every occurrence of the middle voice in my English version, but will not publish the marks because the subject is too difficult for the average English reader.

The critic does *not* give a single shred of evidence in the Scriptures to support his objection. If he should insist that "I will pay" sometimes means the *future* and sometimes the *present*, because some college professor says so, that would correspond to his argument here. In English no sensible person would accept it. Try it on your grocer. He knows the difference between the present and the future, cash and credit, and will not take one for the other. Anyone who will examine the C. V. grammar will see that there is a complete system with middle endings. A prolonged study of the words which use this system will show that their significance is middle also. Without this tool, and misled by the parrot grammars, such a study would be too much of a task, and the student would be compelled to remain in the misty land of scholarship, with neither sun nor stars to guide him, but only the man-made glimmers of tradition and superstition.

MODE

2. Mode. The author seems to be unaware of the fact that the subjunctive and optative modes are either futuristic, deliberative, or volitive. Listen to the monotonous, colorless renderings in the following references:

The C. V. aspires to be *just as monotonous and colorless as God's inspired original!* An "author" of God's Word could change it to suit himself. Not so a translator. I wish that our critic had at least given us a few different colors of the subjunctive or optative as samples! Here is what scholars do: They insist on translating *different* forms the *same*, and the *same* form *differently!* They make their middle and passive forms *both* passive, but the same subjunctive forms "futuristic, deliberative and volitive." As a matter of fact this list of kinds could be lengthened indefinitely, for the contexts may be infinite in variety. To change for each usage is not only impossible, but *contrary to the very nature of language*. The *same* symbol is used to express a given idea, unless the language has a synonym to express another nuance, or is idiomatic. The C. V. always expresses these modes where they are in the Greek, but does not inject them, either for color or variety, where they are not inspired.

Mark 8:38: "For whoever should be ashamed of Me and My words in this adulterous and sinning generation," etc.

The Greek is *ean epeischunthē* IF-EVER MAY-BE-BEING-shamed. The A. V. and the Revision read "*shall be ashamed,*" entirely ignoring the IF-EVER in their verb. (Perhaps they seek to express the EVER in *whoever*, but this is expressed in Greek by *WHO-WHO*.) This context is clearly in *contrast* to the future. "*In this generation,*" is set against the future, when the Son of Mankind will be ashamed of them. There the verb is future, *epaischunthēsetai* WILL-BE-BEING-shamed. Who is right, we or the A. V.? We *make a distinction* between the two different forms and they do *not*; we *express* IF-EVER by changing the subjunctive MAY to *should*, and they *ignore* it in the verb; *we* avoid "monotony" and introduce "color" by cleaving to the Greek, and *they introduce* "monotony" and "colorlessness" by departing from it. The subjunctive is comparatively rare. To reproduce it, makes no monotony. To make it the same as the future—that, indeed, may be monotonous.

Mark 13:2: "Under no circumstances may a stone be left upon a stone here which may not by all means be demolished."

John 6:37: "Everyone whom the Father is giving Me shall be reaching to Me, and he who is coming to Me I should under no circumstances be casting out."

Acts 9:12: "For, lo! he is praying, and perceived in a vision a man named Ananias entering and placing his hands on him so that he should be recovering sight."

Luke 1:62: "Now they nodded to his father, what he should be wanting it to be called." Optative.

Acts 17:27: "If, consequently, they surely should grope for Him and may be finding Him." Optative.

The Greek is *aphethê* MAY-BE-BEING-FROM-LEFT. The A. V. and Revision have "shall have left." I suppose the C. V. is "monotonous" and "colorless" because it does not repeat "shall" as these do, nor even "should," but changes to *may*! These two examples should be sufficient to show the "monotonous" spirit of detraction that characterizes this criticism. We will not examine the other examples given, lest our criticism also become drab and tiresome.

Moreover, the rendering of the A. V. and Revision creates a grave difficulty for the observant traveler in Palestine. They gave me the impression that all of the great stones of the temple area had been overthrown. Yet when I examined the place, especially the wailing wall, I found many stones which seem to be as they were in our Lord's day. The subjunctive is a marvelous indication of inspiration which is hid in most versions. It opens the way to more credible interpretation, fit for *faith*, not credulity.

TENSE

3. Tense. The verb is the most important part of speech, and tense the most important property of the verb. While the author says that the Greek verb has *state* as well as *time* of action, he wrongly classifies verbs as to *state*, and does not carry the idea of *state* over to all tenses. Thus, the imperfect seems to be uniformly rendered as a simple past, whereas the action is always linear, and the present is uniformly rendered as linear when it is also sometimes punctiliar.

In my prolonged investigation of the forms of the Greek verb by means of my card index of every variety which occurs in the Scriptures, I found that many of the terms used in the grammars are inadequate and confusing. Thus a *verb* was defined as expressing *action*, when it often expressed a *state*, as, *it is written*; or a mere *fact*, as, *I write* [with a lead pencil]; in contrast to an *action* in progress, as, *I am writing* the word "writing." I have examined thousands of cases and found these distinctions in Greek as in English. So I classified the Greek verb by *function* as well as the usual voice, tense, mode, person, and number, which may be seen in the Complete Edition of the version. A hazy intimation of the distinction between *fact* and *action* is sometimes indicated in advanced Greek grammars by the unfortunate expressions *punctiliar* and *linear*. As *punctiliar* may not even be in your dictionary, I will explain it as best I can. It is, indeed, "punk," but is not derived from this root, but rather from the word *point*. Newberry, in his pocket edition, uses a dot to represent it. In contrast to *linear*, an action strung out like a *line*, it is an instantaneous action, like putting the period at the end of this sentence. Having worn out several Newberry Bibles, I was familiar with this idea, but found it utterly untenable. A single example should suffice. The word *love* in John three sixteen is *punctiliar*. Therefore God, at some instant in the

past, *loved* the world, but *He does not continue to do so*. In fact, the very opposite is nearer the truth. The *linear* verbs, as *I am writing*, though they cover some time, while the action is in progress, are *confined to the time of the context*. The *punctiliar* verbs state a mere fact apart from time, which may be true at all times, as, *God loves*, or at any time, past or future, as, *God abolishes* death, or both, as, *I write* my own letters. The grammatical elements of a Greek word indicate its *state* as well as its *tense*, etc. I follow these forms scientifically, and *do* carry over this idea of state to all tenses. I do not make the *same form* a number of different states, for this is sheer lawlessness. The so-called "imperfect" is always a simple past, for it never has the endings of the "linear" forms. Besides, when necessary, this is expressed by means of the auxiliary *was* with the participle, just as in English, as *I was writing*. There is an example in Ac.22:5: the chief priest *was witnessing* (*emarturei*) to Paul. This was an action going on in the past.

THE AORIST, OR INDEFINITE FACT

The author's most important departure from recognized principles is found in his treatment of the aorist tense. In the first place he calls only forms with the augment and *s*, the "true" aorist (p. 25 f.). It will be seen that he does not recognize the 2d aorist as an aorist, nor the 1st and 2d aorist passives. On the 2d aorist he says that it was added to the 1st aorist and that it is "in reality a primitive past tense," which he "usually" translates by the past tense. The writer has not found any explanation of the two past aorist tenses to date.

First of all, the author is wrong in holding that there is any difference at all between the 1st aorist and the 2d aorist; and also in the view that the 2d aorist was "added" to the 1st aorist, for the 2d aorist is older than the 1st aorist (Davis, *Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, p. 120; Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, pp. 307, 346 f.), and there is not a particle of difference between them (Huddleston, *Essentials of New Testament Greek*, p. 57; Davis, *op. cit.*, p. 120), except that when one verb has both aorist tenses the 1st is transitive and the 2d intransitive. Green, *Handbook*, etc., p. 83, says the difference between the two aorists is "of form only." But our author translates John 1:14 thus: "And the Word became (2d aorist) flesh, and tabernacles (1st aor.) among us, and we gaze (1st aor.) at His glory, a glory as of an only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth." He criticizes Weymouth for his treatment of *etheto* as an aorist, saying it has "none of the characteristic of the true [that is, what he calls "true"] aorist at all, except the sign of the past." This is on Acts 25:14 (p. 24).

Secondly, we note that he has a wrong conception of the 1st aorist. Half-truths are the worst kind of falsehoods. It is here that our author departs most radically from accepted interpretations. He quotes Robertson on the aorist in part, as saying: "The Greek aorist indicative, as can be readily seen, is not the exact equivalent of any tense in any other language;" and, "Certainly one cannot say that the English translations have been successful with the Greek aorist;" and, "The Greek aorist and the English past do not exactly correspond;" and again, "As a matter of fact the Greek aorist is translatable into almost every English tense except the imperfect;" but he breaks off at a comma. Robertson completes the sentence by saying, "but that fact indicates no con-

fusion in the Greek" (p. 23 f., C. V.; p. 847 f., Robertson's *Grammar*). He also most signally omits Dr. Robertson's statement to the effect that "in the indicative the three grades of time had tenses of their own," and that the augment expresses past time clearly (*op. cit.*, p. 824 f.). Robertson says in the *New Short Grammar*: "There is no element of past time in the aorist tense. That notion in the indicative mode is due to the augment and to the secondary endings employed" (p. 295). Moulton says: "In the Aorist indicative, as in the Imperfect, we have past time brought in by the use of the augment. To appreciate the essential character of aorist action, therefore, we must start with the other moods" (*A Grammar of New Testament Greek; Prolegomena*, p. 129). Our author also quotes Weymouth to the effect that "it is too commonly believed and taught that the Greek Aorist Indicative . . . is equivalent to the Simple Past Tense in English;" and that "the English Past, used according to the true English idiom will largely fail to coincide with the Aorist . . ." (p. 24); and the author of the Concordant Version concludes that no other tense is suitable in English but the present, saying that "it dawned upon the mind of the investigator that its name was a misnomer—it was not restricted to the present at all, but it, too, was indefinite" (p. 25). But he does not correctly represent Weymouth, for that writer also says in the same pamphlet (*On the Rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect*, p. 14): "Now no one questions that in principal clauses the Aorist of narrative is almost invariably translatable by our Simple Past." Instead, he quotes another statement from Weymouth, as follows: "The Aorist too is often used where our idiom demands the Present" (p. 25), and seizes on this statement as authority for his position that it is *always* the present.

Now neither Robertson nor Weymouth nor Moulton admit that the Aorist is always equal to our present. All understand perfectly well that Weymouth is speaking of the Gnostic and the Epistolary Aorists, which all translate by the present. No wonder that the author of the C. V. says: "It should be understood that this attempt to explain the aorist is not intended primarily for scholars, but for the 'unlearned and ignorant'" (p. 25.). His work surely cannot stand the test of scholarship; but the "unlearned and ignorant," who have no way of testing it are easily ensnared by its pious language, seeming contention for the verbal accuracy of the Scriptures, and the assurance that they are being made familiar with the original text.

A few of the examples of the author may be introduced to show how he works out his principles. Matt. 5:21, 27 is rendered: "You hear that it was declared;" Mark 10:20: "All these I maintain;" John 3:16: "For thus God loves the world, so that He gives His only begotten Son." But the translation becomes ridiculous when he renders John 3:14: "As Moses exalts the serpent in the wilderness, thus must the Son of Mankind be exalted." Prof. Innes calls attention also to his translation of 1 John 4:10: "Not that we love God, but that He loves us, and dispatches His Son, a propitiation concerned with our sins;" and 1 Cor. 15:15: "Now we are being found false witnesses also of God, seeing that we testify in accord with God, that He rouses Christ, Whom, consequently, He rouses not if so be that the dead are not being roused." Prof. Innes remarks: "Surely this is an unconcealed falsehood if ever there was one! And one which undermines the one fundamental basis of the Christian faith" (*Bible League Quarterly*, April-June, 1932, p. 62).

We may add a few examples of our own. The following make the meaning either obscure, ridiculous, or false. He renders Acts 2:36 thus: "Let all the house of Israel know certainly, then, that God makes Him Lord as well as Christ—this Jesus Whom you crucify." Were they still crucifying Him? Eph. 5:25: "Husbands, be loving your wives according as Christ also loves the ecclesia, and gives Himself up for it, in order that He should be hallowing it." Heb. 6:10. "For God is not unjust, to be forgetting your work

and the love which you display for His name, when you serve the saints, and are serving." No "when" in the Greek, only aorist participle relating to their past service. Eph. 2:2: "In which you once walk, in accord with the eon of this world, in accord with the chief of the aerial jurisdiction, the spirit now operating in the sons of Stubbornness." Mark 6:17: "For Herod himself dispatches and holds John and binds him in jail, because of Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, seeing that he marries her." Now the marriage was a past historical fact, and John was already beheaded. Can anyone think that a writer would be so silly as to speak of both these things in the present time? Matt. 25:5: "Now at the bridegroom's delay, they all nod and drowsed." At the same time? Aorist and imperfect. 1 John 5:19: "We are loving God, seeing that He first loves us." Take another one from Prof. Innes' list. Heb. 1:3: "Who being the Effulgence of His glory and Emblem of His assumption," which is in the sublinear: "Who being from-radiance of the esteem and carving of the under-standing of Him." Innes well exclaims: "Which surely needs a re-translation to bring it near ordinary folk!" (*op. cit.*, p. 63). 1 Cor. 4:15: "For if you should be having ten thousand escorts in Christ, but not many fathers, for in Christ Jesus I beget you through the evangel." Was Paul still begetting them? 1 Pet. 1:21: "Who through Him are believing in God Who rouses Him from among the dead and is giving Him glory." John 1:14: "And the Word became flesh, and tabernacles among us, and we gaze at His glory, a glory as of an only begotten from the Father." John 15:6: "If any one should not be remaining in Me, he was cast out as a branch and is withered." According to this translation the casting out and the withering take place before it is determined as to whether the person abides. 2 Cor. 8:9: "For you know of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, being rich, because of you He is poor, that you, by His poverty, should be rich." 2 Tim. 1:10: "Yet now is manifested through the advent of our Saviour, Christ Jesus, Who, indeed, abolishes death, yet illuminates life and incorruption through the evangel."

But we need not multiply examples. Let us note yet one thing. To treat every aorist as gnomic is to overlook the fact that in Greek we also have a Present gnomic (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. 15:42 *ff.*, which the C. V. renders as present passive; Matt. 23:3, which the C. V. renders as durative present; Rev. 2:24, C. V. as durative); a Future gnomic (*e.g.*, Rom. 5:7; 7:3); and a Perfect gnomic (*e.g.*, 1 Cor. 7:39; Rom. 14:23; 13:8; Jas. 2:10). The Aorist gnomic is seen in Matt. 23:2; Jas. 1:11; 1 Pet. 24.

This Version, therefore, sets itself up against all grammarians, seizes on one use of the aorist, and forces that usage upon every 1st aorist active or middle. It further differentiates between the 1st aorist and the 2d aorist, and omits both aorist passives as not being true aorists. Surely, we want better authority for such radical departures from facts than the independent effort of a man untrained in Greek who produces this work on spare time!

As I wish to prove *conclusively* and *finally*, beyond all possibility of a doubt, that the so-called "present" tense is used of an indefinite *fact*, and not an action taking place at a definite time, I am determined to give examples from the greatest, most unquestioned literary productions to be found. But what shall I use? Shakespeare? The Bible? I myself have criticised these. *Eureka!* I have it! *We will use the criticism itself!* It is clear that the critic considers his English beyond reproach. If *he* uses the "present" of a past action, all we need to do is to echo his insolent jeer: "*Is he still—ing?*" Surely the M.A. of Cambridge University whom he follows cannot be astray on so simple a matter! What higher

"authority" is there than the critic's own criticism? Let us see if he really practises what he preaches, or only desires to flay a fellow slave. The following are the actual examples of the diction used in the criticism. They show that the critic's acts belie his words. He continually commits the very crime that he so caustically condemns in the version! If "crucify" means "are crucifying" and Paul's "beget" means "am begetting," then, when the critic says of me (called the "author") that he: *comforts himself, rejects, and disregards* other texts [*wrong!*], *prepares* a Greek text, *disregards* principles, *confines* and *limits* himself, *claims, provides* a text, *seeks* to restore, *endeavors* to give, *sets out* to make standards, *dares* to set aside, *presumes* to be able, *carries* a principle, *makes* appear, *expresses* a hope, *renders* some verses, *comments* on a passage, *translates* several verses, *recognizes* several things, *attempts* uniformity, *sets* himself up, *classifies* verbs, *carries* an idea, *criticises* Weymouth, *departs* from interpretations, *quotes* others, *concludes, represents, seizes* on authority [not guilty!] *takes* Greek words, *tones down* Judas' sin, *teaches, adds, holds, classes, calls, admonishes*, etc., when he does these things, he is at this instant, six minutes after six o'clock on the morning of the ninth of September, 1942 [Excuse me, please! My breakfast has come, and it might spoil it to finish this paragraph before eating. Thank you! The peaches were delicious! The grapes were good. But I dread what is coming. To continue] he (yours truly) is at *twenty-six* minutes after six, Pacific Coast war time, *saying* a lot of things, *comforting* himself, *rejecting* and *disregarding* Greek texts, *preparing* his own text, *disregarding* others' principles, *confining* and *limiting* himself to four Greek manuscripts, *claiming* a great deal, *providing* a text, *seeking* to restore it, *endeavoring* to give readings, *setting out* to make standards, *daring* to set aside scholars, *presuming* to be able, *carrying out* a principle, *making* things appear, *expressing* a hope, *rendering* a lot of verses, *commenting* on some passages, *translating* quite a few verses, *recognizing* a number of things, *attempting* uniformity, *setting* himself up, *classifying* verbs, *carrying* an idea, *criticising* Weymouth, *departing* from interpretations, *quoting* others, *concluding, representing, seizing, taking, toning down, teaching, adding, holding, calling* and *admonishing*, all at one and the same time! ! ! ? ? ? How is that for an "utterly lazy man"? No wonder Thomas C. Innes, M.A., of Cambridge University (who originated *this* special form of insanity), exclaimed, "What manner of man is this!" It makes me dizzy trying to realize all that I am doing. I am so sorry that, after all these years, I am *still preparing* a text and *still setting out* to make standards, *still classifying* verbs, and *still engaged* in translating what was published decades ago!

A knowledge of English is needed, as well as of Greek, in

translating into our tongue. I would suggest that Cambridge conduct a scientific investigation of the real function and usage of the falsely named "present tense." Let a card index be made with many examples of each usage, and a new name chosen for it which covers the actual facts, not the statements of fallible, puzzled, conflicting "authorities." In my private concordance I have all of the indefinites segregated. This, alone, is sufficient evidence to show that it is not present, but *indefinite*.

But the "author" of the Concordant Version is not the only prodigy who performs such impossible feats. Robertson, says the critic, *completes* a sentence, and, therefore, in the death state, is *still completing* that sentence by saying, "but that fact indicates no confusion in the Greek," while I am engaged in *breaking off* at a comma. At the same time Dr. Robertson is *saying*, "*there is no element of past time in the aorist tense*," etc. Is this not a rather dreary occupation for so jovial a man as Dr. Robertson, while his body lies beneath the soil, his soul is in the unseen, and his spirit is with God? It must be especially trying "throughout all eternity" to find that other great scholars continue to disagree with him. This is not a very comforting outlook for a saint of God.

Dr. Moulton is also dead. He, it appears, is engaged in contradicting Dr. Robertson, *saying*, "In the Aorist indicative, as in the Imperfect, *we have past time brought in*," etc. Now being in the indefinite, which, our critic solemnly informs us, denotes that the action is continuing in the future (so that we can ask the question, Is he still continuing?) there is no hope that Dr. Robertson and Dr. Moulton will ever agree in heaven. Rather, by eternally reiterating their differences, they will make themselves most disagreeable, not only to themselves, but to others as well. I shall insist on going to some corner where I cannot hear them. In the future I should go to hear Mr. Cowley, who, because he "quotes," must *still be quoting* from my own writings in UNSEARCHABLE RICHES. I don't think this would be nearly so tiring as listening to the others quarrel, and, I am ashamed to confess, I like the sentiments expressed, and am pleased to learn that Mr. Cowley is doomed to repeat them for "the endless ages of eternity." But—what a disturbing thought!—how will I be able to listen if I am doomed to keep on saying so many things myself?

These considerations should show how unwise it is to take one or two examples to prove a rule. There are things mentioned here that I am still doing. *Occasionally*, not constantly, I am still *rejecting* what is wrong, *recognizing* what is right, *departing* from false interpretations, *holding fast* to the truth. These verbs do not involve a definite act, continuously repeated or constantly carried on, but attitudes of the mind, which emerge in acts. Actual acts as *saying* and *setting out* were all accomplished on definite occasions in the past, like

the crucifixion and the begetting to which objection has been made. If the indefinite "*sets out*" does not demand that I am *still setting out*, then "*crucify*" does not mean that the Jews are *still crucifying*. If the aorist "*prepares*" does not insist that I am *still preparing*, neither does "*begets*" involve Paul's *continuing to beget* at a future time. If the critic does not even know English, how can we accept him as authority in Greek? There are some who think that he does not use correct English in his letter to me. He says "many who thinks." They say it should be "many who think." I submitted this to a specialist in this line, who conducts a column explaining and judging such matters. He says "thinks" is wrong.

Had I translated "*are crucifying*," using the form in English that denotes an action going on at the time, then there would have been some sense in asking, "Were they still *crucifying* Him?" But when I use another form, which does *not* denote an action at all, but a fact apart from time, how can a sane man put his query in such a form? No matter what form I used, it is a viciously immoral act to change to a different form in the question. He might have used the vagaries of our idiom in order to make me appear ridiculous by asking, "*Do* the Jews crucify Him?" Then he would have at least preserved the appearance of logic and probity. Usually we can add the word *do* or *did* without changing the grammar. But, in the indefinite, our idiom will not bear this with some verbs, especially when the action is confined to a single occasion. Where it is repeated we can say both "I write" and "I do write." "They crucify" may be unusual, but it is not incorrect English. It is the only possible form which adequately expresses the sense. The whole point of the passage lies in the timeless *fact* that they *are* the crucifiers of Christ, not in an *act* which is past and gone. That act *remained with them as a fact*, not an *act*, and determined the whole course of their history, not only in the book of Acts, where Israel is set aside, but to this present day, when God is gathering them again. It is of vital importance to recognize this distinction at the beginning of the book of Acts, for it is one of the keys to its correct interpretation. The *fact* of the crucifixion of Messiah by His own people is also the basis on which the truth for the present rests. It would greatly mar the Concordant Version of Acts to "correct" this grammatical form.

This matter has gone too far. As the reputation of the university of Cambridge has been used to sustain this outrage, and appeal has been made to its vast influence to deceive the unlearned, I deem it my duty to send its heads a copy of this reply and appeal to them to publicly repudiate the act of one of its graduates, and condemn his vicious spirit in reviling a citizen of a friendly nation, involving in his sneer all Americans; as well as his utterly depraved reasoning, when he subtly displaces what I said for that which I define differently,

in his question; besides, he refused to right the wrong when we exposed it and appealed to the Editor of the *Bible League Quarterly* to publish our reply. If the university does so, we will publish the reply in our magazine. We will seek a wider sphere of publicity in case this is ignored. We will do the same with the *Bible League Quarterly* which aided and abetted this crime, and continues to do so. We feel sure that the university would not knowingly persecute a pioneer in the investigation of truth even if he is "ignorant and unlearned" like his Lord and His disciples. I wish I could say the same of the religious magazine which steadfastly supports tradition against the Word of God.

Have there ever been more silly and insulting questions asked than those of our critics, in their efforts to ridicule the rendering of the Concordant Version? In reply we say: No, the Jews were not "*still crucifying Christ*" on the day of Pentecost. Neither was David *speaking* (Ac. 2:25, see V. 34) on that occasion, although the Authorized Version uses the "present" "*speakeeth*" in their translation. The Jews were not *crucifying* and David was not *speaking*. Why not show up the utter silliness of the Authorized Version also? It would be much easier, because the Jews were still alive and could have kept on crucifying, but David was dead and buried, and could not speak on the day of Pentecost.

Professors are like priests. They like to conceal their thoughts in language a layman cannot understand. The priest says *hoc est corpus* (or *hocus pocus*) when he means *this is [My] body*. The professor prefers *aorist* to the plain *indefinite*, because he "interprets" it to mean *definite*, which denotes the opposite. Their high-sounding jargon too often camouflages unbelief and ignorance. The ancient Greeks used the name *aorist* because it *means undefined* in Greek. We have a close equivalent in our *indefinite*. Why not use it? Among themselves scholars are agreed that they don't know what the *aorist* is. Weymouth and Robertson practically acknowledged this in a nice way. *The ancients DID know, and I agree with them* that the *aorist* is an *aorist*. In English I insist that an *indefinite* is *indefinite*. I have no salary or reputation to lose, so I can well afford it. Do not charge me with lack of respect for scholarship. It is the scholars who insult the ancient savants by claiming to know better than they, even though they can't agree or explain it themselves. What do you think, gentle reader, of a critic who seeks to make a fellow saint appear ridiculous and daft by deliberately distorting his declaration? What is your verdict? Was it malicious, knowingly done, or was it an act of innocent ignorance? Is not the latter the more gracious conclusion? But if we must decide that he does not know that he is bound to repeat the exact form in such a method of reasoning, why is he allowed to criticise at all? Is it not a disgrace to the scholarship which

he represents? Should he not be barred from his profession?

When I left Europe I destroyed all the papers concerned with the defamatory article in the *Bible League Quarterly*, and confined the whole affair to Him Who judges justly. But now I find that the type is still standing, so we may publish it along with this article, which is largely based upon it. We ask our friends to distribute it among the supporters of that publication.

The confusion in the mental processes of the critic is well expressed by himself when he speaks of the marriage of Herod as at that time a "*past historical fact*"! If it had not been a *present* fact, if Herod had meanwhile put away his brother's wife, then John the Baptist would have had no case against him at all. It was a *past* historical ACT, and a *present* FACT. John did not denounce Herod because he had *married* his brother's wife and had divorced her again, but because of the *fact* that he *is* married contrary to the law. Both of Herod's *acts* were in the past. But they were not in view. John also might have been released meanwhile. But the facts and the guilt remained quite apart from time.

The following table may help to clarify the Greek indefinite and explain why its English equivalent is mistakenly called a "*present*." In reality there is no duration to present time. I wrote the word "*present*" in the *past*, and the word "*past*" was then future. Only a continuous action can fill space in the present. A fact is like a state, it breaks the boundaries of the present, though it can be relegated to the past or future.

	ACTION	FACT	STATE
<i>Past</i>	were crucifying	crucified	had crucified
<i>Present</i>	are crucifying	[crucify]	have crucified
<i>Future</i>	will be crucifying	will crucify	will have crucified

We have put the word crucify in square brackets, for it is really a *past-future* in Greek as in English. In Greek it actually has both the sign of the past (a prefixed *E*—) and of the future (a link —*S*—) as its identifying marks. Thus, *I believe* is *E-pisteu-S-a* (2 Co. 4:13). This practically eliminates time or "*tense*," for a combination of the past and future cannot locate action in time. The so-called "*present*" is only the junction of the past with the future, so can have no existence except when actions are in progress or have resulted in a state. "*I am writing*" covers a small segment of time in which this junction moves. "*I have written*" is a state with the action in the past and the state continuing in the present. "*I write*" does not locate the action at all, for it may include the fact that I wrote in the past, my writing at this time, and any future writing I may do. It leaves the time open. I did not always write, nor will I continue to write continuously in the future.

I sorrowfully admit that English is losing the power to distinguish between an act and a fact. In other branches of the germanic languages they can no longer fluently say "am acting." They must say, "act" for both the act and the fact. English also, alas, is gradually losing this power. I have acknowledged this in thousands of cases in the International Edition of the Concordant Version by placing a slight 'vertical stroke before the fact form in order to show that it should be the act form. The word *crucify*, in the imperative, should read "Be crucifying Him!" instead of "Crucify Him!" in Luke 23:21. English prefers the short, incisive form in a command.

We do not treat *any* aorist as "gnomic." A gnome is a maxim. A *maxim*, in Greek, is not determined by the grammatical form of the verb. It has nothing to do with the grammar. Not one of the instances of the indefinite, used by the critic himself, is a maxim. We might use these passages to show that the name "gnomic" is misleading and false. To turn it against us only shows the lack of mental acumen so common in these discussions. The use of a nebulous term does not clarify.

HETERODOX DOCTRINE

V. HETERODOX DOCTRINE. A review of a Version need not, on the surface, include a review of its teaching; but when that version contains such a hodgepodge of mistranslations, consistent enough for the purpose of teaching therefrom certain errors, and especially when that version is accompanied by "expository notes," it becomes the duty of the reviewer to point out the evident doctrinal bias of the authors. We pass by minor differences of opinion, however, and concentrate on a few important doctrines.

A thorough scientific investigation of the facts of the original Greek of the Sacred Scriptures by means of concordances, such as we have made, should uncover much fresh truth, and correct much error, and entirely change the "orthodoxy" of those who do the work, if their orthodoxy is contrary to God's Word, as it must be in these last days, unless the compiler was the only person alive who had escaped the general apostasy. When he began this work he was associated with the so-called "Open Brethren," a split from the "Plymouth Brethren," who claimed to be the orthodox of the orthodox. From them the so-called "Fundamentalists" of today have appropriated most of their orthodoxy. He held tenaciously and belligerently to the new birth, eternal punishment, the Trinity, and a conscious death state, with a vicious zeal that only one of such a sect can entertain. In these days, had he met himself as he became forty years later, he would have enjoyed burning himself at the stake, and applauded any torture which could be applied to such a heretic. He had a little light; but far less love.

My "evident doctrinal bias" in compiling the Concordant Version cannot be what I now hold, but what I held when I commenced. *My critic himself gives ample evidence that I did not corrupt the Version by my doctrinal views, but changed them to conform to the evidence discovered in my investigations.*

At that time I preached in public, "Ye must be born again." Have I injected this into the version or the notes? Then I abhorred "the non-eternity doctrine." Where is this bias evident? Then I taught that there is a "triune God." Have I defiled my pages with such an unscriptural expression because of my theological connections? Yet *these* are the principal doctrines chosen to show that I have corrupted the Version in order to promulgate my heresies! *These ought to be used to prove the opposite! By changing my views to conform to the facts and condemning myself for having harbored unscriptural heresies,* I have provided ample evidence for all to see that I have *not* yielded to my doctrinal bias in compiling the Concordant Version or the accompanying notes. It has not been easy or pleasant to alter my opinions. First, I was cast out of the Brethren because I dared to have fellowship with saints outside their select circle. Then followed a series of heart-rending crises which threatened to separate me even from my dearest friends and relatives. I discovered again and again that my doctrine was not in accord with God's Word. For years I did not dare to even mention the truth of the eons to my wife, for she also was a "Brethren" (with a big B). Thank God she gradually changed into a *sister*, as the evidence was patiently presented to her. She called in one of the leaders to show me my errors. When I quietly gave the Scriptures for my position and he could not do the same, but began to upbraid me, her eyes were opened. "Why," she said, "You gave Scriptures and he could not!" Every fresh find meant a fierce fight with the "orthodox" scribes and Pharisees. Since then I have made the sad discovery that the highest ambition of many of the Lord's alleged servants is to emulate the Adversary, who walks about, seeking whom he may swallow. A great teacher who taught "Brethren truth" (though repudiated by them because he did not confine his fellowship to them alone), actually sought to trap me, so that he could denounce me. He wrote, demanding that I immediately answer yes or no to his question, whether I believed in the "third person of the Trinity." I replied that, just as soon as he should give me one single Scripture that mentions a divine "person" or a "trinity," I would believe God. That muzzled him, but he did not have grace enough to acknowledge the unscripturalness of his words or the heinousness of his loveless act. Daniel in the lions' den! I am in a den of hissing serpents who call themselves (and are) saints. God does not muzzle their mouths,

nor extract their fangs. The saddest part of it is that most of them really *are* God's beloved children, even though they act like sons of the Adversary and do his work, thinking they are serving God.

The trick of labeling error "orthodox," and truth "heterodox" is a very shabby one. I was struck by a question, asked me by a venerable "christian" Arab in Jerusalem, who, I imagine, belonged to the Roman Catholic church. He had been reading about the break between the Roman and the Greek confessions, and asked me what I thought of the matter. Seeing that he was really seeking the truth, I told him plainly that the popes of Rome were heretics, and the Greek church was right on the point that divided them. Just think of it! Rome, the murderer of millions of heretics, is itself nothing but a band of heretics! So, today, churches and individuals, bulging with heresy, are the heresy hunters. This critic, who is reeking with the teaching of men because his honors come from them, and who constantly appeals to human authority rather than the divine oracles, dares to revile another because he cleaves only to God's Word and refuses the heresies of men! God be gracious to him in Christ Jesus!

BIRTH VS. CREATION

1. It lacks a proper doctrine of regeneration. Relegating the Gospel of John to the kingdom, the author holds that regeneration is for Israel, not the Gentiles. He says: "A new birth will fit them for a life on earth during the millennial eon. . . . Regeneration keeps company with repentance and baptism" (Comment on John 3:1). True, he says also: "Paul had been proclaiming the kingdom, with Christ and the nation which is related to Him by physical ties at its head. Entrance into that kingdom was by a birth from above. But now the figure of birth is not radical enough to denote the great change. Just as, after the day of the Lord, heaven and earth will be re-created, so is the spiritual experience of one who is in Christ. There is a new creation. Paul never connects the new birth with his teaching to the nations." (Comments on 2 Cor. 5:16.) But it is to be doubted whether he holds that the "new creation" is a present possession, for he says: "Searching as the figure is, it does not probe nearly so deeply into human helplessness as the truth for the present economy of God's grace. Now, if any one is in Christ, there is a new creation (2 Cor. 5:17). In spirit, we skip the era of the kingdom, the renascence, and enter the new creation, over a thousand years later. A new birth will fit them for a life on earth during the millennial eon. The new creation fits us for our celestial destiny. They will receive a rejuvenation of the faculties, we will be changed at the resurrection and receive powers and capacity far beyond our present possibilities. . . . The new creation accompanies the dispensation of the conciliation (2 Cor. 5:18)" (Comment on John 3:1).

If anyone thinks that he is literally and physically "born again" or a "new creation," he is to be pitied. Our Lord did not say "You (singular, Nicodemus) must be born again," but "*ye*" (the nation of Israel). I tried to explain this to one of the Brethren once, but he insisted that *ye* is singular! All I could say was that his statement was still more singular!

90 "Eternal Punishment" Non-Scriptural

Even now Israel *possesses* all the promises, but the nation certainly does not *enjoy* them! So also, I am a new creation in Christ, but I do not as yet enjoy it. By God's spirit I enjoy an *earnest* of this in my spirit, and a taste of it in my soul, but not in my flesh, except as His spirit is vivifying my mortal body (Ro. 8:11). But I expect something far more glorious in the future. I now *possess* and *taste*, but then I shall *enjoy* the *fullness* of perfection. God will not create such a defective, infirm, decaying creature as I am in His new creation. Then we shall be as we should be, and as wondrous as we would be.

"ETERNAL PUNISHMENT"

2. It denies eternal punishment. We have already shown that the author takes the Greek *aion* and *aiōnios* always to mean a period of time, and never eternity or eternal. We have shown the incorrectness of that contention. He tones down Judas' sin of betraying Christ. These are his words: "Satan entered into Judas. This statement lifts the veil of the invisible powers of darkness and greatly modifies our judgment of Judas. It is evident that the Adversary did not think him capable of committing the capital crime, so forces him forward by actually obsessing him, and controlling his mind and his actions until it had been accomplished. He was not himself when he did it. But later, when he realized what he had done, his heart was filled with bitter regret and he did not hesitate to fling the money he had received into the faces of the chief priests, and acknowledged his terrible trespass." Again: "Who can doubt that His grace will save him yet?" (Comments on John 13:26, 27.)

There is much additional proof that the author definitely teaches that there is no eternal punishment. He says the torment spoken of in Rev. 14:11 is definitely limited as to persons and as to duration. Those who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads will be tormented five months (Rev. 9:5); Satan and the wild beast and the false prophet will be tormented (20:10); the *fumes* of the torment of those here spoken of last for the eons of the eons. He adds: "These are the supreme sinners from among mankind, hence suffer the severest doom. No others will share this fate with them." (Comment on Rev. 14:11.)

The author holds that there is a difference between *resurrection* and *vivification*. The following, he holds, is the order for the future: Believers will be raised and vivified when Christ comes,—they will receive *eonian life*, i.e., life for the age. The unbelievers will not be raised until after a thousand years. Mr. Knoch says in a pamphlet (*The Salvation of the unbeliever*): "Our resurrection and vivification are simultaneous, but the unbeliever will be raised long before he is vivified. The change which eventuates in the ultimate salvation of the unbeliever is wrought, not only by his resurrection, but by the august judgment session, when he stands in the presence of Christ, with all his unbelief swept away by the awful realization of His power and the justice of His throne. We are asked, Is it possible for them to repent? Rather, we would like to know, Is it possible *not* to repent, or change their minds? We can not conceive an unrepentant sinner before the great white throne" (p. 6 f.). But in the C. V. he says that they will be judged before the Great White Throne, and since they "all fall short of God's standard," and since "they are not vivified, or made alive, as the saints are by a better resurrection, hence they die again." He explains the "lake of fire" as the "second death" (Comment on Rev. 20:12, 13). His true view is that a few will be tormented (in the second death?), those who do not repent before the Great White Throne. They will die again, in the second death; but will after a time be

raised when death itself will be abolished and all be vivified. 1 Cor. 15:22 is the strong verse. Finally, after the New Heaven and the New Earth have run their course, Christ will raise and vivify these recalcitrant ones, abolish death, deliver the kingdom to the Father, and be Himself subject to the Father.

Let the reader compare this with the Scriptures and he will see that I need not apologize for any of it. But it is not so with the critic's comments. I make it clear that *all* will repent, or change their minds, at the great white throne. I do *not* say that a few, who do not repent, will be tormented in the second death. No one fails to repent and no one is tormented in death. I know of no "recalcitrant" ones when death is abolished. Yes, 1 Corinthians 15:22 is a "strong" verse, especially for those who are scant of faith. But it is God's Word, and heaven and earth will not be able to frustrate its fulfillment. We must distinguish the different sentences imposed, or we will land in confusion.

THE TRINITY

3. It has no proper doctrine of the Trinity. We note that the words "Holy Spirit" are always written in small letters. Commenting on the "Spirit of truth" (John 14:17), he says: "The spirit of deception is that false flood of spirit force which is sweeping the world on to the worship of the antichrist. The spirit of truth is its opposite." He invariably speaks of the Spirit as "it." In his comment on Rom. 8:9 he maintains that the believer has three spirits: The spirit of God, the spirit of Christ, and his own spirit. Mr. Cowley quotes from *Unsearchable Riches*, a paper apparently connected with this Version, on the Holy Spirit, as follows: "Why should not God's holy spirit be identified with Him? There is not the slightest need to prove its deity. But it is utterly illogical and unscriptural to infer that it is a *distinct* 'person' from God. Who ever thinks of making Christ's spirit another deity? If He is divine, co-ordinate and co-equal with God, why is His spirit not also another 'Person' with these attributes? If this is not so of Christ's spirit, then it is not true of God's spirit. In the original, both are always in the neuter gender, *it*. God's spirit has His 'Personality,' but is not a separate 'Person' from God Himself. God and His spirit are both given as the Father of our Lord. How can two distinct 'Persons' be His Father?" (*Bible League Quarterly*, Oct.-Dec., 1933, p. 171 f.). The word for "Spirit" is neuter, but so also is *to teknon*. *Pais* is sometimes masculine and sometimes feminine; some texts have *arsén* or *arsen* as a neuter, both meaning *male* (Thayer, s.v.). But *fish* (*ichthus*) is masculine; *city* (*polis*) is feminine; *fox*, male or female, is feminine (*alôpêx*) (R. D., p. 51); *sun* (*hêlios*) is masculine; *moon* (*selene*) is feminine. As to the word for *Spirit*, it should be noted that the word *Comforter* (*Paraklêtos*) is masculine and Jesus identifies the Comforter as the Holy Spirit (John 14:26) and the Spirit of truth (John 15:26; 16:7, 13), and repeatedly refers to Him by the masculine (*ekeinos*) pronoun (John 14:26; 15:26; 16:8, 13, 14).

What a mess! As we have made the matter clear in our pamphlet on "*The Personality of the Holy Spirit*" (from *UNSEARCHABLE RICHES*, Vol. XXXIII, page 65), we will not repeat it here. If the "spirit of truth" is a person, then so is the spirit of infirmity (Lu. 13:11), and the spirit of holiness (Ro. 1:4), and the spirit of sonship (Ro. 8:15), and the spirit

of humanity (1 Co. 2:11), etc. I have several of these spirits. Seems as if I must be at least a trinity of persons myself! This spirit of truth within me is a great comforter. But, my dear reader, I wish to warn you not to try to prove to a psychiatrist that this spirit is a distinct "person," living with or within you. He might take it as a sign of serious mental derangement and confine you to an asylum!

GOD AND CHRIST

Again, when we read, "God is an invisible Spirit (John 4:24; 1 Tim. 6:16). The Son of God is the visible, tangible embodiment of Deity. Only in Him can we see God. All other images are condemned because they are false and dishonor God (Deut. 5:8)," we seem to be on evangelical ground with respect to the Deity of Christ; but when we read on: "All creation was in Him, as the tree and its fruits are found in the seed. In Him God created all else for the whole universe was created in Him," we are not so sure (Comment on Col. 1:15). When the author comments on his rendering "toward" (*pros*) in John 1:1, we become very uncertain. He says: "It is impossible for the mind to entertain the two thoughts that the Word was toward (or with) God, and the Word was God. Nothing which is toward (or with) an object can actually be that object. The difficulty lies in the difference between English and Greek idioms. 'Was' and 'is' are usually omitted in Greek, unless they are used in a figurative sense. Thus 'This is my body' does not mean that the bread of the communion actually is the Lord's body, so the Word took the place of God. The God of the Hebrew Scriptures spoke: It was an oral revelation. He was revealed as Elohim, Jehovah, Adonai, etc., by means of utterances which came to the fathers through the prophets, while His essence was concealed" (Comment on John 1:1). But when he comments on Phil. 2:6 ("who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped") we seem to be clearly on heterodox ground. He says: "*Form*" denotes outward appearance, as is shown by Paul's use of it in the contrast, "having a *form* of devotion, yet denying its power" (2 Tim. 3:5). We have found it impossible to sustain the idea that it refers to intrinsic essence. *Figure* or *fashion* denotes the form prevailing at any time. Christ was the Image of God, the visible representation of the Deity. He appeared as God to the saints of old, as in Eden and on Sinai. This *form* was laid aside for that of a slave, at His incarnation. Adam and his progeny seek to exalt themselves and will be humbled. But Christ, Who might easily assume the place of equality with God, found His delight in submission and humiliation. . . . When He was in the form of God He was given the same place as God by men (Gen. 16:11, 13; 22:11, 12; 32:28, 30; Ex. 3:2, 6; Josh. 5:13, 15; Jud. 6:12, 23). All of the divine titles, Elohim, Jehovah, Adonai, etc., were assumed by Him just as if He were God, because He is His image." 1 Tim. 3:16 he translates: "And avowedly great is the secret of devoutness, which was manifested in flesh, justified in spirit, viewed by messengers, proclaimed among the nations, believed in the world, taken up in glory." But even if we reject the reading *theos* in this verse and accept *hos* it is yet evident, as Lock points out (ICC, *Pastoral Epistles*, pp. 42, 44-46), that the reference can only be to Christ.

The appalling ignorance and utter credulity of the orthodox creeds in regard to the place of God and Christ, and their relation to one another, ought to muzzle their mouths. A concordant version makes all clear. We have set forth the truth in a series in UNSEARCHABLE RICHES, Vol. XXII, pages 201,

309, 413, where the honest seeker after the facts will find enlightenment and satisfaction and relief from the superstitious credulity of orthodoxy.

NIRVANA

CONCLUSION. In conclusion we note that the author classes the teaching of "Continuous Conscious Existence," "Personal Responsibility," "Compensation and retribution in the Hereafter," and "Endless Progression" with certain other recognized false doctrines and calls them all "these doctrines of demons" and admonishes us that we should "thoroughly purge ourselves" from them (Comment on 1 Tim. 4:1). It is clear that he holds that death is unconsciousness (1 Thess. 4:13); that it is only physical; that when Christ comes, all who are His will be raised and receive "eonian life;" that they will reign with Christ for a thousand years; that after the thousand years the rest of the dead will be raised and judged; that those who repent will also receive "eonian life;" that the rest will be made to die the "second death," which is merely to pass into unconsciousness again; that then the New Heavens and the New Earth and the New Jerusalem will come in, in which all the then-living will have part; that after that period has continued for an eon or eons, death will be abolished, and those held by the "second death" will be delivered up; that then the Son will turn everything over to the Father; and that henceforth God will be all in all. 1 Cor. 15:22-28 is the star passage for this Version, Verse 28 is about the only revelation of eternity that we have, according to it. We may well ask whether this does not resemble the pagan doctrine of Nirvana.

The doctrines mentioned are the publicly recognized teachings of spiritists, who claim to get them from the spirit world. It ought to *alarm* the orthodox to find that the demons teach the same as they hold. We do *not* hold that death is only physical. We do *not* hold that any receive eonian life at the judgment. We know of *no* eons in the new earth, for there is only one.

Nirvana is defined by Webster as "The final emancipation of the soul from transmigration, and consequently a beatific freedom from worldly evils, by annihilation or by absorbtion into the divine." May God graciously forgive our adversary the mean, malicious and malign accusation that we teach transmigration, annihilation, absorbtion, or any other human error which we vigorously oppose! So low has he sunk, that, by subtle insinuation, without daring to make a clear statement, he forces us into fellowship with a human philosophy, whereas he himself is a doctor of such a philosophy.

Practically all versions agree with the Concordant Version in revealing that God will be "All in all." Nirvana teaches the opposite. *There* humanity vanishes *in the Deity*. *Here the Deity is in all*. Christ is All in all the young humanity now (Col. 3:11). Is it absorbed or annihilated? God is in all believers now (Eph. 4:6). Are we absorbed or annihilated? Even a fool, when eating shark's meat, knows that there is a tremendous difference whether the shark is *in him* or he is *in the shark*. But that seems too subtle for a philosopher! I am in Christ. Not because, by successive transmigrations

through reptiles and even more degraded degenerates, I have become fit for such a precious position, but because of *His* infinite worth and supreme sacrifice on Golgotha. Have I been absorbed in Him or annihilated? By no means! The same, I trust, is true of my critic, despite appearance to the contrary. Has anyone been more insistent on grace and faith, as the only and sufficient channels of salvation, or has protested more vehemently against any other means than we have? No, my dear brother, we are far further from Buddhist error than any others. You are probably able to translate the thirteenth of first Corinthians into English. O, that you would at least try to translate it into practice! Do you not act as if you were in the Adversary, rather than in Christ?

The author and publisher is very eager to circulate the "Version." Often a prospectus is sent out, "Back to God's Inspired Original!" No reference whatever is made to the type of doctrines which it is designed to propagate. The unwary reader unconsciously imbibes some of the heresies to which we have referred. The only hint of warning is found in the statement: "More than twenty years of intense research in the originals has led to the discovery of much precious truth, which has entirely revolutionized the faith of the compiler, and has given him a profound conviction of the inerrancy, of the inspiration, and of the superhuman excellence of God's Word." We surely accept the inerrancy and verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; Mr. Cowley (from whom the thought of this paragraph is taken) well says: "It is surprising that the word 'faith' should be used here at all, and to speak of it as having been 'revolutionized' is putting the case mildly. When writing his first letter to Timothy, Paul described this sort of thing as '*shipwreck*'" (*Bible League Quarterly*, Oct.-Dec., 1933, p. 172).

There is good reason why no reference is made to "the type of doctrine," for it is not "designed to propagate" any. As elsewhere shown, if there had been any such design, it would have turned out very differently. In fact the version would have propagated practically the same doctrine as the Schofield Bible, for this scholar simply appropriated the teaching of the Brethren. I suppose that is the Bible preferred by this critic. *It is definitely designed to impose a system of doctrine on the Bible, and some of it is the most damnable heresy that ever afflicted the saints.* I know, for I taught it myself when I followed the teaching of men and had not investigated the inspired originals. The charge preferred against me is true of it. But, is it not silly to speak of a *version*, teaching a definite type of doctrine? Which of the hundreds of different systems of theology based upon it does the Authorized Version teach? The compiler himself warns against the notes in the Complete Edition.

The reference to Mr. Cowley is sadly unfortunate. Just after the publication of his calumniations in the *Bible League Quarterly*, a friend in London wrote to me saying that he had just seen this brother and that Mr. Cowley was abjectly afraid that I would take steps to have him arrested for his false statements. *His calumnies are the sure evidence that he has*

made shipwreck. This is the chief sign of this disaster. When Hymeneus and Alexander wrecked the faith, they displayed their state by calumniating others, so that Paul gave them up to Satan to be trained otherwise (1 Ti. 1:19-29). I do not need to wreck the faith. *I found it a wreck already.* The Greek church drove the faith upon the rocks. The Romans split it in two. The Protestants are so full of error that they broke it into a thousand fragments. Such a total loss cannot be wrecked. It can only be salvaged. Mr. Cowley and this copying critic have done nothing constructive. They have sought only to demolish. Wrecks are not made by my methods. They are by theirs. *I restore. They wreck.*

Lovers of God and His precious Word! Shake off the shackles of tradition in which you are bound, not only by the priest but by the professor! Our schools and colleges have become hotbeds of apostasy and defenders of superstition. They refuse to investigate God's Word itself, but are hirelings of the corrupt creeds of Christendom. Rome places her priests above the Bible. Protestants put the professor above the Scriptures. Once they *studied* the original, now they quote the oracles of the dead in order to *destroy* it. Instead of following the precept of Paul, to have a pattern of sound words (2 Ti. 1:13), they build on fundamentally *unsound* expressions. Where is *Trinity* or *eternity* in God's Word, in the original? They refuse to correctly cut the Word of truth (2 Ti. 2:15), and cannot even distinguish between birth and creation. Thank God for the choice spirits among them who sigh because of the sad state to which scholarship has sunk! In the world real investigators are discovering the secrets of nature. Research is often thorough and practical and beneficial. Our attempt to discover the secrets in the sphere of spirit is much more profitable. We have unearthed treasures far more valuable than any chemist has ever found. *He* is applauded and enriched and honored by his fellows. *We* are met with calumny and dishonor. Funds are withheld because we cannot avoid exposing the religious blindness and apostasy and downright deception of those who are subsidized to expound and defend the Word of God. The money given to foster the faith is used to destroy it. The sad fact is that saints give their money only to popular teachers of error, who are "sound" and "orthodox" according to the apostate church, especially if they *claim* to oppose error while defending it.

Who is more trustworthy, the base traducer, or the traduced? May God be gracious to him and purge him from a mind that reveals its own depravity when it seeks to fasten this on others!

Having spent so much labor in planting and pruning, I want to harvest some fruit for the friends of God. I know that I will be reviled and ridiculed. I am aware that I have little human backing and insufficient means. But this has

always been the case. I am content to have it so, for it leaves room for *God* to show *His* hand. He has raised up helpers in the past and will do so in the future, though the task and the expense will be many times as great. But I would value the loyal and gracious coöperation of any who will bear the torch to others, who will make the matter known, so that the testing, toil and travail may be fruitful in many hearts, and multiply the appreciation of God's marvelous wisdom and grace, and spread the fragrance of His name from pole to pole, from the north star to the southern cross. May He graciously grant our request, for we make it on the ground of our own unworthiness and the merits of His Son, our Saviour, to Whom shall be glory for the eons of the eons! Amen!

Beloved Reader! If your eyes have been opened in any measure to this the greatest evil on the face of the earth (because it destroys the most vital values ever confided to mankind), if your spirit boils because of the iniquities which are committed in the name of God, if you wish to do your part to help God's saints to enjoy the grace and truth which are theirs in Christ Jesus; if you desire to aid in real, fundamental, orderly research in the originals of God's Word, that the barnacles of tradition may be scraped away, and the thick crust of superstition may be removed; we invite you to coöperate with us and to enjoy the serene satisfaction, as well as the severe sufferings such coöperation will bring—*with no other reward* until you give account to Christ. You are welcome to a part in the most glorious work in the universe, and one which may get the greatest of all rewards in that day.

Thank God from the depths of your heart that He is not such a ferocious fiend as the creeds have made Him. He does everything in love, even as He bids us do. In Christ, He has made ample provision for every one of Adam's erring sons, and all the powers of darkness will not be able to defeat love's goal to be *All* in *all* of the creatures of His hand and heart.

May I ask a special favor of the readers of this defense? Will you write a few lines on a postcard stating your opinion of the criticism we are criticising, and mail it to us for transmission to the author? Perhaps if he is deluged with protests, he will consider his ways and withdraw his slanders. God is able to work miracles of this kind even in this late day. We would be most grateful if we could add a few lines, telling of his repentance and regret, to this sordid tale of hatefulness.

UNSEARCHABLE RICHES FOR MARCH, 1943
BEING THE SECOND NUMBER OF VOLUME THIRTY-FOUR

EDITORIAL

HERALD THE WORD! *Stand by it!* Such are the marching orders of the aged apostle Paul to his son Timothy (2 Tim. 4:2). And this is especially needed in the last days in which we live. Perilous periods *are* present, not merely in the political sphere, but even more so in the spiritual (2 Tim. 3:1). We take this as the Lord's will for our little magazine. Hence, in this issue, we devote most of its pages to exposition, and some to correction. We hope to continue along this line during the coming year. Special stress will be laid on prophëcy or those passages which bear upon it. We will continue with Daniel, for we have some exceedingly interesting and important discoveries to share with our readers, one in particular, in regard to the clay in the Metallic Image, seen by Nebuchadnezzar. In this issue we point out where Solomon got his gold, the subject of much speculation hitherto.

We hope that what we have learned of the Antichrist in the last volume will keep our friends from being disturbed by the false Messiahs of the present time. Alas, how many of the saints were deceived by the rise of Mussolini and his revival of the Roman empire! Had they known that the Scriptures do not predict such a revival they would not need to hide their heads in shame today. So with the present pretenders. None of them fit the picture presented in God's Word, however high they may be or whatever wonders they may perform. And none of them is a Jew. Some, indeed, are enemies of the chosen people. Above all, this administration of

grace, in which we find ourselves, no matter how terrible the times may be, due to man's inhumanity to man, can never be stretched into the time of God's indignation against the nations, or into the time of Israel's great affliction. This is a day of salvation and conciliation. God cannot commence the dire judgments of the era of the end until we have been caught away. We look for Christ from heaven. We do not watch for antichrist on earth.

The great fundamental truth of revelation, that there is *only one true God*, is being assailed, and some of our readers are being disturbed by mistaken scholarship and false inferences. Worship does not imply Deity. Even saints will be worshiped (Rev. 3:9). The Hebrew and Greek words for *one* do not denote a composite unity, like the Trinity. The Hebrew *yachad*, which is not used of God, denotes *united*, not *only*, and is used of Abraham's son Isaac, to whom he was *attached*. Isaac was not an *only* son, for Ishmael had been born long before. This vital truth will be defended in a series of articles, and will appear as soon as there is room.

We hope soon to be able to push the version to completion. Yet we must ask that all our friends join us in fervent prayer that the stratagems of the adversary be defeated. We realize our own utter inability and cast ourselves entirely on God.

A. E. K.

ADVANTAGES OF THE CONCORDANT VERSION

A WONDERFULLY CLEAR and helpful little pamphlet of eight pages, containing an address by Edward H. Clayton, of Sheffield, England, gives many concrete examples of the advantages of the version. Just how to give it the circulation it deserves is a problem. As an introduction to the Version we know of nothing better. If you can help distribute some, order them direct from Edward H. Clayton, 345, Warminster Road, Sheffield, 8, England.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO SOLDIERS

WHEN SENDING SUBSCRIPTIONS for those in the armed forces stationed outside continental United States (including such addresses as c/o Postmaster, New York, etc.), the order must be accompanied by a written request for the magazine by the addressee. At present this restriction does not apply to the Navy or the Marine Corps.

CONCORDANT VERSION TRUTHS FOR THE JEWS

INSPIRATIONAL INFORMATION FOR ISRAELITES

A NEW SERIES of Concordant Messianic messages, prepared especially for Jews, is ready for free distribution to Jews anywhere. Contains such subjects as The Messiah, His Two Comings, Jewish Destiny, Persecutions, Messianic Prophecies and Their Fulfillments, Jewish Genealogy of Messiah, Jews' Justification, Jews' Conciliation, Sovereignty of Israel's One God, The Law or the Lord, Correct Partitioning of the Jewish Sacred Scriptures, Messiah Our Passover, Messiah Our Sin Offering, Messiah Our Sacrifice, Salvation is of the Jews, God's Grace in Messiah for the Jews, The Jews' lambs or God's Lamb, The Jewishness of Jesus. The CONCORDANT VERSION OF THE GREEK SCRIPTURES and the Concordant renderings of the Hebrew Scripture passages are used exclusively in all messages.

Jewish and gentile readers of UNSEARCHABLE RICHES and the CONCORDANT VERSION are invited and needed and urged to help in the free distribution of these messages to Jewish men and women that the Jews may have God's original truths as concordantly translated.

Why should Jews who are seeking the Saviour and salvation be deprived of Concordant truths? Why should Jews be subjected to unscriptural teachings, beliefs and translations? The Concordant Version must be introduced to the Jews that they may have the true translation of the true evangel of the true Messiah.

Thousands of Jews today want the truth in line with Deuteronomy 6:4: Hear, O Israel; Our Lord our God is one Lord. Here is your opportunity and privilege to have Israel's One Lord operate through you for the salvation of His chosen people, the Jews. Millions of Jews have never seen or read or even heard of the Greek Sacred Scriptures, and know nothing whatever of its glorious contents which proclaim the fulfillment of the Hebrew prophecies of their Messiah. Thousands of Jews are heart-hungry for God and Messiah and salvation and need the Sacred Scripture information.

In one eastern city more than 200,000 Jews requested a copy of the "New Testament" during the past two years. Shall we not supply them with Concordant truth? We are confident that the Jews who are versed in the Hebrew Scriptures will immensely appreciate the CONCORDANT VERSION OF THE GREEK SCRIPTURES for the outstanding scriptural and spiritual facts it contains. From start to finish there is no confusion or inconsistency in the Concordant translation and scripturally versed Jewish minds will sense that keenly and quickly, and will be receptive to the truth concordantly translated.

Send your name and address for a sample set of these messages, read them, and then tell us if you will assist in the distribution of our offers to Jews. Or, if you prefer, send us a list of the names and addresses of Jewish men and women in your location and elsewhere, and we will mail the messages to them. God has promised to bless the nations who succor the Jews and are kind to them. This is your opportunity to do that and receive the promised blessing. Every Jew should have a copy of the CONCORDANT VERSION, containing messages for all Jews. Write today to the Jewish Information Service, P. O. Box 34, Jerome, Idaho, U. S. A. A Concordant Version Service for the Jews. God, Messiah, and the Jews need your help for the distribution of these messages among the Jews.

EVOLUTION

OUR ATTENTION HAS BEEN CALLED to two pamphlets, "Evolution, The Facts," and "Evolution—The Witness of Science," known as Evolution Series No. 1 and No. 2. In them, a Christian physician presents positive evidence disproving the theory of Evolution in a thorough and convincing manner. They are obtainable from the International Christian Crusade, 366 Bay Street, Toronto 2, Ontario, Canada. No price is given.

CHRIST CONTRASTED WITH DEITY

CHRIST'S RELATION TO GOD is so obscure in the minds of most believers, that we are reprinting the above article as a ten-cent pamphlet, and hope to follow with CHRIST COMPARED WITH DEITY. These truths greatly glorify God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and should be studied by all who love them.

TIMELY TRACTS

WHY DOESN'T GOD STOP THIS WAR, and WAR—WHO WANTS IT? are the titles of two tracts on this vital subject, which are now available in addition to the four we already had. These are sent free of charge to anyone who wishes to distribute them. Let us know how many you can use.

IS YOUR CONFIDENCE in *Christ* or in your *flesh*? A new tract containing Philippians 3:4-9, 17-21, from the International Edition of the Concordant Version. Intended to help Anglo-Israelites. Available free, in any quantity you can use.

SOLID COMFORT FOR THE BEREAVED

HERE IS THE TRACT you have been looking for! It shows how God will deal with all the unsaved, innocent children as well as hardened sinners, in order to bring them to Himself. Twenty-five cents per hundred, or free to those who cannot pay.

BROTHER J. W. COOK

THE HAMILTON, ONTARIO, CLASS mourns the loss of Brother J. W. Cook, who was put to repose November 25, after a short illness. Brother Cook first became interested in Pastor Russell's teaching, later learning of the Concordant method of study, which he followed until his death. Being fond of music, he was a member of St. John the Evangelist Anglican Church choir, and the funeral service was conducted by the rector of that church.

MARY ANN WILLIAMS

SISTER MARY ANN WILLIAMS, of the Lake Worth, Florida, class, passed away November 29. An inspiring funeral message was given by Brother John Clendening. Sister Williams and her daughter, Sister Edith Claxton Grapes, had been regular attendants of this class since 1932, when Brother Loudy first visited there.

NETTIE LOUISE SMITH

SISTER NETTIE LOUISE (LU) SMITH fell asleep in Christ on December 8. Early in life she had become interested in the study of God's Word. Like many others, she learned of the Concordant method of study after several years association with the I. B. S. A. class in Hamilton, Ontario. For over fifteen years she revelled in it, never missing an opportunity to testify. She was most desirous that a testimony to her faith be presented at her funeral service. Brother A. G. Cameron, of the Toronto class, made an able presentation, and we pray that the message may have helped many. Those who knew Sister Smith will greatly miss her kindly counsel in concordant study. Good night, dear sister, 'till He come!

MRS. FORREST

DURING MY VISIT to Glasgow I enjoyed the kind hospitality of Brother and Sister Forrest, and still am grateful for the warmth of it. I rejoiced that they were still young and strong and hoped that many years of service still lay ahead for them. Now I have received the sad news of the death of Mrs. Forrest from the effects of an operation. My sympathy goes out to her husband. Oh, that the day for which we long may come! Then our sorrow will be turned into joy.—A. E. K.

JOHANNA THOMASS

MISS JOHANNA THOMASS, of Douglaston, Long Island, died on November 16, 1942. She was a reader of UNSEARCHABLE RICHES for many years, and visited California some years ago, meeting the editor personally. She was always diligent in making these precious truths known. We understand that she suffered much during the last year or two, so that her awakening will be one of great joy. She is survived by her sister, Miss Bertha Thomass.

NATURE IS NOT SINFUL

NATURE, or instinct, we are told, is propensity prior to experience and independent of instruction. Without instinct the animals, including man, would soon perish. Were our life altogether dependent on conscious, intelligent effort, we would be born dead. The babe breathes instinctively, naturally, without realizing that it must, or learning how to do it. It suckles its mother's breast before it is able to receive instruction. All of the complex and marvelous functions on which life depends operate automatically, unless hindered, without intelligent co-operation on the part of the child or its parents. The knowledge necessary to operate the human mechanism is so vast, that no one, even though he live a hundred years, could be trusted with its direction, yet the infant never is at a loss. Instinct never makes a mistake in the sphere of physical life and growth.

It is evident from this that nature or instinct is radically different from the knowledge gained by experience, reflection or study. It is a pure, unadulterated gift from the Creator. Of necessity it must not fail, or partake of the frailty which has been brought in by death, or life would soon become extinct among God's creatures. *It operates counter to death and sin.* Sinai is an expression of the *mind* of the Creator, but instinct goes further. It tends to make the natural man conform to the law of God, even if he has never made its acquaintance (Ro.2:14). It is the *unnatural* man whom God condemns, who *alters* the *natural* to that which is *beside nature* (Ro.1:26). It is those who are *without natural*

affection who draw down God's indignation (Ro.1:31). Alas! the mistranslation *natural*, in place of *soulis* (1Co.2:14, 15:44,44,46, elsewhere rendered *sensual* Ja. 3:15, Jude 19), has tended to make the saints *unnatural*, contrary to God's mind. Such renderings are a hindrance to the apprehension of divine truth and bar the path which is pleasing to God.

A study of the word in the Concordant Version concordance will help more than anything else.

The word translated *nature* is the same as the word *SPROUTING* in Greek. It belongs to the same family as *SPROUT* (Heb. 12:15); from which we have *tribe*, which occurs often; and *plant*, both noun and verb; and *leaf*; as well as *natural* (Rom. 1:26, 27, 2 Pet. 2:12) and *naturally* (Jude 10), with their compounds. The Greek word covers the ground of the English *instinct* as well as *nature*. We once used *instinct* in Romans 2:27 and 1 Corinthians 11:14 as more suitable to the context, but the word is so important, and the difficulties connected with it are so great, that we consider it wiser to give it a uniform rendering throughout, even in the version, in order to create a foundation on which to build in the future. But we will retain the word *instinct* as a synonym in the concordance, as it has some advantages over *nature* in its usage.

NATURE VS. FLESH

As *nature* has practically taken on the sense of *flesh* in theological parlance, let us put *flesh* in place of *nature* and see what happens. In 1 Corinthians 11:14 (which has been revised to "Is not even nature itself teaching you . . . ?") the moral atmosphere would be reversed if we change to *flesh*. The apostle would never appeal to the teaching of the flesh, and he would never appeal to the teaching of *nature* if it were at all sinful. Could we find a better recommendation for *nature* than its ability to do what the law demands, even in those who are not

under law (Rom. 2:14)? To Adam was imparted the power to sway over all the lower creation (Gen. 1:26). This mysterious force was not entirely obliterated by sin. James says that "every nature, of wild beasts as well as flying creatures, reptiles as well as those of the salt sea, is being tamed and has been tamed by human nature" (Jas. 3:1). There is nothing wrong about the instinctive sway of man over the animals by means of his nature or instinct. On the contrary, it has survived the ruin caused by death and sin.

The *flesh* is a figure for the entire physical or material part of man in organic form, including the blood and bones. It is to be distinguished from the *body* in that this brings before us the *form* and *function* which the flesh takes in living organisms. It is worthy of note that sin is presented as entering through fruit, a material substance, and that it affected the flesh of Adam and lowered his vitality. It looks very much as if he had partaken of poison. It is this organic substance, flesh, which is the dwelling place of sin. Lacking sufficient life or spirit, it disintegrates, decays, goes to corruption and causes us to make mistakes. This is not natural, but *unnatural*. Nature is not inherent in the flesh, but in the spirit. We do not dominate the animals by the weight or the strength of our flesh. Instinct is no greater in the fat than in the lean. These two are enemies, not identical.

There are passages in the Scriptures which are exceedingly difficult to understand or to reconcile with truth which seems crystal clear everywhere else. Such a passage is Ephesians 2:3: "*we . . . were by nature children of Indignation, even as the rest.*" With this as a proof text, it was drilled into me by teachers of tradition, that the "natural" man is totally depraved. He has a "sinful nature." The fact that this is true, loosely speaking, of the *flesh*, and the further fact that I had not yet learned to distinguish between such terms in

God's Word, increased the difficulty. But when I learned from a study of every other passage in which the word *nature* occurs, that it is *never sinful*, rather is the one aspect of man that has escaped, in some measure at least, the ravages of death and sin, it seemed impossible that this single passage should be an exception. This experience has taught me to sympathize sincerely with those who have the same difficulty, and to encourage them to go on until they have restored this one passage to harmonize with the rest.

One thing that helped me much was the discovery that the apostle, in this part of Ephesians, says one thing to the Uncircumcision and another to the Circumcision. To one he uses the pronoun *you*. When he includes himself he says *we*. This passage is a parenthesis, and refers only to the compatriots of Paul. It was the *Jews* who, "by nature," were as the rest, the nations. This opens up a new vista of truth.

The connective *by* is a very vague one in English, because it is so variously used. It may stand, idiomatically, for any of the oblique cases. It may mean either *of*, or *through*, or *in*, so it will be well to fix its exact sense here. It stands for the dative case, which *locates*. The one connective which is *always* dative is *in*. Let us use it here. The Circumcision *in nature*—that is, in [the state of] nature, apart from circumcision and the law, which are not natural or instinctive, but artificial and superimposed by revelation—the Circumcision are even as the other nations when divested of their rites and religion.

The little word *by* is the culprit here, for it takes on the sense of the genitive *through* in this context, and suggests that the nature of both was equally bad. In our ignorance, we once took it that *we* refers to the believer and *you* to the unbeliever, that we believers are just as bad, apart from God's grace, as the unregenerate. But I found this untenable in this context, and the result of

that miserable habit we had of isolating passages from their contexts. In the first chapter the apostle speaks of the evangel of *your* salvation (1:13) and this *faith* of *yours* (1:15, revised C. V.). In verse eleven of chapter two he says "*you, the nations.*" So that, "by nature," or (as we probably shall revise it in the next edition in order to preserve the dative case) *in the state of nature*, does not refer to us at all! The *Circumcision*, in their natural state, are just the same as the Uncircumcision. The differences do not affect the nature of either. When we become accustomed to it, *in* may bring out the sense clearly without the addition of *the state of*, and make it itself a place in our idiom, but it is hardly understandable at first without adding *the state of* at present.

It is important, in such a study as this, to take the grammar into account, and compare especially those occurrences of the word which have the same relation to the rest of the sentence. In this way Romans 2:14, which is also in the dative case, is of special value. There we read of the nations "doing by (or *in the state of*) *nature* what the law demands." This utterly contradicts the usual interpretation of Ephesians 2:3: "by nature children of wrath" (A. V.). *But it does not clash* with this text *when the context is taken into account*. Despite the fact that the Uncircumcision discharged some of the law's demands because of their instinct or nature, that did not keep them from being sons of Stubbornness, because a spirit from without them, and contrary to their nature (as in the case of Adam) operates in them to resist God and His revelation. The nations were not sons of Stubbornness *because* of their nature or instinct, but *in spite of it*. The saint has a similar experience. As Paul expresses it, "the willing is lying beside me, yet to be effecting the ideal is not" (Rom. 7:18). Even if we have the power of God's spirit to aid us, we are all too often stubborn.

Nature is not only used of man and the animals, but

of plants as well. *Natural* boughs are those which grow on a tree as a matter of course. Those which are grafted on to the tree are, as the Greek puts it, "beside" nature (Rom. 11:24). Perhaps this will help us to understand our difficult passage, although the cases are reversed. In Romans the *nations* are unnatural grafters, while in Ephesians the *Jews* are artificial. Naturally and nationally each nation is like a bough in a wild olive tree, and produces no illuminating oil. But, when a nation is grafted into the cultivated or unnatural olive tree, it is like Israel.

"Total depravity" is a phrase I do not like to repudiate, because the denial *seems* to imply that I expect man to have some small share in his own salvation. Yet, like many another product of man's mind, it may become a snare, trapping us in human philosophy. These words are *not scriptural*, hence are not needed to express God's mind. That "depravity" is *not* "total" is evident from the limitation which Paul imposes on the thought. His exact words are: "I am aware that good is not making its home in me (*that is, in my FLESH*) . . ." The implication is inescapable: the Scriptures do *not* teach that good is not making its home in man's *spirit*. They do *not* teach that man's *nature* is utterly depraved. On the contrary, as we have seen, man's instincts are still good and should be heeded, like his conscience. That can be *dulled*, but it cannot be put into *reverse*. Neither can his nature be turned to *evil*, even if it may be *suppressed*.

For a long time I had to take "total depravity" by "faith," or rather, *credulity*, for I was not blind to the fact that men were not all alike. Not everyone was on the same level of sin. Indeed, I knew *unbelievers* who were far more just, more agreeable, more loving, than the strait-laced sectarians with whom I was associated. I did not know then that "faith" in a human phrase is false and a mark of apostasy. To a certain degree I

believed man, not God, and this almost always leads to darkness, not to light. The teaching of "total depravity" tended to sour my own disposition, not that of anyone whom I contemptuously called a "natural man." I was in danger of becoming *unnatural*, artificial, hypocritical, loveless. Now, thank God, I see in all living things a God-given nature or instinct which mortality and sin have not fully eradicated, only suppressed. It is the *flesh*, not the spirit, which is "totally depraved," if we must use a faulty human phrase, "because the disposition of the flesh is enmity to God, for it is not subject to the law of God, for neither is it able" (Rom. 8:7). I believe in the *inability and enmity of the flesh*, This at least gives the sense of God's Word, not man's wisdom.

The nations were, in their natural condition, without law or ritual, *sons of stubbornness*, not because of their nature or instinct, but because of the operation of the spirit of the aerial jurisdiction in them. The Jews should not have yielded to this sinister influence, for a different spirit, that of God, as embodied in His revelation, should have made them compliant, yielding to their nature and God's law. But the law, because of their flesh, failed to produce obedience. Moreover, its infringement produced indignation. That is why the phrase is changed. The Circumcision are not called sons of stubbornness, but a much stronger phrase is used. They are "children of *indignation*." They are law-breakers. Having God's law, they did not heed it. Their divine advantages have turned to disadvantages. The law produces indignation (Rom. 4:15).

Yet God, being rich in mercy, because of the vast love with which He loved His earthly people, who also were dead to their offenses and lusts, made them alive together with the nations, in Christ, who are saved in grace, and He rouses them and seats them, together with the nations, among the celestials in Christ Jesus, that, in

the on-coming eons, He may display the transcendent riches of His grace in His kindness to them in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:4-7). Thus this passage would read, if written out in full from *our* standpoint rather than the apostle's. For the nations have been saved *in* grace *through* faith, and this is naught of ours: it is God's present sent to win our favor, not the wages for our work, so that we cannot boast. God's achievement are we both, being created in Christ Jesus for those good works which He has in readiness for us, in order that we should walk among them.

The Scriptures would have us heed the teaching of nature, the leading of instinct (1 Cor. 11:14). We are not to do that which is beside nature (Rom. 1:26). For the nations it, in some measure, replaces God's law, with the added advantage that it is written in our very constitution, not on tablets of stone. It may be that the law, written on Israel's heart in the day of Jehovah, will be the release of this nature or instinct from the thralldom of Satan, who will then be bound. Tradition seeks to suppress this divine gift, and calls it "*sinful*," but God declares that it is *not*. Let us purge our vocabulary from the false phrase "*sinful nature*," and seek to disinfect our thoughts from the poisonous impression that we must strive to be unnatural in our behaviour in order to please God. Let us shed the false humility which refuses to recognize the good with which God has endowed all His living creation, the instinct, or nature, which alone preserves it from instant decay and death. Let us thank God for this marvelous nature, without which our most learned scholars, our keenest scientists, would not be able to preserve themselves alive for an instant. It is the presence of God, for in Him we are living and moving and are (Acts 17:28). A. E. K.

ETHIOPIA AND THARSHISH IN PROPHECY

CUSH is the Scriptural name for Ethiopia, just as *Mizraim* is Egypt and *Phut* is Libya. Our Bible uses the names found in the ancient Greek version rather than the Hebrew, as a rule. Sometimes, however, the Authorized Version has *Cush* for Ethiopia (Isa. 11:11, 18:1), besides the proper name in Genesis 10:6, 7, 8, 1 Chronicles 1:8, 9, 10, Psalms 7. It has *Mizraim* for Egypt when it is the name of a person (Gen. 10:6, 1 Chr. 1:8, 11) and *Put* or *Phut* for Libya (Eze. 27:10, Nah. 3:9), as well as in the genealogies (Gen. 10:6, 1 Chr. 1:8). It is difficult to change this now, but it is necessary to know these things if we desire to understand God's revelation concerning these countries.

In the Authorized Version the connection between the founders of these great peoples and the lands themselves has been obliterated. Let us remember, then, that Cush and Ethiopia, Mizraim and Egypt, Phut and Libya are the same. The first name indicates the person and the second the nation which is descended from him, or the country it inhabits.

Of Noah's three sons, Ham was the father of Cush, as well as Mizraim, Phut and Canaan. At first Noah's descendants dwelt on the plain of Shinar, or Babylonia (Gen. 11:2), where men began the tower of Babel. Thence Jehovah scattered them over the face of the earth by confounding their language. It seems as if the confusion was especially great between the three fam-

ilies, for the Hamites may be best identified today by the similarities in the structure of their languages. This would tend to separate these from the others and to group them together. The earliest remains of their language are found in Babylonia, as the Scriptures inform us (Gen. 10:10), but later they left there and went to Arabia and to Canaan and to Egypt and to the north coast of Africa and to Ethiopia. Since then they have been largely replaced in Arabia and Canaan and north Africa by Arabs, who are descendants of Shem. It is probable that the rest of Africa is largely Hamitic also.

It has been suggested that the name Cush, or Ethiopia, has been applied to three distinct regions of the earth, one near the Euphrates (Gen. 2:13), another within hearing distance of Mt. Sinai (Hab. 3:7), and the one usually so called, the Abyssinia of today, south of Egypt. As a matter of fact there is only one passage of Scripture, that in Genesis, which may possibly be used of a location other than Abyssinia, which is near one of the sources of the Nile. The one near Sinai is not Cush, but Cushan.

In Habakkuk 3:7 we read as follows:

Under lawlessness I see the tents of *Cushan*,
The curtains of the land of Midian are being disturbed.

It seems evident from this and the preceeding context, which speaks of Teman and Paran (v. 3), that *Cushan* is in the desert south of Palestine. But it is not *Cush*, but *Cushan*. The name is not the same, but similar. The added n usually makes a great difference in the sense. For instance, *lb* denotes HEART, but *lbn* is WHITE. Surely a different location and another name cannot refer to Cush or Ethiopia.

THE RIVERS OF EDEN

In Genesis 2:10-14 we have a passage which has

called forth many interpretations, but we know of none which agrees with the facts as there stated. It tells us of one stream in Eden which, after it had entered the garden which Jehovah God had planted, was parted into four heads. Then we are given the names of these heads, Pishon, Gihon, Hiddekel, and Euphrates. The latter two seem to clearly indicate the two mouths of the present Tigris and the Euphrates. In fact, if only these two were mentioned, there would be little doubt about the location of the garden of Eden, for it is a remarkable fact that these rivers not only join into one, but that *they also separate again into two streams* before they enter the Persian gulf. Other great rivers do the same. The Nile has many mouths and so has the Mississippi. Anyone who reads the description in Genesis and compares it with the mouths of these great rivers will see that only such a delta will account for the facts. Rivers seldom divide into two, and never four, except at their end.

Such deltas are almost invariably garden spots. The soil is usually silt, brought down by the stream. There is generally an abundance of water beneath the surface. The garden was not watered by means of a fog, or "mist," as the Authorized Version has it, for the moisture went *up* and watered the *surface*. A mist would need to go *down* to do this. It was the water beneath the soil which was drawn *up* by capillary attraction to the roots of the plants. This is the very best way to water a garden. It is called sub-irrigation. To keep the underground reservoirs full they would need to be near a source of supply. A single large stream flowing through such a garden would not be satisfactory, for those parts at a distance from the water would suffer. So the stream was parted into four, much as an irrigationist today turns the "head" of water from the main ditch into

many smaller ones, in order to bring it near the roots of all the plants. This would make an ideal garden from every standpoint.

According to this, Eden's garden was probably located somewhere below Basra, in Iraq, where the combined Euphrates and Tigris divide into two streams. But deltas are very changeable. The Mississippi seems to be more than a hundred miles longer than it once was. The present site of Basra may have been beneath the waters of the Persian gulf when Adam lived. As the land is made by the stream, it is usually very flat, so that the mouths of the river change in location and number. There could easily have been *four* mouths to the Euphrates-Tigris before the deluge.

Although this seems to be the only explanation which agrees with the record, there are some difficulties. The third stream, the Hiddekel, or Tigris, is said to go east of Ashur, or Assyria. This might have been true of the upper reaches of the river, *before* it unites with the Euphrates, but Ashur must have been very small if it was only a part of the delta. The main difficulty arises in connection with the land of *Cush*, the subject of our present study. The Gihon, we are told, surrounded the entire land of Cush (Gen. 2:13). The fact that one of the branches of the *Nile* rises in and flows about a part of the land later called Ethiopia, led almost all ancient expositors to make the Gihon the Nile and the Pison the Ganges or some other great river in India.

For our present purpose it will suffice to observe that, if the Gihon is the Nile, as the ancients taught, then there is only one "land of Cush" in the Scriptures, and that is Ethiopia. On the other hand, if the paradise in which Adam was placed was the delta of the Euphrates-Tigris, then "the land of Cush" was a comparatively insignificant tract of land, not to be compared with any

modern country, and without any significance among the nations of later times.

It is quite possible that Noah's grandson, Cush, first settled in this district and gave it its name, but later, after the peoples were dispersed, his descendants migrated to the much larger land in Africa and gave this the same name. The same course was often followed in the settlement of new lands, sometimes with the prefix "new" and often without. There is a London in Canada as well as in England. There is even a New England and a New Britain.

Today prophetic students are especially interested in the Ethiopia of the future, in connection with the invasion of Gog and Magog (Eze. 38:5). The trials and sufferings of the Emperor, who seems to be a believer in God, have awakened the sympathy of all lovers of God's Word. I remember well, when Ethiopia was attacked by a foreign foe, how sure I felt that they would not be conquered, because they were mentioned among the nations of the future, when Gog and Magog should come against the land of Israel. I was tempted to write an article for the magazine showing that their enemies could not win, according to the Bible. It was well that I did not, for it might not have appeared until after they had been subjugated. It was a salutary lesson, which may help others not to find in God's Word what He has not put into it. Now, indeed, I might claim that Ethiopia is rid of the conqueror, that they will never be vanquished again, but that is not what is written. We only know that they will be present when Gog and his hordes attack the land of Israel.

Ethiopia, or Cush, coupled with Persia and Libya, protected by shields and helmets, will be associated with Gog in the great rebellion which, as we have shown elsewhere, will probably occur in the early part of the mil-

lennium. We may not like this, we may protest that Ethiopia is a "Christian" nation, so this could never be. Indeed, there is a strong tendency among students of prophecy to seek some way of escape from this plain prediction. One of the latest attempts seeks to apply the name *Cush* to some other nation, and identify Ethiopia with Sheba, because its king claims descent from the queen of Sheba. This is worth considering, so we will take it up later. First, we must point out that this whole attitude is wrong. A "Christian" nation may turn against God as well as any other kind. Israel was not kept from turning against Jehovah even though they, as a nation, were in much closer touch with God than any "Christian" nation has ever been.

Gog may have once passed for a "Christian" prince, and his people and allies may have been on God's side. Indeed, this is plainly implied when Jehovah says to him: "*I will reverse you.*" The course of Gog and Magog, as presented to us in Ezekiel's prophecy, is the *reverse* of that which they had been pursuing. Moreover, they did not backslide of themselves, nor were they deceived by Satan, for he was bound. Jehovah Himself reversed their course. So that, if we wish to *reason* that Ethiopia could not be among the opponents of God at that time, their supposed goodness would be no reason why they should not take part in this insurrection. It is characteristic of the day in which we live that an argument against the plain predictions of God's Word is very agreeable and popular, and will be reprinted by many zealous followers of Christianity. Few give God His place, even though they are very zealous to give man his.

SHEBA IS NOT ETHIOPIA

The queen of Sheba is popularly believed to be in the line of the king of Ethiopia. In this way we might also

“prove” that he is the Messiah, for his titles include “Lion of the Tribe of Judah” and “King of Kings.” There is nothing in the Scriptures to show that Solomon married the queen of Sheba. In fact, if the Ethiopian emperors are the line of the Messiah, then our Lord Jesus Christ was an impostor. We cannot recognize the pretentious titles of this man without rejecting the true King. If he were as spiritual as is claimed, his first act would be to renounce every title which belongs alone to the true Messiah, Who alone is the King of Kings, and is far above all others, including the emperor of Ethiopia.

Even if it is true that the emperor is descended from the queen of Sheba, what proof is this that Ethiopia is Sheba? Victoria was empress of India, but that does not prove that England is India. Sheba and Ethiopia are nearly neighbors, so she could easily have reigned over both, or the ruler of one could become the emperor of the other. The fact that the first son of an English king is prince of *Wales* does not keep him from the throne of Britain. It is not necessary to multiply examples, for there is no logic in such reasonings, let alone faith. The Scriptures do not identify Sheba with Ethiopia. They locate Sheba across the Red sea in the mountains of southern Arabia.

Sheba (*Shba*) unlike the names which we have been studying, is uniformly rendered throughout, except in the plural, *Sabeans* (Job 1:15, Joel 3:8 (4:8)). It is a pity, however, that our translators used precisely the same spelling for another name (*Shbo*) in 2 Sam. 20:1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 13, 21, 22, 1 Chron. 5:13, Jos. 19:2. The student should change these to *Shebo* to distinguish them. Like *Cush*, the name goes back to a person, and is first applied to men. It is remarkable that both the line of Ham and Shem have *Sheba and Dedan* together, just as in Ezekiel (38:13). The posterity of Ham is Cush, Raamah, *Sheba and Dedan*. Skipping all before

in the line of Shem, we have Abraham, Jockshan, *Sheba and Dedan*. This would make Sheba a grandson of Abraham, in the same generation as Jacob.

Naturally one would expect the earlier one, the great, great grandson of Noah, to be the founder of the Sabeans, and the ancestor of the queen of Sheba. But we must remember that Abraham was to be a father of many nations, not, indeed, in the line of promise, through Sarah, but through Keturah, later. It is very likely, therefore, that the queen of Sheba was a descendant of Abraham. This may help to explain the special interest manifested by the queen in Solomon's time. And this, in turn, may be a forecast of the attitude of Sheba toward Gog and his hordes in the days to come.

Anciently districts of Yemen, the southwestern corner of Arabia, were called Sheba. This was especially true of the northern part of this territory, which is still marked accordingly on some maps. It is a very different land from the main part of Arabia. Instead of desert, much is mountainous, more like Ethiopia. The people were largely occupied with trade. Their traders carried goods to Tyre by caravan (Eze. 27: 22, 23). They brought frankincense from Sheba (Jer. 6: 20). Probably it was one of these caravans that slew Job's servants and took away his stock. In the Septuagint they have freely rendered Sheba by *Arabia* in Psalm 72: 10. The Jews between the second and third century B. C. were in a far better position to locate Sheba than we are, and they made it Arabia, not Ethiopia. As there is no comparable evidence to the contrary, this should settle the point.

Like Tarshish, Sheba was one of the *trading* nations of ancient times (Eze. 27: 22, 23), but, unlike Tarshish, the trading was not by sea, but by land. Except by a long journey through Egypt, Ethiopia could not be reached by land. Besides, such a journey would be along

the Nile, where ships would be used. Of course, some of the journey could have been by land, but this must have been through Arabia, and through the Sheba in Arabia. Nothing can be proven by the articles they brought to Tyre, for they not only carried the products of their own country, but also of the whole southwest. Besides, the country and climate of Sheba and Ethiopia were so similar that what one would produce would be found in the other also. Sheba in Arabia was far better situated to carry on a trade with the great mercantile centers, as Tyre and Sidon, than Ethiopia, cut off, as it was, by water. Even the products of Ethiopia might come by the caravans of Sheba.

SHIPS OF THARSHISH

The greatest traders of ancient times were the Phoenicians and their colonies. A leader among these was Carthage, near the farther end of the Mediterranean. This, in its turn, was the point of departure for commerce extending to the regions beyond, past the "pillars" of Hercules, the modern strait of Gibraltar, even as far as the tin islands near Brittannia. In the Greek version of the Scriptures, Carthage is sometimes used for the Hebrew Tharshish. In Isaiah 23: 1, 10, and 14 they render it *Karchêdonos*. This should have great weight with us, for we are at a vast disadvantage compared with them in a matter of this kind. We are burdened, not only with ignorance, but with prejudice. That is why so many places have been identified as Tharshish, from India to England. Some think it was the ancient Tartessus, now Seville, in Spain, or the city now called Cadiz, or even Tarsus, in Asia Minor, the city of Saul.

One thing seems very clear, and that is that Tharshish was closely allied with Tyre. In Ezekiel 27: 12 we read that Tharshish was the merchant of that city, which supplied it with such minerals as silver, iron, tin and

lead. There is nothing here to indicate that Tharshish *produced* these metals. Tharshish did not dig them out of its hills, but merely traded in them. They sent ships out into the Atlantic, and probably bought these ores along its coast. In fact it seems probable that the tin came from the mines of Cornwall. But it is most unlikely that it was freighted in the vessels of that country, or that they sent trading vessels to Carthage or to Tyre. In fact the islands of the Atlantic were almost unknown at that time. Silver, iron and lead were found in many places, so that they do not tell us just where the merchants of Tharshish went. But tin is so seldom found that we may well locate the mines in the British Isles.

The ships of those days were small, frail craft, generally, fit for crawling along the shore of the Mediterranean during the favorable season of the year. But they wintered in safe harbors as a rule. Much later, the ship in which Paul sailed to Rome was not able to stand a winter storm, and was wrecked. I, myself, have seen this sea calm and pleasant in the fall, yet change suddenly, so that the small boats which came to carry us to shore were nearly swamped. But such ships were ill suited for traffic on the turbulent Atlantic. If the ships of Tharshish traded with the tin mines of Britain they must have passed the bay of Biscay, which, even today, has a bad reputation. So that these ships, it would seem, were not only at home in Tharshish, but were probably built larger and stronger and more seaworthy than others. Perhaps this may have influenced Jonah to take passage in one, as well as the fact that they alone could bring him to the end of the known world, as far from his people and his God as he could get.

But there are some difficulties in identifying Tharshish with Carthage. These we will now investigate. The name Tharshish means TOPAZ, a semiprecious stone, usually a transparent yellow. There is no ground to

suppose that these gems were found at or near Carthage. Rather, they might have been imported from the tin mines, as they are often found near tin ore. But it is more likely that the name, like Cush, is derived from that of the progenitor of the people of the place. This leads to some interesting facts. Tharshish was the grandson of Japhet, the son of Javan (really *Iun*), from whom the Ionians, or Greeks, were derived. Greece, even more than Phœnicia, was a colonizing nation. It is most likely that the descendants of Tharshish settled in north Africa, where Carthage later stood, and gave the name by which the country was known, while Carthage was confined to the city, as later dominated by the Phœnician seafarers.

When the Phœnicians founded Carthage, the country was already settled. In fact they never formed more than the upper strata of the population, though they probably included most of the merchants and ship owners, because of their connection with Tyre. There have been many examples of this in the course of history, down to very recent times. Powerful maritime nations have founded great trading cities, over which they ruled, although the population was mostly of another race. They have even conquered whole peoples merely to control their trade, and have sent only a few of their own race to govern and protect. Such was ancient Carthage. The people as a whole were descendants of Japhet, and related to the Greeks, but their masters were descendants of Shem and related to the Hebrews. Tharshish, then, like Cush (Ethiopia), Phut (Lybia), and Mizraim (Egypt), is named Tharshish in the Scriptures, but called Carthage, in some of the Greek translations.

Another very grave difficulty lies in the way of this identification. At least it seems so at first, and it has probably caused most of the confusion, leading some to identify Tharshish with India and others with England,

and still others with both. Not only did the ships of Tharshish go to Tyre, on the eastern coast of the Mediterranean and bring the metals already recorded, but ships came from Tharshish by an entirely different route, bringing gold and silver, ivory and apes and peacocks (1 Kings 10:22). Every three years they seem to have made a round trip (2 Chron. 9:21). Hiram, king of Tyre, sent Solomon ships to Ezion-geber, and they went with Solomon's servants to Ophir for gold (2 Chron. 8:18).

How could Hiram send ships to the Red sea? There was no Suez canal in those days. And how could ships of Tharshish, on the north coast of Africa, get to the Red sea? Why should they do this so seldom? Is not the *time* the clue which solves this problem? I once read an account of what was supposed to have been the first circumnavigation of Africa. It took about a year and a half, if I remember correctly. The ships crawled along the coast because the navigators feared to get out of sight of land. The sailors had to debark for several months to grow a crop of fresh food, for no ship could be provisioned for so long a time. According to this a voyage from Carthage, just across from the island of Sicily, clear around the continent of Africa to the Red sea and return, would require just about three years with the ships then in use. So that the time given in the Scriptures is in perfect accord with the length of the trip.

It is usually supposed that Solomon's ships went to India for the apes and peacocks, as the names of these correspond with those in Tamil, one of the many languages of that part of the world. But it certainly would not take three years to do this. And would a wise king send so far for a few animals which could come overland much more easily? We are told that he got his gold in Ophir, which, it is said, refers to Rhodesia, in South Africa, in the Zambesi country. This lies in the

opposite direction, so would hardly be combined in one voyage. Why not get his apes and peacocks in Africa also? The *names* may have come from India, even if the animals did not.

The ships also brought "almug trees," according to the Authorized Version. Because the apes seemed to prove that they had been to India, the tendency is to render this *sandal wood*. But none of the early versions suggest this. The LXX has what might be called "dressed timber," while the Latin renders it "thyine wood." But this seems to be a guess, for Solomon would hardly import wood for burning incense contrary to the law. It is more satisfactory to derive it from the Hebrew negative *al*, and *mug*, DISSOLVE, *indissoluble* or *imperishable* wood, like the redwood of California, suitable for the finish of the temple which Solomon was building. Such a tree grows on the continent of Africa. Sandal wood would not be used for pillars, but indestructible wood, which does not rot, is most appropriate (1 Kings 10:12).

King Solomon amassed an enormous quantity of gold, especially for use in building the temple of Jehovah. Where did he get it? King Solomon's mines have been a favorite subject of speculation. Many a man would give a great fortune to know where all this gold came from, in the hope of finding fabulous riches. So all we need to do is to look it up in the Bible. There we are told that Solomon sent his ships to Ophir (2 Chron. 8:18). But, in the more than a dozen references to Ophir, in the Hebrew text, not one gives us a clue as to its location. Not one tells us where to find it. There was a man named Ophir in the line of Shem (Gen. 10:29), but this is no help. The Hebrew stem *aphr* denotes ASH. About all that we know is that a special kind of gold came from there, very pure and valuable (1 Kings 9:28, Job 28:16, Psa. 45:9(10), Isa. 13:12).

Now let us see if we can be as wise as Solomon in this matter. He wanted a lot of gold. Where would he seek it? Would he not go *where it was* and collect it? Nothing is said about his mines. Now we know that, on the western coast of Africa, there was a stretch of coast so rich in this precious metal that it is still known as the "Gold Coast." There is every reason to believe that free gold was much more plentiful there, and elsewhere on the African coast, then it is today. And there were probably considerable quantities in the hands of the natives, just as there were on the western coast of South America when it was first visited by the Spaniards. All that merchants, like Hiram, would need to do would be to send ships along the African coasts and trade with the natives for the gold that he wanted.

It seems most likely that Solomon sent Tharshish ships clear around to the western shore of Africa and then had them continue collecting the gold he needed along the coast to its southern reaches and up along the eastern shore as well, and then up the Red sea to Ezion-geber, from whence it went to Jerusalem by caravan. This suggests that Ophir may stand for the whole of Africa. And why not? The Hebrew is not Ophir, but Auphir, from the stem *aphr*. These are the first three letters of *Africa*! And the ending may be only a shorter form of the Latin *Africanus*, from *Afer*, as the dictionary gives it.

African gold is different from other gold in color, so that it deserves a special name. It is not simply that it came from Africa, but it was considered a special variety and probably was rarer and more valuable than that obtained elsewhere. This, then, seems to be the real meaning of the almost mystical phrase "gold of Ophir." It was *African* gold.

"ETHIOPIA SHALL SOON STRETCH OUT
HER HANDS TO GOD"

The above quotation, from Psalm 68:32, is often

used to show that Ethiopia cannot have any part in the invasion of the land by Gog and Magog. The Authorized Version rendering "soon," is against such an application, but it is not found in the Hebrew. As this passage may have its fulfillment in the thousand years, especially when the nations turn against Israel, it may shed further light upon this theme. But we must take it in its context, for it evidently is confined to a special situation. For instance, it might be applied to Ethiopia just before its conquest by another power not long ago, if the context did not demand that, at the same time, Egypt should send envoys to Israel, and a temple be above Jerusalem. Then we must also inquire as to its meaning. The context will show that the usual idea, that Ethiopia implores help from God, is not warranted. We will give a tentative concordant version.

Instruct, O God, 'in' Thy strength.

Strengthen, O God, this that Thou contrivest for us.

Because of Thy temple over Jerusalem
Are kings fetching indemnities to Thee.

Rebuke the animals of the reeds,
The crowd of bulls among the calves

Dissipate the peoples who put their stamp upon coinage
silver,

The peoples who desire to attack.

Arriving are envoys from Egypt;

Ethiopia shall cause its hands to run to God.

Kingdoms of the earth, sing to God!

Make music to Jehovah!

As the parallelism is a great help in getting the drift of the passage, as well as the relation of one part to another, we have given the lines which correspond the same indentation. We hope that this example will show how helpful it may be in a difficult passage such as this. Without this it is not easy to determine where bulls and calves and Ethiopia's hands fit into the picture. Once they are connected, the matter becomes plain and powerful.

The subject of this section of the psalm is announced

in the first line. Israel wishes God to give instruction in His strength. If we take this to be a scene in the millennium, as the closing lines seem to indicate, then the spiritual in Israel perceive that there is need of another object lesson in order to reveal the strength of God to both Israel and the nations. Moreover, behind the second line we can read a conviction that Israel's position is weakening in the earth, and needs strengthening. God has contrived marvelously on their behalf, but His strength is still needed to sustain them. This is the same situation that we find in Ezekiel's prophecy of Gog and Magog, and probably refers to the same event. Then Israel will not only use this psalm in their ritual, but they will echo it in their hearts.

It is true that all the families of the earth will send a quota every year to worship, but this will be a matter of compulsion. Otherwise they will be punished by withdrawing their rain (Zech. 14:16-19). So here we read practically the same thing. Because of the temple worship, kings fetch an "equivalent," as the literal Hebrew has it. Force is not applied in the political sphere, but in the religious. Even the Egyptians, if they were not afraid of the plague, would probably revolt. There are signs there and elsewhere that the nations are restive. This seems to be the sense of the highly figurative couplet concerning the animals of the reeds and the bulls among the calves. The reeds remind us of the Nile; the beasts of the crocodiles and hippopotami. But these, of course, figure the violent rebels in Egypt. So, also, bulls among calves is a most expressive figure of the place taken by the great and powerful nations in regard to the smaller ones about them, and elsewhere on the earth. The Authorized Version rendering, "companies of spearmen," is without warrant.

Israel calls upon God to *rebuke* the nations represented by these animals. Perhaps Gog and Persia and

Ethiopia and Libya are the principal bulls of that time.

The literal couplet which follows is evidently a parallel and makes clear that there is disaffection and even danger. Therefore the saints pray to God to *dissipate* certain peoples who stamp upon the "accepted" silver and who desire to attack Israel. The word *dissipate* implies that there has been a drawing together of the dissatisfied nations, such as will occur under Gog. Here, however, we have the human aspect, in contrast to the one given us in Ezekiel. If God had answered this prayer as it was asked, He might have prevented the invasion of the land, when this was just what was required to reveal His strength. First Gog and his allies must develop and exhibit *their* strength, before God could step in to display His. Yet the prayer was answered more fully and satisfactorily than if God had merely stopped the invaders and scattered them.

The phrase "submit himself" in the Authorized Version we have rendered "put their stamp upon." They have rendered it *stamped* in Daniel 7:7, 19, in Chaldee. The "fourth beast" "*stamped* upon the residue." The following words, "pieces of silver" stand for *acceptable* silver in Hebrew. Some have explained this as tribute money. But the whole statement seems quite out of line with the context when so rendered, and makes no parallel with the next. We should expect to find in it some overt act corresponding to "attack." The literal Hebrew, at first sight, suggests that these peoples stamped upon "acceptable silver" with their *feet*. But that not only would be a silly and ridiculous thing to do, but it does not harmonize with the context. How would the stamping of silver harm Israel? But if they put a stamp upon silver and made coins—that is another matter.

Tremendous loss and confusion are caused in the world today because there are so many different monetary systems. Some attempts have been made to rectify

this, and it may be that a single monetary system will obtain under the Man of Sin, the last great monarch in man's day. When the people of God receive the kingdom, in the day of the Lord, is it at all likely that they will permit this evil to continue? This passage seems to imply that it will be a sign of opposition and rebellion to coin money in that day. In our Lord's day all the nations under Roman rule used the currency of Rome. It was a sign of their subjection. Our Lord used it to show the Jews that they were under Cæsar. So, in the millennium, the coinage of the world will be in the hands of the sovereign nation, and any land that dares to coin its own silver will begin an economic war on Jerusalem.

In the United States the power to coin money is vested in the federal government. The separate states have no right to usurp this function. This, at least, is the theory. I am told that much of the economic unrest is due to the legal violation of this law. At the commencement of the civil war, when the southern states seceded, they made their own currency. By this act alone they declared themselves no longer subject to the central government. This, we submit, is what is before us in this difficult line. This makes a perfect parallel with the next line: the people who desire to attack. They manifest their opposition by issuing their own money, thus repudiating the government at Jerusalem, along with its currency.

God answers their prayers in His own way. Egypt, indeed, does not attack. This agrees with Isaiah's prophecy, that Egypt shall be a blessing in that day (Isa. 19: 23-25). They seem to humble themselves under God's rebuke, and take no part in the invasion of Israel. Instead, they send *envoys* (A. V. *princes*) to render an account of the matter to Jerusalem.

Now we come to Ethiopia. It "shall cause its hands to run to God." There is nothing in the Hebrew which

could be rendered *stretch out*. Out of nearly a hundred occurrences it is nowhere else so rendered in the Authorized Version. However, we sympathize with their effort to make the sentence intelligible. The difficulty seems to be with the figure of speech. Hands cannot *run*. So one scholar changes it to *raise*. The Greek version has *fore-stall*. The general impression seems to be vague, that the hands hastily implore or bring presents, or something similar.

But the parallelism favors the rendering *run*. In the previous line the envoys of Egypt *arrive*. There is *motion*. The parallelism then consists of *Egypt* and *Ethiopia*, *arriving* and *running*, and *envoys* and *hands*. How are the *hands* related to the *envoys*? The previous figurative couplet may refer to these two nations also. If the animals among the reeds refer to Egypt, then Ethiopia may be one of the bulls. The calves would be the smaller nations round about.

In Hebrew, *hand* and *hands* is used figuratively more often than literally. In some cases these figures are also used in English. In biblical language we are accustomed to the hand of the Lord, as an indication of His sphere of action. But, ordinarily, we would not use the singular of two or more persons, as the *hand* of Moses and Aaron (Psa. 77:20 (21)), or of animals, the *hand* of the dog (A. V., *power* (Psa. 22:20 (21))). We use it freely of employees, as, the shop has forty *hands*, when, literally, each "hand" has two hands, and there are eighty hands. In figure, parts of an animal, as horns, are used to symbolize associated powers. So we may consider the hands of Ethiopia the nations within its sphere of influence, corresponding to the "calves" which are caused to run by one of the bulls, in the figurative couplet above.

This section of this psalm gives us a marvelous little picture of the political side of the thousand years' reign. God is still dealing with His creatures so as to reveal

their weakness and His strength. Even if the Adversary is bound, so long as God is not *All* in all, there will be some sin and sorrow, and opposition to Him and His people. Mere outward religion will not suffice to fully subject men or nations in that day, even as it does not in this era. Some would call Ethiopia "Christian" as it is, for almost all of its literature deals with God's revelation. Still we send missionaries to convert them. In that day all nations will have a knowledge of God, but that will not keep them from rebelling against Him. Even a true saint, today, is not free from insubordination. But in the millennium all revolts will be dealt with in a summary manner. God will teach the nations their futility and His might through their attack upon His people.

We may be sure that *no* nation is entirely on God's side during its whole history. Israel itself, His special representative people, have been far from Him for many, many years. As with the individual, the experience of evil is necessary to bring each people down to a place of subjection to God and His Christ. This is salutary and alone fulfills His intention to reveal His omnipotence against the background of human impotence. Thus will all nations learn to laud His name and take their place of glad subjection to His almighty power. A.E.K.

GIFTS FREE FROM INCOME TAX

THE FOLLOWING report from the government will interest all who contemplate aiding the work. The Treasury Department of the U. S. Government, after investigating our Concern, ruled as follows:

"Contributions made to you are deductible by the donors in arriving at their taxable net income in the manner and to the extent provided by section 23(o) and (q) of the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts.

"Bequests, legacies, devises or transfers, to or for your use are deductible in arriving at the value of the net estate of a decedent for estate tax purposes in the manner and to the extent provided by sections 812(d) and 861(a) (3) of the Code and/or corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts. Gifts of property to you are deductible in computing net gifts for tax purposes in the manner and to the extent provided in section 1004(a) (2) (B) and 1004 (b) (2) and (3) of the Code and/or corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts."

THE DELIVERANCE OF ISRAEL

Daniel 12:1, 2

12 And in that era shall Michael stand up, the great chief who stands for the sons of your people. And there comes to be an era of distress the which has not occurred since there was a nation 'on the earth' until that era. And in this era your people shall be delivered—all who are found written in the scroll. ²And many sleeping in the soil of the ground shall awake, these to eonian life and these to eonian reproach and repulsion.

Now that we are through with the career of the king of the north, quite a new subject is introduced. We are given a glance at the deliverance of Israel. We are inclined to limit this to the actual advent of the great Deliverer, but in this account, strange to say, His coming is not even mentioned. The deliverance occupies a whole era, and starts with the conflict between Michael and the dragon, in the middle of the last heptad, even before Israel's great affliction commences. At that time they do not seem to need deliverance, but God always anticipates. The end of their tribulation coincides with the coming of Christ, but the worship of Jehovah is not restored until a month later. Daniel himself and the rest of the saints in Israel are not delivered from death until two months and a half later. Within a period of about three and three quarters years the deliverance of Israel is accomplished, of the dead as well as the living. Most appropriately, Daniel's prophecy ends with his own deliverance and reward in that day.

Michael, "one of the head chiefs," "your chief" (10:13, 21), seems to be the great champion of Israel

among God's messengers (Jude 9). He it is who leads the hosts of heaven against the dragon and its messengers, and forces them down to earth. Thus it is that Michael *stands up*. This occurs in the middle of the last heptad, three and a half years before the end of the antichrist. Then a voice in heaven will cry, "Woe to the land and the sea, for the Adversary descended to you, having great fury, being aware that the season he has is brief" (Rev. 12:7-12). This is the cause and marks the beginning of the great affliction or distress which precedes the deliverance of Israel in the era of the end. It will come through men, but it is caused by the presence of evil spirits, Satan's minions, cast down from heaven.

What is it that makes the close of man's day the worst era in human history? Already mankind has gone through many terrible epochs because of man's inhumanity to man. And it seems to be getting worse, for never has there been such widespread distress as during the so-called world war, and this, alas, is followed, after a generation, by another. But in these struggles, in man's day, God was not man's Adversary, as He will be in the day of His indignation. Added to wars and famines and plagues are the divine visitations that will enlist the tremendous forces of nature against the sons of Adam. No doubt Israel and the saints will suffer with the rest of mankind, but they will have the hosts of darkness against them as well as the nations. Altogether, it will be an unparalleled era of distress, because of the cumulation of offensive forces. Then are combined God's indignation against mankind as a whole, the desperate opposition of the spirit world, besides the enmity, which has marred man's history at all times, brought to its highest peak and concentrated against the saints in Israel.

Israelites were accustomed to "books," or rather *scrolls*, with lists of names, for their genealogies were among their most valued possessions. From this to the figure of a list of those who should be delivered was a very small step. To have one's name in the scroll of life would be the same as being among those who participate in the former resurrection. Paul, when he wishes to distinguish his Circumcision helpers from the rest, speaks of them as those whose names are in the scroll of life (Phil. 4:3). It seems that those whose names are *not* in this scroll will worship the wild beast (Rev. 17:6). Some names may be erased (Rev. 3:5). Daniel uses a different figure. It is a scroll of *deliverance*.

Well may we ask, Who will be able to stand in that day? And the reassuring reply is that all has been arranged by God beforehand, even the names of those who will be delivered. Without God's power and prediction no one could stand. No one would be delivered. It is not a matter of man, but of God. Nevertheless He wishes to exercise their souls by means of these unparalleled trials, so, on the human side, it is those that *endure* who are delivered. As our Lord told His disciples, "he who endures to the consummation, *he* shall be saved" (Mat. 10:22). Daniel is shown the divine side. Our Lord gives us the human aspect.

THE FORMER RESURRECTION

To us it would be a major problem to account for the interval between the death of Daniel and other saints of his class, and the deliverance of the kingdom, if Daniel had not been told that they *sleep*, and would *awake*. They are all unconscious of the millenniums of misery which intervene. Was it not a mercy that they were spared the knowledge of these seemingly interminable successions of human failure and futility? Practically,

since Daniel was an old man, there was but a short time until the realization of his most ardent hopes. He did not need to be disturbed, but could *rest* in peace until he would awake in the kingdom and enjoy eonian life and the honor and glory which will surely be his portion in the kingdom of Christ on earth.

Others will awake to eonian reproach and repulsion. As more fully expounded in "The Development of Prophecy," the outlook of each Hebrew seer depends upon the time in which he lived. The preëxile prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, see the future as a single advent. The coming of Christ now past and that still future are not distinguished by them. The exile prophets, Daniel and Ezekiel, see more, for they separate the first from the second advent. Nevertheless, they do not distinguish events beyond the second advent. These seem to occur at one and the same time. So it is that Daniel speaks of the resurrection of life as if it took place at the same time as the resurrection of judging (John 5:29).

From later revelation we learn that there is a *former* resurrection, in which Daniel and those whose names are in the scroll of life will awake, a thousand years *before* those who awake to reproach and repulsion. The seer of Patmos, though he does not see as far as Paul, saw much farther and clearer than the Hebrew prophets. He tells us that the rest of the dead do not live until a thousand years are finished, during which the saints reign as priests with Christ in His kingdom (Rev. 20:5). The latter class will be roused to stand before the great white throne and will be condemned and cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20:12-15). After the eons are past, at the consummation, when death is abolished (1 Cor. 15:26), an outlook far beyond either Daniel or John,

then all will be made alive or vivified (1 Cor. 15:22), so that God may be All in *all*. This was not revealed until the close of revelation, through the apostle Paul.

³And the intelligent shall warn as the warning of the atmosphere, and those who justify many shall be as the stars for the eon and further. ⁴And *you*, Daniel, stop up the words, and seal the scroll until the era of the end. Many shall swerve, and 'evil' shall increase.

The immediate function of Daniel's prophecy is to warn the saints in Israel, so that they may not be involved in the fearful apostasy of the false messiah. But how few of them are intelligent enough! Hence it is the duty of those who know, to warn the rest. Our Lord told His hearers that they could test the sky and predict the weather, but were not able to test the times (Luke 12:54-57). It will be of vital importance for them to recognize the antichrist. Daniel clearly outlines his character and the history of his times, so that that era should not find them unaware. The peasant in Palestine who sees a cloud in the west warns the others that a rainstorm is coming. So the intelligent in the land will watch the north and the south, for from these directions will come the warfare that precedes the time of their affliction.

Our versions have followed the Septuagint in their rendering, "they that be wise shall *shine* as the *brightness* of the firmament." It is possible that they read *zrch*, RADIATE, in place of the present Hebrew text *zur*, WARN. But it is more likely that they translated loosely, as was their wont. The rendering *warn* fits the context so admirably, and agrees so well with our Lord's teaching, that we prefer it. Out of about twenty-two occurrences, our versions translate *zur warn* eighteen times, and twice *admonish*, so the exceptional rendering *shine* has no support, even by the translators themselves. The intelligent undoubtedly will *warn* their fellow saints when the time comes for Daniel to be fulfilled. More

than ten Hebrew stems have been rendered *shine*, so this word should not occur here.

The warnings of the intelligent will "turn many to righteousness" or *justify* them. In Hebrew the verb *tzdq* denotes BE-JUST, as Job 4:17, "Shall mortal man be more *just* than God?" The special forms for *make-just* and *cause-to-be-just* seem to be best served by our *justify*, as, "Israel hath *justified* herself (Jer. 3:11, *make-*), "shall my righteous servant *justify*" (Isa. 53:11, *cause-*). The intelligent will be the *cause* of *justifying* many. Their *warning* will be heeded, and they will be justified, not by faith alone, as in this administration of grace (Rom. 4:4, 5), found in Paul's evangel, but by both faith and works, as in James (2:24). This brief statement in Daniel is developed into two chapters in John's Unveiling. There we have the seven ecclesias and their messengers in the time of the end, together with the awards of the faithful.

Briefly, yet beautifully, we are told of the reward of the intelligent workers in Israel. They shall be as stars in the kingdom. They will receive positions of honor and glory in the last two eons. We use this figure freely today in connection with moving pictures. The warners before the kingdom will be the rulers in it. Those who endure shall reign. They will be the star actors in the magnificent drama of world dominion under Israel's Messiah.

The reward of intelligent service during the era of Israel's trial will not be limited to the thousand years, the coming eon. It is for the eon *and further*. The phrase "forever *and ever*" is misleading. The Hebrew is not a repetition of two *ever*'s. The two words are different. Transliterated, it reads, *b-ulm u-od*, IN-OBSCURER AND-FURTHER. As the so-called *olam* is the equivalent of the Greek *aiōn* or *eon*, we use *eon* for both, to preserve the

connection between the Hebrew and the Greek. Daniel, as we have seen, distinguished nothing beyond the advent of Christ. He tells us naught of the eon beyond, in the new earth. So he simply adds *and further* for the succeeding eon. This is the usual outlook in the Hebrew Scriptures. In the new creation, when Israel's priesthood vanishes, but rule remains, these saints will still be the stars in the crown of Christ. Their reward will give them glory and honor until the consummation.

The fourth verse of Daniel twelve seems to be self-contradictory. First we are told that Daniel is charged to "shut up the words and seal the book," and then that "many shall run to and fro and knowledge shall be increased." We would hardly connect the increase of knowledge with the shutting and sealing of this book. Such knowledge as Daniel had in mind could come only through the fulfillment of this scroll. Let us note that the time is limited. The words are not shut up nor is the book sealed *in* the time of the end. *Until* then this applies. Hence some have been inclined to limit the increase of knowledge to that time. But this is only an inference. We must examine each word concordantly in order to confirm or correct this rendering.

SEALING DENOTES INACTION

In the Unveiling of Jesus Christ the opening of a sealed scroll is not a figure for *disclosing* its *contents*, but for *introducing* its *fulfillment*. So, it seems to us, we must understand the charge to Daniel. The contents of the scroll are not *concealed* until the era of the end, but the *fulfillment* cannot occur until the time appointed. This may be taken as one of the strongest reasons why we should avoid historical "applications" until we are confronted with clear-cut fulfillments. This scroll is similar to that seen by John in the hand of Him Who is

sitting on the throne (Rev. 5:1-4). Only the Lion out of Juda's tribe is worthy to open the seven-sealed scroll. Nothing is said as to the wording of the contents. The opening of each seal called into *action* the events of the end time.

The Authorized Version, for *shut up*, has *close up* in the ninth verse, but *stop up* eight times when used literally of the wells which the Philistines destroyed (Gen. 26:15, 18), of the wells of Moab (2 Kings 3:19, 25), of the land (2 Chron. 32:3, 4, 30), and of the breaches under Nehemiah (Neh. 4:7 (1)). For the sake of uniformity it is better to translate the figurative occurrences *stop up* also, for this helps us to get a clear idea of the figure. We are tempted to apply this to the *understanding* of the words, because so few have been able to grasp what Daniel has written. But we must not blame Daniel for this. He did not throw down the rubbish of tradition into the wells of truth, which makes it so difficult for us to get at it. Rather, by recording these very words, he limits the *action* of these final revelations to the era of the end.

Instead of "many shall *run to and fro*," we have "many shall *swerve*," so we must apologize for making the change. Of course, as we work directly from the Hebrew, not the Authorized Version, it were more apt to say, why we do *not* change from the original. But, in this case the same stem, *sht*, seems to have two branches, *shut* and *shte*, which could easily become mixed in the course of time. The *usage* of one demands *to and fro*, as, "the eyes of the Lord *run to and fro*" (2 Chron. 16:9, Zech. 4:10). It is also used for the noun *rower* (Eze. 27:26) as one who moves *to and fro*. The other, *shte*, is translated *go aside* of a wife (Num. 5:12, 19, 20, 29), *decline* of the heart (Prov. 7:25), and *turn* from the path of the wicked (Prov. 4:15). A late edition of the

LXX has *rave with madness*. Such a sense, it seems to us, is far more in keeping with the context in Daniel. In Amos we read that, "They shall go *to and fro* to seek the word of Jehovah, and shall not find it" (8:12). Those who do not even find the word will not be able to run to and fro in it. That the intelligent will study the Word goes without saying.

It is true that travel has increased in the world since Daniel's day. But that has no vital bearing on this vision. And it may also be true that many will run to and fro in studying the vision. But such a usage is otherwise unknown in the Scriptures. Ordinarily, running to and fro in a book or scroll would not be considered a proper method of study, though, of course, there might be a comparison of one passage with another.

We translate "*evil* shall be increased," rather than *knowledge*. No one can dispute the fact that evil has increased mightily. Just how much *knowledge* has increased or will increase is a debatable matter. Darkness will cover the earth in the era of the end as at no other time (Isa. 60:2), so that the increase in knowledge at that time cannot be universal. The idea that mankind is more enlightened appeals to some, but such enlightenment as this would not appeal to Daniel. The knowledge that he coveted was concerned with the things of God. The usual interpretation of these words seems to us most misleading. The knowledge of God is *decreasing* as the end draws nigh. There is apostasy even among the saints. Israel will not have Daniel's prophecy. Only a few "stars" will be out on this, the darkest night in earth's history.

Dr. Ginsburg, whose edition of the Hebrew text we use as our standard as a rule, also suggests that we should read *evil* instead of *knowledge* here. The stem of knowledge is *do*. That of evil is *ro*. The only difference be-

tween *r* and *d* is that the upper right corner of *r* is round, while in *d* the upper stroke projects beyond the upright. In ancient Hebrew they were quite similar also. So it needed only a little carelessness to confuse them. In our version we hope to indicate all such conjectural renderings by an appropriate sign. A late edition of the LXX reads *adikia injustice*.

⁵ And I see, I, Daniel, and, behold! two others who stand, one on this shore of the river and one on that shore of the river. ⁶ And it is said to the man clothed in linen who is above the waters of the river, "Until when is the end of the marvels 'which you have declared?'" ⁷ And I am hearing the man clothed in linen who is above the waters of the river, and is holding high his right and his left to the heavens, and he is swearing by Him who lives for the eon, that it is for an appointed time, two appointed times and half an 'appointed time,' when he concludes the shattering of the hand of the holy people, all this shall be concluded. And I hear and am not understanding.

At the end of Daniel's vision two new characters appear. Besides the man clothed in linen, who had been speaking to him, two others stand on either shore of the river. One of these it is who asks "Until when is the end of the marvels?"

UNTIL WHEN

When is the end of these marvels? From our standpoint, more than two millenniums later, knowing that Daniel's vision has not yet been fulfilled, it is easy to understand how difficult it would be at that time to make him understand when the end would come. Yet that is just what filled the heart of the prophet and of all the saints down to the very present. There were secrets still hid in God, of which nothing could be told. The whole of the present administration of grace to the nations is entirely ignored. How Daniel's heart would have been disturbed if he had been told that his people must suffer for more than two millenniums before these things would even commence!

One thing seems to be certain, both from the oath of the linen-clothed man, who swears above the waters of the river, and from other passages as well, that *season, seasons and half a season, forty-two months, or a thousand and two hundred sixty days*, as the same time is variously given (Rev. 12:14, 13:5, 11:37), is an unalterable period in God's program, and we may depend upon it to the day. This is far more important for Israel to know than the date of Messiah's return. If they had known all along that He would not come in their day it would have discouraged the saints and encouraged the wicked. But when this terrible trial comes upon them, *then* the saints sorely need to know that, in a short time, He will surely come and relieve them of their unbearable distress. Hence the answer given is only relative. The "appointed time, two appointed times and a half" do not commence in Daniel's day, but are the last half of the seventieth heptad.

Why this is taken as the starting point in the various periods of the era of the end, is evident from the rest of the message. At the beginning of the seventieth heptad, and during its first half, the power of the holy people will be increased. They will be the financial rulers of the world in Babylon. They will reestablish their religious rites in Jerusalem. The outlook seems bright for Israel, but in the center of the last heptad the tide turns. Babylon is overthrown. The continuous ritual is forbidden. The worst of all pogroms commences. It is one of the saddest dates in the history of the nation. But God is merciful. He discounts the days. From this point onward the time is short, the action swift, the end sure.

Perhaps the most important point in the reply as to the time is that *Israel's blessings wait, not for her success, but for her utter failure*. About three and a half years before her collapse she attains the zenith of her

earthly power. At the end of this time she attains the lowest point in her history. It is these tremendous contrasts which will enable God to display to a tense universe the futility of human endeavor and the blessings that come through Him alone.

“SCATTER THE HAND”

The influence and might of Israel in the last days will depend upon unity and coöperation. Their financial despotism will depend on the combination of their wealth into one vast, international trust. Their power in Palestine will depend on the reversal of their deportation. They will be together again after having been dispersed among the nations. Scattered individuals or companies can have comparatively little power, even though they often had an influence altogether out of proportion to their numbers. With a central bank in Babylon and a central government in Palestine, their “hand” will be felt in the world as never before. And how is their power “broken in pieces,” as the Revisers render it? By “scattering” their “hand,” as the literal Hebrew reads. Babylon is destroyed, after the saints have come out of her. Jerusalem is taken. Half of the city goes back into deportation (Zech. 14:2). They are scattered and helpless as never before in the darkest days of their dark history.

“Shatter the hand” is unusual English, yet the same figure is used in regard to the arm to denote force. It is not easy to find an idiomatic equivalent. The Authorized Version has “*scatter the power.*” The Revisers sought to do better with “*breaking in pieces the power.*” The LXX has *scatter*. The Hebrew stem *phtz* really denotes SCATTER, as in the Authorized Version, but in usage it includes scattering by violent means, as

Judges 7:19, were Gideon's men *brake* the pitchers. They *shattered* them and, at the same time, *scattered* the fragments. Thus will it be with Israel, which is also a vessel with a light within it. When Israel is *shattered* and *scattered*, then all of this vision will be concluded, not before. After thousands of years of effort, Israel attains to supremacy over the nations by her own power. But it is all in vain. It must all be lost before they are able to receive the kingdom from the hand of Jehovah.

Here we have an elementary and fundamental truth set forth. Deliverance is not of man, but of God. Israel has striven to deliver herself by her own hands. They are accumulating wealth and influence today as no other nation has ever done. They are striving and sacrificing, in order to pay for Palestine, and thus help to fulfill the Scriptures. They must learn the greatest lesson of all, that God alone can save without the hindrance of human help. He alone wants the glory and the adoration that come from their deliverance. So they are hurled from the height to which they had climbed, down into the very depths of deepest despair before Messiah comes and delivers them from their enemies and gives them the promised kingdom. This lesson they never understood. Even Daniel says that he did not understand. He wanted the people gathered, not scattered.

WHAT IS AFTER THESE THINGS

⁸ And I am saying, "My Lord, what is after these things?"
⁹ And he is saying, "Go, Daniel, for stopped up and sealed are the words until the era of the end. ¹⁰ Many shall be 'chosen' and made white and refined 'and holy.' And the wicked will do wickedly, and none of all the wicked shall understand. Yet the intelligent shall understand. ¹¹ And from the era the continuous ritual is withdrawn, and the abomination of desolation is given, shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. ¹² Happy is he who tarries and is attaining to the thousand, three hundred and thirty-five days! ¹³ And *you*, go to the end and rest. And you shall stand up for your lot at the end of the days."

The end of Israel's shattering was put at three and a half "appointed times," which other Scriptures seem to make years, in all twelve hundred sixty days. Beginning with the middle of the heptad, the great affliction will rage for this period. But Daniel did not understand. He was eager to know what would happen then. What would be his own experiences when Israel is delivered? Without due reflection, we might say, the coming of Christ in power and glory, of course. But it seems that only the living will behold Him in that day. Unlike His presence for us, when the dead will be roused and join us as we meet Him in the air (1 Thes. 4:17), He will not recall the dead to life when He descends to earth, so that *Daniel will not be present when Messiah comes.*

After the shattering of Israel and their deliverance by their Messiah's advent, Daniel is given two more periods, each longer than the era of their affliction. These also seem to commence in the middle of the last heptad, so that they extend beyond the advent of Messiah's presence. After these terrible times, the restoration cannot be accomplished in an instant. The utter devastation and ruin would not be a pleasant place to bring back the dead. Their resurrection is postponed until a measure of order is restored.

Daniel will have no part in the events immediately following the coming of Christ. Therefore he is told very little about them. All is fixed and known and written, but it is kept from him, and will be made known by the fulfillment, when the seals are removed at the time of the end. Although he has no part in these terrible events, many others will be purified and made white and refined by the fiery afflictions, while others will do wickedly: At that time none of all the wicked will understand. Only the intelligent will understand.

The first period is a thousand two hundred and ninety days. It commences when the continuous ritual is withdrawn and the abomination of desolation is put in its place. It seems that the ritual is restored at the end of this period, just thirty days after the advent. This is a very short time, so it is not likely that the millennial temple has been built. But this is not necessary, as the ritual was carried out long before there was any temple. In thirty days the priesthood could be organized and the necessary arrangements made for the restoration of the true *worship of God*, which is the prime consideration in the new world order. All the rest will follow, once this is settled. First things will be first in that kingdom, not last, as they are in man's day.

The third period, here hardly more than hinted at, seems to be the one which is especially connected with Daniel's personal happiness. It is forty-five days longer than the preceding period, and seventy-five days longer than the era of Israel's affliction. By this time the kingdom will be so far under way that the saints of former eras will be needed, and they will be roused from the dead and given their reward. That, indeed, will be a happy day! Not all the dead are roused. Only those whose names are in the book of life. The rest of the dead do not live until the thousand years should be finished. Happy and holy is he who is having part in the former resurrection! Over these the second death has no jurisdiction but they will be priests of God and Christ, and they will be reigning with Him the thousand years (Rev. 20:5, 6).

That Daniel will have a high place in the kingdom goes without saying. What will his "lot" be? Perhaps no other Israelite has had such a long and successful schooling in ruling over the nations of the world. What man would be better fitted to administer the foreign

affairs of the kingdom? Either by personal experience or through visions he was acquainted, as no other man, with the course and character of this world.

Daniel is resting. After a long and arduous career the aged official was weary and worn out with work. He would be in no condition to take up or enjoy the high dignities that await him in the kingdom, had they been offered to him. And so, in God's beautiful language, he sleeps. He rests. But no mere rest will recuperate and rejuvenate as the sleep of death, when it is followed by the power of vivification, the life of immortality. No doubt, especially in his later years, he often longed for rest, for strength, for power to carry on. Never again will he be in such need of rest. As a son of the former resurrection, his body will be aglow with vigor, his soul will be overflowing with happiness, and his spirit vitalized with eonian life.

Daniel's rest is nearing its end. The night is far spent. Much of that which he foresaw has been fulfilled. The era of the end, which was the main subject of his visions, seems about to begin. The feet of the image and the ten horns may already be forming. The wars of the end may be just ahead. Israel is returning to the land. The financial influence of the Jew has become tremendous. All this points to the nearness of Daniel's awakening.

But long before he stands in his lot, before the final act of the great drama which he unfolds before our eyes, we shall precede him to our reward, we shall exceed him in glory, when we are called from earth to heaven, to reign with Christ, not over an empire dominating all the earth, but one which embraces the whole universe. Such grace as this is beyond the ken of Daniel's prophecy. Blessed be the God of all grace Who blesses us with all spiritual blessings among the celestials! A.E.K.

EDITORIAL

THE TRINITARIAN HERESY, which denies the most fundamental fact disclosed in divine revelation, and rejects the plainest assertions in the Word of God, is being used by many earnest believers as the touchstone of truth. Whoever does not hold this heresy cannot expect to reach their ears, or inspire their confidence. It is necessary, therefore, in many cases, to break down this barrier before their hearts are open to receive the vast treasures of truth with which our God has entrusted us. In this issue we seek to set forth the facts as to this delusion, and expose some of the false inferences on which it is founded. We hope, later, to republish these in a booklet so that our friends may be able to conduct a vigorous campaign against this fundamental error, and open the way for further light.

Our experience has shown that a Trinitarian really has no God in the sense of a supreme Disposer, Who is working out His intention unhindered by His creatures. Having made three gods, he has dragged down the only true God to the level of His creatures, while, at the same time exalting the creature into the place of Deity. Indeed, in practise they make a man of God and a god of man. God cannot enforce His will, but man can! Man has free will, and God is bound by it. This and much else that is blinding the minds and hearts of believers has its root in the denial of the only true God, the Father. Not recognizing His deity, their minds become disqualified. They acknowledge that the Trinity is an inexplicable "mystery," and, finding their own inferences from

irrelevant passages in the Scriptures unsatisfactory, they desert faith altogether, for weird deductions from nature. A brother once told me that God must be a trinity because a stool had to have three legs in order to stand. I replied that I manage with two! Such a god must be a cripple. All of this borders on blasphemy. It makes me shudder the way this subject is handled.

THE PASSAGES ON WHICH THE TRINITY IS BASED

A mature consideration of the passages on which trinitarianism depends is enough to brand it as false. *Not a single one teaches it.* It is hardly a deduction, but a mere unfounded inference in every case. A glance will always reveal that *it is never concerned with the number of gods.* Closer consideration will show that the line of "reasoning" is irrational. These hints should be sufficient to keep anyone from being deceived by them, but we will explain this further by an example which is usually considered one of the best proof texts for the Trinity. I myself used it as such, so sympathize with all who misuse it in this manner. Such explanations of the Trinity, which compare our God with the three legs of a stool, the three dimensions of a cube, and use the psychology of His creatures, are not of faith and so near blasphemy that we trust no sincere worshiper of God will entertain them in his heart. Our God is not a device or space or any other created thing.

THE LOT OF THE UNBELIEVER

IN THESE DAYS of death and destruction many a heart aches for near and dear ones who have died or who are in danger of death. What will be their lot if they go unsaved? We hope soon to publish a series of articles dealing with this theme, as well as the fate of infants and the heathen. We will show that the first and second death and the judging between is God's means of preparing them for vivification and reconciliation at the consummation.

THE ONE AND ONLY TRUE GOD

IS GOD ONE? Or is He a union of a number of Gods? To prove the latter we are told that the word *achad*, ONE, which is used of God, means a *compound unity*, and that *yachad*, the word for *only*, is never used of God in Hebrew. This is so extremely important that it demands the closest investigation, hence we present the evidence to show that *the opposite* is true. *Achad*, which is used of God, means ONE or *only*, while *yachad* denotes a compound unity. To begin with, we are all agreed that the "great confession" contained in Deuteronomy 6:4, which our Authorized Version renders, "the Lord our God is *one* Lord," uses the Hebrew *achad*, sometimes transliterated *echad*, which we have standardized as *achud*, ONE. Furthermore, all admit that *Jewish* scholars insist that the word here denotes *one*, as opposed to many gods, such as the nations had, even if they were theoretically monotheistic. The rabbis say that it contradicts the idea of a combination of gods, such as the Christian Trinity.

The *Companion Bible* has a note on this word as follows: "a compound unity (Lat. *unus*), one made up of others: Gen. 1. 5, one of seven; 2. 11, one of four; 2. 21, one of twenty-four; 2. 24, one made up of two; 3. 22, one of the Trinity; 49. 16, one of twelve; Num. 13. 23, one of a cluster. So Ps. 32. 20, &c. It is not *yachid*, which is (Lat.) *unicus*, unique — a single, or only one, occurs twelve times: Gen. 22. 2, 12, 16, Judg. 11. 34. Ps. 22. 20; 25. 16; 35. 17; 68. 6. Prov. 4. 3. Jer. 6. 26. Amos 8. 10. Zech. 12. 10. Heb. of all other words for "one" is *echad*."

We gladly acknowledge that the *Companion Bible* is in a class by itself when it comes to a knowledge of Hebrew. The learned compiler was a personal friend of mine, and asked me as a favor to keep the secret of his identity. But I may say that he was closely connected with an edition of the Hebrew text, and wrote articles popularizing the facts concerning it. He was one of the best friends I ever had and I honor and love him for his works' sake. But this does not bind me to accept all that he wrote, or hinder me from testing his assertions by the facts. Much that he said he took from others, and he was quite politic in his public utterances.

The argument that the Hebrew word *achud* (ONE) means *one made up of others*, and therefore implies a union of three in the "Godhead," is by no means substantiated by the examples here given. On the contrary, the one is usually a *part* of a unity. If applied to the "Trinity" they would prove that each "Person" is One, and the three One's would make *three*. Thus, the one day of Genesis 1:5 is not composed of three days, but is one of seven. This would prove *seven* gods, not One. The "one of four" rivers in Genesis 2:11, likewise, if each one is a trinity, would add up to twelve rivers in all. If each one of the twelve tribes is composed of three, then there are thirty-six tribes forming one nation. The composite is not the same as the unit. The seven days do not make one *day*, but one *week*. The twelve tribes combined do not make one *tribe*, but one *nation*. The three gods of Christendom do not make one *God*, but one *pantheon*.

True, *one flesh* (Gen. 2:24) is an example of a compound, or rather, *composite*, unity. To begin with, man and wife were not two persons. Both were one flesh in Adam. After Eve was separated, man and woman were two. In marriage, husband and wife are re-united, so that their flesh becomes one, as is clearly seen in their children. But, if *this* is the basis of the Triune God,

then it must be the old Egyptian trinity, father, mother, and son, Osiris, Isis, and Horus, the gods against which Jehovah executes judgment. This lands us in inextricable confusion. The components are by no means of "equal power and might." They are *not* "underived." According to this, the Holy Spirit must be the *Mother* of the Son, whereas Scripture makes it the Father, when He became flesh (Luke 1:35). There is no possible escape from the fact that both the Most High and the spirit are the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and that Mary was the mother of His flesh. There is no mention of another Mother in God's revelation.

But the meaning or usage of a word is not established by a few selected passages, but by the concensus of *all* of its occurrences. The word *achud*, ONE, is found ever so often where there is no thought of a compound unity. There are some passages where this idea is absolutely excluded by the context. In Genesis 11:1 we read that the whole earth was of *one* language. Was this language made up of others? *There were no others!* It was the *only* language up to that time. Here we are compelled to give *one* the very sense which we are told it cannot have.

This word *achud*, ONE, is the usual word for a unit. It occurs in hundreds of places where there is no thought of a "compound unity." It is used of a mountain (Gen. 22:2), a pit (Gen. 37:20, A.V. "some"), a night (Gen. 40:5), a stalk (Gen. 41:5), cattle (Ex. 9:7), the plague (Ex. 11:1), a house (Ex. 12:46), a law (Ex. 12:49), a pot (Ex. 16:33). Are any of these a trinity, a compound unity made up of others of the same kind? How many pits make one pit? How many pots one pot? Does the English numeral *one* always imply a *group*, an *assemblage*, a *collection*, a *compound*, a *cluster*, a *combination*? Of course it *can* be used of these, but no one would deduce from this that this sense is resident in the word *one*. That one *army* is composed of many persons does

not prove that one *soldier* is a group of persons. One *word* may be composed of several letters, but one *letter* is not a composite on that account. The meaning of *one* is not changed to *several* by the fact that there are many of the ones, as one day of seven, or that the one is a noun of multitude, as one *nation*. This does not multiply one *individual*.

To the ordinary reader the Hebrew words *achad* and *yachad*, which are used in this argument, seem to be quite different, as if derived from separate stems. Putting a *y* in front of an English word changes it entirely. Thus *awl*, a shoemaker's tool, differs altogether from a *yawl*, a ship's small boat. But in Hebrew there are a number of letters which do duty as servants, hence are called *serviles*. The vowels *a* and *i* (*i* is the same as *y*), as well as *u*, are very often on duty, as will be seen if we examine the stem and branches of this word. Then we will see that *achad* and *yachad* are derived from the same stem (*chd*), and the *y* merely makes the stem active, *be* or *make one*.

Since this word has become so very important, it should be most interesting and instructive to make the acquaintance of the whole group which springs from the same two letters. The accompanying illustration pictures the word as a tree, and will help to show the relation of each derivative to the main stem or trunk. The ultimate stem is probably *chd*. In Syriac, or Aramaic, this simple form is used for the number *one*, just as *achud* is in Hebrew. Thus we have *one* decree (Dan. 2:9, A.V.). The idea of ONENESS prevails throughout its various branches in Hebrew also. In one case (Eze. 33:30) this short form is used for *one*, but the word may be written defectively here. As an adjective, this stem has the signification of *sharp*, as in Psalm 57:4(5): their tongue a *sharp* sword. As a verb this becomes *be sharp* or *sharpen*, when the *d* is doubled, in order to intensify the idea, as in Ezekiel 21:11(16):



SHOWING HOW A STEM, IN HEBREW, DIVIDES
 INTO VARIOUS BRANCHES, OR GROUPS,
 WITH A COMMON SIGNIFICATION

this sword is *sharpened*. This, in turn, forms a strong adjective, *chdud*, found only in Job 41:30(22): *sharp* stones are under him. How the thought of *sharpness* is derived from the stem ONE can be grasped intuitively, but is not so easy to put into words. Such are many of the relations between derivatives from the same stem in Hebrew. There is a natural connection which is felt rather than expressed. It is instinctive rather than reasoned.

Another branch is *chde*, which takes the turn exhilarate. Psalm 21:6(7): *thou hast made him exceeding glad*, is an example. As a noun (*chdue*) we have this variation in Nehemiah 8:10: the *joy* of the Lord is your strength. Besides this there is *chide*, problem. But these derivatives are not in point at present. We simply put them in to round out the picture which this stem presents. We are now interested only in those branches in which ONE continues to be the best word to express the thought in English. We will confine ourselves to those forms in which *chd* has the prefix *i* or *a*.

The letter *i* prefixed to a stem often gives us the *action*. In this case *ichd* is *be*, or *make* ONE, *be united*, or *unite*. In Genesis 49:6 we have: mine honour, *be not thou united*. In the *make* form we have (Psa. 86:11): *unite* my heart to fear thy name. From this it is easy to see how *ichd* is also used for the word *together*, as (Gen. 22:6, 8) they went both of them *together*. This occurs often. *If these words had been used of God there might be some slight ground for the thought of a combination deity.* A *united* god, or a *together* god is absolutely foreign to the Hebrew Scriptures. *If there were a "trinity," these are the forms that should be used to express it.*

Now we come to the adjective *ichid* (*yachad*), which is supposed to mean *only*. Because it is *not* used of God, the reasoning runs that Jehovah is *not* the *only* God, but merely one of the "Trinity." But let us look at the

illustration and see to which branch of *chd ichid* belongs. It is derived from *ichd*, *unite*, along with the word *together*, which denotes a compound unity! Belonging to this group, how can it mean *only*? We cannot *unite* or put together things, while they remain *alone*. The adjective of these words must mean *united*, not *only*. The fact that other languages lack a corresponding term has led to the loose rendering *only*. The Septuagint, the earliest of all translations, made by Jews long before Christ, does not translate it *only*. They have *agapêton*, *beloved*. This expresses the sense freely, for love unites. Out of eleven occurrences, the Septuagint uses *beloved* seven times (Gen. 22: 2, 12, 16, Judges 11: 34, Jer. 6: 26, Amos 8: 10, Zach. 12: 10), according to the Oxford Concordance. This also shows that *ichid* is *never* translated *only* (*monos*) in the Septuagint.

How does this agree with the facts? In Genesis 22: 2 the Authorized Version reads: Take now thy son, thine *only* [son] Isaac. But Isaac was *not* the only son of Abraham. Ishmael was his firstborn, and that is a far higher place in the East than anything else. Of course it can be "explained." I myself have tried to explain it, but my explanation practically changed the sense to the one who was *united* to him by the special ties of promise. Perhaps we can express it best in our idiom by saying that Abraham was one with Isaac, but not one with Ishmael. Hence the tentative Concordant Version reads "your son, who is one with you, whom you love." Could there be better *evidence* that *ichid* does *not* mean *only*?

Another passage is Judges 11: 34. Jephthah's daughter is called his *only* child. This is followed by the statement, that, beside her, he had neither son nor daughter. This has been explained as the repetition of the same sense in different words. But ordinarily it would be considered tautology, a vain repetition. This fault is removed when we render idiomatically: his child *to whom*.

he was united, or attached. Then the reason is given for his attachment. He had no son, who, ordinarily, would have been first in his heart. And he had no other daughter to divide his affections. All of his paternal love was centered on her. She *was* an *only* child, but this is not stated in the word *ichud*, but in what follows.

Another strange passage, which has called forth many fanciful explanations is found in Psalm 68:6(7): God setteth the *solitary* in families. How can anyone in a family be solitary? The Hebrew is not quite so puzzling, for it reads: is causing to dwell at home. I once took this to myself, as I was the only real believer in our family, although we were somewhat religious. I did feel solitary in some ways. But this thought is quite out of line with the psalm. The new rendering: God shall cause the *united* to dwell at home, corresponds far more closely with the parallel, which is: Bringing forth those who are *bound* into successes. *Unite* harmonizes with *bind*: *solitary* does not.

Another parallelism will confirm our conclusions. The Authorized Version of Proverbs 4:3 reads: For I was my father's son, tender and only [beloved] in the sight of my mother. As they have spoiled the parallel, we will give the tentative CONCORDANT VERSION rendering:

For I became a tender son to my father:
And one was I with my mother.

A *tender* son is balanced by one who is *attached* to his mother. The Authorized Version translators felt the need of this thought and inserted "beloved" without warrant. The Septuagint also has "beloved."

Much is made of the fact that this word is not used of God, as if this proved that He is not the *only* God. But there is no need to prove that. The Scriptures use the term god freely of others as well. He straitly charged His people. Thou shalt have no *other gods* before Me (Ex. 20:3). Even men are called gods (A.V., judges, Ex. 21:6, 22:8(7), 28(27)).

LATER AND HIGHER REVELATIONS

All will agree that there cannot be any conflict between God's earlier revelation in the Hebrew Scriptures and His later one, in Greek. We will therefore turn to this to see whether our conclusions are sustained or not. There we will find such clear and incontrovertible light that it is amazing that the scholars of Christendom ever dared to corrupt the Hebrew in order to sustain their traditions.

THERE IS NO OTHER GOD
BESIDE THE FATHER

There is one passage in God's Word which settles this matter for all who believe God rather than man. Paul, in 1 Corinthians 8:4-7, leaves no room for doubt or quibbling for anyone who is subject to His revelation. There we read: "For even if so be that there are those being termed gods also, whether in heaven or on earth, even as there are many gods and many lords, nevertheless **FOR US THERE IS ONE GOD, THE FATHER**, *out of Whom* all is, and we for Him, and **ONE LORD, JESUS CHRIST**, *through Whom* all is, and we through Him. But not in all is there this knowledge."

Let us note that our Lord Jesus Christ is expressly excluded. The one God is the *Father*, in contrast to the Son, Who is the one Lord. In other connections, when there is no question of the number of gods, Christ, *as the Image of the Father*, is freely called God in a figure. But this is literal. Any image may receive the name of its original without causing any misunderstanding. But here, *where the subject of gods and their number is directly discussed*, we are not only informed that there is *one God*, the *Father*, Who is *the Source of all*, but we are also shown the place of the Son, outside and apart from the one God, with a different function, for He is *Lord*, and *the Channel of all*.

THE ONLY TRUE GOD

What of it, even if it were true that the Hebrew word *only* is not used of God? The Greek word *only* certainly is used of Him by One Who was far better qualified to do so than Moses, or any other Hebrew seer. Our Lord Himself, in speaking of His Father, clearly defines His own place in relation to His Father. Shall we reject His testimony because of a false inference from a Hebrew word? He spoke of the Father and Himself as follows: the *ONLY* true God, and Him Whom Thou dost commission, Jesus Christ (John 17:3). Yes, there are many gods, but there is only one *true* God. And this does *not* include the Son, Who was commissioned by Him. God, as His name implies, is a real “Disposer.” He cannot be commissioned by another. Twice Paul speaks of Him as the *only* wise God (Rom. 16:27, 1 Tim. 1:17), when our Lord is plainly excluded and given His true place by the context. What could be plainer or stronger than Jude’s doxology at the close of his epistle, when he says: “. . . to the ONLY GOD, our Saviour, *through Jesus Christ our Lord*, be glory, majesty, might and authority . . .”? May He open our eyes to His highest and most excellent glory—His exclusive deity!

Since later revelation has actually used the word *only* of God, how futile is the inference that He is one of several deities because the Hebrew *ichid*, *united*, is not applied to Him! Such argumentation is utterly unworthy of this august theme. We cannot reason about God from what He has *not* said. And, to deduce something from an earlier part of His Word which is directly denied in a later and higher unfolding, is proof only of a decadent mind, enthralled by the superstitions of an apostate Christendom.

“Israel’s Great Confession,” Deuteronomy 6:4, is quoted by our Lord Himself, in Greek. The meaning of the Greek word *monos*, *one*, confirms our conclusions as to the Hebrew *achud*. He said: The Lord our God is

one Lord (Mark 12:29). Now this same word *one* is used often of the *one* body (Rom. 12:4, 5, 1 Cor. 12:12, 12, 12, 13, 20, Eph. 4:4, Col. 3:15). Is the body of Christ a combination of three bodies? All of the unities of today are expressed by this word: one body, one spirit, one expectation, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father (Eph. 4:4-6). Is there a triune spirit? Is our Lord three Persons? Is our faith three different beliefs? Have we three baptisms? Is there *one* God or three? Is He a triple Father? Many other passages could be given, but these are so uncompromising, so absolutely clear on this point that further evidence is superfluous. Moreover, there is not a single one which is not in line. *One* Lord, in Greek and Hebrew, is uncompounded, uncombined. He is neither a dual, a triple, or a multiple Deity, but the One and Only God Who will be glorified by His Son, the One and Only Lord, Whom we worship and adore.

A scribe, who heard our Lord, answered apprehendingly, for he was not far from the kingdom of God (Mark 12:34). In his reply he said: Thou sayest ideally that He is One, and *there is no other* more than He. In saying this he used the absolute negative, *ouk*, not the relative, *mê*. This elaborating and emphasizing of our Lord's word *one* would certainly have called down His displeasure if He also had claimed a place in the pantheon of the Trinity. What words could be stronger than *no other*? If these assertions allow of a trinity, language is no longer adequate for the purpose of revelation. *Monotheism was categorically affirmed and Trinitarianism was definitely denied by One Who was Himself one of the "three Persons" of this mythical Trinity!*

The shameful thing about Trinitarianism is its acknowledgment that the Bible plainly declares that there is one God, nevertheless it seeks all sorts of devious and desperate devices in order to deny and destroy these declarations, without the least qualms of conscience. This

is the deplorable state to which tradition drives its devotees. We are told that the Bible makes known three distinct persons by the names Father, Son and Holy Ghost. And this in face of the fact that the Scripture plainly says that there is one God, the *FATHER!* (1Cor. 8:6). And the Scriptures *never* speak of any of these three as a "person." The term is not only non-scriptural and unscriptural, but an impertinent and corrupt addition to God's revelation. It is needed only to distort the truth and uphold error.

The word "person" also rests on a perversion of the sacred record. Perhaps we should not object too violently when God and His Son are called "Persons." But it is utterly shameful to distort the figurative passages concerning God's spirit, so as to make it a distinct and separate person. The mere fact that the spirit of the Most High is the Father of our Lord should identify it with the person of the Father. Your spirit, beloved reader, is not a distinct person. Christ's spirit is not another individual besides Himself. Why should God's spirit be otherwise? It is my spirit that communicates with yours. My spirit dictates these words. Only a "person" can do this. Is my spirit therefore a person? Only the demented and possessed are controlled by spirits outside their own personality. Is God to be put in the same class with these?

Sad to say the Trinity is upheld by sheer falsehood. We are told that each of these three Persons are invested with all the attributes that belong to Deity alone. The very opposite is the case. The title God means the Disposer. Our Lord Jesus Christ definitely denies any such function. His greatest glory consists in *not* doing His own will, but that of the Father. Another title is the All-Sufficient. Yet He insisted that He could do nothing of Himself. It was the Father Who did the works. He continually and consistently repudiated the "attributes" of Deity. When His glorious career is finished He abdi-

cates and is *subject*. Is God ever subject to anyone? Does He do the will of another? Is He unable to do His work without the help of another? In all things our blessed Lord was altogether dependent on His God. The Father has no God on Whom to depend. Where do we find the Father praying to the Son? In the nature of things, can the Supreme, the "Omnipotent," implore for help? Can He be born? Can He be weary? Can He die?

The word "attribute" is another theological term which is utterly useless except to lead us into error. What attributes has your spirit, dear reader, that are distinct from yourself? God does all things by His spirit. Does the fact that my spirit has my "attributes" prove that it is a writer such as I am? How silly, you say. The power that gives me life and enables me to do what I do is my spirit. But it is not another "person," neither has it my "attributes," even though I can speak of it as if it were myself. My spirit is sad when I think of the plight of the Lord's dear saints, led astray by those who should enlighten them. But does that mean that *I* am not sad, only my *spirit*? It is identical with my "person," just as God's holy spirit is identical with Him.

In bold denial of the plain and positive assertion that the Father Who commissioned Christ is the *only true* God, it is said that each is truly God. And even the English language is stultified in order to express the supreme Deity of the Father, the supreme Deity of the Son, and the supreme Deity of the Holy Spirit. At another time we are told that these Persons are *equals*, so that *each* is supreme! Sensible men may be forgiven if they think that Christianity is a form of insanity when such statements are stressed. Only *One* can be *supreme*. If *three* are, then *none* are.

I was once impressed by the argument that, if Christ is not the supreme Deity, then my salvation is not secure. But this arose out of the old superstition that God was

not my Saviour, but an angry Avenger, bent on my damnation, while, in contrast to His grim wrath, the gentle Jesus, meek and mild, sought to save me from His clutches. Later I learned that *God Himself* is my Saviour (1 Tim. 1:1, 2:3, Titus 1:3), and the salvation is *through* Christ Jesus, my Lord. Yea, Christ Himself looked to God for salvation from death (Heb. 5:7). It was *God* Who designated us beforehand to be conformed to the image of His Son. *He* it is Who calls and justifies and glorifies. If *God* is for us, who is against us? *He* it was Who spared not His Son. Together with Him, He will graciously grant us all (Rom. 8:28-32). No, indeed. Our salvation is not endangered because God has no other deity on whom to lean. Christ was absolutely perfect in the place prepared for Him by God, but even He, unlike a deity, as the Inaugurator of salvation, needed to be *perfected* through sufferings (Heb. 2:10). Was this an attribute of Deity?

One of the chief foundations of Trinitarianism is the so-called benediction at the end of Paul's second epistle to the Corinthians, which reads: the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the holy spirit be with you all! It has been said that, if Trinitarianism is not true, then this is the invocation of the grace of a created being, the love of God, and the communion of an attribute.

The process of "reasoning" by which some infer that this implies three gods seems to be as follows: This is an *invocation*. An appeal is made to three Persons, each of which is invoked. Only the supreme Deity can be invoked. Therefore each one of these must be supreme Deity and they must form a Trinity. Let us examine this method of changing truth to error, so that we may be able to detect similar substitutes for faith.

But why call this an *invocation*? There is no call for help, no appeal. Those who *invoke* the name of the Lord shall be saved (Rom. 10:13), but saints do not "invoke"

in a "benediction." There is nothing of the kind here. Not one of the Trinity is addressed. It is a mere *wish* concerning *things*. The apostle closes with an expression of his desire that they enjoy *grace* and *love* and *communion*. The grace is that which is in the Lord Jesus Christ for them; the love is that which is in God toward them; the communion is that which is found alone in the holy spirit of which they have the earnest (2 Cor. 1:22), by which alone communion is possible among saints. Paul is not invoking the "Persons" of the "Trinity" to be with them, but that their "attributes" be present in their lives.

Invocation is not confined to the Deity. The same Greek word (*epikaleō*) is used when Paul *appealed* to Cæsar. The Roman emperors were prone to make gods of themselves, but we may be sure that Paul did not do anything to confirm their claim to deity. Instead of using this term to prove that God is threefold, this mode of inference would prove that He is *not*. In the Scriptures, appeal is never made to more than one. When "the name" is not invoked, it is God (2 Cor. 1:2, Heb. 11:16), or the Father (1 Pet. 1:17), or the Lord (Acts 2:21, 7:59, Rom. 10:12, 13, 1 Cor. 1:2, 2 Tim. 2:22). This argument is a boomerang. When used according to the facts it "proves" that there is only one God. But we refuse such reasoning for it is not of faith. The man of faith will not heed it, neither does he need it.

Grace, *love*, and *communion* are the "trinity" in this passage. These are the subjects of which Paul is speaking. He is not concerned with Christ or God or the holy spirit. These are only descriptive terms which limit the grace and love and communion. It is the *grace of the Lord*, the *love of God*, the *communion of the holy spirit*. Were this an invocation, the appeal would be to grace, love, and communion, not to the Lord, to God, or to the holy spirit. The grammar will not allow it otherwise. This is in perfect harmony with the position of the pass-

age. In closing his epistle he is wishing the very best there is for the Corinthians.

Paul's wish not only is based on his unfoldings in the Corinthian letters, but is a prophetic foreview of what was in store for them in the future. It is most remarkable that the great secret of the Ephesian epistle should follow the very lines laid down in this wish. There, in the three items of the "mystery," the apostle first unfolds the transcendent treasures of God's love in giving us a celestial allotment (1:3-19), the greatest of all grace in making us members of His joint body (1:20-2:10), and the communion of all believers in the new humanity (2:11-22). This is the direction of the thought at the end of the Corinthian epistles. Nothing could be more appropriate.

In contrast to this how incongruous it would be if so vital a verse as the foundation of the Trinity should be placed at the close of the second epistle! Nothing in the context leads up to it. Indeed, it is all concerned with their walk and welfare. This is what prompts the apostles wish. A further contrast is the setting and teaching concerning that there is only *one God*, in the eighth chapter of the first epistle. There the Corinthians had brought up a practical problem which needed clarification. Should they eat the food which had been offered to idols? In order to clarify it the apostle assures them that the idols do not represent real deities, for there is *only one God, the Father*. In this passage, *which deals with the subject*, Trinitarianism is distinctly and directly denied. Is it not the height of folly to "reason" to the opposite conclusion from a passage, not even remotely concerned with the subject, and written to the same saints?

No one doubts that God and our Lord are distinct "Persons" (which means *personalities*) but there is no need for this non-scriptural term except to express error. Then it is required in order to find a fictitious "third Person" in the holy spirit. This very verse ought to

show how intenable is such a thought. Is the communion of saints by means of a divine Person? I am now communing with the reader of these lines. Have I sent to you, gracious reader, an awe-inspiring Personage, Who imparts to you the thoughts which are here set forth? This Personage, we are told, makes His home in both of us at the same time, and, indeed, dwells in millions of saints all over the earth. He is also the channel of communication between all these individuals. Sane thinking revolts at such a fairy tale. Our Lord, with all His might and majesty, never did and never will do anything like this, except by *His spirit*. *His spirit* is not a distinct Personage apart from Himself. Neither is God's spirit a distinct Personage. It is that vital power by means of which God imparts His life and light to His saints, and which enables them to have communion with one another. I send to you, gracious reader, no wraith, no ghost, no phantom, no divine Personage Who would devour you by the fire of His holiness, but words vitalized by God's holy spirit. Such is the communion of the holy spirit.

Such passages occur often. If we can prove the Trinity from this occurrence, why may we not, by the same line of reasoning, prove the *Duality* of God from the *many* passages where some "attributes," as grace, peace, and mercy are found in the salutations of all of Paul's epistles? In these there is no mention of the holy spirit as a rule. Why should not the "third Person" of the "Trinity" join in wishing us grace and peace? But how foolish to seek light on this subject in passages which are concerned with nothing of the kind? The mere fact that the "Trinity" must be reasoned from contexts which are not even remotely concerned with it should show its falsity. And the fact that those scriptures which do deal with the number of Gods must be suppressed or "explained," should settle the truth beyond question.

Our Lord declared, "I and the Father are one" (John 10:30). Had our translators been consistent they

would have rendered this one *thing*, for the gender is "neuter." Those who seek to use this statement to establish the "supreme Deity" of the Son do not seem to realize that, at the same time, they are denying the "Trinity." If the Father and Son are one in the sense they take it, there are only *two* Persons in the "God-head"! That no such thing as "equality" or Deity or supremacy is involved is put beyond the shadow of a doubt by other statements, in John 17:11, 21, 22. Our Lord prays for His disciples "that *they may be one, according as We are.*" Did the oneness of His disciples destroy all differences? Does everyone become a Peter, and enjoy every place and privilege promised to him? The oneness between the Father and the Son is evident by their complete harmony in word and work. He spoke, not His own words, but the word of God. He did not His own deeds, but the works of God.

Strangely, those who insist that Christ is the *supreme* Deity, which, if it means anything, puts Him *above* all other gods, also lower Him to *equality* with the Father. The Jews did not object to Him because He said that He is the supreme Deity, or that He is the Father. They objected to His calling God His *Father*. The passage reads: Jesus answers them, "My Father is working hitherto, and *I* am working." Therefore, then, the Jews sought the more to kill Him, seeing that He not only annulled the sabbath, but said His own Father is God, making Himself equal to God (John 5:17-18). It is evident that they used the word *equal* in quite a different sense than that given it by theologians today. We would not conclude that a son was the equal of his father. We may be very sure that our Lord Himself did not claim this, for He said that "the Father is *greater* than I" (John 14:28). It was only in His former glory, when He appeared in the outward *form* of God, that He deems it no pillaging to be equal with God. In the form of a slave, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto

death. Can the supreme Deity die? Who would rouse Him from the dead?

Since Christ, as *God's* creative Original (Rev. 3:14), is before all, and all was created in Him, and through Him and for Him (Col. 1:16-17), He must have had what theologians call a "pre-existence" before He came in humiliation to Bethlehem. Yet He is not *without* a beginning, but *is* the Beginning of God's creation. He is the firstborn of every *creature*, not an uncreated Deity (Col. 1:15). God did not create another Creator, but operated creatively in and through and for Him. The Authorized Version rendering: "*by* Him were all things created" is false and misleading. The Revision changes to *in* (Col. 1:16). Later on in the same verse they have changed, "all things were created *by* him," to "*through* him." If all were *out of* Him, then, indeed He would be the Creator. But if all was created by Another *in* and *through* Him, then He is not the ultimate Cause. Pre-existence is no proof of Deity. It implies the first and highest place in God's creation.

God has *given* Christ many glories, most of which are intended to reveal the Deity to His creatures. To reason that these high honors make Him the Deity is the height of folly. Some have argued that He was the supreme Deity because He had power on earth to forgive sins (Mat. 9:6). The Jews reasoned thus. They said, "Who is able to pardon sins except One—God?" But it is not a question of His *power* or *ability*, but of His delegated *authority*. God is the One Who does the pardoning, but He does not do it directly. He puts this into the hands of His Mediator to do it for Him. Now a Mediator between two cannot be either one. The mere fact that Christ has the *authority given* to Him by God is enough to show that He is *not* the supreme Deity. No one can give *God* such a right, or delegate to Him such authority. He has it in Himself. Christ did not have it in Himself, but received it from God.

A. E. K.

AS IN HEAVEN, ON EARTH ALSO

SIN IN HEAVEN? Most of us have been taught that heaven and sin are irreconcilable, that sin will never enter there, and, by inference, that the earth will never be sinless. But the Scriptures clearly teach that there will be a battle in heaven (Rev. 12:7), and not till then will Satan be cast out of heaven. Surely he must be there up to that time, and is there now, no matter if "St. Peter" tries to lock him out. Heaven has no gates. It takes in the whole universe outside the earth. Those in the heavens are estranged or they would not need to be reconciled (Col. 1:20).

But does not the Bible clearly imply that God's will is done in heaven? The "Lord's Prayer," or, rather, the prayer He taught His disciples, seems to be a petition that earth be made as sinless as heaven, does it not? So it seems. But when we examine the words more closely, we will not find any such thought. We supply it ourselves, from the traditions which we have been taught.

The prayer is concerned with the kingdom. In the millennium it will be fulfilled. But even that blessed era will not be sinless. The law of God will be written on the hearts of all Israel, but not on those of the nations. At the close of the thousand years Satan will mobilize a vast army against the saints (Rev. 20:7-9). The kingdom may not be sinless, but in it the will of God shall be done as it is in heaven, from whence Satan draws his great army before it begins. God's will is done in both far beyond what is known in this, man's day, on earth.

But sinlessness does not come to either heaven or earth until the consummation, when all mankind is vivified and justified and the whole universe reconciled through the blood of Christ's cross. Then both will be beyond the pale of sin and death by virtue of His sacrifice.

A. E. K.

WHAT IS WORSHIP?

— WORSHIP is a word with a slightly different usage in Biblical English than is commonly given to it among the uninformed, especially the illiterate believers. It is supposed to be confined to the Deity, and some zealous advocates of tradition, in the exercise of their "God-given reason," seek to use it as a proof of the "deity of Christ," in the literal and absolute sense. But the word worship is given six distinct usages besides the adoration of the deity in Webster's dictionary, so that there is no reasonable ground for this silly syllogism, even outside of the Bible. It is related to the word *worth*, and ascribes this to those of whom it is used. We may speak of a magistrate as "your worship," without deifying him or expressing any more than "your *worthiness*." *Worshipful* is used in Freemasonry, as *worshipful master*, and in other connections, as *worshipful society*. In Biblical usage, which ought to be the only basis of any such reasoning, worship is freely given to the saints, as well as to Satan. These, we have no hesitation in asserting, are *not* deified thereby.

In our Keyword Concordance the occurrences of the word *worship* are segregated according to the object of worship. First we list the passages where worship is directed to God, then to Christ, then to spirit beings, then to idols, then to messengers, and then to man. They are further grouped, when possible, to show who is the worshiper. We find this arrangement a vast advantage in studying or for reference. The ordinary concordances

do not show these vital facts in most cases, and even our own large concordance, with its long lines exhibiting much of the context, often leaves one at a loss as to who worships or is worshiped, because they are indicated by a pronoun instead of the noun to which it refers. By substituting the name and grouping the occurrences as classified, we are able to make a fuller concordance in less space.

pros ku n e'ō TOWARD-TEEM

worship, literally fawn like a dog or cur.
of God: the Lord your God shall you w
Mt4¹⁰ Lu4⁸ (Samaritans) fathers w in moun-
tain Jn4²⁰ in (neither) w Father 21 you
not aware 22 (Jews) say in Jerusalem 20
we are aware 22 true w in spirit and truth
23 24 24 Father seeking 23 Greeks w Pass-
over festival Jn12²⁰ Ethiopian eunuch to
Jerusalem to w Ac8²⁷ Paul to Jerusalem
to w Ac24¹¹ unbeliever 1Co14²⁵ Jacob w on
top of staff Hb11²¹ twenty-four elders w
Rv4¹⁰ 5¹⁴ 11¹⁶ 19⁴ all the messengers around
throne Rv7¹¹ worshipers in temple Rv11¹
(all men) w Maker Rv14⁷ animals 5¹⁴ 19⁴
nations 15⁴ John 19¹⁰ 22⁹ of Christ: magi
Mt2² 11 Herod (feigned) Mt2⁸ leper Mt8²
chief Mt9¹⁸ disciples in ship Mt14³³ Ca-
naanitish woman 15²⁵ mother of Zebedee's
sons Mt20²⁰ disciples 28⁹ eleven in Galilee
Mt28¹⁷ man out of the tombs Mk5⁶ soldiers
(in derision) Mk15¹⁹ disciples Bethany Jer-
usalem Lu24⁵² man born blind Jn9³⁸ Abs2
messengers w Firstborn Hb1⁶ of spirits:
if Jesus w Satan Mt4⁹ Lu4⁷ rest of man-
kind w demons Rv9²⁰ whole earth w dragon
Rv13⁴ of idols: house of Israel w models,
Moloch, Raiphan Ac7⁴³ the rest of man-
kind Rv9²⁰ those worshiping image of wild
beast 14⁹ 11 16² (not) 19²⁰ of a messenger:
John Rv19¹⁰ 22⁸ of men: slave w king Mt
18²⁶ Cornelius w Peter Ac10²⁵ synagogue
of Satan w Philadelphians Rv3⁹ wild beast
w by whole earth 13⁴ 12 name not written
in scroll Rv13⁸ not w (be killed) Rv13¹⁵
(reign) 20⁴.

THE WORSHIP OF GOD

— Perhaps the erroneous idea that worship is confined to God alone arose from the lines in the law which prohibit the offering of *divine service* to any other (Deut. 6:16, Mat. 4:10, Luke 4:8):

The Lord your God shall you be worshiping,
And to Him only shall you be offering divine service.

Satan demanded worship from our Lord. Seeing that he is the most *unworthy* of all God's creatures, our Lord

refuses him the homage which he will receive from the false Messiah and his dupes at the time of the end.

The *place* of worship seems to have assumed an importance greater than its Object, in the long quarrel between the Jews and the Samaritans. The divine religion given to Israel indicated Jerusalem as the proper place, and this was the location of the temples of the past. In the future it will be in the holy oblation, not far away. In the new earth the place and Person will be merged into one, for the Lord Almighty and the Lambkin are its temple (Rev. 21:22). The Samaritans worshiped in Mount Gerizim, for they were not allowed to come to Jerusalem (John 4:20-24). We worship everywhere, in spirit and in truth, for we see His worthiness in every corner of His universe.

The Ethiopian eunuch had not yet learned this great lesson, for he made a strenuous journey, for those days, in order to worship in the place of Jehovah's appointment. But he found little worship in Jerusalem, at least not in spirit and in truth. So he returns, full of questions, instead of answers (Acts 8:27-39). As a result there is acceptable worship on the road by one who is *leaving* Jerusalem. What a fit picture and foreview of Jerusalem's desolation!

Later Paul went to Jerusalem to worship (Acts 24:11). There has been considerable controversy, whether he was right in doing this. It was, indeed, quite contrary to the light he had received, yet we may be sure that his visit was intended to present us with a moving picture of that very truth, and to illustrate for us the tragedy of Jerusalem's apostasy. Paul, the true worshiper, is not allowed to worship, but is cast out by the false hypocrites. Away with him! How clear it becomes that the sacred city, with all its *divine service*, is no longer a place of *worship*!

Even an unbeliever can worship. Paul exhorts the Corinthians to so conduct their gatherings that a visitor,

even if an unbeliever, will be impressed and worship God. In the Unveiling, as is fitting, there is much worship, for Jehovah will be manifested so that His creatures will be filled with awe at His worthiness and greatness. All men worship Him as their Maker (14:7), and the nations will arrive and worship before Him when His just awards are manifest (15:4). The elders often fall down before the great Enthroned, and with the symbolic animals, offer Him their adoration. John, when he is about to worship the messenger, is told to worship God. Today, there is altogether too much worship of God's servants. May they learn to direct it to the One Who alone is worthy!

THE WORSHIP OF CHRIST

Christ may be freely worshiped, for He is God's Anointed, one with Him in His words and ways. When we worship Him we worship God, Whose Image He is. He, so to say, is the Idol of the true and only God. The first to worship Him were the Magi (Mat. 2:2, 11). The deep significance of this, and of Herod's hypocritical desire to join their worship (Mat. 2:8) is clear from the subsequent conduct of Israel. The nation and its appointed priests should have been the first and foremost, but we never read of them doing it at all. Only a few despised and needy sons of Israel, *who typify the true condition of the nation*, are blessed by Him and respond with words of worship. We have the leper (Mat. 8:2), the man born blind (John 9:38) and the man out of the tombs (Mark 5:6), each representing Israel's actual state before God and picturing their future restoration and response to His mercy. Beside the chief (Mat. 9:18), only His disciples worship Him in Israel (Mat. 14:33, 28:9), if we except the mother of Zebedee's sons, who sought a favor (Mat. 20:20).

After His descent from the mount of the "beatitudes," where the King had announced the laws of the

kingdom (Mat. 5:1-7:29), our Lord resumes His lowly walk among the unclean, leprous nation, not at all fitted for that kingdom, but quite unaware of their sorry state. This is brought before them significantly by a leper, and there is enacted a scene which shows what will take place when the kingdom comes. A leper, coming toward Him, *worshiped* Him, and acknowledged His power to heal and His right to do according to His will. As it was not God's will to heal Israel at that time, because of the greater grace and glory of His secret plans, the nation was not healed. *Their* unwillingness was only a result of His. When the time comes Israel will see that their blessing is not dependent, as they supposed, on their *own* deeds or faith, but on *His* will. Then there will not be an instant's delay.

In the past, although it was not His purpose to gain the worship of the priests, whose whole lives were dedicated to this very end, it was vital to His plan that they should *know* of His works and *reject* them. So the leper is sent to the priests to testify of Him to them, to lock them up in stubbornness. The "cleansing" of the leper (Lev. 14:1-20) was a ceremony which involved all of the offerings besides other symbolic acts and objects, such as the two birds, living, or running, water, an earthen vessel, blood, cedar wood, scarlet and hyssop; as well as loosing one bird, slaying the other and sprinkling its blood seven times, washing, shaving, tarrying seven days, etc., none of which cleansed the leper (for he was healed to begin with), but all of which is full of the glories of Him Who did the cleansing, and Who is worthy of worship. But the priests were blind and callous, and could not read the wealth of signification which was set before them by their own acts when they went through this ceremony.

A maniac was Israel, as well as a leper, a dweller in the tombs of their dead forefathers. Not only was their flesh corrupt, but in mind they were maniacs, indwelt.

by alien spirits which not only made them foes of mankind, but drove them to self-destruction, like the man who met the Lord in the country of the Gergesenes (Mark 5:1-20). It is notable in this case also that worship is accorded Christ *before* the demons were driven out. This accords with the worship of unbelievers in Corinth. Among the Jews, today, there is more and more acknowledgment of the worthiness of Jesus, even before they believe and receive Him as their Saviour.

But outside His own people He is worshiped. The Canaanitish woman, when she acknowledged that she had no claim on the Son of David and appealed to Him as her Lord, worshiped when she sought His help, and was heard (Mat. 15:25). Yet the soldiers, deriding Him, worshiped as they beat His head and spat upon Him (Mark 15:19). Even this will help us to see the nature of true worship, for their acts were the antithesis of worship. Thus we have an epitome of His career. He humbled Himself. Beginning with the worship of the Magi, He ends with the insults of the soldiers. But, even as He, as the Firstborn, was worshiped by the messengers, so also shall He be adored by all creation when He becomes the Temple, as the Lambkin, in the new earth.

THE WORSHIP OF SPIRIT BEINGS

Beside God, there are other spirits that demand worship. The nations worship idols which represent demons (1 Cor. 10:20). In the end time the rest of mankind will worship them (Rev. 9:20). The whole earth will worship the dragon, the symbol of Satan's earthly dominions (Rev. 13:4). They give Satan the worship which Jesus refused (Mat. 4:9, Luke 4:7).

IDOL WORSHIP

Though the house of Israel, in Acts, refused to worship the Image of God, they followed the course which

was theirs antitypically in the wilderness, where they worshiped models of Moloch and Raiphan (Acts 7:43). And at the time of the end, some of them and the rest of mankind will worship the image of the wild beast (Rev. 9:20, 14:9, 11, 16:2) though some will not (19:20) and will receive great reward for their refusal.

THE WORSHIP OF MESSENGERS

Even John, the seer of Patmos and the beloved disciple, worships the messenger who revealed the Unveiling to him (Rev. 19:10, 22:8).

THE WORSHIP OF MEN

We commend the following passages to the earnest consideration of our readers, as they are needed to correct the false impression that is abroad, that worship implies deity. The slave who wished to obtain a favor from his king fell down and *worshiped* him (Mat. 18:26). There is not the slightest suggestion in the context that this involved anything like idolatry. Cornelius actually worshiped Peter, when he came as the answer to his prayers (Acts 10:28). In the future the Jews who worship Satan will be made to worship the faithful remnant who refuses to worship the great enemy of God (Rev. 3:9). When man's day comes to a head, the whole earth will worship the wild beast, the superman, if their names are not written in the Lambkin's scroll of life (Rev. 13:4, 8, 12). Those who will not worship will be killed (Rev. 13:15), nevertheless they will live and reign with Christ the thousand years (Rev. 20:4).

Such is the usage of the word *worship*. All who are God's, whether Christ or His saints, are *worthy*, because they are the direct fruit of His purpose and will, for they are God's achievement. He who worships them worships the God Whose handiwork they are. He is glorified in their honor. They ascribe all that they are to Him. They are worshipful saints in a double sense. They worship Him and are worthy of worship.

Those who are temporarily Satan's are *unworthy*, being only the indirect background of God's self-revelation, needed to carry out His intention, being God's foil. He who worships them worships the Adversary whom they serve, the most *unworthy* of God's creations, and the least worthy of worship. Though glorious and exalted for a time, he will yet be the most inglorious and debased of all God's creatures, and those who are his will share his fate until the consummation, when God will save and justify and vivify all, reconciling these rebels through the blood of Christ's cross.

True worship of the Deity is seldom seen, we fear, in these days of superficial religion. This is due to a considerable extent to the fearfully defeated fiend to which He has been degraded by the orthodox tenets of Christianity. According to accepted theology, He snatches a few out of the flames, but loses the great mass, due to His inability to plan or execute His purpose without the sacrifice of billions of His helpless creatures. If He makes such a tremendous failure why should we worship Him, when Satan seems more successful? When religious leaders, and even great and good men, insist on such a detestable defamation of the Deity, how can there be heartfelt adoration except from self-centered saints whose hearts are callous to the cries of the world about them? Orthodoxy seeks to reap love from a field of hate. They preach that God's words are loving but His deeds are hateful. Oh, how our blessed God must be hurt at His heart at the cruel caricature that Christianity has set up in His place!

And even those who know that all whom He hurts He heals, all whom He wounds He will make well again, all who rebel He will reconcile, do they give Him the worship which is His due? We seek to reach others, which is good. We try to teach them His works and His ways, which is excellent. We thank Him for His benefits and for His gracious way with us. These are beauti-

ful buds and blossoms, as it were, but not the fruit. They should develop into delicious dainties for His delectation. By all means let us thank Him for that which He has *done*, and that He is *doing*, and *will do* in His own good time. But above all, let us adore Him for what He is, and worship Him for His attributes, His wisdom, power and love, in which we may bask as in the sun, on which we may refresh ourselves as from a flowing spring, in which we may delight as in the presence of our heart's love. Let us make Him our All, and give Him the place supreme in our hearts and lives. Then we may, in some tiny measure, give Him the homage, the devotion, the adoration, the *worship* which His heart craves, which is the crowning consummation of the eonian times. May He grant this boon to every reader of these lines!

A. E. K.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS IN NEW ZEALAND

A trust account for the Concordant Publishing Concern has been started by Brother James E. A. Gates, P. O. Box 1900, Auckland. Subscriptions should be sent there until it is again possible to remit direct.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO SOLDIERS

WHEN SENDING SUBSCRIPTIONS for those in the armed forces stationed outside continental United States (including such addresses as c/o Postmaster, New York, etc.), the order must be accompanied by a written request for the magazine by the addressee. At present this restriction does not apply to the Navy or the Marine Corps.

SOLID COMFORT FOR THE BEREAVED

HERE IS THE TRACT you have been looking for! It shows how God will deal with all the unsaved, innocent children as well as hardened sinners, in order to bring them to Himself. Twenty-five cents per hundred, or free to those who cannot pay.

TIMELY TRACTS

WHY DOESN'T GOD STOP THIS WAR, and WAR—WHO WANTS IT? are the titles of two tracts on this vital subject, which are now available in addition to the four we already had. These are sent free of charge to anyone who wishes to distribute them. Let us know how many you can use.

ADVANTAGES OF THE CONCORDANT VERSION

A WONDERFULLY CLEAR and helpful little pamphlet of eight pages, containing an address by Edward H. Clayton, of Sheffield, England, gives many concrete examples of the advantages of the version. Just how to give it the circulation it deserves is a problem. As an introduction to the Version we know of nothing better. If you can help distribute some, order them direct from Edward H. Clayton, 345, Warminster Road, Sheffield, 8, England.

IS THE EARTH A DESOLATION IN THE MILLENNIUM?

QUESTION: Will the earth be a wreck and ruin during the thousand years, according to Isa. 24:1-3 and Jer. 4:23-28?

The context in each of these passages shows that it is concerned with the *land*, not the earth, and with its desolation during the seventy years' captivity, in the *past*, not in the still future millennium.

In Isaiah, the whole section in which this passage occurs deals with the "burdens" or *loads* of the nations of *that day*. Just before, in Isa. 23:15, we read that Tyre shall be forgotten *seventy years*. This occurred during the same time that the land was desolate, from Nebuchadnezzar to Cyrus. This is the period to which Isa. 24:1-3 refers. Then it was that the dwellers in the *land* were scattered. The A.V. translates the word "earth" in verse one as "land" in verse three, as it should be throughout. It was the land of Judah, the people under the law and the covenant (verse 5) whose judgment Isaiah sets forth.

Jeremiah's prophecy was written just before the captivity, and is largely concerned with it. The passage presented as proof for millennial desolation (4:23-28) is in a section dealing with warnings to Judah, in connection with a destroyer of the gentiles who is to come from the north (Jer. 4:6-7), which clearly predicted the campaign of Nebuchadnezzar, who had to go around the desert and enter the land from the north. Again, it is the *land* of Judah, not the earth which is desolate (verse 27). It foretells the seventy years' deportation.

In the thousand years the saints in Israel live and reign with Christ on the earth (Rev. 20:4). Satan no longer is allowed on earth, but is cast into the abyss. The nations multiply on the earth so that, at the end of the thousand years, those in the four corners of the earth are numerous as the sands of the sea (Rev. 20:8).

There are really two millennia. Satan is bound seventy-five days before the saints are raised and reign, and is also loosed before their reign is concluded.

Studies in Daniel

DANIEL STANDS THE TEST

1. In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, to Jerusalem and besieged it. ²And Jehovah is giving into his hand Jehoiakim, king of Judah, and from the end of the furnishings of the house of God. And he is bringing them to the land of Shinar, to the house of his god. And the furnishings he brings to the treasure house of his god.

THE COMMENCEMENT and close of Daniel's prophecy practically coincide with the beginning and end of the desolation of Judah. The prophet Jeremiah had warned the nation, again and again, but without effect. He foretold this calamity as follows (Jer. 25:1-11):

(⁷Septuagint^o ^oSeptuagint Omits')

The word which came to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, king of Judah, ^o(that is the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon)', which ^oJeremiah, the prophet', speaks to all the people of Judah, and to all who dwell in Jerusalem, saying:

³ .."From the thirteenth year of Josiah, son of Amon, king of Judah,

And till this day, this twenty-third year,

....^oCame the word of Jehovah to me,'

And I am speaking to you,

Rising early and speaking,

And you do not stretch out your ear ^o'to hear,'

⁴^oAnd Jehovah' sends to you all His servants, the prophets, Rising early and speaking,

....Yet you do not hearken,

And you do not stretch out your ear ^o'to hear,'

⁵Saying, "Turn back, ^o'now', each man from his evil way, And from the evil of your actions,

....And dwell on the ground which ^o'Jehovah' gave you, And your fathers from the eon and until the eon.

⁶And you shall not go after other gods To serve them and worship them,

- ...And you shall not vex Me by the deeds of your hands,
And I will do no evil to you.
- 7 .. And you do not hearken to me, 'avers Jehovah',
'That you may vex Me by the deeds of your hands
To do evil to you.'
- 8 ..Therefore thus says Jehovah 'of Hosts';
Because you do not hearken to My words,
- 9 ..Behold Me sending. and I take 'all' the families of the north,
'avers Jehovah',
And Nebuchadrezzar, My servant,
..And will bring them against this land,
And against those who dwell in it,
And against all 'these' nations about,
And I doom them.
....And convert them into a desolation and a hissing,
And a desertion eonian.
- 10 And I destroy from them the sound of elation,
And the sound of rejoicing,
.... The voice of the bridegroom,
And the voice of the bride,
.... The sound of the millstones,
And the light of the lamp.
- 11 ...And this entire land shall become deserted 'and desolate.'
- And these nations serve the king of Babylon seventy years.

Jehoiakim, notwithstanding Jeremiah's warning, did evil in the sight of Jehovah, his God. In his third year, Nebuchadnezzar came and bound him in copper gyves and carried him to Babylon. Although he was the son of the good king Josiah (2 Kings 23:34), he did not follow in his father's footsteps, but was guilty of special abominations (2 Chron. 36:8). So he was "corrected with the club" of a mortal, and his kingdom was turned over to another, under the suzerainty of Nebuchadnezzar. The presence of the king of Judah in the city of his conqueror was a standing symbol of the passing of the Davidic line under the domination of the nations, and marked the commencement of the eras of the nations, which have lasted ever since, and will continue until Messiah, as the Son of David, frees His people from the last great world monarch, in the era of the end.

Nebuchadnezzar (or Nebuchadrezzar, as Ezekiel, and

sometimes Jeremiah, call him), notwithstanding his destruction of Jerusalem and deportation of Judah, was Jehovah's servant, in all these things, to carry out His will with regard to them. Coming at the very commencement of the eras of the nations, he has a very high place given him by God. Jeremiah prophesied concerning him and his dynasty as follows (27: 6, 7) :

And now I give all these lands into the hands of king Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, My servant,
And even the animals of the field do I give him to serve him.
And serve him shall all nations, and his son, and his son's son.

Thus does Jehovah use all of the many enemies of His people for their good. Even today the increasing anti-Semitism is not merely the product of race hatred, but the calculated discipline of Jehovah, Who uses all of His creatures to carry out His intention, and the nations to chastise His chosen people.

Throughout this prophecy there are two main currents: the *political* and the *religious*. These are indicated at the very beginning. Not only did Nebuchadnezzar carry away the king and some of the seed royal to Babylon, but also *furnishings from the house of God*. These he carried into the land of Shinar to the house of his god. As they were hardly adapted to the worship of his god, they were put in the treasure house of the deity. The significance of this should not escape us, for the name and fame of God were brought down into the dust at the same time with the house of David. Daniel is as much, or more, concerned with *worship* in his prophecy, as with *rule*. The restoration of the sanctuary is more important than the throne, though both are inseparably united, and will be found together in Him Who will restore both as the great Priest King after the order of Melchizedec.

These vessels from the temple played a tragic part in the conclusion of the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar. They seem to have reposed secure and unmolested in the

treasure house until Belshazzar, the last in the line of Nebuchadnezzar, brought them forth in order to grace his feast in honor of the gods of gold and silver and copper and iron, of wood and stone. This insult to Jehovah had a dire effect, and that without delay. In the same *hour* came the handwriting on the wall, and in the same *night* was Belshazzar slain. The final crisis which closed the career of the first kingdom, the head of gold, was brought about, not by a failure in government, but by the violation of the vessels of God's sanctuary. Nebuchadnezzar was humbled before God, but Belshazzar exalted himself against the Lord God of the heavens by drinking wine to his gods out of the sacred vessels (Dan. 5: 3, 23).

All of the furnishings of the house of God were *given* into Nebuchadnezzar's hand. They were not all *taken* at once. The last seem to have gone when Jehoiachin was carried to Babylon about eight years later (2 Kings 24: 13-15, 2 Chron. 36: 10). The apparently universal translation which tells us that a *part* of the vessels of Jehovah's house were given to Nebuchadnezzar, probably arose from the fact that only a *part* were *taken*, away at this time. The Hebrew word *qtzth*, here mis-translated *part*, occurs thrice more in this chapter, in verses 5, 15, and 18. In each case it is rendered *end*—the *end* of three years, of ten days. In the Chaldee portion it is also rendered *end* twice (4: 26, 31)—the *end* of twelve months, of days. In many other passages the Authorized Version uses *end*, which seems to be its true meaning. More than a dozen Hebrew words are translated *end*, but this one is the most apt. The same mis-translation is found in Daniel 2: 42: the kingdom shall be *partly* strong.

Jerusalem is the city of the great King (Mat. 5: 35). It is the habitation of God. Hence it is the center and source of divine rule and religion. When these are enforced (Isa. 2: 3):

... from Zion shall go forth the *law*,
And the *word* of Jehovah from Jerusalem.

The holy city is the only center from which mankind may be governed *for* God, or brought *to* God. It is most fitting, therefore, when these privileges are taken from the holy nation, that the city be taken and the temple destroyed, and the people driven away from their place of privilege. All these outward evils are the signs and symbols of the inward collapse of Israel. No act could so clearly advertise this to the world as the fate of the city which is the center of all earthly power and holiness.

THE SCHOOL OF STATECRAFT

³And saying is the king to Ashpenas, his grand-eunuch, to bring from the sons 'of the captivity' of Israel, and from the seed of the king, and from the highborn, ⁴boys in whom there is no blemish at all, and of good appearance, and intelligent in all wisdom, and knowing knowledge, and understanding what is known, and who have the vigor in them to stand in the palace 'before' the king, and to teach them the scroll and language of the Chaldeans. ⁵And assigning to them is the king the day's menu for the day, from the dainties of the king and from the wine that he drank, and to grow up three years. And at their end they shall stand before the king. ⁶And among them are of the sons of Judah, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah. ⁷And the chief of the eunuchs is placing names on them. And he is placing on Daniel Belteshazzar, and on Hananiah Shadrach, and on Mishael Meshach, and on Azariah Abed-nego.

The "head of gold" seems to have been more than an arbitrary despotism. More provision seems to have been made for intelligent and efficient administration than is usual in modern systems of government. In such a vast empire as Nebuchadnezzar's, swaying over many peoples and tongues, there would be a special call for officials acquainted with the customs and languages of the conquered nations, to administer their affairs at the central government. With a view to providing capable personnel, we learn from inscriptions that there was a palace school and a large library, in which young men

were trained for the higher government positions. It seems to have been one of the king's first concerns to see that suitable youths from Judea were introduced into this college, in order to provide for the administration of the conquered people.

The candidates for these offices were carefully chosen. Their ancestry, their physical fitness and appearance, and their mental capacity, as well as a personality fit for the royal residence, were all considered in selecting the students in this school of statecraft. They were then taught the official language of the empire, so as to have access to the library and the learning of the country of their conquerors. The course seems to have lasted three years. At the end of this time they were examined by the king, and he probably assigned them their positions in the government himself.

The interest which Nebuchadnezzar took in this school is shown by his personal supervision of the diet of his charges, and by his sharing with them the dainties and the drinks which graced his own board. Such an honor as this probably came next to an invitation to the table of the king, and would be considered a special privilege by the young students, most of whom would duly appreciate both the richness of the food and the favor involved. It would be dangerous to refuse it and a grave offence to fail in appreciating the mighty monarch's favors.

Daniel would occupy a very special and peculiar position in this school, though this would not be apparent on the surface. He was the representative of the real Ruler of Babylon and the world, and he already was in touch with the true wisdom, and had knowledge which this institution could never impart. Nevertheless, he did not assert his "rights," or look down upon the rest, but seems to have endeared himself even to the eunuch set over him. In the course of his career his real position as a prophet of the Supreme is revealed.

THE NAME CHANGES

Four young men are chosen for the school of statecraft among the sons of Judah, for this was only one of many lands which were tributary in the Babylonian empire. Only one matter seemed to be objectionable, in these youths, and that was their names. Each one of them was formed with a divine title, either —*el*, the Deity, or —*iah* (probably —*ieu* from *Ieue*), Jehovah. Daniel and Mishael used the former, and Hananiah and Azariah had the latter. Daniel denotes ADJUDICATIONS-[of-the]-Deity. Michael is formed from who-[is]-what-Deity-[is]. Hananiah is given-[by]-Jehovah. Azariah is HELPED-[by]-Jehovah. Such a recognition of the God of Israel could not, at that time, be allowed at the court, for that would be an affront to the gods of Babylon.

Daniel's Hebrew name is most fitting for the role he takes. His prophecy deals with *adjudication by the Deity*. Man is humbled and God carries out His intentions in the history of the race. What could more clearly reveal the futility of man and the Deity of God than these previsions of human history? Daniel was given another name, which may have related him to other gods, but he still holds fast to the name of his youth, which recognizes the God of Israel and His just dealings with His people.

The names given to Daniel and his companions are variously interpreted. Like the Hebrew names, they seem to include the names of gods in their composition. Bel seems to correspond with Baal, which means POSSESSOR. Bel is mentioned by Isaiah (46:1): "Bows Bel! Stoops Nebo!" Jeremiah also prophesies concerning the gods of Babylon (50:1): "Seized is Babylon! Shamed is Bel! Dismayed is Merodach!" And again (51:44):

And I punish Bel in Babylon,
And I bring forth what he swallows down from his mouth.
And no longer are streaming to him the nations.
Even the wall of Babylon is fallen.

But Bel will bow and be put to shame, with all his worshipers, by the God of Daniel.

DANIEL REFUSES UNLAWFUL FOOD

⁸And Daniel is determining in his heart not to sully himself with the dainties of the king, nor with the wine which he drank. And he is seeking from the chief of the eunuchs so as not to sully himself. ⁹And God is giving Daniel kindness and pity before the chief of the eunuchs. ¹⁰And saying is the chief of the eunuchs to Daniel, "I fear my lord, the king, who assigned your food and your drink. Why should he see your faces more turbulent than the other boys who are of your deportation? And you make me indebted with my head to the king!"

¹¹And saying is Daniel to the steward whom the chief of the eunuchs assigned over Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, ¹²"Try, pray, your servants ten days. And they shall give us seed-food, and we will eat, and water, and we will drink. ¹³And they shall see our appearance before you, and the appearance of the boys who eat the dainties of the king. And according to that which you shall see, do with your servants."

¹⁴And he is hearkening to them in this thing, and is trying them out ten days. ¹⁵And at the end of the ten days their appearance is seen to be better and plumper in flesh than any of the boys who eat the dainties of the king. ¹⁶And it comes that the steward bears away their dainties and the wine which they drank, and gives them seed-food. ¹⁷And these boys, these four, to them God gives knowledge and intelligence in every scroll, and wisdom. And Daniel is caused to have understanding in all visions and dreams.

¹⁸And at the end of the days that the king says to bring them in, the chief of the eunuchs is bringing them before Nebuchadnezzar. ¹⁹And the king is speaking with them, and among them all are found none as Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah. And they are standing before the king. ²⁰And in every matter of wisdom or of understanding which the king seeks of them he is finding them ten hands above all the sacred scribes and magicians which are in all his kingdom. ²¹And Daniel is coming to be there until year one of Cyrus, the king.

There was a strict law in Israel, punishable by expulsion from God's people, which forbade the eating of blood. The blood of all beasts must be poured out when they are killed (Lev. 17:10-16). This is observed by many Jews to this day. They will eat only so-called *kosher* meat, which conforms with the law and the traditions. This is not done on the ground of health, but

of obedience to the law. So, doubtless, it was with Daniel and his three Hebrew companions. They were determined not to break the law and thus sever themselves from their own people. They had been forcibly torn away from Israel by their deportation, but that severance was in accord with the penalties of the law. They did not wish to incur still further judgments, by personal disobedience.

Moreover, it was forbidden to eat of meat sacrificed to idols, and that of the royal household most probably had come from the altars of their gods (Ex. 34:15). There was the utmost danger in associating in any way with the worship of false gods, situated as they were in positions where their whole careers, yes, their very lives, might depend on recognizing or worshipping them. The first step might be fatal, so Daniel determined not to take it. He seems to have been the spokesman, or prophet, for his brethren. Most likely he explained the matter fully to the chief of the eunuchs, for he responded with kindness and pity. But it would be more than his head was worth to fall in with Daniel's request, seeing that the king himself had ordered the menu. The chief of the eunuchs would do nothing for them.

But Daniel is not easily discouraged. He sees that he cannot well expect these idolators to take any risks, in order to enable him to indulge in what they would consider unreasonable religious scruples. So he plans a wiser approach. He will ask for a trial only, and then arrange it so that there will be an inducement, a selfish reward, to make it worth while. So he goes to the steward who brings them the meals and proposes that for ten days he bring them only seeds and water in place of the rich viands to which they were entitled, he, of course, to keep the dainties and the wine for himself. This has the proper appeal, so the steward complies with their request.

SEED-FOOD, NOT "PULSE"

As much has been made of the diet chosen by Daniel, in preference to the king's "meat," especially by vegetarians, we will give the matter more than ordinary consideration, and give the evidence. It is usually supposed that Daniel refused a meat diet and chose one of vegetables. Yet neither of these is mentioned. He objected to the king's *dainties* and *wine* on *religious* grounds, and asked for *seeds* and *water* in their place. But the test was a matter of nutrition and healthfulness. Undoubtedly Daniel chose what he considered the best available food, in order that he might present a well-nourished and healthful appearance after ten days. Then he might be excused from partaking of food that would sever him from his people and sully him in God's sight.

At the time that the Authorized Version was made, "meat" was the common word for *food* of any kind. Indeed, we still use it for the edible part of any food, as the *meat* of a nut. No argument can be based on the word in the Authorized Version, as it is used there of seven other things beside the miscalled "meat" offering. *Food*, *repast*, *prey*, *bread*, *sort*, *morsel*, *game*, and *dainty* are all translated *meat*, yet it is never used for *flesh* (*bshr*) or *meat* (*sher*) itself. Probably the *dainties* set before Daniel included meat, but it is most improbable that they were confined to it.

Daniel chose *seeds* as his solid food. The Septuagint also has *spermatōn* seeds. The Vulgate, however, uses *legumina* and later versions seem to have broadened this to *vegetables*, or, as in our version, *pulse*, with a misleading margin in the Revision, *herbs*. The Authorized Version, in its day, seems to have followed the Vulgate, for *pulse* then denoted the edible seeds of leguminous plants, such as beans, peas, lentils, etc. Inasmuch as these are seeds, they were probably included in Daniel's menu. But it is not likely that it was confined to these seeds. Grains and nuts are also seeds, which

were largely eaten in ancient times. Cakes of bread were the staple food of the day. A grain of wheat, if planted, will grow, hence is a seed.

The vital, reproductive power of a plant is centered in its seed, hence this, when edible, is often of exceptional nutritive value. In the Orient all kinds of seeds are still eaten, especially watermelon and sunflower seeds. In the Occident highly nutritive foods have lately been made by utilizing the germ only. Seeds can be had in great variety, so that an excellent menu could easily be set before Daniel and his companions, full of life-giving energy. Typically, seeds remind us of vivification, of life imparted to that which is dying. The pulp, leaves, or root of a plant may decay and die out. But when the seed dies, it may be the beginning of a new life. So the king's diet was decadent, but Daniel's vivifying.

The facts as to the Hebrew word *seed* (*zuro*, SOWING) are these: It is almost always translated *seed* in the Authorized Version. Such rare variants as *child* and *fruitful* are merely idiomatic. Like English, the Hebrew word is used for one or many seeds. So we read in Ecclesiastes 11:6: "In the morning sow your seed," not seeds. But when a variety is intended, different *kinds* of seed, then the plural is used as in 1 Samuel 8:15: He will take a tenth of your seeds (not seed, as in A. V.). It was customary to sow several different kinds of grains by themselves. This seems to be the only occurrence of the plural in the Hebrew Scriptures, except the two occurrences in Daniel, which are probably a slightly different form, as one of them (1:16) is spelled *zronim*, with an added N. This has probably dropped out of the other (1:12). The modern vowel signs also differ, but, as they undoubtedly refer to the same thing, there seems no sensible ground for variation.

Full many a Bible reader has confidently based his dietetic principles on the Bible, especially on the case of Daniel, who refused the king's "meat" and asked for

“pulse” instead. In German versions the word pulse is usually rendered “vegetables”. Few seem to know just what is meant by this term, though the Oxford Dictionary defines it as “edible seeds of leguminous plants, e.g., peas, beans, lentils.” As we will see, our translators had rather a good old English word for this passage, but now it is seldom used outside the Bible.

The key to the meaning of “pulse” in Hebrew lies in the fact that it is only a variant of the word *seed*. It was seed-food, if we may be allowed to invent a term to express it, which will leave no doubt as to its real significance. We are doing this in German also, having coined the word *Samenkost*. This should be very interesting to dieticians, and, indeed, all who wish to know what a good diet should contain. We do not advocate an exclusive diet of seeds because Daniel found it so becoming, for he may have had reasons other than that of health. Besides God has given us *all* for our enjoyment. A strictly seed diet lacks the necessary bulk. Fruits are undoubtedly among the most healthful of foods. But we may deduce from this that seeds are an especially good form of nourishment.

Undoubtedly “pulse”, that is, leguminous seeds, such as peas and beans are nourishing, but I do not think that the Hebrew word is limited to this class of seeds. I would include all grains and nuts as well. Even the multitudinous seeds of figs may be included. I am inclined to the opinion that the reproductive part of a plant is especially rich in vital values, hence it is especially desirable for food. When animals are fed on grain they can perform more labor than if fed on grass alone. Vegetable meals should be supplemented by seeds of some kind, I imagine. But this is not a health lecture. I simply wish to call attention to the real nature of Daniel’s request and to the fact that it is in accord with our own experience.

I fear that those who oppose meat, that is, the flesh

of animals, will not find much to support it in the Scriptures unless they give the old English "meat", meaning *food*, its modern meaning. The priests in Israel seem to have eaten vast quantities of flesh, for they were given the sacrifices as their portion. They had to be nearly perfect specimens of humanity physically. After many generations of meat eating they do not seem to have deteriorated in this regard. Israelites cannot be strict vegetarians, for they must eat roast lamb at least once a year. The Scriptures seem to hint that, since Noah's day, it is in order to eat the flesh of animals.

Daniel did not refuse the king's "meat", but his *dainties*. It seems to be related to the Hebrew word ENTICE, which is rendered *deceive, silly, flatter, persuade, allure* in the Authorized Version. It was prepared to please the palate, not to nourish the body. It was made to satisfy the sensuous appetites, to gratify the soul, not to help the understanding, to strengthen the spirit.

Is there not a plain parallel between the physical and the spiritual in regard to the food needed by mankind at various times in its history? In the beginning there was no shadow of death in their diet. The pulp of fruit seems to have been their chief sustenance. And so it will be at the end, when sin has well-nigh disappeared. The *fruits* of the tree of life will be for Israel, and the *leaves* for the healing of the nations.

During the presence of sin and death man is compelled to live on the death of other creations. Through the eating of seeds he is taught the lesson of resurrection—life out of death. Plants and animals must give up their lives if he would live. In a way the reproductive part of plants is the fittest food to sustain his spirit. This is in their seeds. These probably possess far more available vitality than the other parts of a plant, and such as a mortal, a *dying* creature needs. These, it may be, are the most valuable in countering the decadence of corruption. They will not be needed at all, perhaps,

when we are immortal. But little will be needed in the new earth.

It seems clear then, that Daniel and his companions were served a variety of seeds, rather than the pulp of vegetables, as some have supposed. At the end of the test these four were found plumper in flesh and of better appearance than the rest of the boys from other nations. So the steward bears away the dainties and the wine. We may imagine that he did not dare to order it stopped, as this would come to the king's ears. He took it and doubtless knew what to do with it. As a reward for their faithfulness God gives the boys a good mind, as well as a healthful body. To Daniel came the special gift of understanding in all visions and dreams.

When, after three years, all of the boys are brought before the king to be examined, the Judean captives excel all the rest. Not only that, but it seems that Nebuchadnezzar found them so far advanced that he called in the best men in the kingdom, the sacred scribes and magicians and they were found far ahead of them also. This is more understandable when we remember that Daniel was able to tell the king his dream as well as to give the interpretation, a thing which none of the wise men in Babylon were able to do.

TEN HANDS AND UNITS, NOT TIMES

Daniel and his companions were found "ten *times* better" than the wise men, says the Authorized Version. This statement, as well as that concerning the flaming furnace, that it should be heated "one seven times more than it was wont to be heated," aroused our suspicions. These seems to be exaggerations. In the Authorized Version the word *times* is used for *hand*, for *counts*, for *foot*, for *day*, and is sometimes inserted, as in Daniel 3:19, where *seven ones*, or *units*, is rendered *one seven times*. Here the addition of *times* practically makes the *one* superfluous. The terms *hands* and *ones* seem rather

to be *units of measure*, as we use *hands* of the height of a horse. We cannot miss the point even if we do not know the size of these units. We should at least seek to distinguish these two phrases from one another, and from the oft-recurring *phom*, the usual word for *times*, as in 1 Chronicles 21:3 (A. V.): "the Lord make His people an hundred times so many more as they be . . ." Our renderings may seem crude at first, but if they lead to better, should we not tolerate them meanwhile?

Daniel's service in Babylon covers the whole period of the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar, including his son and his son's son, until the kingdom was taken by Cyrus. It was about seventy years. Most of the prophecies of Daniel are grouped at the beginning and end of this era.

GOD'S WILL AND INTENTION

DUE TO INSISTENT demands, this chapter from the 160 page book **EVIL: ITS ORIGIN, PURPOSE AND END** has been reprinted as a 10c pamphlet of 16 pages. It solves this perplexing problem and should be widely used.

ADVERTISE YOUR MEETINGS

WE HAVE AVAILABLE the tracts, "Is Everlasting Punishment a Truth of Scripture?" and "The Old Time Religion," with space on the back for advertising local meetings by means of a rubber stamp. We can supply the tracts at 25 cents per hundred, either in this form, or with the price list on the back. Although printing and paper costs are advancing, we are endeavoring to supply our literature and tracts at the established prices, and will continue to do so as long as possible.—E. O. K.

GIFTS FREE FROM INCOME TAX

THE FOLLOWING report from the government will interest all who contemplate aiding the work. The Treasury Department of the U. S. Government, after investigating our Concern, ruled as follows:

"Contributions made to you are deductible by the donors in arriving at their taxable net income in the manner and to the extent provided by section 23 (c) and (q) of the Internal Revenue Code and corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts.

"Bequests, legacies, devises or transfers, to or for your use are deductible in arriving at the value of the net estate of a decedent for estate tax purposes in the manner and to the extent provided by sections 812 (d) and 861 (a) (3) of the Code and/or corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts. Gifts of property to you are deductible in computing net gifts for tax purposes in the manner and to the extent provided in section 1004 (a) (2) (B) and 1004 (b) (2) and (3) of the Code and/or corresponding provisions of prior revenue acts."

DID GOD CREATE EVIL OR "BRING IT ABOUT"?

IT IS SAID, on good authority, that Isa. 45:7 should be translated "I *bring about* evil," because the form in this case is the Poel Participle, and differs from the form in verse 8, 12, and 18. Also Isa. 54:16 should read "I *bring about* the smith." This is a case where scholars, or theologians rather, disagree. Davidson's Analytical Lexicon does not make it Poel, but Kal. But we are not dependent on scholars in this case. The same form occurs in the following passages, which we give as in the Authorized Version, to avoid prejudice.

- Ecc. 12:1. Remember now *thy Creator*
 Isa. 40:28. *the Creator* of the ends of the earth,
 42:5. *he that created* the heavens.
 43:1. thus saith the Lord *that created thee*,
 15. *the creator* of Israel, your King.
 45:7. *and create* darkness: I make peace, *and*
 create evil:
 18. *that created* the heavens;
 57:19. *I create* the fruit of the lips;
 65:17. *I create* new heavens and a new earth;
 18. for ever (in that) which I *create*: for,
 behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing,
 Am. 4:13. *and createth* the wind,

Can anyone read these passages and not smile when these "authorities" try to squirm out of this passage by saying that the italicised words must be translated *bring about* instead of *Creator*? Shall we remember our *Bringer-About*? In what way does He differ from our *Creator*? If God is not the *Creator* of the heavens and the earth, both old and new, then neither is He the *Creator* of evil. These are joined by God. Woe to those who seek to separate them!

The simple fact is that the form of *create* here used is the participle, *Creating* (One), which is very often used in Hebrew for the noun, so we render the line: Maker of peace and *Creator* of evil. Anyone can bring about evil. That is no prerogative of Jehovah! One who seeks to rob Him of the creation of evil brings about a great evil. How sad to see our greatest and noblest intellects, men who have suffered for God's truth, use their learning to rob us of that very same truth! How gracious of our God to enable us to escape the snare of the Adversary!

A. E. K.

EDITORIAL

THE LOT OF THE UNBELIEVER lies, like a crushing load, on the heart of many a sorrowing saint in these days of destruction and death. We long to comfort and console all who are under the terrible burden and deception of the orthodox hell, and we feel sure that all our readers will feel likewise. We have printed a tract for this purpose, "Solid Comfort for the Bereaved," and pray that God may use it to remove the stain which has soiled His great name, as well as to help those whose hearts are filled with sorrow to look to Him for real relief.

As there is much confusion on this subject, and many laudable but mistaken efforts have been made to clear God of the hateful heresy of orthodox teaching, we begin a series in this issue dealing with the fate of all unbelievers, including infants and the heathen. By emphasizing the true state of the dead, both in the first and second deaths, the function of "hell" and the judging before the great white throne, we hope to remove the terrible cloud which has covered this theme with stygian darkness. Then we hope to show that the character of the Judge is not only righteous but full of compassion and love, and that all He does is not with a view to everlasting destruction and torment, but *in preparation for the ultimate reconciliation of all* at the consummation.

The damnable doctrine of eternal torment has utterly distorted the truth as to the future of the unbeliever. God is not the fiend of Christendom Who operates the universe in order to vent His hate upon His helpless creatures. He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus

Christ, Whose love for all will yet be seen even in the evil that they are called upon to endure. The end He has in view is to reveal Himself, and so prepare for universal reconciliation. This is the function of the great white throne judging. There all will be *set right*. Justice will be satisfied. There will be no cause for further inflictions. The way is open for that august consummation which will give God His place in the hearts of all His creatures. All that happens to the unbeliever, from his death until the conclusion of the eons will humble him and prepare him for final salvation. Now, in a sense, he is in the hands of men, then he will be wholly in the hands of God. Through the Son of His love, He will break down the barriers between them at the great white throne. His object is not eternal damnation but endless reconciliation.

CHRIST COMPARED WITH DEITY

This 32-page 15-cent reprint of the article which appeared in *Unsearchable Riches* some years ago, is now ready for distribution. There seems to be an awakened interest in this subject at the present time, and our friends are urged to take advantage of it by using this pamphlet and its companion, "Christ Contrasted with Deity," freely.

THE WORDS AND WORK OF GOD AND MAN

Long out of print, about 200 copies of this helpful book on *Ecclesiastes*, by Vladimir Gelesnoff, are now available. It includes seven chapters as follows: Aim and Author, The Post-Exilic Theory, Wisdom and Toil, The Times and the Seasons, Desire, The Work of God, Light Amid the Shadows, and an Introduction and Analysis of *Ecclesiastes*. Bound in cloth, \$1.00. They will not last long, so we suggest that you order immediately.

ADDITION TO OUR MAILING ADDRESS

Please note that the postal delivery district (23) should be added to all communications addressed to us in future, so that it reads Concordant Publishing Concern, 2823 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles 23, California. The attention of our friends is invited to the fact that the number of the district, 23, happens to be the same as the last two digits of the street number 2823, so that there should be no difficulty in remembering it.

RELIGION *VERSUS* CHRIST

RELIGION, a dread of superhuman spirit powers, is seldom mentioned in God's revelation, and even then it is hid from the English reader by the confusing rendering of our Authorized Version which makes it superstition (Act 17:22, 25:19). This is further complicated by calling *ritual* also *religion* (*thrêskia*, Acts 26:5, Jas. 1:26, 27, *thrêskos*, Jas. 1:26), as well as *venerate* (*sebomai*, Acts 13:43), and changing *Judaism* (*ioudaismos*, Gal. 1:13, 14) to *the Jews' religion*. It is remarkable that the Bible in English uses *religion* for three words, when it should represent only one Greek term. And it is still more striking that every one of these is better rendered by another expression. Most remarkable is its absence as the rendering of *deisidaimonia* (DREAD-demonism), which is generally acknowledged to mean *religion*.

By a process of elimination we may be able to clear away some of the haze which surrounds the term, so that we can use it in line with the inspired contexts. First of all, we may be sure that it does not necessarily mean *superstition*. Paul certainly would not insult the proud Athenians by asserting that they are too *superstitious* (Acts 17:22). They would not have listened to him any further had he done so. He is most careful to bring home their ignorance to them by means of one of their own inscriptions. On the contrary, he is commending them because they are *more religious* than ordinary. They were *devout*, even in their ignorance. Their gods were demons (1 Cor. 10:20), and their devotion was dictated by dread of these spirit powers. Yet

the apostle diverts this term, without change, to the worship of the true God, the One they did not know.

In this sense it is used by Festus concerning the Jews who sought to destroy Paul. To an outsider Judaism appeared only another way of propitiating other demons than those worshiped by the nations. These two places are the only ones where *religion* is really found in the Scriptures. What a contrast to the free use of the word "religion" in our day! Now the worship of God in Christ has degenerated to such an extent that "Christianity" is, indeed, little more than a religion, like that of the Jews and the heathen, so that we are justified in speaking of it as a "religion" and the others as "non-Christian religions." This should not be so. Indeed, the vital elements in it, the genuine believers in Christ, if they are intelligent, abhor religion, and do not form a religious body, except in the sense that their union with Christ takes the place of other religions, not excepting Christianity.

Is it not strange that this word occurs so seldom in the Scriptures? Is it not highly suggestive that it is never applied to believers in Christ by God or an apostle or anyone else in sympathy with them? It never occurs in Paul's epistles, which contain the special truth for today. But it is quite correct to apply it to that dread of the deity, whether a true One or a false, which is common to humanity apart from the special operation of God's holy spirit. Man has been called a religious animal, and instinctively dreads an invisible, higher power. He will do what he can to appease it. Christianity consists largely of those who do this, simply substituting the God of the Bible for the demons, and adopting some of the rites and ceremonies of Judaism, as well as those of other religions. They seek to gain favor by good deeds. They seek to attain a righteousness of their own in themselves. They seek salvation as a reward of their efforts. The true saint finds all this and more in Christ.

The translation of other words by *religion*, even if they are closely associated with it, has brought the subject into the present state of confusion. The verb REVERE (*sebomai*) is rendered *worship* six times, and *devout* thrice. Is it not a pity that it should be rendered *religious* (Acts 13:43) in the only remaining occurrence? To one who is acquainted with Paul's ministry it is like a jarring discord to find that *religious* proselytes followed him, and that he persuaded them to remain in the grace of God. Religion is not concerned with the *grace* of God, but with man's efforts to merit blessing. Missionaries among those of a foreign religion have great difficulty in connection with *grace*, for it is foreign to religion, or, rather, incompatible with it. Even Christianity repudiates *grace* whenever possible, inasmuch as it is concerned with man's efforts to reach God rather than His means of reaching man.

Religion tends to become largely a matter of ceremony and outward *ritual*, hence it is not always easy to draw a clear line between these expressions. Paul warns us against the ritual of messengers because it denies the headship of Christ. In Him we are far above messengers, and beyond the sphere of ritual. Otherwise ritual is unknown in Paul's epistles. In James' epistle, however, which is addressed to the twelve tribes, it is taken for granted. Yet he calls it vain, if the tongue is not bridled. He insists on acts of mercy to man as well as ceremony before God. Indeed, he uses a bold figure, calling that ritual which is quite another matter. Instead of empty physical forms in the worship of God, he substitutes acts of mercy to men, such as visiting the bereaved and widowed, for God prefers mercy to sacrifice, and he would have them unspotted by their contact with the world rather than go through a vain ritual. These are *acts* which are to take the place of other *acts*. They do not replace religion, or the inner attitude toward a higher power (James 1:26, 27).

The difference between Judaism and other religions is very simple. They dreaded the true God and the nations the false demons. How little effect this advantage had on their hearts is seen in the crucifixion of Christ at the instigation of the leaders of Jewish religion. Is it not remarkable that the word *religion* is applied to the Jews when they are seeking to kill Paul? A philosopher who had carefully considered the course of religion in the world, especially the Christian church, came to the conclusion that "religion has radically vitiated the standard of human morals." Even those religionists whose holy law declared "Thou shalt not kill," deemed it their religious duty to murder their Messiah and to seek the life of His apostle.

A. E. K.

Human Destiny

THE LOT OF THE UNBELIEVER

THE GOD of Christendom, judged by the alleged lot of the unbeliever, is a fell fiend, more ferocious than the gods of the heathen. The God of the Scriptures is love, more marvelous than the mind-reach of mortals. I have read quite a little about the demons and the idols representing them, which are worshiped in other lands and at other times. Some of them are cruel, but I have never heard of one that condemns all who do not believe, young and old, small and great, ignorant and wise, innocent and crime-ridden, to eternal torment, so terrible that only a callous mind and a hard heart can consider it seriously and not go insane.

THE FATE OF INFANTS

It is to their credit that some, at least, refuse to believe that infants are included. But they can give no valid ground for excepting them, for the creeds of Christendom do not. No one who does not accept the damnation of infants has a right to call himself orthodox. He cannot quote a single text in the Bible that distinguishes between the fate of the babes and the aged. Nowhere is there a hint of "the age of responsibility," before which children are exempt from an eternal hell, and after which they are certain to be damned if they do not hear and believe the gospel.

THE DESTINY OF THE HEATHEN

We are glad to acknowledge that the hearts of some are not so hardened as to insist on the damnation of the

heathen who have not heard the gospel. Ask them why they make this distinction and they cannot cite a single decisive text. In fact there are places in the Authorized Version which seem to clinch the matter, such as Psalm 9:17: "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and *all the nations that forget God.*" Of course it should read *returned*, and the stress should be laid on the fact that only nations that have known God can *forget*, and that "hell" is oblivion. There can be little doubt that, in this matter, the Bible is translated to support the damnable doctrines of malevolent men, rather than the righteous revelations of a benevolent Deity. In truth the Scriptures know nothing of "heathen" in contrast with "Christians," or "gentiles" in contrast with Jews. The Greek word is *ethnos*, and denotes *nation*, and may be used of Israel itself, as a nation, but usually embraces *all other nations*, "Christian" as well as "heathen." Orthodoxy has drawn a false line between the heathen and Christendom, just as they have between infants and adults, in order to conceal the barbarous brutality and outrageous wrongs of the creeds. The unscriptural terms "heathen" and "gentile" are needed to express error, not the truth, hence we usually avoid them.

"CHRIST REJECTORS"

It may be that we could do a great service to the adherents of orthodoxy if we pressed them to take a public stand as to the fate of infants and the heathen. It should reveal to them how vulnerable their position is, and how far their creeds have departed from the Word of God. Some have taken refuge in the phrase "Christ rejectors." That is, only those are damned who hear the gospel and refuse to believe. But this is not only outside the Bible, but serves to create further difficulties. If the heathen are not eternally damned, neither are they saved. What, then, is their fate? This theory forces us to leave God's revelation for idle speculation. As with the age of responsibility, which is not revealed, the question would

arise, when do they hear the "gospel"? I, myself, reject a great deal that is called the gospel today, when it is based on man's works, not on God's grace. There is no way out of it. The Scriptures leave *all* unbelievers for judgment, whether they have heard the evangel of God or not. That can only affect the *measure* of judgment.

THE AWFULNESS OF ORTHODOXY

The enormity of this slander against God and His Word is beyond our grasp. It may help us to get a little glimpse of it if we simply look about us in the world today and see how many millions are to be consigned to everlasting woe even in a "Christian" country, that sends out missionaries by the hundred to the "heathen," and looks back to a beginning when it was the asylum of fugitives who fled from their native land in order to worship God and obey His Word. It is said that only eight per cent. of the people in the United States go to church on Sunday morning. This would be about ten million. A hundred and twenty million are not interested. But how many of these ten million are really acquainted with God and know Christ as their Saviour? Alas! God only knows. Judging by my limited experience there may be many of them whose religion consists mostly of self-righteousness. But we will be safe in assuming that there are at least a hundred million in one "Christian" land whose orthodox destiny is endless agony and everlasting anguish. Every year about three million beings like ourselves, 300,000 a month, 10,000 a day, 400 an hour, and 15 a minute are hurled into an "eternity" of awful and unutterable woe.

Only one small corner of the earth—northwestern Europe—can make as good a showing as this. The tremendous populations of Asia—Japan, China, India—would probably reduce the ratio of the saved to the damned below one per cent. Each one of these billion souls is a world all to himself. Each one is capable of loving as well as hating his Creator. And all will agree

that most of them suffer so much misery that the love of God seldom comes within the range of their perception. Frantic appeals have been made, based on their great danger, and the terrible torments, that await them, as well as their unending banishment from God, but the general response has been insignificant in comparison with the awful situation. This does not in the least criticise or condemn the missionary effort that has been made and the noble sacrifices that have been endured. But it is totally inadequate. The population increases faster than the number of converts. Every second sees another soul sent to certain and ceaseless doom.

If the orthodox realize this in their heart, what shall we think of them? Are they not the most callous and culpable of all God's creatures? *They* ought to suffer for their apathy in allowing their friends and neighbors to plunge headlong into everlasting torment without making any serious effort to stop them. But hold! If these same sinners were about to topple over a literal brink into a tangible conflagration, nearly every orthodox church member would make a heroic effort to save them. Some would even risk their own lives to rescue a friend from a burning building. Why is there such heroism on one hand and cowardice on the other? *Because they do not really believe their own doctrine!* It is so unreasonably excessive, so abominably inordinate, that their hearts revolt. Their minds may formally assent, but their feelings find the strain too great, so that, in most cases, they develop a coating of callousness. The zealots among them will fight for their precious damnation doctrine, but the great mass cannot get enthusiastic about such a horrible thought. Most of their paid preachers have seen that it is best to use the soft pedal when referring to it.

"FAITHFUL" GOSPEL PREACHING

Some, indeed, who earnestly seek to faithfully preach the gospel, have tried to respond to the awful load laid

upon them by this dread doctrine. Those who have done so have been led away from the evangel found in the Scriptures. I have listened to the "faithful" preaching of hell fire for months. The best preparation for preaching, I was advised, was to "take a look over the brink of hell." The frenzy induced by the sight of the damned, writhing in unbearable agony, was said to be the best inducement to a faithful heralding of God's love and grace! Yet, when I came to study the Scriptures in order to preach like the apostles, I found that they never used the word "hell" in any of their evangelistic work, so far as the record goes. Peter, at Pentecost, did not threaten his hearers with "hell," or promise that Christ would save them from it. On the contrary, he announced that *Christ* had gone to "hell," and had been saved from it (Acts 2:27, 31). None of the other apostles even mention "hell," except John (A.V., Paul, 1 Cor. 15:55) (Rev. 1:18, 6:8, 20:13, 14), and then it has no connection with the evangel in any case. In his extended discussions of the various evangels, Paul does not refer to "hell" at all. It is not even a "gospel," but an excrescence, a tumor, which poisons God's gracious message. In the evangel, God wins men by His *love*. He does not hound them with His *hate*.

VARIOUS FORMS OF PURGATORY

As a result of the intolerable dogma of an eternal hell there have been many attempts to mitigate its horrors or to modify its injustice. The Roman Catholic church has its purgatory, in which the suffering of the sinner at least accomplishes something, and, as a result, may come to an end. Because it substitutes the suffering of the sinner for that of the Saviour in salvation, I reject it absolutely, yet I must admit that it is immeasurably preferable to the protestant doctrine of eternal damnation, because it does not do such irreparable injury to God's character or so finally rob Him of His creation.

Others have tried to find a solution by reasoning from the Scriptures. The fact that sulphur or brimstone is called *theion* (divine), because it was used in the lustrations of the gods of the nations, has been employed to prove that the lake of fire was divine and, in some way, beneficial. The clearest intimations of the Scriptures are laboriously reasoned away, and the rules of logic are generally reversed. The fact that the lake of fire is called the *second* death is used to prove that it is *not* death, whereas sanity insists that is called the second because it is a repetition of the first.

SALVATION BY WORKS

There has even been an attempt to prove that some who stand before the great white throne are not cast into the lake of fire, but receive eonian life as a reward for their good conduct. This seems to be based on fallacious reasoning from the negative, that only those not found written in the scroll of life were cast into the lake of fire (Rev. 20: 15). It is even claimed that all were not *condemned* (verse 13) because some manuscripts have it simply *judged*, notwithstanding the plain passage in Romans five which makes the scope of condemnation and justification the same, including *all mankind* (Rom. 5: 18). The idea that anyone could actually earn eonian life by means of his own acts ought to be so abhorrent to everyone who has tasted of God's grace that all would reject it without investigation.

THE LOT OF THE UNBELIEVER

The unbeliever, no matter what his age or condition, faces "hell," the judging, and the lake of fire, all of which orthodoxy fills with dire dread. These are described as so fearful that both head and heart refuse to face them. In fact, they are usually evaded. Yet orthodoxy must insist that unbelievers go to "hell," and to judgment and to the burning lake, no matter how young or innocent they may be. In order to drive away this fearful

nightmare, and justify the ways of God to some of the most helpless and harmless of all His creatures, we will consider their lot in relation to each of these. In brief, we will find that God's Word declares both "hell" and the lake of fire to be *death*, a sleep, an oblivion in which no suffering is possible, and the judging a process of correction that may be mild compared to that endured by infants in the orthodox "hell." Indeed, we will rejoice that our fellows have fallen into the loving hands of God and are no longer in danger from the cruel claws of men.

CHRIST GOES TO "HELL"

The atrocious translation, "hell," is unmasked by a single passage (Acts 2:27). God did not leave the soul of *Christ* in "hell." Dare anyone say that *He* was punished and tormented because of any evil He had done? On the contrary, He had not only lived a perfect life, but had just accomplished His great sacrifice, the deed for which He will be given the greatest reward in all the universe. Why should He be sent to "hell," when He deserved the highest heaven? "Hell" has come to mean almost the opposite of the Greek word *hades* and the Hebrew *shaul*, which it translates. Instead of a place of torment, it denotes utter unconsciousness. Those in the *unseen* will perceive nothing. There is no knowledge in the "grave." The spirit goes back to God at death, and the body returns to the soil. Their combination produced sensation or soul. When they separate, sensation ceases. That is the real "hell" of the Scriptures. Not only Christ, but every believer who dies goes to "hell." It is not confined to the unbeliever.

"Hell" is simply the *unperceived*, the *unseen*. In relation to human beings it is used to indicate the utter cessation of consciousness in death. It returns the soul to its original state before it had any separate existence, just as death returns the spirit to God, and the body to the soil. The idea of suffering in this condition is pre-

posterous, unless used in a figurative sense. The opposite can be “proven” only by rejecting the literal assertions and misusing the figurative. It is for saints and sinners alike. Jacob had no hesitancy in saying: I will go down to “hell”! Our Authorized Version camouflages such passages as these by translating them “grave.” That is how we have been deceived. Saints as well as sinners go to “hell.” If Jacob has been suffering the torments of “hell” for thousands of years, how can he have any place in Christ’s kingdom? If the billions of babes who have gone to “hell” for the last six thousand years have been tortured so long already, why rouse them at the great white throne, in order to judge them?

No mother who knows what “hell” really is in God’s Word will worry about her child going there. On the contrary, we who wish to shield our children from all suffering, who would like to spare them the many miseries of life, should rather rejoice that they have *escaped* the “hell” of existence in this wicked and woeful world, with its dire disappointments, its dread diseases, its immeasurable miseries, in the midst of human beings, some of whom have fallen lower than the level of the beasts. It is mortal *life* that brings weariness and woe. Death, however, brings rest and surcease from sorrow. There may be all the difference between them that we feel between a day full of toil and travail and despair, and a night of satisfying sleep. Which would we chose? So far as our feelings are concerned, we would rather—a thousand times rather—sleep. Even a believer would rather rest forever than return to such a scene as this, with the infirmity and the senility and the decay of old age wrapping slimy tentacles about him.

Death is dreadful. But how unutterably more terrible would it be if there were no death! Had Adam lived on until now, every day adding to his weakness, helplessness and decrepitude, his body ruined by disease and racked by pain, he would long to die. Who would care

to live so long? Could any "hell" be worse? Let us face the facts. Dreadful as death is, for mortals it may not be nearly so dreadful as the slow dying process that we call life. If the world today were filled with all the dead that lie in our cemeteries, with bodies foul with disease, with spirits debased by sin, and souls tormented by their condition, it would be about as bad as the "hell" of orthodoxy. Dying while we live is the source of all our tribulations, and death is a cessation, not the commencement, of the woes of mankind. They must be roused from death before the inflictions of judgment are possible. Why raise them if they could be judged in the death state?

THE SECOND DEATH

And what is the lake of fire? It is the second *death*. This is God's definition (Rev. 20:14). As the first death closes the present life in merciful oblivion until the judgment, so the second death succeeds the judging of the great white throne which again, in mercy, wraps up all in oblivion, not for another judgment, but for an awakening to the salvation, the justification and the reconciliation which is provided by the blood of the cross for the whole Adamic race. When He Who is sitting on the great white throne, judges, or *sets right*, all who stand before it, there is no more affliction or distress possible in the lake of fire. The judging is past. All are ready for reconciliation. But this is not due until an eon later. The same problem is presented as in the case of the former death. Then it was, How can all be brought into the judging immediately after their life is ended? Now it is, How can all who have been set right be ushered straight into the reconciliation, when a vast epoch intervenes? They are simply dissolved in death, so that, *in their experience*, there is no final eon, but they go from the judgment scene right into the reconciliation, when God becomes their All.

The first death comes to men, no matter what they *do*, because of what they *are*. Not only the confirmed criminal dies, but even the innocent infant expires before it can do any harm. Of course there are accidents and executions, but these abnormal incidents do not affect the great law that began with Adam after he had sinned and had become mortal. Men may hasten their death by dissipation, but no acts of theirs will enable them to escape the operation of death within them, which they inherit from Adam. The point is exceedingly important, especially in connection with the second death, which is usually taken to be the penalty pronounced at the great white throne. There, as now, the suffering results from what was *done*, but the death arises from the fact that none have their names in the scroll of life. We must keep both the first and second death entirely distinct from the judging, for neither one is concerned with the *acts* of unbelievers. If they were, we might expect consciousness, for acts cannot be judged in oblivion.

DEATH BY FIRE

The first death is produced by a slow, gradual, painful disintegration, as a rule; often accompanied by long periods of infirmity, disease and distress. Some are bed-fast for years, and some suffer excruciating torment well-nigh unbearable before they finally find relief in the sleep of death. I have been tempted to envy those who die suddenly, without, indeed, sometimes knowing what has occurred to them. *We* may think such an end terrible, but *they*, when they awake, will be thankful that they did not suffer the awful agony or prolonged pain that some are called upon to endure. All of these sufferings have their proper place in God's dealings today, when He is deliberately giving us the experience of evil in order to humble us (Ecc. 1:13). But no such object can be in God's mind after Christ has judged mankind at the great white throne. Then this object will have

been accomplished. The second death is not accompanied by any prolonged, painful infliction. There is no distressing delay or dread disease, but all are ushered into death in an instant.

I have just burned my hand, and it hurts. But I am sure that, if I had jumped into a lake of fire, I would not suffer now, for I would have been dead before I could feel anything. Such a death is practically instantaneous. It is useless to discuss the length of time a human being would suffer in such a case. It would be too short to reckon. In fact it could occur so swiftly that life would be extinct before the nerves of sensation could function. It would probably stun them into insensibility. For all *for whom the lake of fire is the second death, who have been set right by the great white throne judgment*, the lake of fire is *not* a place of torture, but the instrument of death. This must not be confused with its action on the wild beast, and the false prophet, and the Slanderer or Adversary (Rev. 19:20, 20:10). Nothing is said of death in their case. They have not gone through the judgment session. They are the greatest of all the enemies of God, and receive a fate corresponding to their deserts.

SAVED "BY" FIRE

The apostle Paul, in speaking of the *work* of the believer today, says that fire shall try every man's work, what sort it is. If any of it stands this test, he shall receive a reward. But if any of it is burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved: yet so as *by* fire (1 Cor. 3:12-15). Salvation *by* fire, especially the lake of fire, is only another form of purgatory. But the passage speaks of the burning of unworthy *works*, not of the believer himself. Works are judged at the great white throne, not in the lake of fire. The word *by* is unfortunate. It should be *through*, as in the Revised Version. No one is saved by fire, though many are destroyed by it. Those of our works that are figured by

“wood, hay, stubble,” will be *lost*, not saved, by fire. We will not be burned, but saved, *as through* fire. A man whose house is aflame may lose some of his treasures in finding his way to safety. But that is very different from being burned in order to be safe.

If the great white throne session simply passed sentence on each one, and this was carried out in the fiery lake, as I once thought, then we are confronted with an insuperable difficulty. Everyone, from the tiniest infant with no acts to speak of to be judged, and the life-long offender, grown old in crime, would get the same “punishment.” The sentence could not be adjusted to the case. All would share alike a fate so terrible that God reserves it for three supreme and superhuman sinners. But if the judging occurs in the great white throne epoch, as is shown by the form of the Greek word *judging*, rather than *judgment*, the Judge can deal justly with each one, not with a view to “punishing” him, but in order to “judge,” or set right, all that is wrong. Then God will pay each one, individually, according to his acts (Rom. 2:6). We seek to do this with our children, from earliest infancy, in order to bring them up to do right. But, alas! we often fail. Can we not trust Him to do this, Who does not fail, and Who will succeed by this means in bringing them to the very place that we so ardently desire—into complete harmony with God, so that He may become their All?

THE SECOND DEATH

The lake of fire is defined as the second *death*. Could it be more explicitly stated that it is *death*, and nothing else? Yet there is an elaborate argument that, being *second*, it is not death, but life! In every other occurrence of *second* in the Scripture (and, indeed, everywhere else), the word *second* can be left out and the resulting statement is true. The second *child* that was told to go into the vineyard, was still a *child*, even if he

was second (Mat. 21:30). The second of the seven *brothers* to marry the first one's wife was just as much a *brother* as the other six (Mark 12:21). The second *watch* was also a *watch*, even if it was not the first or third (Luke 12:38). The second *sign* that Jesus did was no less a *sign* than the first or any of the rest (John 4:54). If the second *Man* were not a *man*, He would have no right to the title whatever. Peter's second *epistle* is certainly an *epistle*. In every case we may omit the term *second* without affecting the truth.

In English the word second often has the figurative usage of *inferior*, a second *grade* product, a secondary school, etc. Because the word *first* is so frequently used for the highest and best, it is not possible for the word second to acquire the constant meaning of superior, though it may be used of such, as the second Man, Who certainly is infinitely better than the first man Adam. That this abnormal condition occurs oftener in Scripture than elsewhere is easily explained by God's method of despatching the first, that He should be establishing the second (Heb. 10:9). But there are many cases where this difference does not exist. In the parable of the two children, the *first* said 'I do not want to,' yet he went. The *second* said he would go, but didn't. Which was the better? The *first*, not the second (Mat. 21:28). There is no difference on record between the seven brothers (Mark 112:21). The second watch was at a different *time* than the first and third, but there is no evidence that it was preferable (Luke 12:38). Why should the healing of the courtier's son be greater than the turning of water into wine (John 2:1, 4:46)?

The second death is no less death than the first. There may be differences between first, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh brothers, and undoubtedly there were. So also between the signs that our Lord did. Especially is this the case between the first and second Man. But these differences do not change them to something

else. If the second brother had been a distant relative, he could not have married the woman. So the second death also differs from the first in many ways. The first death occurred *before* the second. Those in it died at greatly scattered intervals, covering thousands of years, while all will suffer the second death at about the same time. Those who enter the first death do so in a multiplicity of ways, by decay, infirmity, disease, accident, violence, drowning and burning. The lake of fire knows only one method, the last. Even this is vastly different from the slow torture of fire that some have to endure, for, being a lake, it will consume in an instant. The second death indeed differs from the first, but it still remains death.

Death is never beneficial. The lake of fire is not a purgatorial cleansing agent for those who enter it. The conqueror of Smyrna has the promise that he will not be *injured* by the second death. The second death *injures* those who enter it. In the parable of the workers in the vineyard, those who worked all day considered themselves *injured* because they received no more than those who were there only one hour (Mat. 20:13). This passage shows that the Authorized Version's change to *hurt* gives a wrong impression of physical suffering. The word *injure* is literally UN-JUST, do an injustice, and does not necessarily imply that the lake of fire will *hurt*, that is, cause physical pain or suffering. This comes out clearly in the Authorized Version's own renderings: hurt not the *oil* and the *wine* (Rev. 6:6), hurt the *earth* (7:2,3), hurt the *grass* (9:4). Oil and wine and the earth and the grass may be injured or harmed, but never hurt, because they cannot feel physical pain. The first death does not necessarily hurt. Some die in their sleep. Executions are usually carried out in as painless a manner as possible. But death is always harmful, an injury, the greatest harm that can come to a living creature.

The actual length of time between the death of an

unbeliever and his final reconciliation may be many thousands of years. But in his *experience* nothing will come between but the great white throne judging, which may be a comparatively short period. So that God most marvelously brings His grand consummation very near to every one of Adam's race, no matter when he lives. ~~The time may be no longer for a sinner before the deluge~~ than for one who lives in the impending indignation. It is manifestly wrong to punish a man before his guilt is proven. Many a man has suffered the injustice of imprisonment for a lengthy period while waiting for a trial, but God is not guilty of such a wrong. The moment a man dies, he is awakened to face the judge, along with all the rest of the dead. The moment his judging is over, he is once more roused to enjoy the reconciliation.

A. E. K.

^ to his perception, the duration of death is

C. SWAN

THE WORK has lost one of its earliest, most loyal and helpful friends in the death of our beloved brother in Christ and in the Lord, C. Swan, of Worthing, England. He had been in close touch with Dr. Bullinger and his work, so was prepared and eager for further light when our little magazine made its appearance. During the long years since, his interest never flagged, and his help did not cease.

Knowing my desire to check my work on the ground by actually living in the land, Brother Swan offered himself as my companion during a sojourn in Palestine. He had already visited there, and had travelled some in Europe, so took over all the business details, acting as my manager, which was a great relief, and left me free to concentrate on my own special line of work. I shall always remember his never-failing kindness and consideration, and the zeal with which he stood up for the truth, and did all in his power to forward the work.

He was especially interested in the Hebrew version. He took lessons from a Jew in Tiberias while we were there. When the Hebrew text and sublinear were planned he volunteered to help, so the task was placed in his hands, with others to aid him. Thus the Hebrew text was copied, and a tremendous amount of work was done on the sublinear. He was working on this at the last.

Farewell, faithful friend! It will not be long until, once again, we will have the privilege of working together for the Lord we love, not, as now, in weakness and weariness, always falling short of our ideals, never serving as well as we would wish, but clothed with power and glory, able to please Him and live up to His high standards, and really merit His approval! What a joy and satisfaction that will be! Till then, good night!

THE BLESSEDNESS OF BELIEVING

THE virtue and blessedness of believing is clearly set forth by the apostle Paul. His letters portray its power, his life its stirring triumph. His pen, as no other, has made an indelible impression on the heart and mind of the believer. In proof, let us look at an introductory expression of it.

“Yet now, apart from law, a righteousness of God is manifest (being attested by the law and the prophets) a righteousness of God, through Jesus Christ’s faith, for all and on all who are believing, for there is no distinction, for all sinned, and are wanting of the glory of God” (Rom. 3: 22, 23, C. V. Revised).

A righteousness of God is manifest. And attested by the law and the prophets. Surely, an array of testimony which places it in a clear light, and beyond all shadow of doubt. Indeed, the sacred oracles overflow with the beauty of it. But, it has seemed so far away. Paul, however, gives it life and meaning as he so finely adds to the thought. “Yet a righteousness of God, *through Jesus Christ’s faith, for all and on all who are believing.*”

Now in very truth and radiant grace, it comes near to the heart of man. *Jesus Christ’s faith.* What a channel for the stream of God’s grace! How far beyond our own frail faith. Our righteousness is a broken reed. Of what avail are ethics to give life and peace? There has been but one life, one faith, eminently pleasing to God. He alone could say, “I am always doing what is pleasing to Him.”

His faith, and not ours, brings to our heart the deep sense of God's righteousness. And here is the glory of it. It is *for all and on all who are believing*. What a gift! Could we wish for anything better with which to commence the life of faith? Note, also, the exquisite equality of blessing. "There is no distinction, for *all sinned*, and are wanting of the glory of God." There is the "all" in each clause, but the blessing, right here and now, is for "*all who are believing*."

Is it so simple and so easy as that? Well, that is God's way and manner of entrance into blessing. And there is a grandeur in it, too. For, to go on and on believing God, as He reveals Himself in the word of His grace, is to experience great things. Not only is there joy and peace in believing, but a rare knowledge and understanding.

Paul, in writing of "this faith of yours in the Lord Jesus, and that *for all the saints*," refers also to "the transcendent greatness of His power *for us who are believing*." This is that one great faith of the Ephesian epistle, which so links us with the "one God and Father of all, Who is *over all*, and *through all*, and *in all*." In the permanent power of these three "alls" there constantly flows to the heart a joy and peace in believing.

To believe in the divine supremacy solves so much that is otherwise perplexing. Therefore to see that God is *over all*, and *through* and *in all* the affairs of life, is to experience in some measure, an understanding of His thoughts and ways. We shall notice how human proposals are subject to God's disposals.

Abraham believes God, and is chosen as the progenitor of a people whose amazing destiny will one day thrill the world. Joseph's brethren sell him into Egypt, yet by this very means they are all kept alive. And again, as Pharaoh seeks to diminish these people, God multiplies them. Indeed, the Hebrew Scriptures are full of illustrations displaying God's own way of dealing with

men. In all these there is an exactness and equity of judgment truly divine.

The ills of life are seen to serve purposes of God. But where some things seem a mystery, it is well to leave them, leave them with God as matters not to be probed by our poor knowledge. And this is where the blessedness of believing comes in. In peace or in war we take up Eli's language, "It is the Lord. Let Him do what seemeth Him good."

It is well to remember that at all times God has His own ends to serve. He moves in ways so different to human estimates. Knowing the end in view, He acts accordingly. It is not given to human beings—happily for them, for otherwise life would be intolerable—to foresee or to predict to any large extent, the unfolding course of events. In one phase men seem to have been right, in another they seem to have been wrong. Then again, a few years later, when the perspective of time has lengthened, all stands in a different setting.

For believers, however, in all contingencies of life, there is the solace of "joy and peace in believing." And what a difference this makes! The heart is stilled amid the strife of tongues, and the spirit rejoices in God our Saviour. Daily is He praised for His loving-kindness, and for His thought upon us for good.

Content with what He gives, and hourly resting in the wisdom of His will, man's day need not disturb us. We look to the great beyond of the day of Christ, and the day of God. And in those wondrous days, things rare and lovely will enrapture the vision, and enrich the whole being.

Our blessedness, then, lies in believing God as He unfolds Himself in the word of His grace. For in this word is wisdom which will rightly shape our lives, to His glory and our good. And in the exercise of believing God there will be found the highest motives for a well-spent life. But far too many are influenced by what

they see and hear around them, and so become creatures of environment. Faith would save us from this as it did Abraham. The worthy patriarch believes God, and is lifted out of and above his environment.

Happy are we, should God so lay His hand upon us, and it behoves us to take Paul's words to heart. "Faithful is the saying, and I am intending you to be insistent concerning these things, that those who have believed God may be concerned to stand for ideal acts. These things are ideal and beneficial for humanity" (Titus 3:8).

Opening in a similar way there is yet another quotation which stresses the value of belief. "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all welcome . . . that we rely on the living God, Who is the Saviour of all mankind, *especially of those who believe*" (1 Tim. 4:9, 10).

That God is the Saviour of all mankind gives much point and power to the believer's reliance on Him. It inspires God's children with the best of motives for kindness towards their fellow men. They see in them not just what they now are, it may be to bear with, but something also of what they will become. Even that rare something which will spring to life and being when they are truly subject to the Son of God. When, with clear vision, they see and understand.

God is a great leveller. See how distinctions vanish in His wise judgment. Note how "the scripture *locks up all together under sin*." And to what intent? Paul goes on, "that the promise out of Jesus Christ's faith may be given to those who are believing" (Gal. 3:22).

Believing, sinners become saints. And how really so, if they live as becomes those who would claim such dignity. A colored preacher once said: "There are two parts in the gospel. The first part is the *believing* it, and the second part the *behaving* it."

There is a word much in use today with the psychologists. The word "function." Does our believing truly

function? Does it work or operate in our lives as Scripture assures us it will? There is not a man or woman of God, who, looking back on life, could say it did not. And, if not in a way open to all, then in some manner clearly known to ourselves, and none the less real, our belief has more than justified itself. In ways wonderful to contemplate, God has been our environment. And in no circumscribed fashion. Rather has He brought us to a large place, above things of sense and transient feeling. Even to where, as Paul says, "you are enriched in everything in Him, in all expression and all knowledge" (1 Cor. 1:5).

The writer overheard this question: "What do you make of life?" The answer given was, "Well, it is just made up of what you put into it." Life, however, is far better for us if we see that it is made up of what *God* puts into it. Such insight makes all the difference. Just to learn, as a preacher once did at a conference, that there is a *struggling* faith and a *resting* faith.

One outcome of believing God is tranquillity of spirit. And what an asset at the present time! "True rest is as unchanging as God Himself—like Him it rises above all earthly things. It is secret, abundant, without a regret or wish."

There is, then, no end to the blessedness of believing. A wealth of discovery awaits our approach. And, blessed be God, the eventide of life is no bar to richness of experience, or to quality of testimony. Our believing, however, will have more point and more value, if we fully see our freedom from the law. Our initial blessing is "apart from law." And so is the whole of it.

We are surrounded enough by enactments and laws. It is, therefore, an exquisite relief to live as becomes the atmosphere of our celestial citizenship. And what more spiritual and suitable expression of this high altitude can we find, than in Paul's prison epistles? And in all his letters are precepts and counsels of a simple and

noble perfection. He is truly the apostle, herald, and teacher for the blessing of the nations, and for the true edification of the body of Christ.

Blessed are they who, needing no loud sign,
Of reason, or felt proof, or voice divine,
Believing love, and loving, do not sigh.
Believe because they love, and ask not why.
But on His wisdom rest they all day long,
And read His words, and are refresh'd and strong.
Thro' all His works His thought, at every turn,
Thro' all His Word His grace and truth discern.

WILLIAM MEALAND

JOHN BOETSMA

BROTHER BOETSMA fell asleep in Christ in Millville, N. J., on the 17th day of May, 1943. He was born of strict Calvinistic Dutch Reformed parents who taught predestination, but had little knowledge of the matchless grace of God as manifested in the Lord Jesus Christ. When a young man, for years he was assailed with skepticism. He came into a saving and joyous knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ through reading Dr. C. I. Scofield's "Ten Sermons on the Second Coming of Christ," and was instrumental in bringing two sisters into this same knowledge and in leading his widowed mother into the joy of salvation.

Brother Boetsma was gifted with an unusually keen intellect. Due to the straitened circumstances, he received only elementary schooling, but he later supplemented it by long hours of study, after working in a factory through the day. He studied the Moody Bible School Correspondence Course and also graduated from an interdominational Bible School in Philadelphia. There, as everywhere, he displayed his gifts by assisting fellow students with their lessons, who today credit him largely with their ability as preachers of the Word.

For years we was burdened because of the prevalent teaching concerning the final state of the wicked. When he saw universal reconciliation he learned to revel in concordant truth. He soon began to speak to others and zealously strove to spread the truth by word of mouth, letters, and literature in both English and Dutch. When he learned that he could have a part in the routine work of preparing the Hebrew Scriptures for publication in the Concordant Version he eagerly devoted much drudgery to this work, exulting in the realization that he was having a part in the most important task that can occupy human mind and hand, serving faithfully with no expectation of reward in this life. His Lord will reward him richly in that day!

THE METALLIC IMAGE

2. And in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, Nebuchadnezzar dreams dreams. And his spirit is agitated, and his sleep is come from him. ²And the king is saying to call the sacred scribes and the magicians and the enchanters and the Chaldeans to tell the king his dreams. And they are coming and are standing before the king. ³And the king is saying to them, "A dream I dream, and my spirit is agitated to know the dream."

BEFORE Daniel could have profited very much from his new instructors, his real test came. No doubt this was timed so as to make it doubly clear that his wisdom was from above, and was not due to the royal schools. The course was to be three years. It may be that Daniel was not even out of school in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar. In fact it seems that Daniel was not asked to take part in recovering the dream or giving its interpretation. It would be foolish to ask mere students, when their teachers could not solve the problem. It is marvellous to see how a mere lad, by God's help, could put to shame the combined wisdom of the wisest of mankind.

The time of this vision is most significant if we connect it with events in Judea. There also, at this same time, God revealed the fate of Israel and Judah and all the nations through Jeremiah, the prophet. But when it was read before the king he cut it up and burned it (Jer. 36:23). Let us note the marvellous contrast: Israel's king, whose first duty it was to hearken to the words of Jehovah, imprisons His prophet and destroys His revelation. On the other hand, Nebuchadnezzar is

so desirous of knowing what had been revealed to him that he was about to slay his own prophets because they could *not* give him God's revelation! This striking contrast shows what a reversal has taken place at this great crisis in human history. The eras of the nations have begun because Israel has rejected the word of Jehovah. It commences with a revelation direct to the head of the nations.

God's place of meeting His people was over the propitiatory. Above it He spoke with them, between the cherubim (Ex. 25:22). But when they were out of fellowship with Him, He sent them prophets, to speak to them, whether they would hear or not. But to the heads of other nations He spoke in the night, in their darkness, when they were unconscious, by means of dreams. Thus He spoke to Abimelech (Gen. 20:3), and to Laban, the Syrian (Gen. 37:5), and to Pharaoh (Gen. 41:7), and now to Nebuchadnezzar. But his case was peculiar in this, that he had quite forgotten what it was. Yet it had made such a powerful impression on his spirit that he could not rest until he had its interpretation.

Nebuchadnezzar called four different classes of his advisers to help him in his dilemma. Just what function belonged to each one is none too clear, nor is it vital to an understanding of the matter. The point is that the wisdom of the world was incorporated in these men. They were regarded as the most capable for the purpose. The Authorized Version calls the first class *magicians*. As this term is used for the second class by the Septuagint, and it fits better there, connecting it with the same term in the Greek Scriptures, we will need to find another name for this first class. The Greek *epaoidous* suggests a writer of charms or incantations. The Hebrew stem (*chrt*) denotes a GRAVER, or *style*, as in Isaiah 8:1: "write on it with the *style* of a mortal." So we have tentatively chosen *sacred scribe*, the name by which Josephus calls them. Later, Daniel was put at their head

and named grand sacred scribe (4:9 (6), 5:11). It does not seem right to make Daniel a *magician* in the modern acceptance of that term.

As the second and third names, *magicians* (*magous*) and *enchanters* (*pharmakous*) were chosen independently, yet agree with the Septuagint and our standards for the Greek, we may be as close to the right expressions as English will allow. There were *astrologers* in those days, but they were called *surveyers of the heavens*, as in Isaiah 47:13. Perhaps they are kept out of this intentionally, as they were not supposed to derive their knowledge from dreams, but from the position of the stars. It would hardly be right to demand that they be called in on this matter. As to the Chaldeans, in the first place the name seems to refer to the land, as "Ur of the Chaldees" (Gen. 11:28), or the people, as "bands of the Chaldees" (A. V., 2 Kings 24:2), but in Daniel it seems to refer to a limited few, in Babylon, whose learning ranked them with the king's advisers.

THE SYRIAC PORTION OF DANIEL

⁴And the Chaldeans are speaking to the king in Syriac, "O king, live for the eon! State the dream to your servants and we will disclose the interpretation."

⁵The king answers and says to the Chaldeans, "The matter withdraws from me. Should you not make known to me the dream and its interpretation, you shall be dismembered and the confiscation of your houses shall be promulgated. ⁶And should you disclose the dream and its interpretation, you shall receive gifts and a fee, and enormous esteem before me. Only disclose to me the dream and its interpretation."

⁷They answered a second time and said, "The king will state the dream to his servants, and we will disclose the interpretation."

⁸The king answers and says, "Of a certainty I know that you would win time, forasmuch as you perceive that the matter has withdrawn from me, ⁹for, should you not make known to me the dream, there is one edict for you, and a lying and corrupt matter you will concoct to say before me, till the season is altering. Only state the dream to me, and I shall know that you will disclose to me the interpretation."

¹⁰The Chaldeans answer before the king and say, "Forsooth, there is not a mortal on dry land who is able to disclose

the king's matter, forasmuch as no king, grandee, or authority asks a matter such as this of any sacred scribe, magician, or Chaldean. ¹¹And the matter that the king asks is extraordinary, and, forsooth, there is no other that will disclose it before the king, only the gods whose abode is not with flesh."

The Chaldeans seem to be the mouthpiece of the wise men. They are the ones who carry on the dialogue with the king. They speak in Aramaic or Syriac, not Hebrew. In fact, the whole narrative, from the beginning of their speech to the close of the seventh chapter is in this Aramaic dialect. It has been suggested that this is in harmony with the contents of these portions of the prophecy. In general the Syriac portion deals with the history of the nations during Israel's subjection, while the Hebrew, especially at the end, is more concerned with Israel's affairs, and the restoration of the kingdom. Other Syriac portions are found in Ezra (4: 8-6: 18, 7: 12-26) and Jeremiah (10: 11). The Syriac is commonly called "Chaldee" today.

The Rabbinic interpretation which is followed by the Authorized Version, "your houses shall be made a dunghill" presents serious difficulties. As a certain scholar has remarked, "who would suffer dunghills in a celebrated, much more, a royal city?" The great Babylon of which Nebuchadnezzar was so proud would be vastly vitiated by an accumulation of such noisome and unhealthful nuisances. The ancient translations, the Latin Vulgate and the various Greek versions do not hint at such a senseless judgment. Once the Vulgate has *publicabuntur*, shall be confiscated and once *vastetur*, shall be plundered. Theodotion's version, the accepted Greek rendering, has various forms of *diarpagê*, plunder. But the Septuagint proper has *be made over to me*, which is the equivalent of *confiscate*, like the Vulgate. This seems by far the most sensible rendering as well as being in agreement with the circumstances and the context. It occurs in 2: 5 and 3: 29.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S ABSURD DEMAND

That God's hand is in man's preposterous acts as well as in his reasonable ones is clear from Nebuchadnezzar's request. Though he probably had no inkling of the real object God had in view, he acts just as the Deity would have him act. If Nebuchadnezzar had only told them what he had seen, these men could have invented some plausible explanation, and one more pleasing to the king than Daniel's, but there would have been no guarantee that *it came from God*. This fact must first be established. In the wisdom of God He so ordered the matter that these men themselves declared that Daniel's interpretation was divine, before they even heard it.

Another object God had in view was to teach the wise men the fatal inferiority of their wisdom and the fearful consequences of their failure, as well as his goodness in rescuing them from the fate their folly called for. Nebuchadnezzar did not merely ask them to do the impossible, but threatened them with a dire doom if they did not fulfill his wish. To be very sure, he offered great rewards. But how could they escape the loss of life and property? His threat was no idle one, we may be sure, and must have seemed the height of high-handed injustice. So, at first, they simply ignore the king's conditions and repeat their own. "The king will state the dream to his servants, and we will disclose the interpretation."

The evasion of the wise men only angers the king. He begins to be suspicious, and thinks that they are trying to take advantage of the fact that he has forgotten his dream. He accuses them of staving the matter off in hopes of a change in the situation. In matters such as this the East is far in advance of the West. To this very day such impossible problems are often left to be settled by time, and, very often circumstances do alter sufficiently to remove the problem out of the way. In this case, Nebuchadnezzar might recollect his dream, or he

might be called away, or even fall in battle. Time was their best ally. But Nebuchadnezzar, or rather God, would not let them counter His action and defeat His object by this subtle scheme. So the king insists on an answer, and that without delay.

The Chaldeans are finally forced to confess their ignorance. Yet, even in doing so, they make a momentous mistake. They still consider themselves the wisest of mortals, and boldly declare that there is no one on dry land who can give the answer the king requires. They reckon without God, which is the height of folly. Daniel himself acknowledged that he could never have given the dream or its interpretation by his own wisdom, but he also showed that it was within the power of a mortal to supply the king with a correct answer if God is with him and uses him. Here God is making foolish the wisdom of the wise, by forcing them to a confession, and by making even that false, because they do not recognize the living God.

But their wisdom fails them still more when they seek to turn the blame for their failure upon the king. Probably no one had ever asked so much of such men before, but it surely was well within the claims made by them. Besides, if no one knows the answer but the gods, why not ask them? Here, too, they make an admission which is fatal to their pretensions. The gods do not abide with flesh, hence they cannot inquire of them. Not only is their own knowledge limited, but they have lost contact with the only true source of knowledge. This consideration should have been very salutary for the wise men.

THE DOOM OF THE WISE MEN AND DANIEL

¹² Wherefore the king is angry and wroth enormously, and says to destroy all the wise men of Babylon. ¹³ And the edict goes forth to despatch the wise men. And they petition Daniel and his partners to the despatching.

¹⁴ Then Daniel replies with counsel and tact to Arioch, the

grand-executioner of the king, who goes forth to despatch the wise men of Babylon. ¹⁵ He answers and says to Arioch, who has the authority of the king: "Why is the edict urgent from before the king?" Then Arioch made the matter known to Daniel. ¹⁶ And Daniel goes in and petitions of the king that he give him a stated time to disclose the interpretation to the king.

¹⁷ Then Daniel departs to his house and makes the matter known to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his partners, ¹⁸ and they are to be petitioning for compassion from before the God of heaven concerning this secret, that Daniel and his partners perish not with the remaining wise men of Babylon.

Now that it has been clearly established that God alone can disclose the dream, the next step is to bring this home with power to the hearts and consciences of all concerned. What a humiliating experience was this for the wise men! To be executed for their ignorance! To be unable to allay the wrath of the king! That in which they excelled, fatally fails them! They were supposed to be able to help others out of their difficulties and dilemmas, and to advise the king. Now they could not even save themselves from his anger.

Nothing in the whole proceeding seems so unreasonable and unfair as to include Daniel and his partners in the edict to despatch the wise men of Babylon. He may not have been through the three years' schooling. He had not been given an opportunity to solve the problem. He was about to be executed for the failure of others. But he does not become indignant, nor does he seek to exonerate himself from all blame, as most of us would be inclined to do. He uses *counsel* and *tact* when the grand executioner comes around. He said nothing that could give offense. He merely asks why the matter is so urgent. When he is in possession of the facts he simply puts in a petition, asking for an appointment when he could disclose the interpretation to the king, and thus gained the delay which he wished without asking for it.

Daniel knows better than the wise men that God alone was equal to the occasion, and he had wisdom

enough to go to God, for he and his companions were the only ones who knew Him so that they could communicate with Him. So Daniel informs his friends of their dire danger, and they unite their petitions for compassion, first of all, that they may not perish with the rest. Their very lives were at stake, so that there would be no lack of fervency in their prayers.

DANIEL'S THANKSGIVING

¹⁹ Then, in a vision of the night, the secret is revealed to Daniel. Then Daniel blesses the God of heaven. ²⁰ Daniel answers and says: "Blessed be the name of God from the eon and until the eon, for wisdom and might are His. ²¹And *He* alters the eras and the stated times. He causes kings to pass away, and is setting up kings, granting wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who know understanding. ²²*He* reveals the deep and the concealed, knowing what is in the darkness, and the light with Him solves. ²³ God of my fathers, *Thee* I acclaim and laud, that wisdom and might Thou dost grant me. And now Thou dost make known to me that which we petition of Thee, for Thou hast made known to us the matter for the king."

As the case was urgent, the petition of Daniel and his partners was answered without delay. The secret is revealed to Daniel in a vision. *Then Daniel blesses the God of heaven.* Here is the firstfruit of God's action. No doubt it was soon followed by praise from the hearts of Daniel's companions. Later, this was followed by an acknowledgment on the part of Nebuchadnezzar (2:47). And may not the wise men, whose lives and property were saved, have echoed the king's acclamation? They had much more cause than he. Countless myriads of the saints, who have heard of Daniel's deliverance, including, we dare to hope, the reader of these lines, have lauded the God of Daniel. And, in due time, when God's harvest is full ripe, all His creatures will follow the example of Daniel and bless the God of heaven (Phil. 2:11). Is it not wonderful to apprehend that the revelation of this era of the nations, in which we also live, is introduced by such a response? It reminds us of the

opening words of Ephesians that inaugurate this secret administration, which bless the God and Father . . . Who blesses us.

Daniel's thanksgiving should be of special interest to us, for it is concerned with God's operation in the eras of the nations, the subject of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. It involves blessing upon Him, not in the next eon, when all Israel will laud him in the kingdom, but "from the eon and until the eon," that is, between the preceding and the next eon, which is the present. It is the wisdom and might which He displays in this interval of Israel's subjection which was shown to Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel. During this period He *alters* the eras and the stated times as at no other period in the world's history. Five of God's administrations have a place in the eras of the nations. In order to reach the present pinnacle of grace God has frequently altered to a different era (Eph. 2:12). See the chart of the Divine Calendar.

If, in the midst of the confounding confusion of the present day, we are able to bless God for His wisdom and might, we also are blessed, for this knowledge alone can save us from the doubts engendered by the fearful futility of everything in the world around us. We cannot blame too severely those who see nothing but folly and weakness in human affairs, for they do not know that this also is an evidence of His wisdom and power, as is manifest from the sequel which He has foretold. The eras of the nations are intended to show that *the nations, as well as Israel, are utter failures in government and religion*, so that their ultimate achievement must be smashed before a really righteous reign can be set up on the earth. God, in His wisdom and power, varies the forms and functions of human government so as to provide a full demonstration of human incapacity to rule apart from Him.

What other part of the world's history has seen so many kings pass away and so many new ones set up?

This God will not do in the next eon, for there will be only one King of kings throughout its course. About a dozen kings, Nebuchadnezzar and his son and his son's son, Cyrus and his successors, Alexander and his generals, are foretold in this book as rulers of the great world powers. Besides these have come the hundreds of other men who have headed the many nations which have passed across the stage of history since the days of Grecian supremacy.

Daniel himself little knew what *depths* of wisdom were *concealed* within the limits of the eras of the nations. That which was deep and concealed, which stirred his spirit at the time, was doubtless the vision which he had seen, which was too deep for the wise men and concealed from their view. We have much more cause to praise God, for He has revealed to us depths of grace and has disclosed to us secrets which were concealed even from Daniel. The secrets of the kingdom, made known by our Lord (Mat. 13:11), and the secret, made known by Paul concerning the present administration of grace (Eph. 3:3), were absolutely hid from Daniel, even though they find fulfillment in the very period occupied by the metallic image.

The reason why God can reveal the deep and the concealed is that His eyes penetrate the darkness and the light that is with Him solves. Recent advances in the knowledge of nature furnish good illustrations of this. By means of ultra light rays we are now able to see much that was once hidden from our scrutiny. From Him Who is light nothing can be concealed. The Authorized Version tells us that light *dwells* with Him. The Greek, Latin, and German translations say that light *is* with Him. But here the question is one of revelation, so *solve* seems supremely suitable. The Authorized Version has rendered this verb (*shra*) *loose* in Daniel 3:25, 5:6, and *dissolve* in Daniel 5:12, 16, so that *solve* is very

near their own renderings elsewhere. No where else do they translate it *dwell*.

Daniel's prayer takes the form of an ascription of praise to God, which wells up out of his heart spontaneously. It is all on a very high plane, worthy of the occasion. He makes no more requests. He hardly refers to the matter in hand, the revelation of the secret and the salvation of his life. Only at the close he adds a note of thanksgiving for the immediate benefits received. We ought to pray like this. Yes, we ought to ascend still higher in our dealings with the Deity. Our *requests* should be accompanied with thanksgiving (Phil. 4:6). We need not wait until they have been fulfilled, for we know that, even if they are denied, *that* is also a cause for thankfulness.

²⁴ Wherefore Daniel goes in unto Arioch, whom the king assigned to destroy the wise men of Babylon. He departed and says thus to him, "The wise men of Babylon may you not destroy. Bring me in before the king and I will disclose the interpretation to the king."

²⁵ Then Arioch, in a fluster, brings Daniel in before the king, and says thus unto him, "I found a master of the sons of the deportation of Judah who will make known the interpretation to the king."

Daniel's first concern was to hinder the execution of the wise men, so he goes to the grand executioner and, in the exuberance of his spirit, actually takes it upon himself to reverse the king's commandment. Then he demands to be taken to the king, promising to disclose the interpretation to him, and thus save the wise men's lives as well as his own, and also fulfill the wishes of the king.

The grand executioner was much impressed, as well he might be. The prospect of slaughtering so many of the king's counsellors on such an outrageous charge may have been too much for even his nerves. The versions usually say that he brought Daniel before the king in haste, which, doubtless, was the case. But this same

word (*bel*) is rendered *trouble* most of the time (Dan. 4:5 (2), 19 (16), 19 (16), 5:6, 10, 7:15, 28), and in these instances *haste* cannot be used. Nebuchadnezzar's vision did not *hasten* him (4:5). The word seems to denote a nervous agitation, induced by disturbing thoughts (5:6, 10) or visions (7:15).

But Arioch is not so flustered as to forget his obligations to himself. He must have been a seasoned courtier. *He* certainly had not done very much to *find* Daniel, unless it be to summon him to his execution! Yet he realizes that this is a rare opportunity to curry favor, not only with the king, but with the very men he was about to destroy. So he starts his report with that which seemed most important to him: "I found . . ." There is no record that he profited by it. What a contrast to Daniel, who takes pains to deny that he is in any way worthy of a reward! How much of this commercial spirit there has been, ever since! Why, much modern gospel preaching is an appeal to the sinner to take a selfish advantage of God's message. In China it converts "rice Christians." More money, better clothes, nicer friends, greater respectability. All this is contrary to the cross of Christ.

Arioch did not fail to see that Daniel was worth cultivating. He might be given a high place if he succeeded in this matter. Daniel was very young at this time, and hardly what we would call a *man*. Yet here, perhaps for the first time, he is called a *master*, a *mighty one*. Perhaps our *mister* would give the right idea. The adjective of this word is almost always rendered *mighty*. It is rendered *champion* in 1 Samuel 17:51, referring to Goliath.

²⁶ The king answers and says to Daniel, whose name is Belteshazzar, "Forsooth, are you able to make known to me the dream which I perceived, and its interpretation?"

²⁷ Daniel answers before the king and says: "The secret which the king asks, the wise men, magicians, the sacred scribes, the hieromancers are not able to disclose to the king,

²⁸ but, forsooth, there is a God in heaven who reveals secrets,

and He makes known to king Nebuchadnezzar what is to occur in the latter days. Your dream and the visions of your head on your bed—this is it:

²⁹You, O king—your thoughts come up on your bed as to what is to occur hereafter, and the Revealer of secrets makes known to you what is to be. ³⁰And I, not by wisdom that, forsooth, is in me more than anyone living, is this secret revealed to me—only to the intent that the interpretation be made known to the king, and you may know the thoughts of your heart.

What a contrast do we find in Daniel himself! When the king asks, “Are you able . . . ?” he takes advantage of the opening to belittle man’s ability and to extol his God. He emphasizes the fact that the whole of the king’s brain trust, of which he formed a part, could *not* disclose the secret. He did not go on to say that he alone of them all was in a position to do this. He had a perfect right to bring himself in as the mediator between the king and God. The absence of all reference to himself at this point is most delightful to see. The true mediator effaces himself. Besides, before Daniel had received his vision, God had already revealed the matter to Nebuchadnezzar direct, and he was only repeating and confirming what God had previously made known.

The *soothsayers* of the Authorized Version seem to be limited to *hieromancers*, that is, those who examine the victims of sacrifice and base their predictions on this. These are especially mentioned here because it should have been their duty to find the answer to Nebuchadnezzar’s problem. It seems that he was accustomed to getting their advice in the graver affairs of life. The name comes from the stem *gزر*, SEVER. It is used of the stone not *severed* by hands (2:34, 45). The *hieromancer* was called a SEVERER because he *severed* the parts of a sacrifice from one another. Symmachus, in his Greek translation, renders this name *thutas*, *sacrificers*. The Latin Vulgate has *aruspices*, *beholder of a slain victim*. This is precisely our *hieromancer*.

Nebuchadnezzar had made himself master of the

world. His conquests had taken up his thoughts, and engaged them with the present. Now that he has succeeded, however, his thoughts turn to the future. What will become of his vast kingdom after he is gone? What will be the course of empire among mankind? It is not likely that he realized the part he was playing in God's program. He probably took all the credit for his achievement, just as he did again, on a later occasion, even after he had received this revelation. God's purpose demanded that He make known to men beforehand what was to be, in order to reveal to them His own deity and their own creature impotence. Nebuchadnezzar, especially, needed this lesson, and, as he was the head of all, the secret was revealed to him under circumstances most earnest and impressive.

Daniel not only effaces himself by silence, but erases himself by a solemn and emphatic denial: "*I, not by wisdom that, forsooth, is in me more than anyone living, is this secret revealed to me—*" No courtier could have made this disclaimer. No one with an eye to his own interests would have ruined his own reputation by such a statement, lest he should lose the anticipated reward. And Daniel is right in his estimate of his part of this transaction. The dream and its interpretation should not be overshadowed by personal matters which do not affect them.

Before considering the special aspect of human dominion, as presented by the image, let us remind ourselves of God's earliest revelation concerning the rule of man, and the various spheres in which he will sway. At Adam's creation God said, "We will make a human being in our image, according to our likeness, and they shall sway over the *fish* of the sea, and the *flyers* of the heavens, and over the *beasts*, and over all the earth, and over every *crawler* that crawls on the earth" (Gen. 1:26). Here we have man's proper domain, that is not taken away from him. These crowns adorn his brow

throughout the eons and, so far as is revealed, will be his in the consummation, when he resumes his proper place of subjection to God.

The dominion of man over *man*, or over celestial creatures, is confined within the eons, and is not included in the original proclamation. It did not begin until after the deluge, and will fade away in the last two eons, when Christ rules out rule, and Himself abdicates and becomes subject in the consummation (1 Cor. 15:28).

God's saints are to judge, or rule, the world (1 Cor. 6:2). Not only Israel, on earth, but the ecclesia, in the heavens. Man's attempts to rule are our college, in which we learn statecraft. Like Daniel, we are also in school, yet we do not study under the wise men of Babylon, but have Daniel's prophecy as our textbook. In the exercise of our political functions among the celestials it will be a vast advantage to be well grounded in the history of human misrule, and to understand the course of history, and the reason for *man's* failure. Let us not look upon these revelations as if they did not concern us personally, but are only for the terrestrial saints. The earth is the stage of the universe. Through us the heavens may learn and avoid the downward path to destruction. Our rule will not be a failure, because man's was, and we have learned not to trust in flesh, but in God. The clearer our apprehension of God's dealings with the nations, the better we will be fitted to reign with Christ among the celestials.

THE IMAGE AND ITS EXPLANATION

In order to assist us in our study and guard against the injection of our own explanations, we will immediately follow each item of the vision by God's explanation, although this comes later in the chapter. This will assist in testing the version also, for we must adopt that reading and rendering which brings the vision into harmony with the inspired explanation. This will prove of

special help in later visions which, in the current versions, are hardly intelligible.

³¹ You, O king, come to perceive, and behold, one enormous image. The same image is grand, and its aspect excellent, rising in your view, and its appearance terrifying. ³² The head of the image is of good gold, its 'hands and' chest and arms of silver, its belly and thighs of copper, ³³ its legs of iron, its feet 'part' of them of iron and 'part' of them of clay.

³⁷ You, O king, are king of kings, for the God of the heavens a kingdom safe-guarded, with power and glory, grants to you, ³⁸ and in every place that the sons of mortals abide, the animals of the field, and the flyers of the heavens, 'and the fish of the sea,' He grants into your hand, and He gives you authority over them all. You are the head that is of gold.

³⁹ And in your place shall arise another kingdom, inferior to you, and another third kingdom that is of copper, that shall have authority over all the earth.

⁴⁰ And the fourth kingdom shall become powerful as iron, as iron pulverizes and overcomes all: and as iron that smashes all these, shall it pulverize and smash.

⁴¹ And seeing that you perceived the feet and toes, 'part' of them of potter's clay, and 'part' of them of iron, the kingdom shall come to be composite. And there comes to be the stability that is of iron in it, forasmuch as you perceived the iron mixed with muddy clay. ⁴² And the toes of the feet, 'part' of them of iron and part of them of clay—the end 'part' of the kingdom shall come to be powerful and part of it shall come to be frail. ⁴³ Seeing that you perceived iron mixed with muddy clay, they come to be mixed with wealth among the force of mortals, yet with wealth that is not clinging, this with that, as iron mixes not with clay.

God is going to rule the world through the *Man* Whom He has chosen. He will put all beneath the feet of *man-kind* (Psa. 8:6). All of this was to have been and will be fulfilled on earth through His chosen nation, Israel, and their Messiah, the *Man* Christ Jesus. Now that that nation has demonstrated its utter inability to rule even itself, not to mention the world, God turns to the other nations, so that they, also, may demonstrate the impotence of their strength. Only so can the race learn to distrust itself and appreciate the beneficence of the rule which will be theirs in the eon of the eons. How fitting, then, that the rule of the nations should be symbolized by the image of a man! This colossal figure is the ideal

for which man is striving: *good government without God.*

To us, as men, the vast empires of the past and great governments of the present make a most imposing impression of magnificent grandeur. Their power and pomp fill us with awe. All this seems to be suggested in the enormous image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. It was grand, of excellent aspect, and even terrifying. Nothing else could set forth so well a world's-eye view of human government during the eras of the nations. To be sure, when Daniel got a saint's-eye view of some of these kingdoms, they were no longer human, but beasts. Even in the dream itself the divine element enters at the end, when a stone, which is not as strong as any of the metals, smashes it to powder, so that the wind blows it away. That is God's evaluation. But the image pictures man's opinion.

THE HEAD OF GOLD

The ideal government of the earth seems to be such as will obtain in the eons of the eons, when Christ will be King of kings and Lord of lords (Rev. 19:16). His power will be absolute and unlimited; and include the entire creation. First of all, the nations are given a kingdom of this kind, a golden government, where the form is satisfactory, but the functioning a failure. Nebuchadnezzar did not remove all other kings, but set his throne above them, so that he literally was a king of kings, even as Christ in the coming eon. But he had never learned to humble himself or give the glory to God. His power was not directed by righteousness.

There are only three kingdoms in the past that had authority over all the earth, Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece. These are definitely named (8:20, 21). The Roman empire *claimed* jurisdiction of the entire inhabited earth (Luke 2:1), but Satan knew better than that, for he did not offer our Lord the headship of the Roman empire, the place of Cæsar, but *all the kingdoms* of the earth (Mat. 4:8). There were many outside the bound-

aries of Rome. Parts of the British Isles, most of Germany and all of the vast territories north and east of the empire successfully resisted the Roman army. Only these three world-wide empires find a place in the image in the past, and only such kingdoms are represented for the future. The kingdom of Christ will fill the whole earth. So will the fourth kingdom, the composite state of the end time. All lesser governments are ignored.

The second, the silver kingdom, the Medo-Persian empire, is said to be *inferior* to Babylon. This is the divine commentary on the significance of the metals. Gold is superior to silver, silver is more esteemed than copper, and copper is more valuable than iron, while iron is better than clay. According to this, *human government has steadily deteriorated, instead of advanced*, as we are asked to believe. Perhaps we would be able to grasp this better if it were stated otherwise. When has there been more general dissatisfaction with existing governments than now? When has there been more emergency legislation, more cry for reform, more taxes than in these last days? When has there been a greater variety of governments and more disagreement as to which form is best? After more than two millenniums, the nations are further from the ideal than when they started. We have descended from gold to iron-clay.

In *strength*, however, the inferior forms excel the superior. The silver conquered the gold, the copper the silver, and the iron will be strongest of all. In military power there has been an *advance*. The two horns of Medo-Persia destroyed Babylon. The one horn of Greece broke these (8:3-7). Perhaps this can be seen best when we consider that, from now on, nation shall rise against nation (Mat. 24:7). They do not merely send armies against each other. There is almost total mobilization of man-power and of all other resources. As they have not enough wealth to pay for their armaments, the future is mortgaged to provide instruments of destruc-

tion. Yet the admixture of mud makes the iron kingdom fragile at its close.

The different kingdoms are marked by metals, rather than members of the human body. All of the head is gold, hence represents Babylon. The breast and arms are silver, for Medo-Persia. The belly and thighs are of copper, for Greece. The legs and feet are of iron for the last of these empires. The clay is only an admixture at its end, and represents no separate kingdom. The image of a man is only a figure, and must be limited in its application to the explanation. There is no significance in the fact that the head has two eyes and ears, or the breast two arms, the belly two thighs; or in the fact that there are two legs and two feet in the last kingdoms. There were two hands with fingers of silver as well as two feet with toes, but they do not mean anything. The feet and toes, however, were different in their composition, containing clay as well as iron. At its close the silver kingdom did not change in character. But at the end of the iron kingdom, represented by the legs and feet, it will become fragile (2:42). It remains the same kingdom as the legs, for it still is debased iron. Had the feet been all clay, there would have been a fifth kingdom. The feet and toes are the latest phase, the end of the iron kingdom.

The fact that Rome, during the latter part of its history, was divided into two kingdoms, with emperors at Constantinople as well as at Rome, while it may seem to agree with the image in a superficial way, is proof sufficient that it is *not* the iron kingdom. It does not agree with the image, for it did not divide into two empires until late. In the image, the legs are never united. Rome was one empire about a thousand years, then two for about a hundred, after which it was one again for a short period. To correspond, the image should have had only one leg, with two feet, partly united. The members of the image do not describe these kingdoms

or their history. Moreover, all other accounts of the final empire make it one to the very end. There are not two antichrists, or horns, or governors, or kings of the north. There are not two distinct metals in the image. The legs represent *one* empire of iron, as the thighs represented one of copper, under Alexander. The two legs seem to agree with a part of Roman history and the ten toes with the ten kings of the time of the end, but such agreements are incidental, not intended, and no basis for interpretation.

One interpretation makes the clay democracy and the iron autocracy, and goes on to deduce that the autocracies destroy the democracies, and thus it finds a fulfillment in the European war. But no such action is brought before us in the vision. Both of these, rather, are destroyed by the Stone. They are *mixed* with one another, and the mixture seems to remain until the end.

RADIO TESTIMONY

WE wish to call attention of our readers to a series of radio broadcasts over station WOL, Washington, D. C. It is planned to commence the series in August, but a definite time and date has not been decided upon at this writing. The message will be thirty minutes in length, one each week for thirteen weeks. Brother Adlai Loudy is preparing a series which is intended to appeal to Jew and gentile alike, and he will be the speaker.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS IN UNITED STATES

To insure speedy delivery of your copy of Unsearchable Riches, please notify us of the number of your postal delivery district, if you live in one of the 178 large cities where district numbers are being assigned.

GOD'S WILL AND INTENTION

DUE TO INSISTENT demands, this chapter from the 160 page book EVIL: ITS ORIGIN, PURPOSE AND END has been reprinted as a 10c pamphlet of 16 pages. It solves this perplexing problem and should be widely used.

SOLID COMFORT FOR THE BEREAVED

HERE IS THE TRACT you have been looking for! It shows how God will deal with all the unsaved, innocent children as well as hardened sinners, in order to bring them to Himself. Twenty-five cents per hundred, or free to those who cannot pay.

JEHOVAH'S ADVENT DAY

THE DAY of our Lord's *advent* and the day of the Lord, or Jehovah, are distinct. The former denotes His personal appearance. The latter figures the whole time of His intervention in human affairs, before the conclusion of man's day to the commencement of the day of God. The Authorized Version usually renders the word *advent* by *appearing* (1 Tim. 6:14, 2 Tim. 1:10, 4:1, 8, Titus 2:13) or *appear* (Acts 27:20, Titus 2:11, 3:4), which comes near the truth, although it fails to distinguish this term from the form which does mean *appear*. It is to be regretted that, in Acts 2:20, the Authorized Version has changed it to *notable*, "that great and *notable* day of the Lord." This robs us of one of the notable keys to the time of the end, and has led to untold confusion. It injects an insoluble contradiction into the prophecies concerning the commencement of the Lord's day.

There are many passages dealing with the day of Jehovah which describe it as a day of trouble, of distress, and of wrath. Its essence consists in humbling man and exalting Messiah, as is clear from the first reference to it (Isa. 2:10, 19, 21, 13:6). The minor prophets, especially Joel, paint it in gloomy colors (Joel 2:1, 3:15-16, Zeph. 1:7, 15). But one passage in Joel (2:30), and its quotation in Acts (2:20), flatly contradicts all these scriptures, by insisting that the very last of these terrible portents, the darkening of the sun and the moon, and the shaking of the heavenly powers, which immediately precedes His advent—these are to be *before* the coming of the great and terrible (or notable) day of the Lord (Joel

2:31, Acts 2:20)! This passage not only nullifies all of the predictions of this kind in the Hebrew prophets, but all of the Unveiling of Jesus Christ before the sixth seal, when these heavenly disturbances take place (Rev. 6:12-17).

We had hope that the corrected rendering in the CONCORDANT VERSION would remove this difficulty, but it seems to have made little impression. We should have called attention to it in a note. So long as Joel is not corrected, it will continue to baffle earnest students of the Scriptures, and lead to debate and controversy, each side claiming to abide by the Word of God. Besides, the expression, the advent day of the Lord, is so similar to "the day of the Lord," that the difference fails to register. Perhaps we should change it to the Lord's advent day. We humbly beg our readers who have not considered the distinction to give it due consideration, for we have found it a great relief.

The figure of a "day" is freely used in Scripture of various periods of time. The fact that any time is dubbed a "day" does not identify it with other periods similarly called. The very same time may be named both night and day, when viewed from a different angle. This is the night, yet we should walk as in the day (Rom. 13:11-13). Even if it is night in respect to our walk, our warfare may be in a wicked day (Eph. 6:13). Such a day may come at any time in the present "night," whenever the spiritual forces of wickedness may attack us. I am in such a "day" most of the time, for the work which I seek to do draws down the arrows of the powers of darkness. The time of the end is by no means the only wicked era, any more than it is the only time of trouble. Only the close context can tell us what is included in the figurative use of the word "day." It is absurd to reason from the figure as if it were literal. Man's "day" is nearly all night! The Lord's advent day is literal. The Lord's day is figurative.

Apart from this one passage in Joel and Acts, the order of events seems quite clear. After the saints of the present administration are caught away to meet the Lord in the air, Jehovah takes up Israel again, and the Lord's day commences. As we are God's ambassadors, our withdrawal is tantamount to a declaration of war. The conciliation of the world gives place to God's indignation against mankind as a whole. We were not appointed to this, hence it cannot come until we leave. Christ, as Prophet, takes His place among Israel's ecclesias (Rev. 1:10-3:22). This is distinctly stated to be in the Lord's day (Rev. 1:10). As Potentate, at the throne, He opens the seven seals and directs all the ensuing judgments which clear the scene for His kingdom (Rev. 4:1-11:18). As Priest, He cleanses the earth by means of the bowls (Rev. 11:19-19:10). Then comes His *advent* day, *after* these judgments, by which man's rule is completely destroyed, and man's day brought to a final finish.

Without a concordant version it was practically impossible to keep the events and the terms which describe them distinct and in their place. There have been attempts to differentiate between the Lord's *presence* and His *coming*, but not much has been said about the *advent*, because of the confusion in our translations. But some things are clear enough in all versions, yet are apt to be confused in our expositions. The *kingdom*, for instance, is not the same as the Lord's day. It does not come until the *advent*. One of the millenniums does not commence until later yet, when the saints of old are roused. We need, more and more, to distinguish between the things that differ, and then all will be clear. It is one of the best proofs of inspiration, that the closer we come to the original, the more credible all becomes. We should also seek to grasp the real inwardness of God's expressions. The days, for instance, are usually figures of speech, and are not necessarily an exclusive period of time. They may overlap.

The fact that the time of the end is so filled with trouble and terror shows that *both*, man's day and the Lord's day, are on the scene. The conflict is due to their collision. If man had fully relinquished his rule, there would be no call for force. If Jehovah were not preparing for His kingdom, there would be no object in the inflictions. As with the night and the day, one gradually gives place to the other. There is light before the sun actually appears above the horizon. So with Jehovah's day. The darkness is not done away in an instant, but gradually recedes before the dawn, and is not entirely overcome until the orb of day has made its advent. Like the sun, our Lord does not actually appear until after much of the darkness has been dispelled. The day of the Lord does not commence with His visible presence. That comes later.

If Joel and Acts should refer, not to the commencement of the Lord's day, but to His actual advent, then they also would fit perfectly into the picture elsewhere drawn. Properly translated, *this is just what they do!* It is not the *notable* day of the Lord, but the Lord's *advent* day, the day on which He personally appears. The celestial signs will *not* appear before *the day of the Lord*, but much later, after the other inflictions, just before the judgment era is brought to a close by the advent of His presence. Our versions have missed this, partly by their loose rendering, and partly on account of the corruption of the Hebrew text. The Authorized Version practically removes the word *epiphaneia* from the Bible by translating it *appearing*. They have no special term for it, but borrow one which they have already applied to a simpler form of this stem. In Acts they actually depart from their other renderings, when they translate the adjective *notable*, which adds very little to the sense, and fails to distinguish it from the Lord's day, or day of Jehovah, which has been the cause of so much confusion.

In Joel the Authorized Version renders it *terrible*, because the Hebrew text reads *fearful*. The Greek version, however, preserves the ancient reading, so that it should read *advent*, or its equivalent, there also. In English, the words *fear* and *advent* are not even remotely related, but, in Hebrew, both have the common letters *ra*, the other letters, *i* and *e*, which make the difference (*rae*, SEE; *ira*, fear), are used for the grammar also, so may be added to either one without changing the sense. It is clear that, about three hundred years before Christ, when the Septuagint was translated, the Hebrew text read *appearance*, which comes close to *advent*, and refers to the time of Messiah's personal appearance, not to the beginning of Jehovah's day. This brings it into accord with all the rest of revelation on this theme.

Let us not imagine that the word *advent* applies to only one of our Lord's appearances. It is not a special term for His coming for us, or to Israel. It is used of His coming in the past as well. Paul speaks of the grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before eonian times, yet *now* is manifested through the *advent* of our Saviour (2 Tim. 1:10). That was in the past. In the future it sometimes seems to be used in an inclusive or general sense, so as to embrace every phase of His personal return. A wreath of righteousness is due to all who love the advent of our Lord (2 Tim. 4:8). We anticipate the happy expectation and glorious advent of our great God and Saviour (Titus 2:13). We desire and delight in His advent to earth as well as to the air. In a very real sense they are only different aspects of one future advent, although they occur at slightly different times, and one is a secret, unknown to the Circumcision Scriptures.

Man's day, mortal misrule, does not cease of itself when the ecclesia is caught away. It does not voluntarily hand over the government of the earth to Messiah. On

the contrary, it reaches the summit of its development in the day of Jehovah, just before His advent, in the man of sin, the false christ. No man has ever been elevated to the height which he will attain. The indignation of God is turned against mankind and its head at the very commencement of Jehovah's day. The great object of God's dealings with His creatures is to humble them and make them subject to Himself. This He does by means of evil. When man rises in rebellion against Him at the time of the end, He uses the same medicine, but in much stronger doses. He gives vent to His indignation by turning the powers of nature, the pride of man, and the spirit world against humanity, so that the earth is swept clear of rebellion and Christ assumes the throne. This is the divine side of that era. For a brief period, as at the deluge, He allows His fury free play.

THE GREAT AFFLICTION

The so-called "great tribulation," or great affliction, presents a widely different line of thought, and ought to be associated with man's day rather than with the day of Jehovah. It speaks of the distress brought upon Israel by men. The nations have persecuted His ancient people during most of man's day, and they are doing so still. But the greatest of all pogroms will come when Jehovah's day has got under way. Then faithful Jews will refuse to worship the symbol of man's rule, and suffer from his hands. The unfaithful part of the nation, however, along with the other nations, will suffer from *God's indignation*, which must not be confused with the great affliction of faithful Israelites from their fellow men. This time of trouble will be the climax of Jewish persecution, the last that will be allowed. It is the climax of man's day rather than the commencement of Jehovah's, though it is *in* both. It belongs to the darkness of the night rather than to the light of the morning. Christ

does not *direct* this affliction, but *avenges* it. Although it takes place in the commencement of the Lord's day, it is a holdover from man's day. For the *saints* the day of the *Lord* is characterized by blessing and glory, not by affliction.

Our Lord, in His ministry, especially near the end, spoke much of His actual *coming* (Mat. 24: 30, 44, 25: 6, 13, Mark 14: 62, Luke 21: 27) and His personal *presence* (Mat. 24: 3, 27, 37, 39). The signs which He gave were to precede *this*, not the day of Jehovah. The final signs in the sun and the moon and the stars are to be immediately *after* the great affliction (Mat. 24: 29, Mark 13: 24). There seems to be no doubt that this great time of trouble occurs in the day of the Lord, under the fifth seal (Rev. 6: 9-11). Here we have additional evidence that the signs in the heavens, foretold in Joel and Acts, cannot occur before the day of the Lord. That would place the great affliction also before the Lord's day. As this occupies the second half of Daniel's seventieth heptad, the whole heptad would be shut out, notwithstanding the fact that the Hebrew prophets refer to this time especially as the day of the Lord.

THE DAY OF THE LORD NOT PRESENT

When the Thessalonians fell into the error that the day of the Lord was present, due to an epistle supposed to come from Paul, he exhorts them, first of all on behalf of the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ and our assembling with Him (2 Thes. 2: 1). *That* ought to have kept them from any hasty alarm, and should keep us from entertaining any such idea. The day of Jehovah is concerned with Israel and their Messiah, and His kingdom on the earth, and will involve an entire change of administration, so that we will have to be removed before it can commence. God's indignation will be poured out on the nations. Paul had told them that we are to be saved

248 The "Abomination of Desolation" comes from that (1 Thes. 5:9). The day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night, but they were of the day, and would not be overtaken by it. This should be sufficient for us. That day has nothing for us. We are to escape it when the Lord takes us to Himself. This is Paul's appeal to the Thessalonians. Yet he adds a few more facts which might help them to see that the day of the Lord was not present at that time.

Paul calls their attention to two things to show them that the day of the Lord was not yet present. One of these was to come *first*, or *before* the day of the Lord, the other is the most notable indication that can be given of its presence. First must come the *apostasy*. There was no apostasy then, especially not in Thessalonica. But it was not long in coming, for all in Asia left Paul before his course was finished. It is with us today. So far as the apostasy is concerned, we stand before the day of the Lord at all times. But in the beginning of Paul's message it was not so. Until it had been fully heralded, God would hardly revert to Israel. Mankind was to have another, a much more gracious test, which would greatly increase their guilt if it should be rejected. The wonder is that He did not close this administration of grace as soon as Paul's message was rejected, nearly two thousand years ago. What a contrast between this long drawn out era of grace and the short era of indignation! The world and the false church have been ripe for His wrath, but grace still reigns.

The other event, the unveiling of the man of lawlessness at his deification in the temple, the so-called "abomination of desolation, "with accompanying signs and false miracles, *is the one great and conclusive sign given to the saints in Israel which would precede the great affliction, in which the Thessalonians thought they found themselves* (Mat. 24:15-22, 2 Thes. 1:4). Until we see this sign we need not be alarmed that we are about to go through the greatest of all tribulations. But this is all

negative. Let us not fall into the common error of deducing from this that the church will be on the scene at that time. The negative is no basis for deduction. The apostle is only showing the impossibility of their false conclusion. He appeals positively to their assembling with Christ in order to show that they are not in the day of the Lord. They were not so much concerned about the *time*, but the *persecutions*. If those that they endured were the great affliction, then the man of lawlessness must have been unveiled. Since he had not been manifested, they were not in the Lord's day.

The Thessalonians suffered much affliction (1 Thes. 1:6, 3:3, 7, 2 Thes. 1:4, 6). The great truths of the present secret administration had not been revealed to them. It is easy to see how they might imagine that they were not only in the day of the Lord, but in the great affliction which comes not so very long after its commencement. Theirs was a practical difficulty, which arose from their experience, and the sufferings which they endured. They were not simply date setters, or prophecy mongers, seeking some new sensation. They were not concerned about being in the first few years of the day of the Lord, when there will be no specially violent persecution of the saints. Their sufferings seemed to show that they were already in the great affliction, three and a half years later. They were drifting away from the truth which they had learned when Paul was with them, and which he taught them in his first epistle.

When Paul was in Thessalonica he grounded them so thoroughly in the times and the eras, that he had no need to write to them concerning these (1 Thes. 5:1). They knew that the day of the Lord is as a thief in the night. So it will come to *others*, not to them. *They* will say "Peace and Security" when extermination is standing over them unawares, and *they* shall not escape. But the Thessalonians were *not* in this class. They were not in darkness. The day could not overtake them unawares.

250 *God's Indignation is against Mankind*

They *will* escape because God has not appointed them to bear His indignation, which causes the extermination, but to procure salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ. This salvation he had just revealed to them in the fourth chapter (13-18). They were waiting for His presence previous to that day.

The saints today do not seem to be as well grounded as the Thessalonians. They seem to expect the day of the Lord to be heralded by wars and commotions. Yet it will not overtake the world in such a time. It will be when mankind seems to have solved its problems, and looks forward to a rosy future. It is when they are expecting peace and safety, then the signal for their destruction goes forth. It is when they think that they have finally succeeded in reaching Utopia, without God's help, that He smashes all their dreams. At such a time will the day of the Lord break in on an unsuspecting world. But we will be saved at or before this terrible outpouring of God's indignation, for it is altogether opposed to His dealings with us in grace.

To differentiate between the *indignation* of God against *mankind* and the great "tribulation" or *affliction* of the *saints* at the hands of *men* is so vital that we will repeat the principal contrasts. The indignation *introduces* the *day of the Lord* and is the *opposite* of the conciliation which characterizes this administration of grace. The *great affliction* is only a *continuation* of the afflictions of the *saints*, which have been present throughout *man's day*, but is the worst of all because this day reaches its climax, and is reaching its *end*. It does not commence until the man of sin is unveiled. If we relate the indignation to the Lord's day, and the great affliction to man's day, that will help much to clarify our conception of that era, the greatest crisis in human history.

The book of the Unveiling commences with the announcement that John is in the Lord's day. All subsequent action in it corresponds with this fact. Christ,

as Prophet, takes His place among the Israelitish ecclesias and judges them. As the Lambkin in the Throne section He breaks the seals and sends the messengers of doom. In the Temple section He directs the pouring out of the bowls of God's fury. God's indignation is everywhere, until the kingdom comes. The great affliction, however, is confined to the fifth seal. It occupies only the latter half of the seven years.

The structure, or framework, of the Unveiling seems to be quite symmetrical, and is pivoted between the day of Jehovah and the day of God. In both, Christ is seen in His three characters as Prophet, Potentate and Priest. But it does not seem to include any other time. It is quite remarkable that nothing is said of the consummation, after the day of God. If there were, we might expect to find a period before the day of the Lord, to correspond. Even as the messages to the ecclesias at the end (Rev. 22: 6-17) are in the day of God, so the messages to the seven ecclesias in the beginning must be in the Lord's day, as, indeed, we read that they are (Rev. 1: 10). John was told to write what he himself observed in that day. But the *advent* day comes before us several times. After the seals and the trumpets and the thunders are past, then the world kingdom becomes our Lord's and His Christ's (Rev. 11: 15). After the outpouring of the seven bowls and the destruction of Babylon, then again we read that the Lord reigns, and He comes on His white horse and takes His place as King of kings and Lord of lords (Rev. 19: 7, 11, 16). The advent day is the crowning event in the day of Jehovah.

There was a time when we imagined that, at its close, the church would go through a protracted period like that in the book of Acts at the beginning, because we sought to find a reversal everywhere. In some sense we still see such a reversal in the apostasy. In the beginning there was a forward movement and now there is a gradual falling away. But to apply this to the actual end of

the administration, to the removal of the ecclesia, is directly opposed to God's revelation. No other event is presented as so sudden. It will occur in an instant in the twinkle of an eye (1 Cor. 15:52), and corresponds to the call of Saul, rather than to the forty-year period of the book of Acts.

The Acts period *was* a period of gradual change, an interregnum, a no man's land, and was preparatory for this administration. So also will be the era which follows this era, but it will prepare for the coming kingdom, not taper off the present administration. Not all of the time periods in the Scriptures fade into one another. All of those which are inaugurated by one of Christ's advents are clean-cut and definite. The "day" of the Lord suggests a dawn and a dusk, but the reign of Christ and the saints has clear boundaries, and does not include the whole of the day of the Lord.

The reason for the sudden break between this and the next era is in perfect harmony with their character. In Acts there was a *shift* from mercy to grace. God was lingering in love over His ancient people. But the next era *falls* from the highest grace to the direst wrath. God changes His attitude from conciliation to indignation. A God of love cannot linger in dealing out destruction as He does in dispensing His benefits. Thanks be to Him, He hurries through His strange work. Therefore we should not look for any prolonged period of indignation at the dawn of the Lord's day. The great affliction of the saints is shortened to three and a half years. There is nothing in revelation to indicate that God's indignation against the nations will greatly exceed seven years.

The "great tribulation" is the time of *Jacob's* trouble. It is concerned only with the *kingdom* saints. It is revealed only in the Circumcision writings. It does not occur until at least three and a half years after God's indignation is let loose against the nations. It comes under the sixth seal, after five have already ravaged

mankind. If we are not appointed to indignation, then we certainly will not suffer in the great affliction. We are not immune from affliction from our fellow man. We should suffer from the world. But we cannot have part in the greatest of all afflictions because it does not come until after God's indignation is loosed upon mankind. *That* is not our portion. From *that* we will be saved. The expectation of this salvation has been given us as a helmet which protects us from the divine indignation (1 Thes. 8-10). We need fear nothing from our God!

RADIO TESTIMONY

Brother Loudy's series of radio messages, which were mentioned in the July issue, have been delayed, and will not begin until the latter part of September. No definite information is available yet, except that the series will be broadcast over WOL, Washington, D. C., which is affiliated with the Mutual network. Whether other stations in the network will broadcast the series is as yet undetermined. If possible, we will notify all subscribers within range of WOL, as soon as definite information is available.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS IN UNITED STATES

To insure speedy delivery of your copy of Unsearchable Riches, please notify us of the number of your postal delivery district, if you live in one of the 178 large cities where district numbers are being assigned.

THE WORDS AND WORK OF GOD AND MAN

Long out of print, about 200 copies of this helpful book on Ecclesiastes, by Vladimir Gelesnoff, are now available. It includes seven chapters as follows: Aim and Author, The Post-Exilic Theory, Wisdom and Toil, The Times and the Seasons, Desire, The Work of God, Light Amid the Shadows, and an Introduction and Analysis of Ecclesiastes. Bound in cloth, \$1.00. They will not last long, so we suggest that you order immediately.

ADDITION TO OUR MAILING ADDRESS

Please note that the postal delivery district (23) should be added to all communications addressed to us in future, so that it reads Concordant Publishing Concern, 2823 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles 23, California. The attention of our friends is invited to the fact that the number of the district, 23, happens to be the same as the last two digits of the street number 2823, so that there should be no difficulty in remembering it.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF THE BLOOD

DEATH, or *dying*, brought sin into the world (Rom. 5:12, "on which all sinned"). Vivification, with its abundant life, will put all beyond the reach of sin. Christ was sinless because His Father was God, and He had life so abundant that He imparted it to others, and died only because He gave up His spirit.

It has been suggested that, in birth, the blood comes only from the father, not at all from the mother. Others deny this, and, indeed, it seems contrary to all experience. The mother certainly supplies all the materials of which the blood is composed, for the father is in no position to do this. And the flesh is formed from the blood. But it is not necessary to settle this point. We need only apply it to the case of Christ to see that it only involves us in further difficulties.

If only the blood of Christ came from God and His flesh from His mother Mary, then He was only partly sinless. The flesh, being from Adam through Mary, must be dying. Yet, even when the blood flowed forth, His body did not see corruption. Now He has no blood, yet who would say that His body is not sinless? If we make any such division, the Scriptures clearly show that God's holy *Spirit* was imparted to Him, but all that was *material* came from His mother. It was the overwhelming *vitality* of that *Spirit* which made Him sinless. The *life* is in the *spirit*, not in the blood. The *soul*, or *sensation*, is in the blood. Suffering is impossible apart from blood, hence the soul is connected with His suffering for our sakes.

There is no need for ignorant credulity in connection with the sinlessness of our Lord. Once we learn that *death* or *mortality* is transmitted, *not sin*, and that we sin because of our lack of sufficient life, we see that He must have been wholly sinless, even in that which He inherited from His mother. Moreover, we will rejoice also in that day when *we* will enjoy *life* eonian, for that alone will hallow us for His presence. A. E. K.

THE METALLIC IMAGE CONTINUED

THE CLAY ADMIXTURE

But, at the end, the strength of the iron will be greatly weakened by an admixture of clay. Who are represented by the clay? The usual explanation is *they*—"they come to be mixed with the seed of mortals" (43)—but who is this *they*? The suggestion has been made that *they* refers to the *toes*, but this yields no light, and brings in confusion. The toes themselves are composed of iron and clay. Besides, both *toes* and *feet* are *feminine* in Aramaic, and the *they* is *masculine*, so it is not likely that *they* refers to either. According to the usual renderings, the Aramaic reads as follows: *being-mixed (singular masculine) to-to-become-them (masculine) in-seed-of mortals*. Yet Wigram's *Englishman's Hebrew Concordance* and Bagster's *Analytical Lexicon* seem to make *to-become* simply *they are becoming (masculine)*, which cannot account for the *to* (*l*).

It must be acknowledged that neither *they* nor *them* gives a sure clue to the identity of the clay. If Daniel were speaking to a member of the holy nation we might infer that he referred to them. But how could Nebuchadnezzar draw such a conclusion? He had no such knowledge of the Scriptures as we have, nor did he give Israel the place which God does, and we seek to do. If there is any other translation possible it should at least receive consideration, and be compared with the truth as revealed elsewhere in the Scriptures.

We therefore commend the following rendering to the kind consideration of lovers of God's Word: seeing

that you perceive iron mixed with muddy clay, *wealth* being mixed with the *force* of mortals, yet *wealth* not clinging, this with that, lo! as it is that iron mixes not with clay. The italicised words show the changes, *wealth* for *they*, and *force* for *seed*. Strange as it may seem, only one letter of the original needs to be changed to get this rendering, as we will seek to show even the most unlearned of our readers. Yet there are questionable features in this rendering, which we will not fail to emphasize. A comparison of the Greek version with the Hebrew shows that the latter needs to be restored in many passages. Here is a scripture of extraordinary importance, yet we have seen nothing really satisfactory, so we feel that we are justified in making suggestions which may not appeal at first, but which fit into the picture of the end time as no other that we have considered.

The Aramaic word *eun*, which may be rendered literally *to-become-them*, is practically ignored in the ordinary versions, so that one hardly knows what word they use for it. Idiomatically it might be *they come to be*. These letters, *eun*, also stand for the word *wealth* in *Hebrew*. We have it in Psalm 112:3. *Wealth* and riches are in his house. Proverbs 10:15 reads: The *wealth* of the rich is his strong town. So also Proverbs 19:4: *Wealth* will add many associates. Unless the word *wealth* occurs in this passage, it does not occur in the few chapters of Aramaic which we have in the Scriptures.

An ancient scholar has said, "In truth we even now find that of all languages the Chaldee or Syrian differs the least from the Hebrew, so that it is rather to be deemed a dialect of varied pronunciation than a different language." Many of the words in Syriac are exactly the same as in Hebrew. It seems certain that the Hebrew *eun*, *wealth*, was either a Chaldee word, or that it would be understood by Nebuchadnezzar from his acquaintance with the Hebrew. The fact that it is not listed among the Chaldee words of Scripture has kept scholars from

considering it the Chaldee word for *wealth* here. To the eye, the two occurrences in Daniel 2:43 and the one in Proverbs 28:22 are exactly the same, except the uninspired vowel signs, added by the Jews much later. Both are *l-eun*. Literally it would read: *being mixed to-wealth in arm of mortals, and no to-wealth clinging this with this*. Idiomatically we render it: *being mixed with wealth among the force of mortals, yet with wealth that is not clinging this with that*. In this rendering we do not ignore the word and the prefix, as in the Authorized Version, but give both a place and a force in harmony with the near and the far context, as we shall see.

It is easy to see how this translation could be lost in the period before the Septuagint was made. The idea that wealth should weaken a great empire might appear too fantastic to gain credence in those days. Without the evidence before us in the world today we also might find it difficult to entertain. So the matter was glossed over by reading it BECOME, and changing this to BE, thus virtually eliminating the word, and setting an example for later translators. The evidence of later revelation should have suggested the new reading, but this does not seem to have had much effect on the translation of Daniel. We hope to employ the resplendent light of God's later unfoldings to illuminate these dark corners much more than has hitherto been done.

The word *force*, in Hebrew, comes from the stem, *zro*, sow, or, as a noun, *seed* or *arm*. The only difference between *seed* and *arm* is that the former is sowing (*zuro*) and the latter is to-sow (*zruo*), according to the system adopted in the projected sublinear of the CONCORDANT VERSION. It is supposed that the *arm* got its name from its use in sowing seed. It is called the *sower*. In a figurative sense the *arm* is often used for *force* in Hebrew as in English, as *armed*, to *arm*, *army*. An *army* is an *armed force*. In Daniel we have rendered *arms* by *forces* in 11:15, 22, 31. The *u* which makes the difference be-

tween *seed* and *arm* is omitted so often in our present texts, because it has been replaced by vowel signs, that its insertion, in place of the sign for *a*, is only one of thousands of similar cases, where it is "defective."

But one letter may need changing. Chaldee spells *sow* and *seed* just like Hebrew. But most manuscripts spell *arm* with a *d* in place of a *z*—*druo* instead of *zruo*, in the only occurrence elsewhere. On the other hand one manuscript spells it with a *d* in this passage. It looks like the spelling was not very stable, and a Hebrew writing Chaldee might easily spell it his way, just as we spell some English words differently on the western side of the Atlantic. We would prefer not to change any letter in the text, but we may make this change (marked questionable) in order to make our spelling uniform.

Now comes the real test. The text itself presents no serious difficulties. But is it in harmony with other passages of Scripture? Does it agree with the facts of the world about us? Does it fit into its context? Could Nebuchadnezzar understand it without further explanation? Does it add a vital element to our knowledge of the time of the end? To all these questions the proposed rendering seems to call for a favorable reply. Wealth is becoming a controlling factor in world politics to an increasing and alarming extent in the last few decades, and promises to take an even more prominent place in the future. Money rules as never before in the history of the world. On all sides we hear the "money power" spoken of, and to it is ascribed much of the weakness of governments today. It seems more potent than the will of the people and forces even the strongest rulers to take it into account.

"Come now, you rich, lament, howling for your wretchedness which is coming on you! Your riches have rotted, and your garments have become food for moths. Your gold and silver corrode, and their venom will be for a testimony against you, and the venom will be eat-

ing your flesh as fire. You hoard in the last days'' (Jas. 5:1-3). Here we have evidence from God's Word that some of the sons of Jacob, the twelve tribes to which James wrote, will have immense wealth *in the last days*. Such an accumulation of riches has never been known before. Proportionately it seems that the Jews own far more of this earth's goods than any other people. It would be no surprise if the less than twenty million Jews, if they pooled their resources, could live without further effort from the interest on their holdings. Thus the other nations are practically their slaves.

But what has the wealth of the Jews to do with the government of the end? In the Unveiling of Jesus Christ this matter is further developed. There we find that Babylon, the very place where Daniel is speaking, the center of world dominion, as a city *will have a kingdom OVER the kings of the earth* (Rev. 17:18). This is not the kingdom of the antichrist, the last great monarch of the world, but is the seat of the false woman, apostate Israel. Jewish international bankers and their associates will one day build the most luxurious metropolis this world has ever seen, and from it, by means of their wealth, they will dictate to the rulers of the whole earth. The governments of earth will be their debtors, and *beneath* them, and subject to their dictation. Further details are given in the pamphlet, *The Mystery of Babylon*. It is *wealth* that will weaken the iron of the last great world power.

I suppose that there are greater accumulations of wealth today than ever before, and these are so vitally affected by legislation that business has been forced to go into politics. Thus we have lobbying, campaign contributions, bribery, and other devices by means of which wealth seeks to control government for its own ends. Then we have the acquisition of wealth by political influence, by party membership, the use of public office to obtain fees, contracts, pay for work which is not per-

formed. In many cases the salary of an official does not cover the expense of an election, and he is forced to reimburse himself by other means.

So it has come about in these last days that government is so mixed with gain in many lands, due to the character of modern civilization, that its great strength is nullified. Just as the private interests of a lower official may be satisfied at the expense of the tax-payers and lead to an uneconomical and inefficient administration, so the larger concerns of the state may be sacrificed to satisfy the greed of great magnates. Some even claim that Wall street has a greater influence on the foreign policy of the United States than the people. The interests of wealth may be quite contrary to those of the state. If so, it could be the source of much weakness. Most of us will recall many instances where the "government" has been mulcted of millions.

It is in the field of international affairs, however, that we must look for the greatest development of this condition. When the Rothschilds stationed members of the family in various countries, commencing international banking, and making state loans, they started a movement which has gradually become a power in the world that threatens to become paramount. When it comes to its full fruition, in the Jewish world-capital in Babylon, we have the word of God for it that their kingdom will be *over* the other kingdoms. Their interests and those of the nations will by no means be identical. They will be able to weaken the iron by their wealth.

THE KINGDOM OF THE HEAVENS

³⁴ You come to perceive till that a stone that is not severed by hands hits the image on its feet, that were of iron and clay, and pulverizes them. ³⁵ Then were pulverized as one, the iron, the clay, the copper, the silver, and the gold, and they became as the chaff from the summer threshing floors, and the wind lifts them up, and any place with them is not to be found. And the stone that hit the image becomes a grand mountain, and fills all the earth. ³⁶ This is the dream, and we will state the interpretation before the king.

⁴⁴And in the days of these kings the God of the heavens shall set up a kingdom, which shall not come to harm for the eon, and ^{His} kingdom shall not be left to another people. It shall pulverize and terminate all these kingdoms and *it* shall be set up for the eons.

⁴⁵Forasmuch as you perceived that a stone was severed from a mountain, and that not by hands, and it pulverizes the iron, the copper, the clay, the silver, and the gold, the grand God makes known to the king that which will occur hereafter. And the dream is certain, and the interpretation faithful."

"Near has come the kingdom of the heavens!" (Mat. 4:17). Such was the burden of our Lord's heralding to the nation of Israel. What kingdom was this? The only clue His hearers would have is Daniel's declaration to Nebuchadnezzar: *the God of the heavens shall set up a kingdom*. What Daniel reveals concerning this kingdom is of the greatest consequence to an understanding of our Lord's ministry and of the times in which we live. What kind of a kingdom is it? How does it come? How could it be near in our Lord's lifetime? When will it come?

THE PULVERIZING STONE

That this kingdom is not Christianity is abundantly clear from the way in which it is set up. Without a human hand, as a stone it falls upon the final phase of government among the nations and pulverizes it so fine that the wind whisks it away. And immediately the new kingdom spreads over the whole earth. The saint today must be subject to the superior authorities (Rom. 13:1). He has no right to rule. He is not in this kingdom. No such kingdom has ever come. It is not brought in by a gradual process of education and sanitation, but by the sudden, violent destruction of the political regime at the time of the end. The nations will no longer rule in defiance of God to their own hurt, but God will rule the nations for their blessing.

The striking contrast between the metals of the image and the stone may not be without significance. A metal is artificial, the product of human effort. A stone is

natural, made by God. Each part of the image was succeeded by a stronger metal, but the whole is destroyed by a stone which is weaker than they are. This may point out where the strength of the kingdom lies. It will not be safeguarded by vast iron monsters. Its decrees will not be enforced by an appeal to armies. Rather, the great King will have control of the powers of nature. He will shake the earth, if necessary, or send His clouds with hail, or, more potent still, withhold the rain from those who would resist His mandate. This will be unutterably more effective than a clash of arms.

WHEN THE KINGDOM COMES

The *absolute* date for the setting up of this kingdom has not been revealed, but the *relative* time is clear. It cannot come until the first three kingdoms have passed away. This condition has long since been fulfilled. A later revelation to Daniel postponed it beyond this. Seventy sevens of years after Babylon's headship passes away must elapse before the kingdom can come. Sixty-nine of these were nearly fulfilled when our Lord commenced His ministry. That is why He heralded the kingdom as *near*. So it was—relatively. But He prefixed His heralding by one condition, "*Repent!*" Humanly speaking, had the nation repented, the kingdom would have come not long thereafter.

If we firmly *believe* that the kingdom was near when our Lord heralded it, this will save us from many false paths and futile deductions. We will not look for chronological indications in Daniel or any other prophet which bring its date down much later than this, and by no means down to our own day. That it has not come yet does not disprove this any more than the failure of Israel at Kadesh Barnea proves that they were not near the land of promise. Our Lord said it was *near*, and He understood chronology as no one else. The prophetic periods, as before revealed, were nearly fulfilled, and

should never have been stretched and manipulated so as to cover the thousands of years since then. Thousands of calculations throughout the centuries since have failed to fulfill the false hopes they have raised, and have done untold harm to the saints and direly discredited God's Word. Let us *believe* that the eras foretold in the prophets were about fulfilled as our Lord averred.

The attractive suggestion that the kingdom will come after six thousand years is also shown to be unscriptural by this fact. Were this the case our Lord would not have heralded it as *near*, for only four or five thousand years had elapsed since creation. Since comparing the whole of the Hebrew text of the book of Genesis with its Greek translation (which goes back to a Hebrew text a thousand years older) we have come to accept almost all of its additions and alterations. They commend themselves to everyone who examines them. In the Greek the ages of the patriarchs, when their sons were born, is nearly always a hundred years greater than in the Hebrew and our English versions. Consequently the time from Adam to Christ is about a thousand years more, that is *five*, rather than *four* thousand. According to this we are near the end of the *seventh* rather than the *sixth* thousand, and, if this is the millennium, we are nearly through with it already!

Imminence and *ignorance* are the words to describe all that follows the break in the sequence of events after the rejection of our Lord's ministry. When they supposed that the kingdom of God was about to loom up instantly, He told them the parable of the nobleman, who went into a far country to obtain a kingdom and to return (Luke 19:11-27). He told His disciples what would be the signs of His return—the abomination of desolation, the great affliction, false christs, and false prophets who will show signs and miracles, the darkening of the sun and moon just preceding His presence. He told them that these were so near that all these things

should occur to the generation to which He spoke. Yet He warned them they were *not aware* when the era is, and no one, except the Father, was aware of the day or the hour (Mark 13:14-33). They were left alert, watching the world about them for indications of His return.

The signs are divided into three classes, the beginning of birth pangs, the great affliction, and the marvels immediately preceding His coming. First, there are deceivers and the battles and tidings of battles, but the disciples were warned that these are only preliminary. Nation will be roused against nation and kingdom against kingdom, accompanied by earthquakes and famines and disturbances. These are the beginnings. Along with them will come a persecution of our Lord's Jewish disciples, who will then represent Him on the earth, after the present ecclesia is gone. The great affliction will not come to them, however, until the abomination of desolation is set up. Then, when they need it most, signs will abound until the Son of Mankind Himself comes with power and great glory.

Watch is the word for the Circumcision. After telling them the signs of His advent, He added, "*Watch*, then, seeing that *you are not aware* what day your Lord is coming" (Mat. 24:42). Then He compared His absence with that of a man travelling. In those days the return date of a long journey could not be fixed beforehand, as travelling was very uncertain. So He exhorts them to *watch*, as they were not aware of the day or the hour (Mat. 25:13). The limitation to the *day* and the *hour* is striking, for, if they watch carefully, it may be possible for them, after the signs once make their appearance, to calculate the year and the month if not closer. But they will not be able to do this until the last period in Daniel's prophecy, in which the signs mentioned by our Lord are found. This is true only of the Circumcision.

To be sure, there are movements or trends in the world today which seem to point in the direction of these

signs, and fill us with hope and anticipation, not only that the kingdom is near, but that our deliverance is nearer, for we must be out of the way when God's indignation sweeps over the earth. But the actual signs are not for us and cannot occur so long as we are on the scene. The persecution of Israel is no sign, for that has continued since they have rejected their Messiah. Wars are no sign, for these have raged again and again among the nations. Even earthquakes and famines and disturbances are no sign, since the earth is seldom without them. It is the relation of these things to our Lord's Jewish disciples at the time of the end which will make them signals of the approaching kingdom. All that we can expect to see is the trend of things among the nations, but especially among the Jews, for the presence of signs would indicate that we had missed our upward call.

Wait is the word for the Uncircumcision. In the earliest intimation of our expectation Paul speaks of the saints of the nations who turn back to God from idols . . . to be *waiting* for His Son out of the heavens (1 Thes. 1:9, 10). It is not *watching*, but *waiting*. It is not *signs*, but His *Son*. Many marvelous signs will precede the kingdom, but there are none which precede the coming of His Son. As Paul wrote to the Romans, we were saved in expectation, yet expectation, being observed, is not expectation. We are expecting what we are *not observing*, and *awaiting* it with fortitude (Rom. 8:24, 25). There is no *watching* of visible signs, but blind confidence. Besides, we are *awaiting* the sonship, the deliverance of our bodies. We find no symptoms in our flesh of that which awaits us, but we groan and bear it in anticipation of the future.

We are even *awaiting* the events for which the Circumcision are watching—the unveiling of our Lord, Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 1:7). This seems to be a clear intimation that the signs and portents that accompany His unveiling will not occur during our days, and that

our expectation will be fulfilled before they take place. Otherwise we would change from passive waiting to active watching. This attitude did not change after Paul revealed the present secret administration. In the very highest epistle devoted to our present walk he tells us that our realm is inherent in the heavens, out of which we are *awaiting* a Saviour, also, Who will transfigure the body of our humiliation to conform it to His body glorious (Phil. 3:20, 21). There are no outward indications that such a marvelous change awaits our mortal frame. We cannot watch for signs of this event, for none are given. Faith, unsupported, unaided, unadulterated *faith* is the only intimation that is given of this grand and glorious expectation.

In this light we can see how this precious expectation has been a power in the lives of the saints from Paul's day until the present. Those who *watched for signs* to precede His presence during all these many centuries missed its power, for the only signs they could have seen would be deceptive and disappointing, just as the dates that have been set and have caused so much harm, not only in the lives of the saints, but in their testimony to the world, which ridicules the faith and derides God's Word because His people have *watched* events and calculated years instead of *awaiting* the Saviour at all times.

For those who *awaited* Him there is no disappointment. Throughout their life of faith this blessed expectation has been a power and a consolation second to none, and, in their experience, it will crown their lives in the very moment of their deepest need and direst distress. For even though they die, they will know nothing of the time until He returns, and it will seem to them that the object of all their longing will be fulfilled just as they are about to enter the portals of death. Practically, He comes to all His own as soon as this life is past, and thus fulfills their hopes and longings.

Peter also made it plain that the kingdom was near when he heralded it to the nation of Israel, after our Lord's crucifixion. He also insisted on repentance. He said, "Repent, then, and turn about for the erasure of your sins, so that seasons of refreshing should be coming from the face of the Lord, and He should dispatch the One fixed upon before for you, Christ Jesus, Whom heaven must indeed receive until the times of restoration of all which God speaks through the mouth of His holy prophets, who are from the eon" (Acts 3:19-21). But they did not repent. Throughout the record of Acts, both in the land and among the dispersion, they reject the message, so that the kingdom, humanly speaking, receded during the era of the Acts, until the very end, when, for the third time Isaiah 6:9, 10 is applied to them (Acts 28:26, 27) and the *salvation* of God is sent to the nations, even as the *kingdom* was transferred to the nations in Nebuchadnezzar's day.

Our Lord, when quoting Isaiah's solemn words, making their hearts stout and their ears heavy, revealed certain secrets concerning the kingdom which, of course, are not to be found in Daniel, but which affect the absolute time of its arrival (Mat. 13). Instead of presenting Himself as a Reaper, as He will be just before the kingdom comes (Rev. 14:14-16), our Lord calls Himself a Sower. In His parables He predicts the course of the kingdom heralding, based on its rejection by Israel and their callous condition. All is postponed until the darnel, the hypocrites, are culled out at the conclusion of the eon (Mat. 13:39). Israel rejected Jehovah (Isa. 6:9, 10), our Lord (Mat. 13:14, 15), and the spirit's testimony through His apostles (Acts 28:26, 27), so now, once more, through their callousness, the kingdom waits until the great secrets concerning Christ's celestial headship and His gracious work among the nations has been fulfilled. All of this was hid from Daniel. We must shut our eyes to it in reading his prophecy.

Positively, the exact date of the advent of the kingdom may not be known until just three and a half years before it comes. When the great governor of the end time receives universal power from the hands of Satan, and he stops the worship of Jehovah in Jerusalem, then all may be certain that, in forty-two months, the God of the heavens will destroy his realm, and cast him into the fiery lake, and set up the kingdom so long foretold. True, just seven years before, the Antichrist enters into a covenant with His people, and *this* may be taken as the earliest actual date from which to reckon the time of Christ's appearing. Before this all time is relative, not absolute. It depends on events which cannot, in the nature of things, be divulged without disturbing or counteracting the object God has in view.

For the faithful Israelite in the fearful days of the final affliction our Lord gives many signs to encourage and sustain him. There will be false christs and battles and famines and pestilence, as figured by the four horse-men (Mat. 24, Rev. 6:1-8). When Jerusalem is surrounded with encampments (Luke 21:20) and the abomination of desolation is set up they will know that the worst lies just ahead, but the best is not far off. At the beginning of these occurrences He bids them unbend and lift up their heads, because their deliverance is near (Luke 21:28). After the seven seals have been broken and the six trumpets blown, and the two woes have occurred, comes the last of all. The kingdom is proclaimed. *"The kingdom of this world became our Lord's and His Christ's, and He shall be reigning for the eons of the eons! Amen!"*

No wonder the twenty-four elders fall on their faces and worship God! In anticipation of that mighty event, even though it is concerned primarily with the earth and Israel, not with us and our celestial allotment, and is not in full harmony with the spirit of grace which is ours in Christ Jesus, we would say *Amen!* to their pean of praise,

as they say: "We are thanking Thee, Lord God Almighty, Who art and Who wast, for *Thou hast taken Thy great power and dost reign*. And the nations are angered, and Thy indignation came, and the era for the dead to be judged, and to give wages to Thy slaves, the prophets, and to the saints, and to those fearing Thy name, the small and the great, and to blight those blighting the earth" (Rev. 11:16-18). The stone that struck the image becomes a grand mountain, and fills all the earth!

Relatively, when we see the rise of wealth as a world power, taking a place *above* the political authorities, when Wall Street dictates and Washington obeys, then we are approaching the era of the end. *That is the case today!* The kingdom cannot be far away according to this sign. And every tendency to world-wide unity, every league of nations, even though a failure, shows the way in which the wind is blowing. When, at last, there is another kingdom like Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece, which will dominate the whole world, with a king of kings at its head, then, in the days of these kings, the kingdom will come.

The kingdom of the heavens, while it is a kingdom in the same sense as Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece were kingdoms, differs from them most blessedly in four particulars. They came to harm, and each had to transfer its power to another people, so was not the last of the kingdoms, and none lasted for the eon. But the kingdom of the heavens will not come to harm for the eon. It will not be left to another people. It terminates the nations' rule, and it is for the eon.

Babylon fell before Medo-Persia, Medo-Persia before Greece, and Greece before others. Even the iron kingdom, with all the rest, will be pulverized by the stone. But the kingdom of the heavens will not come to harm. True, there will be a mighty rebellion, led by Satan himself, at the end of the kingdom eon, which actually surrounds the beloved city. Such a host could easily have

overthrown one of the previous world kingdoms, especially as the kingdom of the heavens has no army and the holy city has no defenses at all. No force is needed, for the powers of nature are at the command of the King. He will withhold the downpour if compulsion is necessary (Zech. 14:17). When Gog and Magog are mobilized against Jerusalem fire descends from heaven and devours them (Rev. 20:9). No harm can come to such a kingdom!

The Babylonians had to yield to the Medo-Persians, and they were replaced by the Greeks. The world-rule of the nations will be in the hands of four different peoples, the inferior always replacing the superior. No such succession can occur in the kingdom of the heavens. From the time of Abraham and Israel one nation has been before God for the purpose of blessing all the nations of the earth. Notwithstanding the fact that they failed in the past, God's purpose must be carried out. The kingdom was taken from them, but it will be given to a new nation, a regeneration, which will bring forth the fruits of this kingdom (Mat. 21:43). When all sovereignty and authority and power is nullified at the consummation the kingdom is not handed over to any creature, but reverts to God, the Father, Who is the Source of all rule (1 Cor. 15:24-28).

None of the previous kingdoms *pulverized* its precursor. The Authorized Version always renders this word *break in pieces*. As they use *break* for over twenty Hebrew words and *break in pieces* for five, we must not expect to learn anything very exact from their renderings. This very passage shows that *break in pieces* is hardly strong enough. Should we break in pieces an image made of gold and silver and copper and iron there would be little likelihood that the wind would blow the pieces away. Gold is very heavy, so that small particles are not easily disturbed by the air unless they are very minute or very thin. The image is *broken into*

pieces, or pulverized into specks so small that they are gone with the wind. As the psalmist says (2:9):

Thou shalt smash them with a club of iron:
As a potter's vessel shalt Thou shatter them.

The kingdoms of the nations do not differ in the great essentials. They are all based on physical force. In none of them would the laws of the kingdom be practicable. They do not love their enemies or do good to their persecutors. The kingdom code is laid down by our Lord in the so-called sermon on the mount (Mat. 5-7). It is clear that every vestige of our present code must be swept away before it can be made the constitution of the world. When Medo-Persia followed Babylon no great change in the basic administration of the empire was made. And so with Greece. But when the kingdom of the heavens comes it completely pulverizes all of the fundamentals of human rule hitherto, and places the relations of man to man on an entirely new basis.

But the form of this kingdom is not final. Therefore Daniel speaks of it as lasting *for the eons*, not *forever*. For a thousand years it will be a Melchizedek rule, with Christ as a Priest upon His throne, and a temple with many priests, who mediate between the Deity and mankind. Death will still be in operation, and a multitude as the sands of the sea will be deceived and rise against it at its end. Beyond, all is obscure in Daniel. But now we know that the priesthood (which is also mistakenly made "forever") vanishes in the next phase of the kingdom, in the new earth, which has no temple (Rev. 21:22), because God Himself will tabernacle with mankind (Rev. 21:3). Priesthood is a sign of imperfection, of distance from the Deity. When He comes near it must vanish.

Rule by intermediaries, lords or kings, is also a sign of insubordination which can never find place in a perfected universe, when God is All in all. For that reason rule also retires after the eon of the eons, on the new

earth. Then the kingdom takes its final form. God's beloved Son has brought all creation into subjection to Him, and then, when all else is subject, subjects Himself, leaving no creature in all the universe that really needs the iron club. Thus it is that the kingdom of the heavens, instead of leading men to a climax of the utter repudiation of God, will lead them into utter subjection and reconciliation with Him, and He becomes All, not merely in the saints who believe, but in *all*, even if they rebelled.

THE SIZE OF THE FIRST WORLD KINGDOM

The extent of the Babylonian kingdom is stated as clearly as words can do so, but it seems to demand a special measure of faith for us to believe them. Nebuchadnezzar's sway included *every* place where the sons of mortals abide. He was given authority over them *all*. It is very easy to doubt this. Our ignorance of the world at that time, and our exaggerated conception of human progress since then, leads us to look back upon the earlier eras of mankind with a false pride in our own superiority, so that we question their attainments. But we are not told that Nebuchadnezzar, or his generals or his armies went everywhere and gained a universal empire by conquering every tribe on the face of the earth. He did, indeed, subdue some nations by the sword, but his boundless sway was *granted* to him by the God of the heavens. It was a *gift*, and it was *universal*. Let us hold fast to this, otherwise we will miss the point of this revelation, and may be led into false lines of interpretation.

This warning is necessary. The scholarship of Christendom denies the universal scope of the early empires described by Daniel. In a Bible atlas intended to enlighten us as to their dominions we are told that "the *important* parts of the Bible world were *nearly* all under the rule of Babylon," and "Persia was far greater than . . .

Babylon." In a diagram showing the Assyrian empire (700 B. C.), the Babylonian (600 B. C.), and the Persian (450 B. C.), the Babylonian, which Daniel gives universal sway, is represented by a small square about a third as large as the Assyrian, and less than a sixteenth the size of the Persian, and this, of course, was given only a small part of the earth's surface. Not one hundredth of God's Word is believed by scholars, in this case.

If we believe men, that the area of the Babylonian empire was so small, and the Persian also failed to attain to the size of the later Roman dominions, it spoils the whole picture. Messiah's rule will extend over *all*. Other scriptures make it clear that the lowest section of the image represents an empire which will exercise authority over *every* tribe and people and language and nation (Rev. 13:7). Could language be more elaborate? Yet when this very dominion comes before us in the image we are told that it was the Roman empire, whose boundaries were well known, and whose area never covered more than a fraction of the earth's surface. Why, today there are a number of empires, much greater than any of these ancient realms, if we are to accept the dictum of scholarship. This makes the whole matter ridiculous. If the God of heaven gave Nebuchadnezzar only a tiny kingdom, smaller than the one before him, and gave Cyrus and Alexander only the little territory usually assigned to them on our maps, the whole vision loses its significance. Why, we have empires today that could swallow all of them at once!

The kingdoms of the image are all world-wide, though this was not the case throughout their history, nor was their supremacy undisturbed and unchallenged. Nebuchadnezzar spent much of his life in completing his conquests. Moreover, the closing era of the head of gold was spent in war with Medo-Persia, which revolted and replaced it. So with Alexander. Only a part of his life was marked by actual sovereignty over all. And so it will

be with the last monarch, over the iron kingdom. Until he is given universal power by the dragon, he seems to be involved in almost continual conflict. Even after that his rule seems to be challenged in some quarters (11:44), down to the very end of his career. Indeed, the reign of Christ Himself is disturbed at its close by the tremendous insurrection of Gog and Magog. Undisturbed and permanent sovereignty over all nations will not come until a new earth replaces the present one.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR WORSHIPS AND REWARDS DANIEL

⁴⁶ Then king Nebuchadnezzar falls on his visage and worships Daniel, and says to offer him a present and a restful libation. ⁴⁷ The king answers Daniel and says: "In verity, your God, He is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a Revealer of secrets, seeing that you were able to reveal this secret. ⁴⁸ Then the king made much of Daniel, and he grants him enormous, immense gifts, and gives him authority over the whole province of Babylon, and he is grand-prefect over all the wise men of Babylon.

⁴⁹ And Daniel petitions the king, and he assigns Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego over the service of the province of Babylon. And Daniel is in the gate of the king.

The impression made on Nebuchadnezzar was overwhelming. As Daniel speaks, his dream comes back to his memory, and he begins to realize that he is in the presence of the Supreme, and that Daniel is His prophet, and his first impulse is to worship the representative of the God Who had revealed Himself to him through his dream. No doubt the high place given to the king, as the head of gold, had much to do with his feelings, and controlled his action at the time. So he himself shows divine honors to Daniel and orders offerings to be made to him.

Daniel, however, had made it as plain as possible that he ascribed everything to his God. So Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges that He is a God of gods, a Lord of kings, and a Revealer of secrets, even as Daniel had said (29). Otherwise Daniel never could have revealed the dream or its interpretation. This recognition of God was real enough, in its way, but made no lasting impression on

his character, as will be seen by his later conduct. Exaltation does not seem to bring men nearer to God. A much deeper impression was made upon him later, by his humiliation to the status of a beast. Evil seems a more potent means of revealing God than good.

Daniel's reward was very great. The king "increased" Daniel, or, as we would say, made much of him. This is evident from the gifts and preferments which the prophet obtained. He received gifts of such magnitude that the language seems a little strained in describing them. Politically, he is set over what was probably the most important province of the empire, in which was the capital itself. It was nearly as high as the honor accorded Joseph in Egypt (Gen. 40), who also attained his eminence through the interpretation of a dream. Besides, he is made the grand prefect over all the wise men of Babylon, whose lives and property he had saved.

The Authorized Version nearly always translates the Hebrew *sgn*, *ruler* (Eze. 9:2, Neh. 2:16, etc.) but the Aramaic, in Daniel, is made *governor*. As it does not occur until the time of Isaiah and is always used of an Assyrian or a Chaldean in the prophets, it is probably a foreign word. Some would relate it to the Aramaic *sgn* or the Hebrew *shgi*, *grow*, but the strong consonant *n* is lacking. The title *prefect*, denoting one who is put in charge of a department or group, seems to be the nearest term we have in English. Daniel was made the greatest of those who headed the various groups of wise men.

DANIEL'S COMPANIONS

It will be remembered that the three other members of the deportation from Judea had associated themselves with Daniel in his resolve not to eat the king's dainties (1:11), and they made their petition with him concerning the secret which was revealed to him, although they had no public part in its revelation. But Daniel does not forget his friends. He finds a place for them in his

own department, that of Babylon, where they doubtless continued to be his close associates in the administration of the province. Thus we find Daniel not only true to his God, but loyal to his friends. May he be an example to us!

A. E. K.

WOULD ADAM HAVE DIED IF HE
HAD NOT SINNED?

IT HAS BEEN ASKED, Would Adam and Eve have died if they had believed and obeyed God? *Superficially*, the answer, of course, is *no*. They would not even have become mortal. The death process, which men now call life, did not begin with them until after they had disobeyed. But this question, like many others which imply that man, rather than God, controls the course of human events, is misleading. If Adam and Eve had not offended they would have *lived*, no doubt, but they would not have fulfilled the prime purpose of their creation. Through them, and the race of which they are the progenitors, God desired to display the depths of His love and the heights of His glory. This could not be done unless they had a knowledge of good. And this, in turn, demanded an acquaintance with evil. Mortality and death are essential features of God's self-revelation. *Intrinsically*, therefore, the answer would be *yes*. God might have used other means of introducing sin into the world and by sin death. The same is true of all of Adam's descendants. Their dying and sinning, with the consequent death in the unseen and the lake of fire, as well as the judging before the great white throne, are not the end that God has in view. They are only the means He has chosen to attain His grand ultimate. If these means had not been used, He could, no doubt, have found others. If we look at God's dealings with His creatures from *His* standpoint, we will come to the conclusion that *all* is according to His intention, and no if's are worthy of notice.

A. E. K.

JUDGE AND JUDGED AT THE GREAT WHITE THRONE

WHO IS IT that will judge the dead at the great white throne? He is not given a name or title, but is simply called *Him Who is sitting upon the throne* (Rev. 20:11). It is more than likely that He assumes a number of characters, according to His relationship to those standing before Him and the task in hand. These we must seek elsewhere in the Scriptures. But it is remarkable that, unlike the previous throne of judgment in this scroll, there is no elaborate setting, no elders or animals, no thunder and lightning, no trumpets or bowls. The reason is clear. The former throne expresses God's indignation against man's misrule on the earth, and introduces the iron club of Christ's millennial kingdom. But this one deals with all the dead, and is a prelude to their salvation, justification and reconciliation at the consummation. Those at the great white throne do not enter the new earth at all, but are held in death until the time when God becomes All in all. The great white throne must bring them up to this great goal.

In the Scriptures we are reminded that God will judge the world. He will judge the hidden things of humanity, according to Paul's evangel (Rom. 2:16). He cannot be unjust, else how shall He be judging the world (Rom. 3:6). Paul, in Athens, exhorts his hearers to repent, forasmuch as God assigns a day in which He is about to be judging the inhabited earth in righteousness by the Man Whom He specifies (Acts 17:31). This truth has been caricatured and presented in such a lurid light that almost all members of so-called Christian

nations have formed a distorted and revolting misconception of that august tribunal. This is due chiefly to the fact that theology has altered the Deity from a God of love to a fiend of hate. Even those who have learned better, cannot help shrinking in fear from a personal meeting with the One Who can preside at such a judgment, although, in Christ, the believer is exempt. In relation to the unbeliever He is looked upon as a magnified bogey, who has only one object, to punish each one for his sins. That His inflictions have any love behind them or that they will in any way benefit the sinner is absolutely debarred by the indiscriminate severity and eternity of every penalty.

We must all acknowledge that a god who would unhesitatingly consign the vast mass of mankind to eternal torment, no matter how much or little they have sinned, must be a monster more terrible than the worst of men. Why, not even the Satan of Scripture is as bad as that. Such a character in the judgment seat of the great white throne would change it from white to black. In that case it is impossible to think of justice being dispensed there. Sympathy would be out of place, and love would be entirely absent, even in the remotest motive of the judge. It is useless to *talk* about a god of love who is capable of such superexcessive cruelty. This very judgment is based on the *acts* of those present, not on the mere words of their lips. And it is impossible to avoid judging God in the same way. One of the greatest functions of the Scriptures is to justify God for His strange acts, not by simply excusing them, but by showing that they are done in love and will bring about blessing for His creatures and glory for Himself. This judgment is no exception to this rule, for it is needed, not to damn the sinners that are judged, but to prepare them for the consummation, when they will be unutterably thankful for their sufferings.

God, indeed, judges, not directly however, but through

the Man He designates for this purpose. God is invisible and will never be seen by human eyes. Only in visions are there symbols of His presence, and this judgment is not a vision, but a solemn reality. In all His contacts with mankind He is represented by a go-between, the Mediator, the Man Christ Jesus. It would make a tremendous difference if men realized that they would not see God Himself seated on the great white throne in the judgment. Although His Son is a perfect Representative of God, and ought to be considered just as grim as God in the judgment, men mistakenly make Him much milder than His Father. This is a fatal error. The Son is no more loving than the Father. Christ is no more gracious than God. If God tortures eternally, then Christ torments everlastingly. It should not be more difficult to visualize our Saviour in the role of tormentor than His God and Father.

Inasmuch as God has been so terribly blasphemed and His character blackened by the heresies of orthodoxy, and this has taken hold of Christendom like an incurable cancer, it is wise to stress the fact that He has delegated all judging to Another, in Whose case the nominal church has gone to the opposite extreme. They have overstressed the gentleness and mildness of Jesus, as if He, in contrast to God, would gladly overlook our sins and condone our shortcomings, and look with indulgence upon our ways. This is far from the truth, for He is no more lenient with sin than His Father and His God. But the prevalent idea that He wishes to *save*, while God wants to *damn*, demands that we emphasize the fact that all will be condemned by the very One Who is the Saviour. *Christ* is the Condemner. Believers should glory in this, for it frees them from all condemnation (Rom. 8:1, 34).

SON OF MAN AND SON OF GOD

In considering the final judging of mankind, we should always remember the character which our Lord

assumes when He sits upon the great white throne. Most of His activities are *official*. He acts as God's *Christ*, His Anointed. Others are associated with His place as *Lord* or *Master*, Whom all must obey as slaves. During the course of human history, as *Christ* He will set much right with His iron club, and as *Lord* He will smite the nations. But neither of these characters are emphasized when He sits upon the great white throne. Indeed, He is given no name or title in the description of this august session in the Unveiling. But elsewhere the Judge Himself has revealed the special characters which He will assume when He will pass upon the acts of mankind. As the *Son* of His Father, and as a *Son* of Adam or of mankind, He will summon all unbelievers before Him, to *prepare them for the final reconciliation*. *The Father has delegated all judging to the Son* (John 5:22). *He gives Him this authority, seeing that He is a son of mankind* (John 5:27).

A SON OF MANKIND

If God were *Justice* instead of *Love*, He would probably have chosen a judge from some other race of beings, who would not be influenced by contact with earth's accursed mortals. Some brightly burning seraph might have been appointed to illumine their dark deeds, and consume them for their shortcomings. We can understand that, as a Priest and as a Saviour, our Lord must have compassion on human infirmity, but it is generally supposed and taught that He divests Himself of all His sympathies when He acts as Judge. This is refuted by the two relationships involved in His Sonship. It may be that the tie that links Him with Adam is His authority for taking the judge's bench, for Adam would have that right as the Head of the race had he not forfeited it by his offense. But as a son of humanity He is not only *authorized* to judge between man and man, but He is *qualified* to understand and sympathize with human

frailties and shortcomings, for He has a close acquaintance with them and a deep feeling for those who are burdened by them.

Should it not warm our hearts to know that a *Man* will sit upon the judgment throne? He can sympathize with our infirmities, for He has been tried in all respects as we are, apart from sin (Heb. 4:15). A Man Who was weary with the way (John 6); Who wept with the sorrowing sisters of Bethany (John 11:35). A Man misunderstood by His family and even by His own disciples. A suffering Man Who bore with their heartless unbelief, as well as with the stubborn opposition of His countrymen. A Man Who prayed for His murderers, because they did not realize what they were doing. A Man Who suffered the agonies of crucifixion to save His fellowmen. Perhaps it is wrong to say *a* Man, for He was *the* Man, the only one of Adam's race worthy of the name. Sin makes all others inhuman, unfit to judge a fellow man, even when their own sad experiences should make them loving and lenient in judging one another.

Although I have never been haled before an earthly tribunal, there was a time in my life when I made contact with a judge in his official capacity as such. I was in the midst of one of the severest trials I have been called upon to endure. The way before me was dark, and I needed advice such as this judge was in a position to give. It would not have taken more than a minute of his time. I thought that, in my plight, he might sympathize with me and help me set things right which had gone wrong through no fault of mine. His answer was most prompt and, to me, most offensive. "See a lawyer!" That is just what I wanted to avoid, for I wished to make things *right*, not merely *legal*. I did not realize at that time that justice is a commodity which must be paid for with money, as a rule. I am now glad for this brief experience, for it is such a contrast to that which will occur at the great white throne. No one will need a

lawyer there, and no one will have the fee to pay him. There justice will be free, and it will be administered by a judge in fullest sympathy with all who stand before Him, for whom He suffered on the cross, and who will be saved and reconciled to God through His sacrifice.

Let us see what the Son of Mankind, Who will sit upon the great white throne, has already done, so that we may assure our hearts as to the character of His judicial acts. We may be sure that He will have compassion and pity for the poor and needy, for He had nowhere to recline His own head (Mat. 8:20, Luke 9:58). He even knows how it feels to be called a gluttonous man and a tippler, for He ate and drank like the rest of us (Mat. 11:19, Luke 7:34). His main work was to *pardon* sins (Mat. 9:6, Mark 2:10, Luke 5:24, John 5:27). Has He not made it very evident that He has no pleasure in the infliction of punishment? Did He not give His soul for the very one's who will stand before His judgment seat? For my part, I rejoice that all who have not the rare privilege of believing in Him and enjoying life eonian, will stand before the very One Whom I have learned to love beyond all others. He, even when He condemns them, has their welfare in view, for He has already done more than anyone else for their salvation. Would I sympathize with them? I would! But by no means like my Lord.

THE SON OF THE FATHER

In the Orient a son has a high place in the affections of a father, much more so than in the Occident. This is especially the case when there is only one. No doubt God has brought this about in order to give a human expression to His own affection for the Son of His love (Col. 1:13). We have lost the force of this among us when we divide our affection equally among our children, or have a special pet among the younger ones, or even prefer a daughter to our oldest son. More than that, the very word *son* conveys a thought of much wider and

richer scope in the East. It includes close concord and congeniality between father and son, so much so that Easterners can say "You are no son of mine." They merely mean that one in the family, although their offspring, is unlike his father and unsympathetic to him. That is why the term son is so frequently used in a figure. A son of stubbornness is not the offspring of a quality, but one who possesses that quality to a marked degree. The Authorized Version "children" confuses the figure (Eph. 2:2). A son of God may be one by adoption, but he is not entitled to be called a son unless his character conforms to that of his Father.

An appeal to the son's special place in the father's affections was made by our Lord when He addressed the throngs in His mountain message concerning the kingdom (Mat. 7:9). "... any man who is from among you whose son will be requesting bread, no stone will he be handing him! Or he will be requesting a fish, also, no serpent will he be handing him!" Something very near to that might be done to a daughter, but not to a son in those lands. The son usually has the preference in food. *Christ*, as God's Executive, receives great glory from God for what He *does*. But, as His *Son*, He has a much nearer and dearer relation to the Father, and is given high honor for what He *is*. It is not necessary that a son should *earn* his keep in order to be fed. He is rather pampered because of his relationship. This is true even among wicked men. It is nowhere more true than in the relations between God and His Beloved, for all the others are but feeble figures of His place and portion.

THE BELOVED SON

"Beloved" is never used of our Lord except in His character as the *Son* of God, His only Father. Christ is never termed beloved, nor is it applied to Him as Lord or Teacher. He is the *Son* of God's love (Col. 1:13). He is in the *bosom* of the Father (John 1:18). God's

love to us was expressed in the gift of His only begotten Son (John 3:16). Repeatedly are we told that the Father *loves* the Son (John 3:35, 5:20). While, as *sinner*s, we are *justified* in the blood of *Christ*, it is as *enemies* that we are *conciliated* through the death of God's *Son* (Rom. 5:10). It was the Son Who loved us and gave Himself for us (Gal. 2:20). It is generally deemed that love and affection are incompatible with justice. We imagine that they are partial, and antagonistic to the infliction of righteous pains and penalties. And this is usually true among shortsighted mortals. But our own experience should show us that this is not true of God. He loves His saints, yet how He lets them suffer nevertheless! Love and justice are not enemies, nor rivals, but real right can only be found in love.

God's *delight* is associated with His Son, the Beloved. When He was baptized the heavens opened, and a voice came out of the empyrean in order to introduce the Messiah to the people of Israel (Mark 1:11). Thus, at the outset, was answered the oft-recurring question, "Who is the Christ?" He is not only the Son of David, but the Son of God. And, because He is His Son, He is Beloved, and His *delight*. This is not approbation or praise for service performed, but tenderness and attachment due to relationship and affection.

Thus we see fondness and affection are the special characteristics which qualify the unnamed One Who sits upon the great white throne. On the human side He is the sympathetic Man, on the divine He is the beloved Son of God. Because He united these two relationships in Himself, He is the most acceptable Personage in the universe to readjust the human race to God, and bring them into the sphere of His love. There is no question of the *justice* of His judgment. That has usually been emphasized to the exclusion of all else. Indeed, it has been so overstressed in speaking of this scene that it has become the most flagrant injustice. The idea that justice

could be compatible with pity and compassion has been lost. Justice need not be blind and heartless as it so often is among men. It may work havoc if divorced from all the finer affections of the human heart.

THE CHARACTER OF THOSE JUDGED

Who will stand before the great white throne? Why, you say, sinners, unbelievers, the wicked, the ungodly. These are the answers we would expect to get. They show how warped our thoughts are concerning this great tribunal. We make it a great *black* throne, because of the darkness of our own hearts. There is no doubt that these characters will be there, but God has not chosen these terms to describe them. He uses a much wider and more expressive one. The *dead* are judged at the great white throne. This is a notable figure of speech, for they cannot be actually dead at that time. They have emerged from death and are about to enter it again. It is like such expressions as, the deaf hear, the lame leap. That is, those who *were* deaf, hear, and who *were* lame, leap, and who *were* dead, stand up. This will include billions, such as infants, whom we would hardly care to call wicked, or sinners, or unbelievers, or ungodly, though, of course, they had all of this in them like the rest of us.

It is evident from this that those who are raised were dead *toward God* during their lifetime, and are still dead *to Him* when they stand before the throne. As *dead* to God they appear before the Judge. It may seem at first that a sight of the Enthroned One will compel all to *believe*, and this should lead to life as it does now. Not so. It will be *sight*, not *faith*. And sight, even under such august conditions, has not the vivifying power of faith. When our Lord was on earth, He wrought mighty miracles, yet these did not produce real faith in all who saw them. It is clear that faith will be absent at the great white throne, for its effects are not in evidence. No one receives eonian life. All are condemned (Rev. 20: 13,

Rom. 5:18). They are dead, and will be judged accordingly. Indeed, if all became believers at this time, they would be alive and exempt from judgment.

The fact that they are dead will materially modify the measure of their judgment. The dead are blind and deaf. They cannot apprehend God's will. The slave who knew little of his lord's will received few lashes. But he who knew it well, he received many lashes. Very little was committed to these dead unbelievers, hence little will be expected from them (Luke 12:47-48). Let us, who have life and light, be exceedingly thankful that the orthodox myth of a "general judgment," including believers as well as unbelievers, is not true. It is a most lamentable fact that the conduct of some believers, who claim much light, compares unfavorably with many unbelievers, in spite of their death and darkness. I fear that, if we were included in this judgment, we would fare worse than these "dead" unbelievers. Ours will not be a judgment, although the Authorized Version mistakenly calls the *bêma* or dais of Christ a "judgment seat." Such cross-wiring obscures the truth. Believers should be unutterably thankful that God has arranged to have an entirely distinct tribunal for them before which only the *living*, the *immortal*, will appear, to have their ungodly deeds consumed, while they themselves are saved (1 Cor. 3:13, 2 Cor. 5:10).

How loving are the ways of God! Even in His strange work of judging mankind He remembers our frailty. We, to whom He gives life and light so that we may know His will, even if we fail to do it, are exempt from judgment. If we were not, we would suffer much, much more than those who sit in death and darkness. Our judging, to be just, would be unbearable. Instead of justice, we get grace. Moreover, even though our unworthy deeds are consumed in the fire, we will not mind, for we will have life, immortal, abounding, glorious life, which will put us beyond the reach of pain and suffering. Will

we not rather find relief in being rid of all that of which we will then be ashamed? In the light of that day even our most righteous deeds may show a tinge of unrighteousness. Even our most gracious acts may need to be purged from the subconscious selfishness of which we are not even aware. Let us thank God that our greater accountability is not balanced by a greater judgment.

At the *dais* of Christ all will be *alive*. Before the great white throne all will be *dead*. They will not be accountable as those who have life. They will not suffer as those who have light. Such, we take it, is the force of the figure of the dead standing before the throne. However, by the same figure, their works will be dead. They could not have been done with a view of pleasing God, no matter how just or good they may appear to men. Is not this the reason why all are condemned? And does not this explain why the scroll of life is introduced? Those who are not written in that scroll cannot act acceptably to God. The judging at the great white throne is based on what they *do*. But the lake of fire, the second death, follows as a result of what they *are*. They are dead. Their names cannot be in the scroll of life. They are not cast into the lake of fire for what they *do*, but for what they *are*. Their figurative death becomes literal, with a view to their vivification at the consummation. Their Judge is the sympathetic Son of Mankind, the beloved Son of God, Who will bring them back to God, so that He may become their All.

A. E. K.

GLASGOW SAINT REPOSES

It is with deep regret I write to inform you of the sudden passing on May 4, 1943, of Sister E. H. McEwan, for many years a prominent member of the class in Glasgow. She was an able speaker, possessing a wonderful knowledge of the Scriptures and of the purpose of God—an inspiration to the whole class.

In addition to her duties as secretary and treasurer of the class, she spoke at women's meetings in many churches in the city, and visited the sick and the aged. We shall miss our sister, but we feel these deep experiences only make the light shine brighter and the "things eternal" more real.—A. F.

IN HIS DEATHS

CHRIST DIED to sin *once for all* (Rom. 6:10). How is it, then, that the Hebrew text of Isaiah 53:9 reads that He was with the rich in His deaths (plural)? That He was buried in a rich man's tomb is clear from later revelation, but that was only *one* death. Various ingenious explanations have been given. We used to say that His death included ours, so that it took in all who died with Him. While this is true, there is little likelihood that the prophet had it in view. It is altogether out of line with the context. Death with Christ is altogether outside the range of that early revelation. It is unknown even later among the Circumcision. Only Paul reveals it to the nations. So with other explanations that have been given. It must be a death, or deaths, because of the transgressions of His people. It must follow His humiliation, due to Jehovah's desire to crush Him when He bore the sins of many.

A good while ago, when called upon to make a concordant version of this chapter, I found that the Greek translation, made by Jewish rabbis more than a thousand years before the earliest Hebrew manuscripts that we have, has it in the singular, *death*, not *deaths*. In Hebrew the difference is very minute, *muthiu* is *His deaths* and *muthu* is *His death*. The letter *i*, in Hebrew, is almost as small as an apostrophe and is shaped just like the following *u*, except that the *u* has a longer stroke. In Greek, however, the article is needed, so there are two words, each of which has more to distinguish the plural than the Hebrew has. The Greek reads *tou thanatou*, *of-the death*, not *tōn thanatōn*, *of-the deaths*. The Hebrew could easily be altered by mistake, but hardly the Greek. In such matters the Greek is less likely to be copied wrong, and it has been found better in many passages, when tested by the near and far context. We therefore translate it: in His 'death.' The small figures stand for Septuagint (70), and show that we have adopted its reading.

EDITORIAL

GOD'S GRACE has enabled us to send forth this little witness to His truth and love for over a third of a century. Much of His revelation, long hidden under the rubbish of tradition and unbelief, has been recovered. Some of His grandest glories, long eclipsed, have blazed forth in their pristine splendor. We have a God of Whom we are not ashamed! We acquiesce and concur in all that He does, however it may hurt and humble us, if we know the sequel of His love that lies ahead.

We have been enabled to grasp the broad outlines of His purpose, and realize the end He has in view. Yet there is much detail left to engage our hearts, as well as many a delightful harmony that we have not yet enjoyed. We hope that His grace will enable us to recover some of these and share them with our friends by means of our little magazine.

Next year we hope to deal with two vital chapters in Daniel's prophecy, Nebuchadnezzar's Humiliation and Belshazzar's Sacrilege. These open up to us the wonderful ways of God in a most impressive manner. As there is especial interest at this time in the great distinctions between the two evangels, we may publish some long-promised expositions on the underlying reasons why the Circumcision evangel is so unlike that which is ours today. In this connection we may point out some remarkable intimations of the grace which has come to us, in the characters and conduct which is clustered about the cross. In Pilate and his soldiers we have pictures of justification. In the four who were crucified with Him

we may recognize our death and crucifixion. Even the Potter's Field has a message for us, and doubting Thomas, and our Lord's ascension on the day of His rousing.

But we will make no promises. We wish to fill the need, to met the demands that arise among the saints, without much delay, so as to be as helpful as possible, and be of real service to them when they need it. The times are moving fast and no one knows what lies just ahead.

JUDGMENT, especially the final adjudication at the Great White Throne, is so utterly distorted in Christendom, even by those who are most zealous in God's work, that we feel constrained to implore all who even refer to it to *beware, let they sully God's glory* and make Him as unjust as themselves. The mere fact that our translators have rendered *judge* as *damn* shows how far men were from God's thoughts in their day. Accordingly, they should have made Hebrews 10:30, "the Lord shall damn His people." God's great assize, in which He prepares His rebellious creatures for their reconciliation to Himself by a revelation of His righteousness and their unrighteousness, has been altered into the most futile and fiendish display of divine injustice and cruelty and hate, such as will eclipse the most malignant acts of man or demon or the adversary himself.

In this number we seek to set forth the truth as to judgment at some length, and hope it will help the saints to see that the throne of judgment is *white*, not *black*, nor even *grey*. Moreover, may they discover that it is a preparation of all the condemned for *reconciliation*, not damnation. Above all, may it be clear that men will be set right in their relationship to *God* primarily. This will vitally affect their relations to their fellow men. "The Fate of Infants," and "The Function of the Great White Throne," will appear in our next volume.

SUBJECTS OF RADIO BROADCASTS AND SONGS

Sunday afternoons, 3:30 to 4 o'clock beginning October 17th over station WOL, 1260 kc, conducted by Brother and Mrs. Adlai Loudy.

Theme Song, 1 Minute: How Firm A Foundation.

Song, duet: Be Still and Know.

1. The Messiah to Israel, according to the Prophets.
Song, solo: The Heart that was Broken for Me.
Song, duet: His Love is Wonderful to Me.
2. The Distinctions Between "the Bride of the Lamb" and "the Body of Christ."
Song, solo: Reigning with Christ.
Song, duet: 'Neath the Old Olive Trees.
3. "Thy Kingdom" Is To "Come" and is Not a Time or Place to Go.
Song, solo: 'Tis Jesus.
Song, solo: One Day.
4. The Gospel of Our Salvation.
Song, duet: Our Glorious Salvation.
Song, duet: Over in Glory.
5. The Celestial Destiny of the Church.
Song, solo: Heaven.
Song, duet: It's In My Heart.
6. Modern Christianity Not the Solution of this World's Problems.
Song, solo: His Grace.
Song, duet: My Only Hope.
7. The False Messiah — Antichrist — Must Come First Deceiving the World.
Song, solo: Christ Jesus Is Coming Again.
Song, duet: The Lining of Silver.
8. The Judgment of the Nations according to their Treatment of the Jews.
Song, solo: There's a Rainbow Shining.
Song, duet: Back of the Clouds.
9. The Terrestrial Destiny of Israel.
Song, solo: Christ is Counting on You.
Song, duet: Resting in His Love.
10. The Five Eons of God's Purpose and Where We are Today.
Song, solo: The Land where the Roses Never Fade.
Song, duet: God's Way.
11. God's Administrations with Man.
Song, solo: 'Twill Not Be Long.
Song, Duet: Where My Dreams Come True.
12. Universal Reconciliation.
Song, solo: Where the Years shall be Counted No More.
Song, solo: At the End of The Road.
13. Why We Need a Concordant Version of the Bible.
Song, duet: Where They Never Say Good-Bye.

Transcriptions of the above broadcasts are available at cost price, \$10.00 for each set for the half hour plus expressage, for any of our friends who might wish to put them on over a local station. Mimeographed copies of the talks will also be furnished with the sets. No announcements are included, as these are to be made up locally, with announcements of meetings, etc., as required. An announcement in your local newspaper may help in directing attention to this series.

SAVIOUR OF ALL

A radio broadcast presented by Brother Joseph E. Kirk each Sunday at 6:30 p.m. over KMTR, Hollywood, California. He is presenting the truth of reconciliation, along with many other truths not usually heard over the radio, in a fearless yet Christlike way. We are sure that our readers in Southern California will want to listen regularly.

CASH FOR EARLY ISSUES

There is a constant demand for early issues of Unsearchable Riches, and we are in need of the following numbers: Vol. I, numbers 3 and 6; vol. II, numbers 1, 2, 3; vol. III, numbers 2 and 3; vol. IV, numbers 1 and 3, and vol. V, number 3. Any one having any of these numbers can extend their subscription with them, or we will pay 25 cents each, cash, for any you may have. Volume I, number 6, is especially wanted. If you have any that are not in use, you can help someone else by sending them to us, so that we can place them where they will be used.

AVOID THE CHRISTMAS RUSH

May we suggest to our friends that they send in their renewals and orders soon, so as to keep the post office from being overloaded during the holidays? Otherwise wait until after New Year, when the peak is past.

WALL TEXTS

A few more sets of our Concordant texts as advertised on the cover are still available at \$1.00 a set. We also have in stock some Concordant texts as follows, which we will supply at two cents each: Romans 11:32, Romans 5:18, Romans 4:8, 1 Timothy 2:3-4; at ten cents each, Romans 11:35, Philipians 2:9-11. The first four listed are in a size suitable to enclose with Christmas cards. We also have a few texts with cactus wood frames, at various prices. Details will be gladly furnished to anyone interested. Also bundles of about 20 mixed texts, including the first four above, and others, may be had at twenty-five cents.

TIME TO RENEW

A large proportion of our subscriptions run with the calendar year, so your subscription is probably expiring with this issue. We do not have office help available to send individual notices, so this reminder constitutes the only notice you will receive.

THE INTERNATIONAL EDITION

The delay in the issue of the new edition of the Concordant Version is due largely to matters beyond our control. We would like to be able to assure our friends, especially those who have ordered copies, that there will be no more waiting, but conditions in the business world are such that it is growing increasingly difficult to procure materials or labor. Even the Complete Edition was out of stock for sometime. The work of correcting the new edition is slowly proceeding, and should be finished before long. As soon as we are reasonably certain when the books will be ready we will announce it in the magazine.

THE COMPLETE EDITION

Orders for the Complete Edition of the Version should be sent in well in advance, as the binder has difficulty in securing materials, and is short of help. This is especially the case with holiday presents. We would not like to disappoint our friends at such a time.

CHART AND PAMPHLET

Scriptural Chart, "God's Purpose of the Eons," 11x32 inches: black and white prints, 75c, blue line prints, 50c, blue prints, 40c. Pamphlet, "God's Perfect Plan," 2 for 5c, 50 for \$1.00. Order from Evangel Publishers, 412 Pueblo Street, Boise, Idaho.

HUMAN NATURE NOT SINFUL

Nature, or instinct, and conscience are in accord with God, but this is contradicted in the common translation. This pamphlet gives the evidence in the original. Ten cents.

TIMELY TRACTS

WHY DOESN'T GOD STOP THIS WAR, and WAR—WHO WANTS IT? are the titles of two tracts on this vital subject, which are now available in addition to the four we already had. These are sent free of charge to anyone who wishes to distribute them. Let us know how many you can use.

CHRIST'S RELATION TO GOD is so obscure in the minds of most believers, that we are reprinting the above article as a ten-cent pamphlet, and hope to follow with CHRIST COMPARED WITH DEITY. These truths greatly glorify God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and should be studied by all who love them.

1717 Stevens Ave., Minneapolis 4, Minn.
October 4, 1943

Dear Friends and Readers of Unsearchable Riches:

Greetings and much love in the Lord!

It has been some time now since you last heard from us, and some of you, no doubt, wonder what has become of the China missionaries. Since we left Chicago last February, we have spent most of our time in Minnesota, and have made our home in Fosston, where I was born. We have also visited parts of North and South Dakota, and in every place we have endeavored to make known the fulness of God's saving grace, and to dispense the truth which God so graciously has revealed unto us in the Sacred Scriptures, especially in the epistles of Paul. In many places the messages have been accepted with heartfelt rejoicing, but in other places again, we have met with opposition, as is to be expected in this time of unbelief and falling away.

We have also been much gladdened in our so-called "deputation work," reporting the activities and steady progress of the work in China, where we spent about thirty years. It is said of Paul and Barnabas that, on their journeys back in their homeland, they were detailing the conversion or the turning about of the nations where they had been ministering, and they informed the ecclesias and the elders of what God had done for them, and it caused great joy to all the brethren. We have not heard directly from our work in China, but we keep in touch with the different missions and get papers and letters with a certain amount of information from free China. And we understand that God is mightily working in that land, and many are turning to the Lord and sincerely seeking for the way of life. Great numbers of Bibles and portions of the Sacred Scriptures are continually being distributed. Terrible famines are raging in various parts of the country, especially in our adjoining Province of Honan, where, according to some reports, 40,000 were dying daily. Food is so scarce that even tree leaves and bark is not freely obtainable, even human flesh is being sold and eaten by the hungry throngs, and rice is selling for U. S. \$1.50 a pound. How grateful we, who live in a land of plenty, ought to be! We have been in three great famines over there ourselves, and were engaged in relief work, and we have learned from experience that God makes use of all these means to awaken and bring lost humanity to Himself.

The Swedish ship, the MS "Gripsholm" that brought us and other repatriates home last year, has again sailed for the Orient, and is expected back in December with about fifteen hundred American civilian internees. We think that some of our missionary neighbors will be among this number, and we may get some direct report from our people and work in Kaoyi. If we live, God willing, we still hope to go back to our adopted land at the conclusion of this war. We are happy to say that all our daily necessities have been met, and even our fare from the Orient has been paid back to our government. And we are very grateful to all who have participated in making this possible.

Your missionaries in the service for Christ and China,

LAVINIA AND ABRAHAM HEIDAL

GOD AND THE GOLDEN IMAGE

3. In the 'eighteenth year' of Nebuchadnezzar, the king, he made an image of gold, sixty cubits in height, six cubits in breadth. He set it up in Dura valley, in the province of Babylon. ²And Nebuchadnezzar, the king, sends to collect the satraps, the prefects, and the viceroys, the noble hieromancers, the governors, the magistrates, the lawyers, and all the authorities of the provinces, to arrive for the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar, the king, sets up. ³ Then the satraps, the prefects, and the viceroys, the noble hieromancers, the governors, the magistrates, the lawyers, and all the authorities of the provinces are collected for the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar, the king, sets up. And they rise in view of the image that Nebuchadnezzar sets up.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR seems to have succeeded in bringing the whole earth into *political* unity under his absolute rule, but he had failed to force the people under him to *worship* his gods. According to his viewpoint, this was a lack which should be remedied. Religious differences may result in much friction and even rebellion in a realm which consists largely of subjugated peoples. So it seemed expedient to establish one state religion to which all must bow and to enforce it through the officers of his government.

The previous chapter dealt with the *political supremacy* of the nations, but this one is concerned with their *religious subordination*. Nebuchadnezzar was *not* given the *religious* supremacy, neither is this delegated to the nations during this era. Church and state should be united in an ideal government, yet the nations are not intended to play this role, but rather to show *the failure of every form of rule which is NOT under the direct control of the Deity*. So the lesson of the image in the first case is to illustrate the rule of the nations, and in the

second to show that this rule does *not* include the sphere of worship. The question of a state church is really settled in this chapter. Nebuchadnezzar had to give it up. Since then, whenever the state controlled religion or religious dignitaries the state, the result has usually been a fiery furnace for those who dissent. So it is today, even in those countries that claim religious freedom. In emergencies the state is inclined to enter a realm which has not been given it by God.

The tendency to rule in the sphere of religion has caused a great deal of persecution and suffering. A goodly proportion of the pioneers who left Europe and settled in North America did so under the lash of governments which had exceeded their jurisdiction in this regard. There is a counter movement in the world today for freedom of religion, but, alas, under the stress of the times, believers are called upon to suffer more than ever, especially where there is conscription. In the era of the end, particularly during the last half of the seventieth heptad, the head of the nations will once more set up an image and seek to enforce its worship by means of the most dreadful methods yet devised. Then will come that real affliction of the sons of Israel, of which the fiery furnace was but a lurid preview.

We are distinctly disappointed in Nebuchadnezzar, however, in his choice of a god. Had he not acknowledged that Daniel's God is a God of gods and a Lord of kings? This seemed to make a powerful impression on him at the time, but, alas, it evidently was not permanent. Practical considerations may have had an influence on his decision also. To take any god of a conquered nation and make its worship universal would meet with grave difficulties. It would disgrace the gods of Babylon and meet with serious opposition from all the other peoples. So he seems to have set up an entirely new deity for which there does not appear to be a name. He makes his own god. To quell all opposition before it could manifest

itself, he provided it with a "hell," or flaming furnace.

The use of the word "image" in the previous chapter of a man naturally leads us to think of Nebuchadnezzar's image as one of a man also, perhaps of himself. But the proportions given, one to ten, are not those of a man. Pictures usually seek to remedy this by putting the statue on a short pedestal. But even then it does not agree with the text. A normal man is about *four* times his average width. The image was more than twice as high as this. How tall and slim this is can be illustrated if we lay *both* the middle fingers of our hands together, end to end. The cubit was probably about the distance from the elbow to the end of the middle finger, let us say a foot and a half. Then the image was about nine feet wide and ninety feet high. The figure six reminds us of humanity and its highest attainments, always short of seven, which denotes perfection. The number of mankind is 666 (Rev. 13:18).

The name *Dura* seems to come from the stem *dr*, or *dur*, BE-ABOUT. It has been identified by some with the modern *Duair*, about a dozen miles to the south and east of Babylon. It is not likely that it was a *plain*. The Syriac *bqoa* occurs only here, but the Hebrew is translated *valley* twelve times and only seven times *plain*. The stem denotes REND, as, a wind tempestuous shall *rend* it (Eze. 13:11), and it is used of the *valley* of Megiddo (2 Chron. 35:22, Zech. 12:11), and of the *circular plain* of the *valley* of Jericho (Deut. 34:3). All this suggests that the image was set up in a valley, perhaps a small one, but with sufficient slope on the sides to make a partial amphitheater, so that all could see. This would be better than any plain for the purpose.

The titles of those assembled to worship Nebuchadnezzar's image seem to comprehend all the government officials, from the top to the bottom. Commentaries change every one of the Authorized Version renderings. We will briefly give the facts which show why a change

is necessary, as well as those which support our choice. The CONCORDANT VERSION titles are the result of a canvas of *all* of those found in the Hebrew and Syriac Scriptures, so that no title is used for more than one in the original. Each one is exclusive. This is what enables us to distinguish between them and helps us to find the nearest English equivalent.

As the Authorized Version uses *prince* for ten different titles in the original, it will be seen that a concordant version, which is allowed only one, is forced to refuse this rendering in most of the places where they have used it. On the other hand, once we have settled on *nshia* as the word to be rendered *prince*, and are confirmed in this by the frequency with which the Authorized Version does the same, we are compelled to reject their other renderings, such as *captain*, *chief*, *governor*, and *ruler*. Few of its readers have any inkling of the utterly needless and confusing inconsistency in the renderings of the Authorized Version. They are probably due to a plurality of translators, working independently, without any system at a time when tools for exactitude, such as concordances, were not yet made.

The word in Daniel, however, is not *prince* (*nshia*), but *achshdrphnia*, SATRAPS, a title that occurs only in Daniel, Ezra, and Esther. One of these was over each province (6:1), so they were the highest officials apart from the central government, being next to the ministers that conducted the business of the empire. Daniel was no satrap. He was above them. That may be the reason why he was not commanded to appear at this gathering. He was too high in rank. The Septuagint and the Vulgate usually render this word *satrap*, which is probably a shortened form of the Syriac title. It has passed over into English, so it seems best, by far, to retain it in our version.

The next title, *prefect* (A. V., *governor*) we have already discussed in connection with the elevation of

Daniel to be grand prefect over all the wise men of Babylon (2:48).

The Authorized Version *captains* we make *viceroy*s. *Captains*, in the Authorized Version, does duty for at least a dozen titles in the original, among which is *phche*, VICEROY, or representative of the king. Zerubbabel is a good example (Haggai 1:1, 14, 2:2, 21). The modern title *pasha* probably comes from this, but it has now become more of an honorary title, affixed to the names of men of high rank.

Judge is the translation of six Hebrew terms, only one of which (*shpht*) should be *judge*. The others are *adjudicator*, *corrector*, *mediator*, *arbiter*, and *noble hieromancer* (*adrgzria*), the title used in Daniel 2:2, 3 only. This long word seems to be compounded of *adr*, NOBLE, and *gxr*, *sever* or *heiromancer*, which the Authorized Version translates *soothsayer* in Daniel 2:27, a diviner who based his predictions on the appearance of a sacrifice.

The Authorized Version *treasurer* seems to be based on the assumption that the Syriac *gdbr* is the same as the Hebrew *gzbr*. This would be possible, but its probability is reduced by the fact that *gzbr* occurs in Syriac (Ezra 7:21) as well as Hebrew. Besides, the Greek and Latin translations do not seem to have any name of this kind at all. They have LEADER, or *governor*, probably. As this title may be compounded of *gd*, LEAD, or *govern*, and *br*, SON, it may be the equivalent of the Hebrew *ngd*, *governor*, literally *son of governing*, according to the idiom of the East.

Council in Syriac is *ota*, as in Daniel 2:14. Hence *dthbr* is not likely to be the title for counsellor. Rather, being compounded of *dth*, EDICT (2:9, *decree*), and *br*, SON, *son of an edict*, or a *magistrate*.

Ruler is a title which the Authorized Version gives to eleven distinct kinds of men. It is not likely that the *rulers* of the provinces would be placed last on this list.

Indeed, the *satraps*, who head the list, are the rulers of provinces. This seems to represent a comprehensive class, all who have any sort of *authority* in the provinces.

It seems that here we have a gathering of the entire executive staff of the empire except a few of the very highest officials at Babylon. This new god is to have the full support of the whole machinery of the government. It is to be the state religion, not only of Babylon, but of the whole world, which is subject to it, no matter what may be their inherited form of worship. It was the most ambitious scheme to convert the world ever conceived, and would have changed the whole course of history, had it been enforced. Not until the time of the end will there be anything to compare with it. Then, again, an image will be set up, and worship will be compulsory. And then, again, there will be a few among the sons of Israel who will endure the fiery furnace, and come forth unscathed, to the glory of God.

COMPULSORY WORSHIP

⁴And a herald calls valorously: "To you is it said, O peoples, clans, and languages! ⁵In the period that you are hearing the sound of the horn, the pipe, the lyre, the sambuke, the psaltery, in concert, and all sorts of music, you shall fall and worship the golden image that king Nebuchadnezzar sets up. ⁶And whoever shall not fall and worship, in that hour shall he be heaved into the midst of the glowing, flaming furnace."

⁷Wherefore, at the stated time, as all the people hear the sound of the horn, the pipe, the lyre, the sambuke, the psaltery, and all sorts of music, all the peoples, the clans, and languages fall to worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar, the king, sets up.

What a one-sided evangel is heralded here! Not a single promise to the obedient, yet a terrible punishment to the disobedient! Even if he is of gold, he seems to be a very unjust and stingy god. Yet that is man's way. God attracts by His gifts. Man compels by dire threats. Alas, this spirit has done much to destroy the power and attractiveness of the true evangel, as it is preached in our pulpits today. Let us beware lest our gracious God

be dragged down to the level of a golden image which must be worshiped under penalty of an "eternal hell." What is such worship worth? Our God loves and He seeks a response from the hearts of His creatures. He wins them by His grace.

Mankind may be classified in a variety of ways. As to *descent* they are usually called *people*. As to *government* they may be *clans*. As to *speech* they are grouped by *language*. In the era of the end the wild beast is given authority over all mankind looked at under almost identical divisions. Every *tribe* and *people* and *language* and *nation* will be forced to worship it (Rev. 13:7).

The principal instruments of Nebuchadnezzar's orchestra seem to fall into two classes, wind instruments, the horn and pipe, and stringed instruments, the lyre, sambuke, and psaltery. Except for the variety which we have today, and the lack of percussion instruments, there was no great difference between the sound made by Nebuchadnezzar's orchestra and a modern one. It was more than a mere signal. The psychologists of that day knew the value of music in stirring the people and rousing their souls. It is used for this same purpose in our churches today. To some an organ is almost indispensable in the worship of God. But it should always be joined with sense. Sound is not enough. Psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs should harmonize soul and spirit.

It is not likely that the ancient *horn* was as elaborate as a modern *cornet*, so we choose the simpler name, which leaves the exact shape undetermined. The word here (*qrn*) is the same as that used for the horns of animals elsewhere in Daniel. English idiom agrees with Syriac in using the same name for both.

The *sackbut* is a *wind* instrument like a trombone, whereas the ancient *sambuke* was a *stringed* instrument. The Greek and Latin versions both copy the word (*sbka*) with a slight change, as we do in English. Luther made it *geige* (*violin*).

What a difference between the secular and religious penalties imposed by Nebuchadnezzar! He captured and deported those who opposed his political power. But those who would not bow down to the image, even though they might be his trusted servants or friends, were doomed to a far worse fate. Like the god of Christendom, he kept a special fire burning in order to torture them to death. Religion is far more vicious and malicious than politics.

The saints today are in much the same dilemma as Daniel's three companions. We are bound to be subject to the superior authorities (Rom. 13:1). But that need not produce any special hardship. But if we refuse to bow down and submit to the orthodox god, to the creeds and confessions, to the accepted evangelical interpretation, and are true to God's revelation, we will soon find ourselves heaved into the fire of unprincipled persecution, misrepresented and maligned, even as the Pharisees and priests misused our Lord before us. But we are not alone! The presence of Another is all we need to preserve us in peace and safety, in the midst of the flaming fires of malice and hatred.

Human worship is soulish. It appeals to the senses. The divine method is to use the senses to reach the spirit. The sights and sounds and scents in His dwelling place were symbols of intangible spiritual values. The tunes to which the psalms were sung, even the instruments used to accompany them have not been made a part of God's revelation. But the *words* have preserved for us the spiritual contents of their worship. Very different are the scenes and sounds at the dedication of the golden image. We have a long list of the instruments of music, but not a syllable that might reach our spirits. It may be that the image stood for some immaterial reality. If so, we may be sure that it was soulish, rather than spiritual.

Nebuchadnezzar seems to have assembled a symphony orchestra for the occasion with all the musical instruments available. What the Authorized Version renders *dulcimer* is the Aramaic *sumphnie*. The Latin Vulgate makes it *symphoniæ*. The Greek omits it altogether. This leads us to think that it was no added instrument, but states that these were a symphony, that they were played together, *in concert*. Our word symphony comes from the Greek *sun*, TOGETHER, and *phōnê*, SOUND. It seems to have been adopted by the Chaldees at an early period to denote concert playing of musical instruments.

THE JEWS ACCUSED

⁸ Wherefore, at the stated time, masters of the Chaldeans draw near and accuse the Jews. ⁹ They answer and say to king Nebuchadnezzar, "O king, live for the eon! ¹⁰ You, O king, promulgate a decree that every mortal that is hearing the sound of the horn, the pipe, the lyre, the sambuke, the psaltery, in concert, and all sorts of music, shall fall and worship the golden image, ¹¹ and whoever shall not fall and worship the golden image shall be heaved into the midst of the glowing, flaming furnace. ¹² Forsooth, there are masters of the Jews that you assign over the service of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, yet these masters place no weight on your decree, O king, serving not your gods, and the golden image that you set up they do not worship."

God had given Nebuchadnezzar *political* power over all the earth, but He had *not* transferred to him the *religious* rule. Daniel's companions were subject to him in all secular matters, but they had not eaten of food which had been offered to idols. Their hearts were set to obey the law of Jehovah under all circumstances. Now they are faced with a far more severe test. The very first precept in the law disallowed any god other than Jehovah (Ex. 20:3). To worship the golden image would have cut them off from their own people and their promises, and put them under the curse of the law. Yet if they did not worship there was nothing else for them but the flaming fire.

Jehovah, through the prophet Jeremiah, clearly defined the scope of Nebuchadnezzar's jurisdiction and instructed His people to bow to his authority. He said,

I made the earth and the man and beast which is on the surface of the earth

By My great vigor and outstretched arm,

I give it to him who is right in my eyes

And now I give all these lands into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, My servant,

And even the animals of the field do I give him to serve him,

And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son.

And Judah's king, particularly, is exhorted to acknowledge the supremacy of Nebuchadnezzar.

Put your necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon,
And serve him and his people, and live.

Why will you die, you and your people,

By the sword and the famine and the plague.

According as Jehovah speaks to the nations

Which will not serve the king of Babylon.

Notwithstanding the false prophets, who sought to keep the people from serving the king of Babylon, it seems that the deportation heeded the words of Jeremiah and bowed to God's decree and served the foreign ruler faithfully.

The fact that Nebuchadnezzar and the rest of the kingdoms comprising the metallic image were *not* accorded the sacerdotal supremacy, is vital to an understanding of the present era of the nations, and it is a great aid in grasping the further revelations in this prophecy. The religious rule of the earth has not coincided with the political. Manifold attempts have been made to unite the two, not only by means of state religions, but by the spiritual usurping the temporal authority. The popes of Rome have a double kingdom. They exercise the civil authority in Vatican city. They hold a tremendous power over the political lives of their adherents who are nominally subject to other rulers. So with the heads of the remaining religious bodies.

When Daniel does deal with the religious sovereignty of the earth as recorded in the seventh chapter, Nebuchadnezzar is not mentioned. Indeed this vision was not given until the golden head of the image had been removed from the scene.

But these Chaldees are crafty. They know how little there is of god in this new religion. So they do not present the disobedience of the Jews as a sin against the *god*, but as an offense against the *king*. After the hypocritical salute, "O king, live for the eon!" they begin with an emphatic *you*. "*You*, O king, promulgate a decree . . ." Moreover, they remind him that these Jews not only do not worship the golden image, but never have worshiped his gods.

Man's inhumanity to man is most flagrant in the sphere of religion. It seems that the Jews quietly refrained from worshiping. Knowing the terrible penalty, everyone with the least spark of kindness would have let the matter rest. Especially the Chaldees, whose lives and property had been saved by the intervention of these very Jews, along with Daniel, had cause to shield them from harm. But alas! instead of being thankful they are jealous of the prominence which these Jews had attained in the province of Babylon and wanted to get rid of them. Now they had a marvelous opportunity of venting their spite, under cover of religious zeal. Religion is the best cloak that evil ever had. It makes sin invisible and even glorious.

The Authorized Version rendering "*certain Jews*" seems strange. Elsewhere they have made it *men*—nine times in this very chapter. They call the Chaldeans *certain* also. This stem, *gbr*, MASTER or mighty, presents a trying problem to the translator. The fact that the verb is rendered *confirm*, *exceed*, *great*, *be mighty*, *prevail*, *be strong*, *be valiant*, and never merely *be man*, in the Authorized Version, shows that it means more than a mere *man*, as it is usually translated. We seek to render

it MASTER, when possible. The Chaldeans and the three Jews were mighty men in Babylon. It is to be regretted that the Revisers retained the *certain*, which has no warrant at all.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR CHAMPIONS HIS GOD

¹³ Then Nebuchadnezzar, disturbed and furious, says to bring hither Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego. Then they bring hither these masters before the king. ¹⁴ Nebuchadnezzar answers and says to them, "Is it intentional, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, that you, forsooth, are not serving my gods; and the golden image that I set up you are not worshipping?" ¹⁵ Now should you, forsooth, be ready in the period that you are hearing the sound of the horn, the pipe, the lyre, the sambuke, the psaltery, in concert, and all sorts of music, you shall fall down and worship the 'golden' image which I made. And should you not worship, in that hour shall you be heaved into the midst of the glowing, flaming furnace. And who is the god that will deliver you out of my hands?"

At hearing of this slight against *himself*, Nebuchadnezzar's pride is touched. He does not inquire whether the accusation is *true*, as the Authorized Version says, but whether it is *intentional* (*tzda*, not *amn*). This solves the difficulty which necessitates both the Authorized Version and Revision to add the word *well*, in order to complete the sense in the next sentence. Nebuchadnezzar favors them to the extent of overlooking their past offenses. If they are ready *now*, all they need to do is to worship the image. If they are ready to worship, all will be well. If not, Nebuchadnezzar does not turn them over to the vengeance of his new god. He has much more confidence in himself in such a matter, so takes vengeance in his own hand instead of leaving it to this untried deity.

This comes out in his question. "Who is the god that will deliver you out of *my* hand?" The real test is not between the golden god of Dura and Jehovah, but between Nebuchadnezzar and the God of Israel. It was a necessary and important lesson for him to learn at this time. He must be taught that the authority given to him is exclusively political and must not be extended to

the sphere of worship. It is a lesson for us today. The eras of the nations, in which we also live, do not combine church and state. The authority delegated to the state is from God, but the tyranny usurped by the church, whether united to the secular power or not, can never be. It is time that Nebuchadnezzar and his successors in the eras of the nations be taught this important lesson.

THE COURAGEOUS REPLY

¹⁶ Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego answer and say to king Nebuchadnezzar, "Unnecessary is it for us to reply to you concerning this rescript, ¹⁷ should it, forsooth, be that our God 'in the heavens,' whom *we* serve, is able to deliver us from the glowing, flaming furnace. And from your hand, O king, will He deliver us. ¹⁸ And should He not, be it known to you, O king, that your gods, forsooth, we will not serve, and the golden image you set up we will not worship."

Who is the Deliverer? That needs no reply in case Jehovah delivers them from the flaming furnace. But He will do more than that. He will also deliver from the hands of the king. Yet it is not always in accord with God's purpose that He deliver His people. He had already refused to deliver the Jews from the political power of Nebuchadnezzar, so that they were kept from worshiping in their temple. Some of the faithful did not anticipate deliverance, that they may be happening upon a better resurrection (Heb. 11:35). Deliverance or no deliverance, they gloriously defy the king, and absolutely refuse to serve his gods or worship the image of gold. In the era of the end they will have many followers who refuse to worship the image of the wild beast. Yet many of the sons of Israel in that day, as at present, make gold their god. Greed is idolatry (Col. 3:5), and this will be their golden image also.

¹⁹ Then Nebuchadnezzar is filled with fury, and the cast of his visage is altered against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. He answers and says to heat the furnace seven units over that he perceives it to be heated. ²⁰ And to the mightiest of the mighty ones of valor that are in his army he says to truss up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, to heave them into the glowing, flaming furnace. ²¹ Then these masters are

trussed up in their mantles, their turbans, and their boots, and their clothing, and heaved into the midst of the glowing, flaming furnace.

²² Wherefore, because the king's matter is urgent, and the furnace is heated excessively, the mighty men who hoist Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego are despatched by the flare of the flame. ²³ And these three masters, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, fall trussed up into the midst of the glowing, flaming furnace, and they were walking in the midst of the flame, singing hymns to God and blessing Jehovah.^o

A despot defied is dangerous. It would seem that Nebuchadnezzar had been kindly disposed to the Jewish youths, probably because of their connection with Daniel's interpretation of his dream. He did not realize that he had transgressed the boundary of the authority which it conferred. But he did feel that his honor was at stake, and that he must, by all means, assert his authority or lose face. How could anyone defy him in this fashion! He would show them and the world what happens to such rebels! So he has the furnace heated hotter than it was, and has his mightiest soldiers truss up the three men and heave them into the fire. But a sudden flare of the flames deals out to them the fate reserved for the offending Jews. This left no doubt as to the force of the fire, and the miraculous preservation of the Jews.

The Septuagint does not tell us of the fate of those who came near enough to the furnace to heave the offending Jews into the flame. But it adds a few touches concerning the faithful youths that will appeal to many of us. They walk about in the furnace and sing hymns and bless their Deliverer. Some such action is implied by Nebuchadnezzar's response. The Authorized Version seems to say that he was astonished that they fell down into the flames. Later, however, he himself says that he saw them walking. It seems likely that the Septuagint has preserved for us a part of the text which we would not care to miss. How good it is to know their feelings as they expressed them in word and song! Is not this the fruit of all deliverance? Indeed, is it not the object of the trial which led to the deliverance?

THE MIRACULOUS DELIVERANCE

²⁴ Then king Nebuchadnezzar marks it, 'and marvels,' and rises in a flurry. He answers and says to his retinue, "Heaved we not three masters trussed up into the midst of the flame?"

They answer and say to the king, "Certainly, O king!"

²⁵ "The king" answers and says, "Aye! I perceive four masters, untied, walking in the midst of the flame, and, forsooth, they have no harm. And the appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods."

²⁶ Then Nebuchadnezzar draws near to the door of the glowing, flaming furnace, and he answers and says, "Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, servants of the Supreme God, go forth and come hither." Then Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego go forth from the midst of the flame

²⁷ And the satraps, prefects, and viceroys, and the king's retinue, collecting, perceive these masters, that the flame had no power over their bodies, and no hair of their heads is singed, and their mantles are not altered, and the smell of flame has not passed on them.

Nebuchadnezzar could deal out *death*—at least to his own men—but God is the Giver and Preserver of *life*. Great as was the sensation caused by the death of the soldiers, this was immediately eclipsed by the miraculous preservation of the worshipers of Jehovah. And even that was not so striking as the appearance of a fourth figure in the flames, having an appearance like a "son of the gods," or, the "Son of God." It may be read either way, but the first is far more likely from the lips of Nebuchadnezzar in speaking to his retinue

At first the king doubts the evidence of his own senses. So he seeks confirmation from those about him, who had witnessed the proceedings as well as he. He had no need of *counsel* as to this matter, as is suggested by the usual rendering, *counsellors*. A Greek version makes it *mégistasin*, *great ones*, and *dunastai*, *potentates* (in verse 27), and the Latin version uses similar expressions. The word here used may be derived from the stems *ed*, *OBTRUDE*, and [*d*] *br*, *SPEAK*, that is, those who could obtrude themselves into the presence of the king and speak with him. For lack of a better term, we have used *retinue*, for it is more than likely that the king's entour-

age would be with him on such an occasion as this, and that he should appeal to them because of what they had seen as eye-witnesses with him.

Such an exhibition of God's power would scarcely be believed unless there were more than one witness. Therefore many are provided, and these have great influence with the king. To his first question they answer with an emphatic affirmative. Some versions say *yes*, others *true*, but the expression is stronger than these. There could be no doubt, so they reply, *certainly!* Re-assured and encouraged, the king proceeds to recite what he sees. In the midst of a fierce flame, that would utterly destroy all ordinary mortals, walk the three Jews, accompanied by a fourth. They show no signs of any harm. Their bonds, indeed, have burned, but nothing else. Such are the blessed effects of affliction on God's beloved saints. Not they, but their bonds, are destroyed.

"Who is the god that will deliver you out of my hands?" Such was Nebuchadnezzar's proud defiance of the God of Israel. Now he answers his own question. The *Supreme* God has delivered His servants! The king is not slow to see that he is in the presence of One Who is unutterably greater than his god of gold, or even himself, for the image seems to have been under his protection. But no man can withstand such evidence as this, and, under like circumstances, all would acknowledge God's supremacy. This shows how easily the Deity could convince His creatures of His power and presence, if He chose to do so. And, in due time, it will suit his purpose to become All in *all*. Meanwhile He has begun a work in Nebuchadnezzar which is only superficial as yet, for the king's pride has not been abased.

First, Nebuchadnezzar "repents." He recalls his declaration that they be despatched by the fiery flame for the very good reason that he finds himself unable to carry out his will. So he seeks to save face to some extent by reversing his own decree. He commands them

to go forth from the fire and come to him. As it was clearly God's will that they should be subject in civil affairs, it being an era of the nations, they were obliged to obey.

All of those present were not only astonished but incredulous, so that the higher officials of the kingdom and the king's retinue gathered about the three Jews to see what effect the flames had had upon them. In four particulars, each of them more incredible than the foregoing, they *perceived*, with nose as well as eyes, that not the slightest evidence of burning clung to them. Ordinarily it is only necessary to go near such a fire, and the smell of burning will be present. The material of which mantles are made usually would make them very inflammable. The hair singes readily. The human body may stand more heat than these, but nothing like the superheated furnace. It should have been burned to a crisp. They are convinced.

NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DECREE

²⁸ Nebuchadnezzar, 'the king,' responds and says, "Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, Who sent His messenger and delivered His servants who relied on Him, and they altered the king's declaration, and they granted their bodies 'to the fire,' that they shall not serve, neither worship any god, only their God. ²⁹And by me is promulgated a decree that every people, clan, and language, that says aught carelessly against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego shall be dismembered and their houses shall be the equivalent of a confiscation, forasmuch as their is, foorsooth, no other God Who is able to rescue thus."

³⁰ Then the king prospers Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the province of Babylon. 'And he promotes them and deems them worthy to govern all the Jews who are in his kingdom.'

Humiliation and blessing go hand in hand. Most men would consider Nebuchadnezzar's exaltation to be the head of gold, the supreme monarch of the world, as the height of blessedness. Not so. His real blessing begins when he humbles himself under the Supreme. His degradation to the sphere of the animals will be found his most valuable experience. God begins to bring him

down in the valley of Dura. There the servants of the Supreme defy him and make him retract his declaration. But, alas! he does it in such a high-handed way, by threatening all who speak carelessly of the Supreme (of which he himself was guilty) that it is evident that his pride is not laid low as yet.

But let us not minimize the revolution wrought in the king's mind. From blind defiance he is converted to intelligent blessing. He is not yet ready to accept the God of these Jews as *his* God, but he will not allow Him to be slighted in his kingdom. He still refers to Him as the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, on whom His servants relied and were delivered. He begins to realize that, in the religious sphere, God has *not* granted him the same supremacy as in the political. So his decree is negative only. No one is compelled to worship the Supreme. But there is liberty to worship Him, and this was doubtless an inestimable boon to the deportation throughout the world.

The immediate object of the Adversary doubtless was to destroy the worship of Jehovah and cause it to cease in the empire of Nebuchadnezzar. Had the king not reversed his decree, all of the faithful would have perished in the fiery furnace, and all of the rest would have been silenced. Except among a few fugitives, perhaps, the name and fame of Jehovah would have been banished from the earth. The result was the very reverse. Not only does the government demand respect for the God of the Jews, but, in the province of Babylon, they are placed under a special government bureau, composed of the triumphant trio who had passed through the flames for their faithfulness. Satan overreached himself. He turned the government in their favor, rather than against them.

At first it did not seem so. There must have been much trembling among the worshipers of Jehovah when the king's decree was promulgated. The outlook was

very dark. So it may seem to us today when a government demands that a believer do that which seems contrary to his faith and his spiritual instincts. Many a mother's heart is aching while these lines are being written, because it seems that her son may be forced to deeds of violence against which her spirit revolts.

The sufferings of the sons of Israel, especially at the end of the eras of the nations, when their fiercest affliction will threaten to destroy them, even as the fiery furnace did Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, will lead to such prosperity and peace as they have never known. Perhaps we may look upon the prosperity of these three faithful servants of Jehovah as a picture of that future day, when the prophets receive their wages and all who fear God and serve Him will get their just deserts in the world kingdom of the Messiah.

A. E. K.

JEHOVAH AN IMPREGNABLE RETREAT

WE have often exulted in the thought that, in the day of Jehovah, not only shall man be abased, but Jehovah alone shall be *exalted* (Isa. 2:11). It was with regret that we found it impossible to translate thus in a concordant version. No one will blame us for not following the Authorized Version in every case when they learn that it renders five distinct Hebrew stems by *exalt*. These are *be lofty*, *lift up*, *ascend*, *be high*, and *be impregnable*. In a loose version they do not depart so very far from the sense in the first four. But they seem to have missed it in the last. How confused was the apprehension of the translators as to the word which we always make *impregnable* will be seen by their renderings: *defend*, *be exalted*, *be excellent*, *be high*, *set on high*, *lofty*, *be safe*, *set up*, *be too strong*. The passages where it is rendered *defend* (Psa. 20:1, the name of the God of Jacob *defend thee*; Psa. 59:1, *defend me* from them that rise

up), and *safe* (Prov. 18:10, a strong tower: . . . and *is safe*; Prov. 29:25, whoso putteth his trust in the Lord shall *be safe*), and *strong* (Deut. 2:36, not one city too *strong* for us), these show that there is more than *elevation* in its meaning. It includes safety and strength.

As there are four other words which amply cover the idea of *height*, it is most likely that the stem *shgb*, of which we write, belongs in with words concerned with *safety*, which will fit every passage and is necessary in some. The first occurrence (Deut. 2:36) gives us the key: not one city *too strong*. This suggests the fine English term *impregnable*. All the cities were conquered. In order to make a noun we will need to add a word, as *retreat*, in some cases. A strong tower, even if it is not high, may be an impregnable retreat (Prov. 18:10). In Job 30:22 the tentative Concordant Version reads: Behold, the Deity is impregnable in His *vigor*. Vigor does not exalt, but makes unconquerable. Not merely the *lofty* city, but the town *impregnable*, He is laying it low (Isa. 26:5).

When used of Jehovah or His name, the new rendering is most satisfying and in accord with its contexts: The only *impregnable retreat* is Jehovah in that day (Isa. 2:11, 17). Only those who are in His keeping will be safe when He rises to terrify the earth. The name of the God of Jacob is an *impregnable retreat* (Psa. 20:1). He will never be conquered, and all who trust Him are safe.

A. E. K.

ADVERTISE YOUR MEETINGS

WE HAVE AVAILABLE the tracts, "Is Everlasting Punishment a Truth of Scripture?" and "The Old Time Religion," with space on the back for advertising local meetings by means of a rubber stamp. We can supply the tracts at 25 cents per hundred, either in this form, or with the price list on the back. Although printing and paper costs are advancing, we are endeavoring to supply our literature and tracts at the established prices, and will continue to do so as long as possible.—E. O. K.

WHAT IS JUDGMENT?

IT IS A SAD COMMENTARY on the human race to find that the word "judgment" is so unstable and liable to deterioration. This must be because men are so unjust and vindictive themselves. The word has come to mean condemnation and punishment almost exclusively, when it ought to be neutral. How seldom is it used in a good sense among us! It will be worth a good deal of effort to restore its true meaning, if only to keep us from distorting it in connection with the great white throne. Let us note first what company it keeps in the Greek Scriptures.

The Pharisees were not slow to *condemn* others. Yet our Lord rebuked them for passing over *judgment* and the *love* of God. They neglected the reparatory side of judgment. The *poor* (Prov. 29:14, Psa. 72:4) they failed to judge, and the *fatherless* (Isa. 1:23, Psa. 10:18), that is, they did not protect them in their rights. Our Lord combined *judgment* with *mercy* and *faith*. These, the weightier matters of the law, they neglected. Such a "judgment" certainly did not mean punishment. Instead of so judging, the scribes devoured widows' houses, though they were swift to condemn those who did not keep the traditions (Mark 12:40).

Perhaps the best place to show that judgment is always *right*, is found in Abraham's appeal to the Lord, when He spoke of the state of Sodom. The Authorized Version reads, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do *right*?" (Gen. 19:25). I agree that they expressed the sense correctly, yet I deplore the fact that, in doing so, they passed up a notable opportunity of anchoring the

true meaning of the word *judgment* in our language. The Hebrew reads, "The Judge of the whole earth, is He not doing *judgment*?" It is clear that anything wrong would not be judgment in Abraham's eyes. If anyone in Sodom should suffer unjustly that would not be *judgment*, and would be wrong. *There is absolutely no injustice in divine judgment.* It is rather, *the righting of what is already wrong.*

THE CONDEMNATION OF ALL

About a dozen times the Authorized Version renders the word *judgment* *condemnation* or *damnation*, and half as often they change *judge* to *condemn* or *damn*, and *judging* to *condemnation* or *damnation*. This itself is to be drastically *condemned*, for when the translators damned others, they themselves were far more guilty, because they sinned against light and mutilated the most precious possession of mankind. With this before him, the editor of the Concordant Version text was inclined to choose the word *judge* rather than *condemn*, when the reading of the original was not absolutely certain. In the final occurrence of *judge*, dealing with the fate of those before the great white throne, however, he was compelled against his inclination to read *condemn*, where the Authorized Version has simply *judge*. The Greek texts differ at this place, but the best of them, Sinaiticus, reads *condemn*. In this text there are many omissions, and, as the three letters (*kat*) which make the difference, could easily be omitted, but hardly be added, they deserve a place, as they probably were found in the original. Even if rendered *judge*, the fact that all were condemned is clearly established from other passages.

The apostle Paul makes it clear that Adam's one offense brings condemnation to all mankind (Rom. 5: 18). Not only shall God *judge* the world (Rom. 3: 6), but not one will be found just—not even one (Rom. 3: 10). One sin brought condemnation (Rom. 5: 16).

These things are racial, and go back to Adam for their origin and scope. It is not an individual matter. The great white throne judging does not determine this. It was known long before. It simply confirms the previous verdict, after considering the acts of those who inherited mortality from Adam. The same is true of justification. It will not depend on the acts of those who enjoy it, but upon Christ, and *His* obedience. When Paul, upon a later occasion, speaks of condemnation, he makes it worldwide (1 Cor. 11:32). Moreover, everyone who accepts Christ thereby acknowledges condemnation apart from Him. Only in Christ Jesus is any mortal of Adam's race free from condemnation (Rom. 8:1).

"Punishment" is a word that I have come to hate, for men have so fearfully misused it of God's operations. Once we see that all of God's dealings are with a view to the eventual reconciliation of all, the idea of punitive retribution, introduced by corrupt theology, will become abhorrent. If the great white throne sentenced all those who stand before it to eternal torment or annihilation, such a thought might be entertained. But we must remember that the object of all God's operations are rooted in love and fruited in reconciliation. If God is love, He cannot be orthodox. The experience before the great white throne must prepare each one for the consummation, for that is what lies before him. Before there can be a universal reconciliation, each one must be set right with God, and this is accomplished at the judging. Such, indeed, is the true meaning of judgment, which is almost lost, because of the penal character of human adjudication.

The orthodox "hell" completely nullifies all judging and justice. What is the sense of bringing anyone before a judge if he has already been suffering torment for a thousand years and is due to undergo the same eternally, no matter what his sentence is? Such a system would not be tolerated even among the most unjust and cruel of

mankind. Justice demands that the sentence suit the crime. It must be adaptable to the most innocent infant as well as the most ungodly adult. This is impossible if the term is infinite, for infinity does not admit of gradations. Moreover it is highly immoral to torment anyone without some useful end. A man who would be guilty of such a thing would be adjudged mad, and confined in an asylum.

RIGHT AND WRONG -

What is right and what is wrong? How will it be determined at the great white throne? It will help much in solving these questions if we consider one of the grave problems of right and wrong which occupy the world today. As we know how God will settle this satisfactorily, it may enable us to see how the multitudinous smaller questions, which crowd into our daily life, and which must be set right before the great white throne, may be settled. For the Bible student, one of the most interesting and important problems, as well as the most perplexing, is the land of Palestine. Superficially, one who believes the prophecies concerning the restoration of Israel according to the promises, may be led to insist that the land is theirs, and the Arabs have no right to it. But even they must admit that this might be doing a great wrong to the inhabitants.

The Arabs are in possession. They have lived there for hundreds of years. They have their homes there. Their legal right has been recognized by all nations and the law of the land. It would work a great and grievous hardship on multitudes if they were driven out. Many of the sites in the land are sacred to them. Jerusalem, next to Mecca, is the most holy place in their religion. Having lived for some time in touch with the Arabs in Palestine, I sympathize keenly with their viewpoint. All those commendable sentiments which cluster around home and country, and especially religion, bind their

hearts to their native land. To them these are paramount. It would seem a terrible wrong to most nations to be uprooted from their homes. The deportation of a few inoffensive French colonists from part of eastern Canada, as depicted in Longfellow's poem, "Evangeline," has gone down in history and literature as a great and grievous wrong. Even if we sympathize strongly with God's ancient people, let us not lose sight of the "rights" of the Arabs.

The Jews, on the other hand, are in dire need of a homeland. Long before the Arabs came it was theirs, and they were wrongfully expelled. They are able to develop it and make much better use of it than the Arabs. They are willing to pay for what they get. But the reason which seems to carry most weight with Christendom lies in the ancient promises to their forefathers and their prophets. The land given to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob is to be theirs for the eons. It is graven on their hearts. In Palestine itself I listened long to one who had left wealth and comfort, family and friends in the United States in response to a vague but insistent yearning to have a hand in the restoration of Zion. Money that should have been used for peace and comfort in old age was expended in building and planting and helping others to develop the land of promise. There is an elemental urge in the hearts of many of the dispersed of Israel which we cannot ignore.

On the other side, the title of the Arabs to the land is that of conquest. It is debatable whether force ever justly conveys possession. If it does, then territory can be taken away by the same means, and the only right would be might. Yet, we must remember that Israel also got possession of the land by force of arms, though under the guidance of Jehovah, and as His instrument. However, they did not really "possess" the land, but held it only as an allotment from Jehovah, the real Owner. The Arabs hinder the development of the resources of

Palestine, so that it cannot support anything like the population which it ought to nourish. In the future, according to prophecy, they will have to leave the land to the Jews some day, even if they do not do it now, so there is not much force in the injustice. It must occur, sooner or later, and should by rights be done as soon as possible if the Jews can establish their title at the present time.

Strange as it may seem to Bible students, the title of the Jews to the land has some fatal flaws which are almost always overlooked. In fact, *it is wrong for them to even claim it*. There is not a single son of Israel on earth today who can establish his right to a solitary square foot of the land of promise. More than that, not one has a right to claim even an allotment in it. There are two classes of Jews, those who believe God and those who reject their Messiah. The believers are joint-members in the body of Christ, like Paul, and have their allotment among the celestials. If they know how much higher and better this allotment is than the very best of Palestine, they will not claim any portion or possession in it on the ground of the promises. The other Jews, the great mass, are unbelieving and stubborn. It is only through the observance of the law that they were to prolong their days on the soil of Palestine (Deut. 32:47). In crucifying their Messiah they did the greatest possible evil in the sight of Jehovah, and they perished utterly from the land, and have been scattered among the nations (Deut. 4:26-27).

Now these Jewish unbelievers are returning to the land. There is no doubt that it is in line with God's intention, but this does not give them any *right* to it. They pay large sums of money for holdings in it. But even this is wrong, for the land belongs to Jehovah, and He does not sell it or convey a property right to any part of it. The title of the Jew is far worse than that of the Arab. He knows, or should know, what is right, from

the revelation committed to him. He sins against light, while the Arab has never had the law. The Jew should know that the land is Jehovah's, and that He alone owns it, so that all that he can obtain is an allotment in it, under Messiah. He is sinning against light when he returns to it and barter for it with money. So long as the Jews reject their Messiah, their only "right" is to be scattered over the face of the earth, far from the land of Jehovah, their God. That is His decree, and the sentence of His righteous law. No other nation has laws as just as that given to them through Moses. According to it, they have forfeited their rights to Palestine, and every foot of it that they own is held in defiance of the law and its just penalty.

I have studied the problem of Jewish-Arab relations in the Holy Land a long time, and at close range, and I am quite sure that, judging by our human standards of right and wrong, there is no solution possible that does not wrong one side or both. But it *will* be solved in the future in perfect justice, not by recognizing the spurious claims of either party, but by giving God His prior and unimpeachable rights. He will not give the land outright to either one. In this they are both wrong. He will not allot it to the Arabs, so they must be wrong. He will not allot it to the unbelieving Jews, so they also are wrong. *All are wrong!* All are usurpers. They are squatters without the least chance of securing a right or title to the land. Moreover, they rob Jehovah of His rent. They ought to give a tenth of its produce to support His worship. He will take away the land from all of them and allot it to the saints in Israel in that day, who will restore it to its proper function, which is the manifestation of God's goodness and glory, and the maintenance of divine service in His dwelling place.

There is much deplorable dissention among the saints as to the right attitude toward the Jews, which would vanish if a clear line were drawn between the apostate

nation and the believing remnant. What benefit will it be to the apostate if they are restored to the land, only to be destroyed there? The very fact that they are stubborn and withstand their Messiah, should show us that their conduct cannot be commendable among the nations. I once laid all the blame on their persecutors, but further investigation has satisfied me that they draw down the afflictions upon themselves, as a rule, by sharp practices, overreaching their hosts, by financial and political operations which cause great loss and distress to the nations, the very reverse of what they would do if they fulfilled their mission of being a blessing to the whole earth. In the future eons, under Messiah, *God* will give them the land, in His own good time, but their present return is due to their own wilfulness and insubjection to Him.

If both Jew and Arab acknowledged Jehovah's rights, the problem would vanish. Both would renounce their own claims. The Jew would confess that he has broken God's law and deserves deportation. The Arab would acknowledge that he has never settled with the rightful Owner. Both would admit that they are only receivers of stolen property. They would see that they owe for much back rent besides. But their problem would be solved. Their quarrel would end. They would both be at peace on this matter, and realize that their fancied rights were all wrong, and that all rights are rested in Jehovah, not in mortals. There is no other satisfactory solution. So long as either side asserts its supposed rights, there will be friction and fighting.

We have dwelt upon the quarrel over the Holy Land in order to use it as a parable of the misunderstandings, the disagreements, the dissensions, the feuds and the fightings which create so much discord among individuals, because of alleged rights, all of which will be judged before the great white throne. To keep as closely as possible to our parable, let us consider the question

of a disputed boundary between neighbors. I remember a case, long ago, of a man who built his foundation right on the line, so that the eaves of his house overhung his neighbor's land. It is surprising how much can be said on both sides of such an insignificant matter. Should a man waste a narrow strip of land, to which he has no access, and which, as a consequence, is neglected and becomes a nuisance, in order to avoid invading his neighbor's sky with his roof? On the other hand, what right has anyone to trespass on the air space of another? I have solved this by placing my houses far enough from the boundary to allow of care. But how much needless argument and bitterness could be avoided if both parties recognized that neither one had a clear title, and that both plots belonged to the same Owner! And neither one was paying their rent!

At the great white throne this matter will be settled. There will be no lawyer with wearisome arguments as to the laws of trespass, or in regard to the air above the ground. Once in the presence of the Owner's Representative, nearly all human "rights" will be dropped as invalid, as infringements, as violations of the rights of the Creator and Sustainer of all. Both sides will be condemned because they did not recognize the actual Owner, neither did they give Him His due.

All of this has a vital bearing on the judging of the unbeliever at the great white throne. His debts, his unfulfilled obligations, his trespasses, his crimes, as they affect his fellow men, may be very great as viewed from the usual standpoint, but the enormity of His obligations to God throw them into the background, and they are judged automatically, as a rule, when God's claims are settled. The few actual previews we have been given of the judging are not so much concerned with questions between man and man, but between man and God. Those very wicked cities, Sodom and Gomorrah, on which men would pass the severest sentence, will be treated with

more toleration than those cities in our Lord's day, which rejected one of the twelve disciples of Christ. The implication is that they were on a much higher plane of morality than the cities of the plain, which were destroyed by fire for their iniquity (Mat. 10:15). But this may refer to kingdom judgments, commencing the thousand years. So it was with cities in which our Lord did most of His mighty deeds. They would not receive the consideration shown to Tyre and Sidon, because they did not give Christ His rightful place when He appeared among them.

Ninevites and the queen of the south did not live at the same time as the men of our Lord's generation, and they will not have a place in the kingdom, so that, in this case, we seem certain that we have an actual preview of the great white throne judgment. Our Lord did not bring up the personal sins of anyone, though the Ninevites probably had plenty of them. The crucial point is, How did they treat the representatives of God? The contrast is a double one. Jonah and Solomon cannot compare with the far greater Prophet and King Who was rejected by Israel. The Ninevites *repented* at Jonah's heralding, and the queen of the south *came to hear* Solomon, while the men of that generation *rejected* Christ. Condemnation will come to those of His generation because of their failure to treat God's Anointed right. This will overshadow their individual iniquities. But we may be sure that, when they see Him on the judgment throne, they will not only accept the condemnation of the Ninevites, but will condemn themselves, and their whole lives, and thus be set right in their attitude toward God, which is the prime necessity preceding their reconciliation.

Our parable should show us how it is that the fundamental and underlying sin is the failure to have God in recognition (Rom. 1:28). The judgment is not primarily to set right the relations between man and man.

That is accomplished indirectly by bringing the sinner into a realization of God. Believers are exempt from judging because they have already acknowledged God. Men who seem to be moral and who appear to lead an exemplary life cannot escape the judging, for they still need to realize their great lack and their failure to give God His place, apart from which He cannot be All in them.

It is evident that all is of God, hence is His property. In reality there can be no other Owner, for not only *things*, but all *creatures* are likewise His, seeing that He made them and sustains them. They bring nothing into this world, and acquire nothing except what is loaned to them by Him, hence they take nothing out. Why, then, should there be the illusion of human property rights? These, no doubt, have their place under human governments, and saints are bound to respect them. But it will help them much to avoid friction and to lead a quiet and peaceable life if they refuse to assert their own "rights," even if perfectly legal, remembering that the earth and that which fills it is Jehovah's, and man's only possible title to its use is to render to Him His part of the produce. Let no one think that this is a plea for tithing. Under law, tithing is just, but under grace it is niggardly ungratefulness. It is a source of intense satisfaction when all that we have is, directly or indirectly, devoted to the Lord's service. If this amounts to a tithe, we have, perhaps, done our duty, but we should never try to deceive ourselves into the delusion that it is a *gift*, or any return for God's transcendent grace. Even under law, the gifts were over and above the tithe.

The saints, of course, will never need to stand before the great white throne. Nevertheless, it will greatly lighten their lives if they regulate them from the divine viewpoint. It will be much easier to determine what is *really* right or wrong if we put God's rights first, and press our own rights, or even withdraw them, according

as they promote His. It will modify and mature our conceptions of God's will, and give stability to our walk, and relieve us of much perplexity. No one can speak for another in such matters very well, so I will use my own experience as an example. My studies in the Scriptures led me very early to avoid earthly encumbrances, so that I did not care to own property. At first, considerations of health led to a home on high ground. Later came the problem of a permanent address for the magazine and storage for the literature. It had shifted from Minneapolis to San Diego, and then to Los Angeles. It became clear that there should be a permanent place of publication. After many years I feel that this was eminently right, especially as the location has, I trust, paid rent to the true Owner, by bringing Him worship and adoration from many hearts. The work God has committed to me is the touchstone which controls my course. I will give up my own rights, but I will be very zealous for His. Yet such rights of mine as may forward the work I will maintain.

I have been the center of much friction in connection with the translation and interpretation of God's Word. My experience has taught me some valuable lessons. Each critic, of course, considers himself right. I have noticed that those who are gracious, diffident, and reluctant, usually are right. Those who are confident, or insistent, or impatient, often are not. And those who are self-assertive, absolutely sure, and abusive, even when they are capable, are almost always wrong. It is just the reverse of what should be expected. A humble spirit seems a better safeguard than great gifts. One thing is sure, it leads to harmony and truth, while pride precipitates strife, and promotes error.

GOD'S RIGHTS ARE PARAMOUNT

The only possible way to determine right from wrong is to acknowledge first of all the place and purpose of

God. None of our rights can rest on injustice to Him. We cannot have any clear idea of the nature of the great white throne judgment unless we know what will accrue to God by means of it. Perhaps the most terrible misconception of its function has come from the unscriptural and abominable teaching that all who are judged will be tormented forever in the lake of fire which follows it. In that case it is utterly futile and harmful, and so sheer injustice to God, for He will lose all and gain nothing as a reward for His vast expenditure of creative power and provision. The injustices that men have practised toward men—and how great is the sum of them!—not all of them together would amount to so unspeakable an injustice as that men's acts should not be righted in their relation toward the *Deity*, so that *He* may reap the harvest of His work.

What is right? Man has no standard by which to determine this except the feeble flicker of conscience and the monitions of nature. We will probably discover, some day, that most of his rights were wrongs, and even that which seemed altogether right contained an admixture of wrong. This is difficult to discuss unless we take a concrete example. The best is property rights. You have a certificate of title to a piece of land. You can trace its ownership back until someone took it "by right of discovery" perhaps. But what right is that? The land was created by God, and belongs to Him until He gives a valid title, which He will never do because you cannot pay for it, and it is not for sale. Property rights! They will never be right until they revert into the hands of the only rightful Owner and Creator. With this background it would be easy to quiet all the titles in the world in an instant, and, at the same time *give God His rights*, and His creatures theirs. In this way God will become the universal Owner. All their rights will be found only in Him. So He will become their All.

Is it not significant that, at the great white throne,

both earth and heaven flee? Those who are raised at that time cannot claim that part of the earth which they owned at death. In some cases there might be a thousand claimants, and that would only lead to interminable contention, not to a final, righteous settlement. During their lifetime some of them laid claim to vast estates, while others did not even own the ground in which they were buried. But now none have even standing room on the earth, which seems to show that they had forfeited what they had, and that it has reverted to the rightful Owner. Some probably laid claim to a "mansion," or at least a corner in heaven, on the ground of their goodness and gifts. They also find that their title to a celestial place has no foundation. This alone should impress them with the utter unrighteousness of their rights and their failure to recognize God's.

This is the fatal failure in almost all human justice. The relations between men are adjusted without any regard for the rights of the Creator, the Sustainer, the true Beneficiary. All is *for Him*, first of all. This modifies and may cancel every right that we seek to claim for ourselves. The innumerable and inextricable maze of man's inhumanity to man would present an almost impossible and interminable problem at the judgment if human rights were not readjusted to God's. The Son of God will be there to affectionately press His Father's claims, which will open the eyes of mankind to see that the "rights" for which they otherwise would contend are selfishness, egotism, unfounded pride, the repudiation of God's rights. The Pharisee will not stand up in the judgment to boast in his tithes. He once imagined that he had settled his score with God, that he had given Him what was right. Then he will see that he had robbed God of nine-tenths of His due, for *all* that he had was a gift from the All-Sufficient. The Pharisee prayed to himself, and was well pleased with his treatment of Jehovah, but all his righteousness was iniquity (Luke 18:

The tribute collector did not talk to himself, or compare himself with others, but anticipated the judgment by renouncing all claims to righteousness. He had no confidence in himself that he was just, so asked only for a propitiatory shelter. Yet *he* was justified, rather than the Pharisee. I suppose that, from the merely human viewpoint, this was a gross miscarriage of justice. The Pharisee probably was an exemplary character, who tried to keep the law, and was orthodox in his interpretation of the Scriptures. He claimed that, if others were unjust, he was not. Under ordinary circumstances such people would rise in the judging and contend for their own righteousness. The Pharisees would insist that they are right and the tribute collectors are wrong. What an endless debate there would be if all of those before the great white throne should try to settle all disputes among themselves as they do in this life! But if all is made bare and open, the opposite will be the case. All will be condemned by the realization of their utter failure to be just to God.

We know two things concerning the human race. All will be condemned and all will be justified (Rom. 5:18). Before they can be justified they must realize their condemnation. This cannot come about by debating the matter from the human standpoint, as Job and his friends did, but by divine intervention, as when Jehovah compared Himself with Job and asked him if he needed to condemn God in order to justify himself (Job 40:8). Elihu's anger was hot against Job for justifying his own soul rather than God (32:2). Even the Psalmist knew that no one of all the living shall be just before God (Psa. 143:2). But what a tedious and terrible and interminable time it would be if every case were tried as Job's was! If such a session were held today almost everyone, like him, would seek to justify himself, although few, if any, would have as good a right. At the same time others, with a different standard of right, like

Job's friends, would condemn all who do not agree with them. As Zophar said to Job, it is all lip-talk, man's many words of self-justification (Job 11:2).

When it comes to right and wrong, men and nations have forgotten and ignored God. They have lost the fear of Him because He does not interfere. There have been notable attempts to deal justly among men, but seldom, indeed, are God's rights taken into account. William Penn refused to recognize the claim of the English crown to the territory of Pennsylvania, although he paid the king his price. Later, he bought it again from the Indians. Most men would consider this much more than just. But was it? Or was it simply buying from the receivers of stolen goods? The king's title to it was a very poor one, as Penn himself realized. But was that of the Indians much better? Who knows but that they also took it by violence. Even if they were the first settlers, that did not make it theirs. What rivers of blood have been shed in order to seize lands in the possession of others! It could all have been spared if the contending parties had recognized the only Owner of all things and based all their claims on His right to dispose of it as He wills. At the great white throne, right will no longer be based on the futile claims of men. They never believed this, but then they *see* that their rights are wrong, because they rob God of His rights.

In contrast to human judgments, our Lord emphasized the character of His judging. It is always *just* and *true* (John 5:30, 7:24, 8:16). He will not condemn without cause. Indeed, it would almost seem as if, in judging, He will not need to condemn at all, for men themselves will attend to this (compare Rom. 2:3). Ninevite men, who heard and heeded the heralding of Jonah, will condemn those who heard and did not heed our Lord. The queen of the south will condemn them also, for she came from far to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and they would not listen to the One Who is the Wisdom of

God (Mat. 12: 41-42). I am practically certain that the judging will be of such a nature that all will condemn each other, and be themselves condemned when all is exposed and made bare in the presence of the great white throne.

Today all is camouflaged. No act is seen as it is. Sin seeks to work in secret. Motives behind men's acts are hid. Men pay more attention to the outward appearance than to the inward reality. In the judging this will be reversed. Everything that is now covered shall be revealed. What is hidden shall be made known (Mat. 10: 26, Mark 4: 22, Luke 12: 2). Then the hidden things of humanity will be judged (Rom. 2: 16). This will probably reverse many a human judgment automatically, without any tedious investigations, or any attempts, to evade or distort the open evidence. To my mind this, though painful, will be most wholesome for all concerned, and is absolutely essential to their future welfare. There can be no consummation without it. No reconciliation with God can be considered apart from it. How can God be All in anyone who harbors secret sin, and who does not begin to realize how far he falls short of His holiness? Once we see that judging is the necessary preparation for reconciliation, we will not only bear with it, or acquiesce in it, but we will be thankful for it, and praise God for this provision.

Men send criminals to the penitentiary for life in order to shield society from them. God deals with sinners during a short judgment period in order to prepare them perfectly for endless association with their fellows and with Him. The object of His judging is not to requite the sinner evil for evil, and make him suffer for his badness, but to correct and remove the hindrances to his company. In many cases this may involve severe suffering, but, when compared with the benefits that spring from it, we are reminded of the "light" afflictions of the apostle, which were very heavy, yet lost their

weight when compared with the eonian glory to which they were the prelude. Indeed, Paul's glory was limited to the eons, while the reconciliation of God's enemies at the consummation will be endless. The greatest sum imaginable dwindles down to nothing when compared with infinity.

David was given his choice of being judged by Jehovah or by men. His experience with both led him to decide instantly, and he exclaimed, "Let me fall now into the hands of the Lord, for very many are His mercies. *But let me not fall into the hands of men.*" It is instructive to note the alternative judgments, especially their length. He was given the choice of three *month's* fleeing before his foes, overtaken by the sword of his enemies, or three *days* of the sword of the Lord, the pestilence (1 Chron. 21:13). Everywhere we see that God's judgments are swift, and are soon over, while man's are slow, the agony is long drawn out. So, we have every reason to think the great assize will be a short period of time. David's penalty was, indeed, severe, for seventy thousand died before their time. But it accomplished its object. The king had been provoked by Satan to count the number of Israel. This showed that David was trusting in numbers, not in God. He was leaning on man, not on Jehovah. Therefore a large part of his host was taken from him, and David was moved to prepare for the temple on mount Moriah, where Jehovah's worship was carried on during the reigns of the rest of the kings of Israel. Satan was defeated and God glorified, and David recalled to trust in Him alone. God, to a great degree, became his All.

In our Lord's description of other judgments we may gather some idea of what He deems the just procedure. To His disciples He said that a slave who *knows* his lord's will, yet ignores it, shall have many lashes. But one who does *not* know, even if he deserves blows, will have few. Then He laid down a rule which will probably

apply at the great white throne also: As to everyone to whom much was given, from him much will be sought, and to whom they committed much, more excessively will they be requesting of him (Luke 12:47-48). This has a direct bearing on the case of infants, who know practically nothing, and the heathen, who are ignorant of God's Word and will. I shudder, not at the fate of these two classes, but at the terrible fate which would overtake those who have delved deeply into His revelation, if they were not exempt from judgment through the sacrifice of Christ. Yes, we, who know His will, and are such great failures in carrying it out, *we* would probably receive the most lashes, and deserve the severest blows.

The more I meditate upon this theme the more I am convinced that those who are acquainted with God and His Word should rightly take an exceedingly low place in view of God's judgment and the fact that light and knowledge take such a large part in determining its severity. We probably deserve far more stripes than unbelievers, for our conduct is not nearly as far above theirs as our knowledge. I have seen evangelical leaders so loveless and vicious in defense of their creed and traditions as is seldom seen in the world. Those who say they see may be judged accordingly. We find a parallel to this thought in the history of the chosen people. To them were confided the oracles of God. Yet this has not brought them more blessing than other nations, but rather more suffering. In their case they must endure it, for grace does not intervene to shield them from judgment.

JUDGMENT IS ADAPTED TO GUILT

The severity of judgment will depend largely upon opportunity. The same sin will call down heavy inflictions on one and light correction on another. All agree that it is not just to punish indiscriminately. Those who sin against light are ever so much more accountable than those who fail for lack of light. Most people imagine

that, of all cities, Sodom was one of the worst, hence its citizens will suffer the severest penalties in the judging. And it is very likely that the cities of our Lord's day, to whom He sent His kingdom heralds, deemed themselves the most righteous of all mankind, so that their correction, if any, would be very mild. Our Lord reversed this in the case of those who did not receive His heralds. He said that it would be *more tolerable* for Sodom in that day than for that city (Luke 10:10-12)! Is it too much to deduce from this that it will be more tolerable for the "heathen" than for "Christendom"? I am convinced of this. Consequently, if the object of our "gospel" is to save people suffering, there is more need at home than abroad.

More than this, Tyre and Sidon, we are told, would have repented, sitting in sackcloth and ashes, if they had had the same display of power in their midst as Chorazin and Bethsaida and Capernaum, His own city (Luke 10:13-15). Is it right, then, to put them on the same level? What an indictment of the nominal people of Jehovah! Chorazin and Bethsaida and Capernaum were not among the cities that refused to receive His heralds. He did many of His marvels in their midst. Yet the despised cities of the nations shall be dealt with more leniently than they. Does not this reverse our traditional ideas of the place which the "heathen" will have in that day? How blessed it is for those in enlightened lands who actually accept God's grace and Christ's salvation! If they had not, they would be answerable to a much greater degree than the heathen. And does this not throw some light on the fate of infants and children as well? How inexpressably more tolerable will it be for them than for more mature members of the race!

A. E. K.

INDEX FOR VOLUME XXXIII

Adam, Would he have Died if he had not Sinned?.....	276
<i>Advent</i> Day, Jehovah's.....	241
Authority of Men <i>vs</i> the Word of God.....	19-29
Bible League Quarterly, Reply to.....	6-18
Birth <i>vs.</i> Creation.....	89
Believing, The Blessedness of.....	215
Blessedness of Believing, The.....	215
Blood, The Physiology of the.....	254
Christ and God.....	92
Christ <i>versus</i> Religion.....	195
Concordant Version in the Critic's Den.....	1-96
Consistency and Uniformity.....	48-64
Creation <i>vs.</i> Birth.....	89
Critic's Den, Concordant Version in.....	1-96
Daniel Stands the Test.....	177
Deaths, In His.....	288
Deliverance of Israel, The.....	129
Desolation?, Is the earth, in the Millennium, a.....	176
Earth a Desolation in the Millennium?.....	176
Editorial.....	3, 97, 145, 193, 289
Eternal Punishment.....	90
Ethiopia and Tharshish in Prophecy.....	109
Evil?, Did God Create.....	192
God and Christ.....	92
God and the Golden Image.....	295
God, The One and Only True.....	147
Great White Throne, Judge and Judged at the.....	277
Greek Text of the Concordant Version.....	39-43
Heterodox Doctrines.....	87-95
Image, God and the Golden.....	295

Image, The Metallic.....	221, 255
Israel, Deliverance of.....	129
Jehovah's <i>Advent</i> Day.....	241
Judge and Judged at the Great White Throne.....	277
Judgment?, What is.....	315
Lot of the Unbeliever, The.....	199
Metallic Image, The.....	221, 255
Millennium?, Is the Earth a Desolation in the.....	176
Misleading Renderings.....	64-72
Mode, Voice and Tense.....	75-86
Nature is Not Sinful.....	101
One and Only True God, The.....	147
Physiology of the Blood, The.....	254
Punishment, Eternal.....	90
Religion <i>versus</i> Christ.....	195
Sinful, Nature Not.....	101
Tense, Mode and Voice.....	75-86
Tharshish and Ethiopia in Prophecy.....	109
Trinity, The.....	91
Unbeliever, The Lot of the.....	199
Uniformity and Consistency.....	48-64
Voice, Mode and Tense.....	75-86
Worship?, What is.....	167