

Our subject is NEW TESTAMENT SURVEY and we'll take as Roman Number I - The Scope of the Course. This course is very different from Dr. Hedegard's course in New Testament Origin. His purpose in that course is to take up vital, critical questions which are very important in our attitude toward these books and to see what the evidence is and to show that we as Christians can reasonably hold that these books were written by the men they claim to be written by. In this course we are simply taking that for granted. We are not going into critical problems at all in this particular course. Then we have course in Exegesis of the various New Testament books in which we try to get into their fine points and find out exactly what they mean. That is not the purpose of this course. This is a survey course. Our purpose here you might say will fall under two categories. It has to fall under two because of the fact that our entering students differ so much in their general preparation. Some here have had a great deal of Bible work, some have had very little Bible work. And so one purpose of this course is to cover the basic facts about the New Testament that should be known in connection with any discussion of it. And that part of the course will cover a fair amount of material that some of you will be very familiar with, while others will know naturally much less about that phase of it. But that is only one phase of our work to get the essential facts about the contents of the New Testament Books. A more vital phase of the purpose of our course and one which I think should be of value to anyone no matter how much Bible work you may have had, is a matter of studying the - surveying it as a whole and studying the general organization of it, seeing the inter-relation of its parts, seeing how it fits together in order to present God's Truth to us. Now of course some of you may have had certain aspects of this in one course somewhere and certain in another. But I will give to you the view of the New Testament which I see as I look down from a mountaintop over this great area of land and naturally there will be certain inter-relations that I have observed that some others might not and certain viewpoints on it which I feel would be helpful which would hardly have been presented in certain other presentations. And so my hope is that as a result of this course, we may have an idea of the content of the New Testament, and not merely the general content, but of the specific inter-relation of the various parts of the New Testament which will undergird and promote your understanding of all of our work regarding

the New Testament and which also will help in your later study in your advance in dealing with this important section of God's Word. Now I would like in connection with this point of the (3.75) of course, to call your attention very particularly to II Timothy, 3:16-17. We read there that Paul said to Timothy, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable." Now if you would take the average Sunday School and see everything that was said there in the course of 20 years, how much of the "all scripture" do you think would have been covered? If you would take the average church service, average church and take all the church services over the course of 20 years, how much of this "all scripture" do you think would have been covered? If you would take the average Christian's life, even the average Christian worker's life, and think over a period of 20 years of the Scripture passages which have been effective~~XX~~ in his mind, in his heart, in his outlook, in his soul, how much of this "all scripture" do you think would be covered in most cases? Now God says here through the Apostle Paul speaking to Timothy that "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable" and that means not only that it is all true but that it is all profitable. Of course you might say anything is profitable for something but it means that all the Scripture is profitable for all of God's people. Now in this course of course we're thinking about the New Testament. But particularly the New Testament, even take what I just said about seeing how much of the Scripture is covered. Suppose we limited it to the New Testament. How much of the New Testament would be covered in the average Sunday School, in the average church service, or even in the life of most Christians. Whole sections of the New Testament are simply neglected and not touched upon. I feel that it is a very important matter of theology, not only that our theology is derived from the Scripture but that in its emphases it should follow the pattern of that what God stresses, we should stress and what God says little about, if he says anything about it, it is of importance. But if he says little about it we should not magnify its importan~~X~~ce beyond matters of which he says a great deal. Now then this verse we're going to refer back to later in the afternoon but I stress it at this point in connection with a survey like this, that we are particularly interested in this survey in getting a glance into little nooks and crannies that might tend to be overlooked, and seeing their relationship and getting in

mind the importance of eventually working our way into those crannies and seeing what meaning and what blessing they may have for each one of us. So that is the general scope of the course then - it is the survey of the entire New Testament in its inter-relations with perhaps particular attention to certain parts that are apt to be neglected, but also with the very definite desire to make sure that those of you who don't have so much Bible background, do get the main facts very clearly in mind. It would be my guess that most of you would have a fair idea of the main contents of the New Testament. I don't know whether everyone of you could name the twenty-seven books immediately without any hesitation. I doubt if anyone here if I'd say, "What's the 15th book, what's the 12th, what's the 20th?" like that, could immediately give them in that way. But probably most of you have a fair idea of simply the naming of the books. But now ~~why~~ are the books arranged in this order? I believe in many Sunday Schools there is a simple system of the order of New Testament books taught which I imagine most of you are familiar with. That the New Testament's 27 books are divided into certain sections of which the first is the first four - and that of course we call the Gospels. Some might make the first four and the fifth one section called Historical ~~like~~ like the historical beginning of the Old Testament. But the first 4 books then are the four Gospels which of course are the foundation, the life of Christ, the story of the earthly activities of our Lord prior to His Resurrection, to His Ascension. Then we have a section which could be put with this, but perhaps had better be separate, of one book which certainly merits the title Historical in perhaps a more definite way than these four because they would be more biographical than historical. But this is the history of the beginning of the Christian Church - the Book of Acts - and there is no other book like it in the New Testament. There are many books in the Old Testament that are similar in being histories of the progress of God's people. But this Book of Acts is quite unique in the New Testament. And then after the Book of Acts, then we have the Epistles and then finally we have a book of prophecy - the Book of Revelation. Now the Epistles of the New Testament are usually divided into two main groups. And these two groups of Epistles would be according to authorship and that is a very difficult division to make precisely for this reason. You start in with Romans and it is by

the Apostle Paul and you go on through 13 books, I believe the number is 13, it's approximately half of the New Testament, and everyone of them is by the Apostle Paul. You start at the other end and you start from back of Revelation and you have Jude and a number of books back which are not by the Apostle Paul. But as you come from this side books by the Apostle Paul and this side books not by the Apostle Paul you come to one book which you're not sure which category to put it in - whether it is by Paul or whether it is not by Paul. And if you went through the questions of the history of the Christian Church on this point, you would find there have been periods when most people have been convinced this book was by Paul and periods when most people have been convinced that it was not by Paul. You'll find some of the great leaders in Christian history have been quite convinced Paul wrote this book and you find many other of the very great leaders in Christian history who are quite convinced that the book of Hebrews is not written by the Apostle Paul. So that it certainly is placed in the correct position in our Bible - right between the books that are by Paul and the books that aren't. You might in a way say it's like the tidelands - you go out and it's all ocean, you come here and it's all land, inbetween there's an area that sometimes is land and sometimes is water. Well Hebrews is sometimes by Paul and sometimes not - it's one ~~XXXXXXXX~~ or the other. But opinion varies on it and we don't know. Personally I am rather glad that we don't know because to me it stresses the idea that I think is very vital in connection with the New Testament that no book is God's book because we know what man wrote it. These are God's books - these 27 books of the New Testament - this is the New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ and he uses ~~XXX~~ various men to write them. He used any man whom He chose to select to write a book to be part of the New Testament and He used Paul more than He used anybody else. But He did use various men in the New Testament and there are many books of the Old Testament that we have no idea even who the author was that wrote them. The important thing for us is that it is a divine book. Hebrews is certainly a book which the Holy Spirit wrote, whoever the human author may have been. So that Hebrews is in between but before Hebrews we have this group of books going from Romans to Philemon, all of which the Christian Church has always believed were written by the Apostle Paul.

And then after Hebrews we have a group of books - James - first one book written by a certain man then two books written by another man, then three books written by another man, and then one more. So that you have actually seven books here which are written by four different writers and they are usually called the General Epistles. In the manuscripts, in Bible manuscripts, there has been quite a variation as to which comes first, the General Epistles or the Pauline Epistles. Some have one first and some have the other. But the grouping in general, which are the General Epistles and which are the Pauline has been pretty well recognized through the church's history. Now the General Epistles, I don't know that it's such a good name for them. ~~XXX~~ Perhaps the Non-Pauline Epistles would be better. They're the Epistles by other people than Paul. They are called the General Epistles perhaps from the idea that these men didn't write to a particular church as Paul did in most of his letters or to a particular individual as he did when he wrote to Timothy, Titus, and to Philemon. But, as a matter of fact, II John begins, "The elder to the elect lady". It would sound as if it were one individual to whom he wrote. If the Book of Hebrews is Pauline it certainly is not to an individual church. Of course we don't know whether it is or not. It is certainly a General Epistle in that sense. I would think then that Pauline Epistles and Non-Pauline Epistles would be a better title. But the title is generally pretty well accepted. The main thing is that we have an idea of the two different groups. Now from in this verse which we had in Thessalonians (II Timothy?), we have a sort of an outline which I have heard attributed to the Pauline Epistles - and I think it's pretty good the suggestion made. I would not lay too much weight on it but it's worth looking at

End of Record 1

the verse we looked at in Thessalonians - in II Timothy, 3:16 said that all Scripture is profitable and certainly all of Paul's writings are profitable. But it said that it is profitable for certain reasons - and what are they? For doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. Is all Scripture profitable for doctrine? Well if doctrine means teaching, we learn something about God from every Scripture, even where Paul says in this next chapter - II Timothy, 4:13, "The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee and the books but especially the parchments." What doctrine do you get from that verse? If that verse is inspired, it's part of Paul's writing, what is the doctrinal context? Well I think we learn a little bit about the character of God as shown through His great apostle here, His care for these things. He didn't just leave them and feel that it was up to the church to provide him with new ones. He was interested in getting them, having them brought to them, he took care of these earthly things. God could have sent an angel to pick up the cloak, the parchments and the books and bring them right to Paul but he took care to write to Timothy to get them and to bring them. God wants us to use ordinary care in the many details of His work and look to Him to help out, to oversee everything we do, but not expect Him to lift up our food and bring it in and put it in our mouth when he's given us hands and feet to go and get it and carry it in. He expects us to use the best abilities, the best brains, the best facilities we have to accomplish His work in the best possible way and then pray Him to lead us, to oversee, and when we come up absolutely against a stone wall and there's nothing we can do in our strength, then for us to pray Him to show us that we're up against the wrong wall, we should be another way, show it clearly or else to open the wall for us if He can do in this situation, and if He does do (2.5)

We are not too easily to jump to conclusions on these things but we are to know that while His power is boundless, He expects us ordinarily to use human means for the accomplishment of the great purposes He has for us. Now that is a valuable truth out of this verse. Some people say, "How can the whole New Testament be inspired? How can this verse be inspired? Well I think this verse teaches us truth about God and His will for us. I think everything that's in the New Testament is part of God's

message to us. But in the strict sense, you might say this verse is not profitable for doctrine. It tells us something about God, yes, but we think of doctrine as the great facts about God, about Christ and salvation. There are passages in the New Testament which bring us new truth, which are especially profitable for doctrine. And the profit for doctrine of certain others is much less. Now we read here that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. It says ~~xxxxxxx~~ "thoroughly" which is an old English word meaning thoroughly in modern English so it doesn't matter whether you say "thoroughly" or "thoroughly". I remember someone once saying, "It is very important to get the Scripture exactly as it is". I looked it up in the Greek and found ~~it~~ ^{that} the same Greek word is sometimes translated "thoroughly" and sometimes "thoroughly". It is a matter of the English form changing. We say a thoroughfare but a through street and it's exactly the same word. But all Scripture is so that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished unto all good works - some for this good works, some for that good works, some for the other good work, but all of it for all of us. Then that the man of God may be perfect, that we may be complete that we may build up, certainly all Scripture is for that. And for instruction in righteousness - this verse I just read is certainly for instruction in righteousness. I think all the Scripture is for instruction in righteousness. But we notice a question whether all the Scripture is profitable for doctrine. Only to a very slight extent can some of it be said to be profitable for doctrine while other of it brings us the great gospels. What's the second thing? Profitable for doctrine, for reproof - what is reproof? Well isn't reproof for pointing out to you that you are going contrary to what you know is right? That's reproof, isn't it? If somebody thinks that this class starts at 2:35 and he comes walking in the door and I reprove him for being late, I will be quite out of place. You don't reprove a man for not carrying out a principle that he doesn't know exists. If he thinks it's 2:35, I don't reprove him, I correct him. But if a person knows that the class starts punctually at 2:30 and he gets here at 2:31, he is then deserving of reproof for not having ^{followed} that which he

knows to be ~~xxx~~ true. So there's a difference between these two, between reproof and correction. It is profitable for doctrine but then it is profitable to a man for reproof - to tell us, "Now you're doing what you know is wrong. You get back on to what is right." And for correction - "You are misunderstanding this. You have a false idea of it. I want to correct your idea." So there's a difference. So you might say, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable - some of it is particularly profitable for doctrine, some of it is particularly profitable for reproofs, some of it is particularly profitable for correction, but all of it is profitable for instruction in righteousness that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. I think that's reasonable. Well now this I heard many years ago - The application of this to the Pauline Epistles - and it struck me as having a great deal to it. This suggestion that was made was this - you take the Pauline Epistles and you begin with the Epistle to the Romans and that is surely one of the great doctrinal Epistles of the Bible, one of the great doctrinal writings of the Bible is the Epistle to the Romans. What is the doctrine that is given in the Book of Romans. Well there are a number of doctrines given there but ~~the~~ one, great outstanding doctrine there is the method of salvation. If you want to prove that one is saved through the Grace of God and that's there's nothing He can do himself to save himself, there is no greater setting forth of this doctrine anywhere than in the Book of Romans. Martin Luther saw this when he gave his lectures on Romans, those great lectures which the only copy of the notes on Luther's lectures, the only copy in existence was discovered in the Vatican Library. Somebody got ahold of them and passed them on to one of his enemies in his day and since they were written by their arch-enemy, they kept them and passed them on to the Vatican Library. And they were there for centuries before they were finally discovered about 50 years ago in the Vatican Library. And a Roman Catholic scholar set to work to study these lectures in order to prove that the claims of Protestantism are wrong and he wrote a book on it. And what is it he writes in his book to prove? To prove that the idea of the Protestant Reformation of salvation by faith which Luther

presented did not start with Luther's attack on the indulgences, but that actually he was giving it three years before in his lectures on the Romans. Well I think the Roman Catholic scholar has done us a service to show ~~XX~~ that it was not a situation in which he was angry at another monk or what this other order was doing as the Pope said at the time, "It's a fight between two monish orders," but that Luther saw the great principle of salvation by faith so clearly taught in the Romans and that he saw this attacked with the (9.)

So I think that the Roman Catholic scholar did us a real service in that but it also stresses the importance of Romans in this connection, in this great vital doctrine. And Luther wrote a commentary later on the Epistle to Romans - what was in the Vatican with the notes on his lectures given three or four years before the Reformation began at the University of Wurrtemberg. But he wrote a commentary on Romans and he wrote a preface to that commentary and in that preface, he stated clearly the great teaching of the Book of Romans on the way of salvation by faith ~~and~~ in Christ alone. And 200 years later an unknown individual, a member of the Moravian group, in a little chapel in London, read aloud a translation into English of Luther's preface to his sommentary on the Book of Romans. And a man sitting in front of him there who had been trying to serve God in the energy of the flesh for 10 years, had come clear over to Georgia here, in the United States, and worked hard and had no results to show, and worked hard in England and had no results to show for it, and becoming despondent and disheartened and discouraged - this man heard the reading of Luther's preface to the Epistles of the Romans and he wrote in his diary that night, "As I listened to this, my heart was strangely warmed and I felt a change take place ~~XXXXX~~ within me " and he described what he always later on referred to as his "conversion" when he saw the great teaching of the Book of Romans, salvation by faith. And that man, John Wesley, who had previously been working very hard but accomplishing nothing proceeded to turn England upside-down with his preaching of salvation by faith - the same message Luther had and they both got it from the Epistle to the Romans. So the Epistle to the Romans is the great doctrinal epistle on this theme of salvation by faith. Well if Romans is

the great doctrinal epistle on this theme, what is the great central matter of I and II Corinthians? I and II Corinthians have a great deal of very wonderful teaching in them on many subjects but they don't have anything like the amount of doctrine in them that Romans has. They would certainly impress anyone as being epistles whose primary nature is reproof rather than doctrine specifically. They are reproofing those who are erring in connection with this matter of our salvation by faith. And so here we have this great doctrine, the doctrine is presented in Romans, I and II Corinthians reprove false action in relation to this doctrine. We have the Antinomians - they say, "Well we're saved. Let's go and sin, do what we feel like. It's all on the Lord, we're safe." Paul says, "No, your life is very important. It must bring forth fruit in line with the doctrines." He reproofs them for lies which are affected by a false understanding of this doctrine. Then Galatians is an epistle of correction. Galatians deals with false thinking. It deals with false thinking regarding this matter of salvation and as a result Galatians is only second to Romans in its bringing out clearly this doctrine of salvation by faith. And Paul here opposed the errors of the Judaists. He does not set out as in Romans to give us a systematic presentation of the doctrine of ~~XXX~~ salvation by faith, but he attacks those who are denying the doctrine and proves that they are wrong and corrects the false ideas about it. So we have doctrine in Romans, reproof in I and II Corinthians, correction in Galatians regarding this great foundation doctrine of the Christian faith - salvation by faith. Then we come on to Ephesians and Ephesians is the epistle of the life in the Heavenly. It presents the life that is hidden with Christ and it shows ~~XXX~~ us the great blessings that God has given us after we are saved but living a life hid with Christ. It deals with our spiritual life and progress, to our growth in grace after we are saved. Ephesians is the great doctrinal epistle on this. There are no greater doctrinal epistles in the Bible than Romans and Ephesians. And then Philippians reproofs false action in relation to this, to our spiritual life with Christ, our relations with him and Colossians corrects false ideas in this connection. Colossians deals with the Gnostics who are coming in and bringing their false ideas of our relation to Christ and corrects those ideas. After that comes I and II Thessalonians which move on to another phase of life. It is the matter of God's

plan for this age. They are Paul's prophetic epistles. They deal with his great teaching about the return of Christ which would be a third phase of doctrine and then the pastoral epistles, I and II Timothy and Titus and Philemon deal with the care of the church and His provisions for carrying the work on.

End of Record 2

So that we see thus I think quite clearly that even Paul's epistles in the New Testament are arranged in a systematic, orderly fashion. We'll look more in detail into them to see their relation to these matters later, but they are arranged in a systematic, orderly fashion. The Bible is an organism. It is not simply a lot of different writings thrown together. The Bible is made up of 66 different books written by over 30 perhaps over 40 different authors, written over a period of many thousands of years, it is written in three different languages, they are men of many different types, but it all fits together into a perfect structure and we're interested in this course particularly, in the structure of the New Testament. So much then for our general introduction which I call I - The Scope of the Course - which in connection with this matter the general structure, we have anticipated something of the order of the Pauline epistles. And I hope if there are any of you who are not familiar with the order of the New Testament Books, that you will get that immediately. Learn the names of the books in order - that of course is very vital for us to have. The second section then of our course we'll call II- the Gospels. And that will take us a much longer time than this first which is simply introductory - the Gospels. And under Number 1 we will say, "The Gospels in General". And for this I would like to take you back to the Old Testament for the Gospels certainly are nothing which is new or accidental as far as God is concerned. They're new as far as man is concerned. Christ contains within His person, within His attitudes, within His actions, within His activities, within His life program, much that nobody could ever have dreamed of before He came. But many, many different aspects of Christ's life and activities and purpose were seen by various Old Testament writers. God gave one man a glimpse of this, another a glimpse of this, another a glimpse of this and another a glimpse of this. And could

those Old Testament men read what the others had written and fit it together with what they wrote and get an idea of exactly what was the whole truth about Christ - I don't think so. There's too much that they couldn't possibly know until He came but I'm sure there's a great deal they could get. They could get much more than simply stand in the Words of Wisdom. There are many passages in the Old Testament which are chrystal clear when we relate them to Christ, which otherwise it's very hard to get much sense out of. That's one reason why I looked forward with great dread to the appearance of the Old Testament of the Revised Standard Version and when it came out I found that my fears were fully justified. I was agreeably surprised when the New Testament came out in 1946. Here was a book which a group of modernists translated - there's hardly a man of them who really believes in the Diety of Christ, whatever they might say. I mean if you take the word/^{Diety}as simply meaning nothing then they can all believe in the Diety. Dean Weigall of Yale wrote to an inquirer - he said that he believed that except for the Jewish members of the committee, that all the rest believed in the Diety of Christ. He said, "I know I do." And a man wrote me who was a member of church and a committee who was to make a report on the RSV and he simply wrote Weigall that in their report they were just going to quote that to show that they all believe in the Diety of Christ. And he wrote me and said, "Can you say anything about this?" And I simply took the list and I picked out 8 men and I went over to the Lutheran Seminary over here which would have more of the type of literature those men write than we have in our library. We would have all their scholarly books here but when it comes to the popular type of books - we're interested in getting popular books by believers that would be helpful to us. We're interested in getting scholarly books by unbelievers so we can study them and know how to answer them but we don't want to waste a lot of time on popular books by unbelievers. So I went over there and I took this list of 8 writers and looked in their catalog and I found books by 6 of them. And I looked up the books by the 6 and in every single one of them I found statements which took the position that Jesus Christ made very serious mistakes and there were all sorts of things which he didn't know and many statements like that which were sharply in contradiction with any real idea that He was God, the second person of the Trinity.

It was easy to prove that either Dean Weigall didn't know what he was talking about, which would seem to be very unlikely, or that he was using the word in a different sense than these people were using it. If we are going to call Thursday, Tuesday and Tuesday, Thursday, and consequently announce that a ~~train~~ boat will start on Tuesday and mean Thursday, that's all right supposing everybody knows we use words in that sense - a word is only a symbol for an idea. But if everybody uses Tuesday to mean what we call Tuesday and we use it to mean what we call Thursday, we certainly are in danger of grossly deceiving. Now I don't like to accuse these men of intentionally deceiving but it comes mighty close, so close it's pretty hard to get around it. But the New Testament, though these men did not believe in the Divinity of Christ most of them, they were men who had studied the Greek a long time - they'd spent years at studying it and they took this group of 27 books and they found in these 27 books that there is one idea presented - the idea of a divine man who walked on this earth, who believed He was divine, those who wrote these books believed He was divine. There is a unity in the ideas of these 27 men and the modernist translators might believe the idea was utter nonsense but they know what these words mean and they know what the idea is and they can put it into English. While there are many comparatively minor points, yet some of them may be major, in which their translation of the New Testament gives a false impression, it brings out clearly most of the great doctrines of the New Testament, the great outstanding doctrines, because it's perfectly obvious that's what these New Testament writers believe and nobody can question it. And they took the words that are there and put them in English. But when it comes - yes, Mr. Mitchell? (Student question) Well that's a big word, a big phrase, "Hebrew Poetry". I would have to say regarding that that it's like - now - Moffatt, who's written the Moffatt translation, was a member of the committee for the Old Testament but he died (7.5) that he died before it was finished. But Moffatt has a translation of the Bible, The Moffatt Translation, and in Moffatt's Old Testament I have been amazed at the

(7.75) of his translation in some places. I've taken a verse in Isaiah and I've looked in the Hebrew and found that the English didn't get you very

near it - it gave some idea but I ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ had studied that verse and gotten into it and found exactly what that verse meant and I looked at Moffatt's translation and been amazed to find that he had gotten the idea and put it in beautiful English. Oh sometimes his translations are just perfect there, better than anything else I've ever seen. But the trouble is then you go on to the next verse and he's apt to take the Hebrew and just throw it aside and put something else in altogether that has no relation whatever to the original. Now it's possible that some of Moffatt's excellent interpretations had been (8.5) and some of them are very excellent. But that was only the individual verses which were remarkably well put. If you take the passages as a whole in the Hebrew poetry of the Old Testament, there's place after place where he just takes the Hebrew and throws it aside completely. Right where it says, "Kiss the sun lest He be angry and ye perish from the way," they say, "Kiss the ground lest ye perish". There's no word "ground" there. There is the word, "sun". There's absolutely no question of what it says there but they just don't like sun so they put in ground. Well now you see that's not a good translation. But in the verse before they may hit it perfectly so that there's much in it that can be helpful but only to a person who knows the Hebrew thoroughly and can check on it. Otherwise he can't. But the difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament in the RSV I would say is this - though the New Testament has many things that aren't good, it has the big doctrines clearly given because that's what these men believed - you can compare one with the other - it's perfectly clear what they believed and they give it. But when it comes to the Old Testament, the New Testament teaches that the Old Testament writers looked forward to Christ and that even when they were talking about things in their day, they were referring to one who was to come hundreds of years later and showing the answer in Him to all these things. Well now that's something no modernist can possibly believe, that an Old Testament writer could have any idea about Christ. And so when you get into the Old Testament you find passage after passage which makes no sense as something that an ordinary person in the Old Testament wrote to exhort his people to be good but makes perfect sense as a prediction

that somebody made about Christ - they just can't believe that and consequently in 95% of the cases they changed those around so that the result is that you have the New Testament contradicting the Old in at least 20 or 30 cases where the New Testament quotes the Old and they've changed the Old to make it make sense from their viewpoint. What I'm trying to say is you see the difference between the Old and New Testament in this regard. And did the Old Testament writers know much about Christ? They certainly didn't know everything. There was a great deal they didn't know. But did they know quite a bit about Him and did they realize that they were saying things which had a meaning beyond what they understood? Well, that is an interesting question isn't it? Fortunately it is a question to which we can give an absolutely certain answer because our answer is contained in I Peter 1. I Peter 1:10-11. I think the eleventh and twelfth verses, particularly the eleventh are particularly important - "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things which are now reported unto you that have preached the Gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from Heaven." Peter says here emphatically, those Old Testament writers knew they were predicting the salvation that was to come. Unto them it was revealed that they were predicting these great things of the future time. But he says they didn't fully understand them because he says in Verse 11 these Old Testament writers were searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when you testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Certain things were revealed to them and they saw these wonderful teachings and they wondered - David wondered - "How does this fit in with what Moses gave?" And he read Moses and he read what he wrote and he studied them and he tried to understand. ~~XXXX~~ And Isaiah read Moses and he read David and compared it with his and he tried to understand. And they understood a lot more

than they wrote but there's an awful lot they didn't understand. So that I think we have a very important point here that God did know all about the Gospel before they were ever written, before Christ ever came, and that he revealed a great deal in the Old Testament. That's why I'm going to start this consideration of the Gospels in general with the Book of Ezekiel and as you look at Ezekiel, you'll find in the first chapter of Ezekiel, the tenth verse is a verse on which I have preached more often than on any other verse of the Bible and when I preach on it I read Verse 10 and say, "This is my text" and you can see an amazed look on the part of a lot of people who wonder what on earth you're going to get out of this text. But I don't think I get anything out but what is there but it isn't obvious always at first sight. Ezekiel 1:10. Now the Prophet Ezekiel was given a vision of God as he began his ministry, as most of the prophets were given and the vision which the various prophets had was often a vision which was very specially related to the problems they were to face or the work they were to do. This is true of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, and of various others. It's true of Ezekiel. Ezekiel is over in Babylon

End of Record 3

the temple has been destroyed. Not yet when he begins but it is before long. He predicts it's going to be destroyed. The temple to be destroyed, the city of Jerusalem to be destroyed. All his men around him are expecting to go back and he says, "No", they're going to be destroyed. And then he tells us later on how they were destroyed. And so they are left with nothing tangible to look to. The Babylonians have their images and their idols, the Assyrians have their great gods, and the Egyptians. And the Jews have had a wonderful temple that's soon going to be destroyed. And God gives Ezekiel a vision in which Ezekiel sees very strange, almost fantastic things in this first chapter, to impress on his mind the fact that even though the temple be destroyed and that all the physical manifestations be gone, the great God of Israel still exists and has as much complexity and beauty to His nature as the Babylonians picture in any of their gods, that He has as much power

as they picture He really has. And so he sees a vision of wheels moving and very peculiar figures coming forward presenting to him these ideas to make the existence and power of God very real to him. And we find that God stands over - the invisible God of Israel is represented as standing over a peculiar beast which is described here which has four faces. And these four faces are described here in Ezekiel 1:10 - "As for the likeness of their faces, they four had the face of a man and the face of a lion on the right side and they four had the face of an ox on the left side. They four also had the face of an eagle." So here we have four faces - the man, lion, ox, and the eagle. We find the same faces mentioned again later on in Ezekiel only the ox he calls a cherub there. And then we have a similar four faces over in Revelation at one place - I forget exactly where. But we have then these four faces represented on this representation which Ezekiel sees as a manifestation of God and we go on to the New Testament and we find that Jesus Christ's light is described by in four different Gospels and I believe that we find a sufficient resemblance to these four faces to believe that God gave Ezekiel a glimpse of the four different aspects of Christ which would stand out in the observation of the four writers and which would be the central organizing factor of each of the four books. Now why do we have four Gospels? You know Taetian, one of the early writers in the second century A. D., decided that we should have one life of Christ and so he took the four Gospels and spread them before him and he took a piece of this and a piece of that and a piece of the other and he put them together and he tried to keep everything - if there was the same story told of feeding the five thousand in two different gospels, he'd take the longest account. If ~~XXX~~ you have the story of the coming of the wise men in only one Gospel, he'd take that. If you have something told in four, he'd just take one of them. But he put it together to make one life of Christ - the Diatesran - and people began reading that in churches. But soon it disappeared and they went back to the Gospels because that's the way God gave it to us. Actually we don't have a life of Christ in the ordinary sense. There's practically nothing told about the life of Christ between his birth and when He was twelve and between the time when He was twelve, of which there's very

little told, and the time when He was 30. 95% of the Gospels deals with three years of His life. And nearly half of that deals with the last week of His life. They are not lives of Christ in the ordinary sense because they don't set out to give you a detailed coverage of the events of his life showing those matters which would satisfy our curiosity about their outstanding details. Some of them are covered but the purpose of them is to give us portraits so that we can come to really know Him. And the four different aspects of Christ which we see in the four Gospels I believe correspond to the four (5.) in Ezekiel's vision. And so Ezekiel got just a glimpse of this phase of the way God was going to reveal and that he would reveal four aspects of the second person of the Trinity and then that He would show - would have four men picked each to see one particular aspect and to present these aspects to us and so we have these four Gospels related to one another in a way that I think makes us get much more value from any one of them - to understand the organizing principle and relate it to the other, and when we read something in one to see how it relates to the others with the big picture of the four in mind. Well, we'll continue at that point in our next meeting.

End of Record 4

all except two I believe are Juniors. We have all the Juniors and we have two who are more advanced who did not have it earlier. Consequently there are one or two things I can say to the Junior class as a whole. The two who are advanced, who were taking it a little later instead of taking it their first year, I'd just like to mention to them that I'm sorry that I had to miss it last Monday and I will next Monday too but I'm filling up the Juniors with other things at those hours and you two can study something else and I'll try to make up those hours a little later and do it at an hour that would be convenient for you if possible. Also I have a special hour for the Middler Section of this because the Juniors will have the section in with their other work. But since we've only had one meeting before this we haven't used that yet. But we will use that for you next Thursday and that half hour we'll have just a brief written lesson on this two today. That's all it'll be - it probably won't take the whole half hour but just to see that you're getting well started on the assignment for next time and on what is covered in class. Then the Middler-Senior schedule lists at 1:30 Sections in Church History - but that's for Middlers and Seniors. We're putting the Junior Sections at other periods and so the Juniors will get to Church History earlier tomorrow - much earlier in the day than the Middlers and Seniors will. I mention that to you now so that you will be ready for that little written lesson tomorrow/earlier than the 1:30 that is stated here on the scedule. Of course you have sections right after the other so you wouldn't have any time to getready for it except tonight anyway. But the 14 hours of study that you are doing aside from the work in the daytime, either have already done or can do, just the amount that's necessary for that little written lesson which you'll have tomorrow morning in Church History. That'll come earlier for you than it does for the upper sections. I wanted to mention that so there's no misunderstanding. And I want to repeatx again, in case anybody has any danger of any misunderstanding about our sections here. It has always been our rule that a credit hour represents three hours of work. I know that it's very hard to hold to that. That certainly is the theory in colleges. When I was in college the theory was that an credit hour meant an hour in class and two hours of study although in laboratory courses it might be two hours in class or even three hours - that ~~xxx~~ was the theory. But in actual practice we had some snap courses which we'd sit through for the semester - one

hour - we'd never do any studying, and sop it up the night before the exam, and get just as much credit for three hours like that as you would for three hours that you maybe did fifteen hours a week of study. Well naturally that's not right - a credit hour should represent the same thing. With us it is going to represent the same thing very definitely. Now you can't always keep it that way but you do your best. And if you ever find that one credit hour is taking more than three hours of work a week, let me know. We'll see if you're not understanding the assignment or if there's some misunderstanding

(3.75). The only exception to that is that right now I may give you a little more of some class for a couple of weeks and a little less later like in this New Testament Survey. You're only having one hour a week now and we'll have two later. I'm getting a little ahead in some other things to make up for it. But there's one thing too I think is very important to understand about our work here and that is if you go to University of Pennsylvania and take graduate work and pay a thousand dollars a year tuition you might say, "What does the University care? They get your thousand dollars and they give you your work and you can take it or leave it - what's the differenceX to you? You go to Cornell for undergraduate work, I think it's \$750. or \$800. a year tuition - it's up to you. You do what you want. But here we're in a different category altogether. We charge no-one any tuition but we have to raise from Christian people a full thousand dollars a year to pay the expenses of every student that comes here. And that means that those Christian people give that money in order to make it possible for us to give a really effective training for the Lord's service and we would much rather ~~XXX~~ youX spent your time studying and getting the value of that than spend it out doing some other kind of work. We'd much rather you did. If we didn't, we wouldn't try to get them to give the money or we'd ask you to pay tuition instead. But I'm very anxious to keep our work without tuition - I'm very anxious - because I want students to be able to put their time on their work. But I do feel that there's a responsibility to the people who give the money to be sure the money isn't wasted. And if a thousand dollars is put on a person's tuition, which is what it is, I feel it's important that that person get the 51 hours of work a week for those credit hours, if he receives the credit hours. And we are asking the Juniors, except under very special circumstances, we're

asking them to be here for $8\frac{1}{2}$ hours in sections or in classes each day except one hour out for the FMF and then of course, the Chapel. And then with 14 more hours of your own study evenings or Saturdays, it makes up the fifty-one ~~XXXX~~ hours on the lessons. We feel that with that training - that amount - we can give you a good thorough training and without that amount we can't. But we can't with that amount or double that amount if you're not working hard at it. It's your work that counts, it's merely our trying to direct it. But I just want to keep stressing that. I know myself, I begin working on a subject and I see the great importance and it's so easy but you prefer to do other things, prefer to do other things, and you let it slide and then you come up to the time when you need it and you don't have it and so I think a little pep talk every now and then to make these 51 hours count for the utmost, will result in your being happier ~~and~~ in the years to come with the training that you've got to serve the Lord. Now this work in New Testament Survey is a very important subject because we are trying to get a survey of the main contents of the New Testament and if there are some of you who have a background without much Bible training, we want to give you the basic rudiments of the skeleton of the New Testament and be sure you have it. But no matter how much Bible background you may have so that you didn't need to memorize these skeletal facts much, we feel that there's a great deal about the inter-relation of the parts and the general survey of the whole that is of tremendous importance for you to have to make your later courses in Exegesis much more worthwhile. Many people think of a seminary as a place where you go and you take a few verses and study them very, very carefully ~~XXXX~~ in the Hebrew and Greek and know nothing about the rest of the Bible. And there are one or two seminaries that advertise, "We don't spend a lot of time on Hebrew and Greek. We stress the English Bible. We want you to get the English Bible." Well there's nothing any better about the English Bible than the German Bible or the Korean Bible or certainly not as good as the Hebrew Bible or the Greek Bible. But the point of it isn't what language the Bible is in but the point is that we don't want to know just a few passages. We want to know it as a whole. We want to know a few very thoroughly to get method for studying the rest and we also want to get it as a whole. Both aspects are very important

and in this particular course we're going at it from the wide aspect and some things you simply have to take my word for that in the more advanced course I can go into the Hebrew and Greek to give you precise evidence. But we're interested in this general survey. And we looked at Roman Number I - The Scope of the Course and briefly surveyed Paul's Epistles with their general relation to his teaching as a whole. We'll go into that more later on of course. And then we looked at Roman Numeral II - the Gospels and under that we took up Number 1 - the Gospels in General. I showed you ~~XXXX~~ I Peter 1:10-12 with its tremendous importance for the Old Testament attitude toward the New Testament. And then I took up Ezekiel ~~X~~ 1:10 with you and showed a little bit of its context and we noticed that God here gave Ezekiel the vision of God and in the course of this vision, he had a glimpse of the way in which God was going to reveal himself to the world; that is, God in the person of the second person of the Trinity, Incarnate God, Jesus Christ, was to be revealed ~~XXXX~~ with four particular aspects. Now there are many, many aspects of Christ but these are the four which are stressed here and I believe in doing so that he was causing Ezekiel to have a glimpse of that which would be particularly important in giving a clear understanding of Christ in some of the many different angles of His marvelous personality. And so he said, "As for the likeness of their faces they four had the face of a man and the face of a lion on the right side" and I believe that the one we can very profitable start with is the one on the right side. He was of course a man, He was incarnate man and the man is mentioned first but the one on the right side is the face of a lion and whatever anybody might think was the meaning of the other portions of the symbolism, nobody would question that the lion stands for the king of beasts. The lion is the emblem of Kingship. And the face of the lion on the right side we find very well brought out in the picture which Matthew had of Christ. I'm glad right here that the way that we did not have the lecture in New Testament Survey last Monday because you all had my Church History lecture on Wednesday and Thursday and in that lecture we covered in some detail certain material which otherwise I'd of had to anticipate Monday because it fits right in here. There was the people to whom Christ came directly - the people from whom He was born according to the flesh - were people who were anxious

to have a King and the first gospel is written directly to those people. I don't think anyone can question that the Gospel of Matthew while written for the whole world, while it is a book that is full of meaning for all of us, for all people at all times, in the first instance it was written in order to bring the Word of God to this people among whom He was born - to the Jews. There is a tradition that the Gospel of Matthew was written in the Aramaic language originally and then a new edition of it gotten out, perhaps by the same author in the Greek language. If so, that's a very early Christian tradition but if so, the Aramaic form of it has disappeared. I don't know whether you all know but Aramaic is one of the five main Semitic languages. Aramaic is one of the five and the Jews at the time of the exile, gave up Hebrew as their regular language and talked Aramaic and thereafter Hebrew was a sort of a sacred language, a written language for special religious ceremonies but Aramaic was what they talked. And Aramaic was what the people talked in Jesus' family and what they talked in Judea in His time even though Greek was coming in more and more as an official language and was used a great deal in commerce and so on. The language of the people was Aramaic and Matthew may have been written in the Aramaic language but it certainly is written for the Jews. Now I heard a man once say, "The Gospel of Mark is a wonderful Gospel to give people as a brief presentation of the Christian faith - the Gospel of Mark is. But to Jews or Mohammedans the Gospel of Mark is not the one to start with because they begin and it says, **X**'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God' and right away there you have the Diety of Christ hitting them in the face in the very first verse and the Jews and the Mohammedans have as a basic point of their religion, 'There is one God'"and of course we Christians believe equally strongly there is one God but with this great stress on there is one God, people who aren't really informed of what Christianity really teaches are immediately impressed with the idea, "You're trying to teach two Gods when you talk about a Son of God". And for an approach to Jews or Mohammedans, the Matthew starts out much better than Mark does - "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David". The Jew who carefully studied the Book of Isaiah would know that it says that the coming Prince of Peace is to be the Everlasting Father the Mighty God. He would know that but that takes careful study. It's a problem, they don't understand it. How can the coming Messiah be the everlasting God? And so in

the version of the Jewish Scriptures which is used today mostly among them, it simply says, and His name shall be called Pella il Gabor, etc. - it gives it in transliteration just the sound instead of the words so that they won't be struck with His name will be the mighty God, the Everlasting Father. They can't understand it - if they did, they'd have to become Christians. It's a mystery, they just lay it aside. They say, "God is one God - He can't have a son". But you take a Jew and he begins this, "The book of the generations of Jesus Christ, the son of David". He says, "The son of David. Why David is promised a son. He's promised continuing sons through all generations. The sceptre shall not depart from Judah. There's going to be a great son of David who's going to come, who's going to reign. We're looking for the son of David." It starts in a way to win his interest better than to immediately shock him and perhaps repel him

End of Record 5

this in ancient times to a Greek, the Greek would say, "Jesus Christ, the son of David? Who's this David anyway?" Well it's nice to know who Jesus' father was but what great interest does it have?" And with Romans the same way, "Who's this son of David? What's that about?" But the Jew-right away you've got his interest. "We're looking for the son of David. Well they think this is the son of David. Let's see what they have to say about it." And then it goes on "the son of Abraham" and here you have it tied right up with all that is dear to the Jews - "the son of Abraham, the son of David". It has a start that is just adapted to win the interest and attract the attention of the Jew. And then the Jew goes on and he reads, "Abraham begat Isaac" and he says, "I know that's true. What's that going to lead to?" and he goes on and he reads the names of a lot of old Jewish kings. He reads about Solomon and Rehoboam and Abijah and Asa and Jehoshaphat. He knows all these - every Jewish child knew all these kings in order. They can rattle them right off every one of them. Here they are - it gives the geneology and traces right up to Jesus. "Oh, is He a descendant of the House of David? And we're looking for a king, a son of David. Well they claim that genealogically, He is the one. Maybe that requires a little study to be sure the claim is true. But at least here is the claim. Let's go on and see what else he has to say." So that it is a good start for the Jews.

And so you have a book here which is written in the first instance for the Jews and it is written for the Jews in order to show them the King. Now the Jew has known from the time of David that David is going to have a great son and the Jew is interested in the coming of this king and everytime that there would be a firstborn son to the descendant of David, you can be sure there was great celebration, there was great happiness everywhere on account of that. But there would be a special interest in it now because the last son of David to be king had his eyes put out and was taken as a prisoner to Babylon in 586 B. C. and nearly 600 years has gone by and there has been no king reigning who was a son of David so the Jews are interested in the coming of a son of David. And the Jews had been subject to the Syrian king and the Syrians had tried to force them to give up their religion and about 180 B. C. they had revolted under the Macabees and they had won their independence and they thought now they were free but then before so long passed they found that the Romans, to whose friendship they had looked to help them win freedom from the Syrians, eventually a Roman army came through and marched into Jerusalem and took over, took possession and seized the sons of some of their rulers and took them to Rome as hostages for the certainty of the good behavior of the nation and Herod the Great, who reigned in Jerusalem was an Edomite and he had lived in Rome and was a good friend of the Romans and after his death and the brief time of the reign of one of his sons, the Romans who were actually ruling behind the scenes, actually marched in and took over and they had Roman soldiers marching through Jerusalem and keeping the peace and the Roman troops were going all through Palestine establishing such peace as they'd never had in the land before but it made the Jews feel very much oppressed and very inferior to have the Romans ruling over them. And more and more the people were saying, "When are we going to have our own king? When are we going to have freedom from the Romans? When will our Messiah come?" They were looking for freedom with their own Messiah and Matthew says, "Here is the king. Here is the lion of the tribe of Judah. Here is the one for whom you are looking." And so God raised up a man to write this first Gospel who would be especially well prepared to write it. I'm sure that everyone of the disciples saw Jesus as the King. I'm sure that everyone of us who really knows Christ, must see Him as our King, the one who has the right to reign in our lives. But we would see other aspects just as much or

more but here was one man who was particularly impressed with it. He was anxious for the coming king, so anxious that he tried to learn all he could about kingship and rule and he took a job under the hated Romans as one of the tax-gatherers. And he would sit there at the seat of customs, collecting the taxes and as he collected the taxes he would be representing the Romans and trying to learn something about the technique of these Romans who ruled the world. But then in between he'd have big rush periods of work and he'd have other long periods when he was just waiting and he had his copy of the Old Testament and he was reading over the Old Testament. And as he read through he constantly noticed the promises of the king. And he said, "The Romans aren't going to reign over us forever. We're going to have our own king, the son of David is coming." And Matthew read these promises and he meditated over them and he studied the predictions in the Old Testament more and more and so one day when he saw a group of Galilean peasants coming by with ~~the~~ a man who was clad like a peasant, who was their leader and explaining things to them - other people just said, "Here's a bunch of peasants coming along and they seem to have one man who's their particular leader" but Matthew heard what they said and he could see what the ordinary person couldn't see because he was prepared by this study. And you know that's a point I think that is very vital in any kind of study. You get prepared for something, you get your eyes opened to it and you're ready to see the answer to it. I say in studying any subject, it's good to make theory - that any kind of a theory is good to make. I don't care how wild your theory is, make a theory and look for evidence on your theory. Don't jump to accepting your theories - true - but look for evidence for or against and you're looking for things definite. And when you're looking for something definite, you're more apt to find something else than if you just go out absolutely open-minded like a sieve so everything just goes ~~XXXXXX~~ right through and nothing sticks. You have to have a definite objective of weighing and examining. If you're looking for something, you're more apt to find what's there than if you're looking for nothing. I say don't look with a pre-determination of what you're going to find - you're going to find what you look for - but look with something definite in mind. And so Matthew was looking ~~for~~ and I'm sure Matthew wasn't just ready to accept anybody that came along as being the promised Messiah. Chances are that Matthew started out expecting to see a man come along

on a big white horse, a lot of soldiers behind him, and everybody would see he was the great warrior, the great conquering king coming - that's what Matthew thought when he started. But as he studied the Old Testament more and more and read about the coming One and saw His characteristics and His qualities, he saw that the kingship would be something that would be in His character which wouldn't have to have a big outward display to make it evident. And he saw more and more what it was and the time when he saw so many evidences that he said, "This is the one" and I'm sure Matthew was just there thinking, "What shall I do now? I believe this is really the king we're looking for. This is the one unlikely as it seems. What shall I do about it?" And Jesus turned and said, "Follow me". And he looked - this Galilean peasant says to this man at the seat of customs, "Follow me". Well you go up to one of Eisenhower's chief ~~ministers~~ cabinet ministers or somebody and you say, "Follow me" and they'll usher you out the door quite quickly. You go up to somebody with an entirely different group or background or status than you are and you speak to them that way and you get nowhere. And you shouldn't. But the reason Jesus got somewhere with it was because Matthew was ready for it and Matthew saw this was the one he was ready to follow and anxious to follow. But my what a shame Jesus had to say it. You will find in your Christian work that there are many, many people ~~xxx~~ to whom you can say, "Follow Christ" and you'll never get anywhere. It's good to say it but you may feel it's absolutely hopeless. But there are people who are just ready and who will respond when you give the word but without the word will not respond. They need just that little bit to carry them and Jesus said, "Follow me" and Matthew stepped out and followed Him. And Matthew gave a big feast then - Matthew didn't just leave his job and drop everything for somebody else to come along and pick up the pieces. He probably was a few days or maybe a few weeks before he could leave it in proper fashion. But he immediately gave a big feast and introduced Jesus to his friends and told them what Jesus was and how much it meant to him. And I can see them shaking their heads, "Poor Matthew. He had great possibilities and he would have risen high in the service of the Romans if he'd kept on. But he's following some queer will-o-the-wisp somewhere." Some of them though in their hearts thought,

"Well now, He's a pretty sensible man. Now maybe there's more to this than we realize." And probably some of them came 'round to him at night when the others weren't looking and asked him for more details and were ready perhaps later on to become disciples themselves. But Matthew then was ready and watching and he was watching for the man who had the characteristics the Old Testament presented - the God-sent king, the Messiah, the one who was the lion of the tribe of Judah, the one who was the one predicted in the Old Testament. And so Matthew writes his Gospel in order to pass on to others what he saw - the king he saw. It is the same man he saw that the others saw and the characteristics that they saw he could see too and they could see the characteristics he saw but this is the one that impressed him so much that he had to stress it constantly. He was just filled with this desire to make this king known to us. And so you take the Gospel of Matthew and you begin going through it and you see right away "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham". A king has to have a genealogy. He has a right to reign by virtue of his birth. To us in America that does not mean a great deal. We're away from that idea but in a very large portion of the earth today, that is the first question they would ask, "What is his ancestry?" In England, the greatest rulers, the most able rulers that ever sat on England's throne was not a king - it was Oliver Cromwell. He probably had more ability than any five English kings put together that England ever had. And he took the name of England, which had been at the lowest ebb in the reign of King Charles when the Romanist nations of Europe were just ready to wipe their feet on the name of England under Charles I and the same was true under Charles II. And in the few years that Cromwell reigned he made the name of England so strong in the sight of Europe that when the Pope began persecuting the Waldentians in Northern Italy and they massacred quite a number of them and Cromwell sent a warning to the Pope to stop and the Pope stopped. And no previous or later English king could have gotten away with that but Cromwell raised England to the highest position she'd ever had up to that time. But when Cromwell was gone his power was gone and the English people with rejoicing went back to a degenerate, profligate, weak, immoral fellow named Charles II because he happened to be the son of Charles I. And

England sank to a lower ebb than she'd been under Charles I. But it just shows this hold that it has on the minds of many people - the ancestry of a king. It has even today of course in England - the people idolize a young girl because she happens to be the daughter of the fellow who was King of England before. But that is the thing that people historically have looked as the first sign for a king. Well in the case of Jesus it is not extremely important from our viewpoint. The fact that He's Son of God is what's most important from our viewpoint. But God did give them this sign to satisfy those who were looking for one who is the descendant of the line of kings and God had promised to David that David would have a son to sit on the throne. Well here He is. So we start with the genealogy. And then after the genealogy we have the **story** of his birth - the story of the birth of the king. And not only the wonderful story of the birth of the king but the fact that it was a miraculous birth. And this miraculous birth Matthew tells us was a birth which was a miracle which had been predicted 700 years before. But Matthew does not tell us that he has noticed something interesting - that Jesus fulfilled this prediction. Matthew says that an angel told Joseph that this was fulfilling the prediction. He says that this angel said to Joseph that this had happened to fulfill what was spoken of the Lord by the prophets saying, "Behold a virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son." In the Revised Standard Version they insert quotation marks which are not in the original and they put the quotation marks before this and make them stop so that it's only Matthew who says this and not the angel. But in the context it's very clear that if Matthew said it, he wouldn't put it in at that particular point. If Matthew said it, he would put it at the conclusion, at the end, not right in the middle between the story of what the angel says and (14.5) of Joseph's waking up. It is the argument that the angel gives Joseph to convince Joseph that this is the fulfillment of the Scripture

End of Record 6

that Matthew is interested in himself and interested in getting across. This Jesus has fulfilled the Old Testament predictions and there are one dozen times in the Book of Matthew where it says as it does here, "These things were done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophets saying". Matthew keeps telling us how the prophecies are fulfilled. Now I'm a little bit uncertain whether right now to go on ~~to~~ through Matthew a bit to show you how the king picture fits or to wait until we take Matthew up in a little more detail. I think I'll make a compromise between the two - I'll just very briefly look at a few features. Matthew starts with the genealogy, then the story of the birth of the king, and then we have the wise men from the East coming to bring presents to a king. "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" they say. And then we find another king and this king is jealous. He says, "I'm the king of the Jews. X Now of course the Jews don't like me for their king. I'm an Edomite. I'm not a Jew at all. I'm holding them by virtue of my possession of the friendship of the Romans and I have some Roman soldiers helping me do it but I am their king. And now if there's another one going to come to be king, I won't rule or my son rule anymore. I want to do something about that." So we have another king jealous of Jesus and deciding to try to kill Him. So we have the slaughter of the innocents here in the end of this first chapter. And then we find that Joseph flees down into Egypt and then he comes back from Egypt after Herod dies and he dwells in a city called Nazareth that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, "He shall be called a Nazarene". You won't find those precise words in the Old Testament. It is a summary of the teaching, "He will be a Nesar" is the Hebrew word which means "the branch" which is used of the coming king, a branch. And here is this town of Nazareth which has a name derived from the word for branch. Evidently there was a certain kind of foliage or vegetation there after which the town took its name. And the Old Testament speaks of the Messiah, the branch. It isn't a specific statement but it is a relationship between this mentheantic title and the name of the town where he goes. I don't think this is perhaps as much of truth from the Old Testament as an incidental similarity in the name of the town. But then we find that Jesus the King comes and there's a forerunner who comes first. Chapter 3 tells of the coming of the forerunner, John

the Baptist. And John the Baptist says that one is coming after him. And then we find Jesus. And then the king is tempted by the other king - Satan, the Prince of this world. And he tries to get Jesus to bow down to him and offers to give him all the kingdoms of the world if he'll bow down. And Jesus stands the various tests of temptation. Then we find that Matthew points out that Isaiah predicted where Jesus would begin His preaching. "The people that sat in darkness saw great light" and where did this light begin to come? "In the land of Zebulon, the land of Natalie, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan - Galilee of the Gentiles". We'll study that next year in the Book of Isaiah in its context and see exactly what it means in Isaiah and see that Matthew is not twisting anything out of context at all. That Isaiah predicts where the light will come and here's where it comes. The beginning of the coming of the light is the preaching of Christ beginning in this very place which is here described - Galilee, the way of the sea beyond Jordan - in the land of Zebulon and the land of Natalie. Then we find Him calling His first followers and then we have three chapters which might be called the proclamation of the principles of His kingdom and that is a good way to start a kingdom is to proclaim the principles upon which it is to be based. And we could thus go on through the Book of Matthew and we will look at a good deal more of it but right now we're not looking at Matthew but at the Gospels in general. And I want to notice what was on the left side. What was on the left side in Ezekiel's vision? On the right side there was the face of a lion and on the left side there was the face of an ox and that certainly is a queer combination. One time I walked across the hills from Germany into Czechoslovakia and there I saw the farms and there were the people out farming and there I saw a horse and an ox yoked together pulling the plow. It looked ludicrous to me - of course in those days I was accustomed to seeing horses in the field here in America. Nowadays you hardly ever see them - it's all tractors. But I was accustomed to seeing two horses pulling the farm implements. But here was a horse and an ox together and it looked ludicrous but how much more to see a lion and an ox. On the right side was the lion and on the left side was the ox - very strange combination. And when you turn from Matthew to Mark the contrast is very, very great. Now just a minor part of

the contrast - and yet it's symptomatic of the whole - Matthew is the longest of the Gospels - 28 chapters in the Gospel of Matthew. Mark is the shortest of the Gospels with 16 chapters in the Gospel of Mark. Well the difference is the difference in that which they saw. Matthew sees the regal majesty of the lion and he takes the longest of the Gospels to portray it. Mark sees the ox which is the one, the strong animal that does the heavy work about the farm. He sees the one that is able to accomplish things. And here we see what I think is a marvelous illustration of the tact of the Holy Spirit. There are cases when you go right up to somebody and you rebuke them violently for what they're doing that is wrong and God uses your rebuke to win them. There are cases but those cases are rare and as a rule he uses a different approach. As a rule it is bringing the person that of which they feel the need that wins them rather than bringing them the immediate rebuke which they really need just as bad as the other but they don't realize it. They realize that there's something to fulfill their need and then later on they will realize the other need. They will feel the repentance and the need of forgiveness perhaps a little later but not right immediately. If you show something of the wonder and glory of Christ at first. Well of course that's what Matthew does with the Jews - he shows them the wonder of the king, the promised Messiah, but they don't read very far in Matthew before they find out that if they're really going to get any good out of this Messiah, they've got to turn from their sins and recognize themselves as sinners deserving eternal punishment for their sins and that in the proclamation of the principles of His kingdom was enough to drive away a great many of the Jews. Those requirements of the Sermon on the Mount - the modernists talked a lot about the sermon on the mount but they don't live up to it - nobody can live up to it. But they talk about it a lot and some fundamentalists reacted if the modernists talk about it a lot, we shouldn't say anything about it. And of course that's utterly wrong. It's a very important thing, The Sermon on the Mount and very important for us too. But it doesn't show us how we should live but it shows us our failure, our need of a savior and then it does show the ideals toward which in His power we should move after we're saved.

But Mark comes to another people and the people that Mark writes for in the first instance are the Romans. And the Romans - one of the three great elements in the world at that time - the world into which Christianity came. And Mark comes to the Romans and Mark says to the Romans - what does he say? "Here's the king, here's the coming king!" Well the Romans ~~XXXX~~ say, "We're the king, we rule the world. Why do we want a king?" Well he says, "God's going to topple you from your kingship. Put on His own king." That's what he tells the Jews about the Romans. And that's what the Romans find out before they're through but it's not the way he starts with the Romans. The Romans have got the kingship. The Jews are obsessed with the idea of kingship - "We want a king. We want our independence". That's what they want and Matthew shows where they can find a real king. The Romans aren't thinking much of kingship - they've got it. When I first went to Germany, the rule there was that the heat was turned on the first of November. Anyway there was a certain day at which the landlords were required to give you heat and it got cold a week before that. And that week I shivered. I'd sit trying to study with an overcoat on and blankets around my legs - it was the hardest thing in the world to get comfortable enough to study. Well I was thinking of heat all the time - I was conscious of the need of getting warmed up. Well after a week the day struck and they brought up the briquettes and put them in the old oven ~~there~~ in the corner and warmed up the room and then I didn't think of heat anymore - it just wouldn't enter your head - you've got it! So the thing you haven't got you're apt to be thinking about and craving and dreaming about. And the Jews were doing that about kingship but the Romans weren't - they had the kingship. And so to go to the Romans and say here is the coming king would either strike a thought they weren't particularly interested in or else it would bring them a realization that something they already had was going to be taken away from them. And either of those was not a tactful approach. But the Holy Spirit through Mark goes to the Romans, who are not obsessed with the desire for kingship, they've got it, but who have another desire, and shows how Jesus meets that desire. The Romans have got the kingship, they've got the rule, and it's easy for people to think, "My if I had the power, I'd just fix everything up just right" and they say that in political

things it's always interesting how in ~~XXX~~ politics if you have one party ruling in a nation and then you have a party that's out of power, the party out of power is always slamming everything and saying how much better everything would be. And they say it's wonderful how a party gets sobered down as a rule by being in power for a little while because they find that it isn't so easy as they thought it was and they have to deal with situations and try to get things done. And here were the Romans, they had the power but they had to use the power and use it right and it was a problem. The Romans wanted to cement their empire together so they built big roads going all over the empire - some of those roads are still in use today. Some of them are in better shape than some of ours that are five years old, some of these Roman roads that are 2000 years old. They built thoroughly and carefully. They didn't know the principle of physics that water if it goes down will rise again to the level of the start. They didn't know that so they built high aqueducts across the plains to keep the water up high so it would stay up so as to get it to their cities. But my the work that went into those aqueducts - the ruins of them are in many parts of Europe today - tremendous engineering (12.) work. It's just a shame they didn't realize that one principle which would have saved them a lot of trouble. But all over Europe today you see the remains of the great work the Romans did. They were interested in getting things done. And Mark goes to the Romans and doesn't say, "Here's a king. You need a king." They say, "We've got the king." He doesn't do that. He says, "Here is the one who is the perfect servant, the one who can accomplish, the one who can get things done, the one who can fill your need." And so the ox - the patient burden-bearer, the servant, the one who is able to fill your need - is brought to the Romans. And the Roman who has all the power and still isn't satisfied because he finds that power alone is insufficient. He's not getting the results he'd like to get. He's looking for a perfect servant - oh, for a perfect servant. Oh, for somebody who will just take ahold of things and do things and do them right and get them done. Mark says, "Here's power, here's the one who can do things. Here's the one who can meet your needs." And so Mark sees Jesus as the servant which the ox is a very good emblem to typify.

He sees Him as the perfect servant the one who is able to perform the work that is needed, the one who is able to - has the power to accomplish our needs. Mark is a young man, he's impetuous, he's interested in deeds rather than words and he goes rapidly from one thing to another - "Straightway"- straightway He does this, straightway He does that - he sees Jesus as a doer accomplishing things. And you have more deeds in Mark than you have in any other Gospel and less words. You have far less presentation of what He said than in most of the Gospels but you have more presentation of His great power and what He was able to do. Mark was a young man, an impetuous young man and he got much of the detail of his Gospel from Peter who was the most impetuous of the disciples and he got this attitude of "Let's be doing things. Here's the one who did things. Here's the one who accomplishes. It is the great power of the servant." Well Matthew starts with the genealogy of the king. You don't need a genealogy of a servant - it's not even mentioned, anything about his ~~king~~ genealogy. But Mark writes in the first instance for the Romans. The Romans have got lots of Gods. Here is Jesus Christ, the Son of God - that won't repel anybody, it won't drive them away but will suggest that He is a strong, powerful one who can accomplish - and then a little later they find that by "the Son of God" it doesn't just mean one who has a divine power but one who has the divine power, one who is the Son, the only son in the true sense of the only daughter. So that it doesn't repel them at all but it attracts them and then we read about the great deeds

End of Record 7

We read about the great deeds of this great effective servant. We don't have so much about the words of the servant and Matthew was writing for the Jews who were interested to know how you fulfilled the Old Testament. The Romans didn't know anything about the Old Testament and Mark quotes from the Old Testament occasionally but not very often. The Romans weren't familiar with the Old Testament and they're comparatively few quotations from the Old Testament. There is almost a jerking style as he goes from one great deed to another great deed - you can just feel the power that's there - the one who can meet your needs too. And then you turn to Luke and anyone who was in Church

History this week would immediately know to whom the Gospel of Luke would be addressed. We've already seen that of the three great factors of the world into which Christianity came - Matthew was to one of them and Mark to the other and Luke is to the third. And it's impossible for anyone today to realize today what an influence in the world the Greeks were in the day of Christ. But Greek as a language was spreading through the world, it was the beautiful language and the efficient language for precise expression of ideas and the Greeks as individuals had an influence because of their great, clear thinking, their interest in science and their interest in beauty. The Greeks looked at the Romans and they had the kingship and the Greeks would like to have the kingship too but they didn't worry quite so much that they didn't have it. They weren't like the Jews, obsessed with the idea of getting freedom and power for themselves and the Greeks looked at the Romans and saw their great works and they weren't like the Romans wishing to do greater works all the time. To the Greeks there was something a little bit barbaric in these great tremendous works of the Romans. They were more interested in a little statue which was beautifully carved and just right than they were in a great big tremendous building that would make a tremendous impact but the details weren't quite so artistically worked out. They were interested in artistry, they were interested in the esthetic and they were interested in science. And so we have Luke writing, Luke the beloved physician, writing for the Greeks. We don't know whether Luke was a Jew or a Greek or perhaps a Jew who was half Greek or who had a gentile background - we don't know. There are all sorts of theories about it but we do know this that Luke was very familiar with the Greek mind. And where one of the other Gospels says, "Jesus went into the city and talked", Luke names the city. One of the others said, "There's a man who'd been sick so long." Luke names the disease. Luke gives us the details much more than the other Gospels. He had that interest in those little touches. You read the ~~XXXXXX~~ Gospel of - of course in Ezekiel's picture there's the face of a man - and that's Luke - the face of a man. And of course that's even more incongruous than the lion and the ox, putting the man. Yet Jesus is represented by all three aspects of his character. You look at the rather choppy Greek style of Mark and what a contrast when you start reading Luke. The beautiful flowing

style, the Gospel of Luke. The noted French skeptic, Renaud, made the statement once about the Greek Gospel of Luke that it was the most beautiful book ever written. He was impressed with the Greek style, the beauty of the book of Luke. And Luke is picturing the perfect man. The Greek says, "Yes, that's very nice to build these big aqueducts and to build roads. It's very nice to have the kingship and the power but after all what's the good of a man being able to take a city and not to control his own spirit? What's the good of this great, powerful king that makes a fool of himself? After all the most important thing is to live your own life in a way that's worth while." How should human life be lived on the highest plane is a problem that the best of the Greeks were constantly devoting their thought to. And Luke says here's the answer. Here is the example of the perfect man. Again the modernists talk about living in Jesus' way, about following in His footsteps. Well that's a scriptural thought. Nobody will ever be saved by following in Jesus' footsteps but after we're saved we should want to follow in His footsteps. And the marvel of the example of this perfect man is something that we shouldn't just cast aside because the modernists give it a tremendous stress. It deserves a tremendous stress but there are other things that deserve a greater stress. But it is a wonderful approach to Christ - it's one of these great approaches to Christ - the perfection of His life, the perfection of His character. It is something which can be used as a marvelous instrument to reach those who are of the frame of mind that this particular approach is most effective with them. And then we have the others - they just start in and tell you of the genealogy of Christ, tell you about His mighty ~~works~~ works, but Luke writing for the Greeks - they want to know, "How do you know about this anyway? Where is it? Where did it come from?" Well "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of His word, it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus." He has gathered his facts, he has investigated the thing, he has been a personal eyewitness of many and he got the facts from others, from talking with them directly. He goes into the explanation of his method for the Greek who was interested

in knowing the evidence that this is really a true picture. And there's the scientific approach - you get the facts and you present them in a clear way. Matthew tells you about the great king and how the great king had wise men come and give presents to Him such as were fitting to give to a king while Luke tells you about the perfect man who had the shepherds out in their fields by night. He has a universal appeal - the great men, the wise men, the powerful rulers of the world will have to come to Him, yes. They have to come to Him if their lives are to be worth anything but Luke brings out how there is that in Him which appeals to all humanity. And the shepherds are told of the message of "Peace on earth, good will to men" and that in Bethlehem there they will find it. And so we have here the picture of the perfect man told from the viewpoint of the interest in the esthetic, the interest in science given in a way to the Greeks. Now Mark gives us very little of Jesus' words. Luke gives a great deal. The Greeks are interested in good thoughts and clear expression of them. They are interested to know what the perfect man would say. He doesn't have the proclamation of the principles of kingship given at the beginning but most of the material in the Sermon on the Mount is given in other connections, in the connections which impressed Luke as fitting in most directly with the purpose which he had in mind. And so he gives you from a little different slant, the slant which appealed to him and which is an equally true slant, he gives you these different aspects of the life of Christ. He tells you the story of the virgin birth even as Matthew told it - the birth free from sin of this perfect man. And you have here the Gospel then ideally suited for the use of the Greeks and ideally suited to meet particularly certain universal needs of the human heart and to show them the answer to those needs in Jesus Christ. Well here are the three great elements in the world into which Christianity came and here we have a Gospel to go in the first instance to each of these three and yet after you are won you find the other also have a message for you and you have a real need of them too. But there were the three great elements and we have the three Gospels. And now there's a fourth Gospel and there's a fourth great element and the fourth great element was not in the world into which Christianity came. It was an element which was in the world only after Christianity had come into it. And we find that suggested in Ezekiel, "As for the likeness of their faces

theyfour had the face of a man and the face of a lion on the right side". Well the RSV says "The face of a man and the face of a lion on the right side" - that doesn't make sense. How are you going to draw this picture? The face of the man must have been in front. So they say, "As for the likeness of their faces they four had the likeness of a man in front" then they have a footnote "Hebrew omits 'in front'". Now it's not true to say that Hebrew omits it. You say the RSV inserts it - the Hebrew doesn't have it because it isn't there. The Hebrew is our Bible but the RSV inserts it and then they go ahead and they say "They had the face of an eagle in back" and they have a footnote, "Hebrew omits 'in back'". Of course it would have been truer to say, "We insert 'in back'". There's absolutely no warrant for it. Ezekiel says "They had the face of a lion on the right side and they had the face of an ox on the left side. They four also had the face of an eagle." They also had the face of an eagle - where was it? It isn't a picture you can present - it's an idea. Ezekiel saw it and you see things in a dream that you can't picture. You get a vision in a dream but when it comes to making an exact picture of how it was, it's hard to say. Here is the lion, here's the man, here's the ox, but where does the eagle come into it? How do you get the eagle in? Where is the eagle? Well they also had the face of an eagle. It's separate, it's distinct. The eagle that soars up to Heaven, the eagle that flies far above, the eagle that is distant from the others. And you finish Matthew, Mark, and Luke to the three great factors of the world into which Christianity came and then you have the fourth, not to any one of these but to a new factor that wasn't even there to any extent when the others began their preaching. And it's separate from the rest - John is later. Matthew, Mark, and Luke give their Gospel. They present the picture to reach the Romans, to reach the Greeks, to reach the Jews and then you have something to present - a people not even in existence when they began to write and knowing these three pictures, adding details that they didn't have.

End of Record 8

Record 1(Record numbers start over again)

At our last meeting together we were speaking at the end of the hour about the discourses in Matthew's Gospel and we noticed that it has six extensive discourses in it. And we were looking a little bit at the last one of these - the great Apocalyps - Chapter 24 to 25. Now of all the discourses in Matthew's Gospel, this one has more parallel in other Gospels than any other. In fact the Gospel of Mark has very little comparatively in the way of discourses - it's mostly about what Jesus did rather than what he said. But this discourse, the Olivet discourse, is given quite fully in Mark and also in Luke. Now I had thought of going into this fairly fully at this point but it does seem to me that perhaps it would be better to wait till we look at the other Gospels since there are so many points of parallel between them and to look a little more in detail at the Olivet discourse after we look at the other Gospels. So I perhaps won't say much more about Matthew now. We have seen how the ~~ix~~ picture of the king and the picture of the one who is the fulfillment of the Old Testament - the fulfillment of all the desires and aspirations of the Jews - how this runs right straight through the Gospel and yet there's nothing that is local or temporary or national about this Gospel. It completely fulfills the aspirations of the Jews but it is equally vital to everyone of us. And I really doubt if any one of the Gospels has had more influence in the Christian world than the Gospel of Matthew. It is the longest of the Gospels and certainly it is one which is worthy of a tremendous amount of study. But let us look now at the Gospel of Mark. Let's see we called Matthew "B" I believe. "A" was the Gospels in General, "B" was Matthew, and "C" is the Gospel of Mark. Now we have already looked at the general features of the Gospel of Mark. We have seen how this is the shortest of the Gospels and it is a Gospel which differs from the others in having its emphasis largely on what He did rather than what He said. Of course as we've seen, all four of the Gospels place as their central emphasis, what He did in dying on Calvary's Cross and destroying the power of Satan there. That is the big central emphasis of all four and that is an emphasis of deed rather than of word. The modernist talks about the teachings of Jesus as if that was the most important thing in the world and it certainly isn't. The most important thing in the world is the doing of Jesus when he died on Calvary's Cross.

But though that is the most important thing, His words are and His teachings are of tremendous importance and they cannot be properly understood without relationship to the central fact - the reason He came was to die on the Cross. Dr. Machen in one of his writings once, said, "If you take the critical idea which considers the Gospel of John as mostly late and considers that ~~the~~ Mark is the original Gospel and most of the material in the others is based on Mark and added later and then that there are certain parts of Mark which are late, you crowd back the higher critical process as far as you can and still you find that there is no reason adduced sufficient to drop out of the original Gospel the statement in Mark 10:45, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister and to give His life a ransom for many." " Give us all that any half-way reasonable argument can be made for giving up and still in what remains you have this that the central fact of the life of Christ is that He came to give His life a ransom for many. The death of Christ is the vital central thing in the Gospels. I was much interested a few years ago to hear a paper given by a professor in Crozier Seminary, the liberal Baptist Seminary down in Chester, Pa. Crozier used to be not many years ago quite a conservative seminary. In fact a professor at Crozier was one of the original editors of the Scofield Bible. But when Crozier began to change, it changed rapidly and it became an extremely radical seminary. It is now moderately radical rather than extremely radical but it still is pretty radical. But this professor who was at Crozier for many years, who is now teaching in a Universalist Seminary up in New England, I heard give a paper on the authenticity of the Gospels once in the Oriental Club of Philadelphia and the extremely sceptical view which he took there was quite a shock to those professors there, most of whom were little interested in the scripture, most of whom had the very secularistic attitude, a very modern attitude toward most things but the attitude he took toward the Gospels practically was this, "That we know there are some verses from the Gospels that are original and tell us true facts about Christ but nobody know which ones they are." That's practically what it amounted to and it was interesting to see these quite advanced men themselves in a sceptical viewpoint turning against him as being much

further than they were able to follow. But then I heard him give another paper more recently there and that was called, "The Artistry of Mark" and I thought that was most interesting. He presented how the idea of the liberal scholars used to be this-that Matthew and Luke are largely based on Mark and they have additions, they have all this supernaturalistic addition, etc., but Mark is just the original Gospel, the raw material, the account of somebody who actually saw Christ and knew what Jesus had actually done. But he said, "YOU examine the Gospel of Mark and you find that Mark is a wonderfully artistic product. It's not just raw Gospel material at all. And you take the supernaturalistic ideas of Christ as being the Son of God and the one who died for our sins and so on and you find them all in Mark. They're all there in Mark already." So of course what he wanted to do was to make Mark very late itself and not a

(7.25) Of course that's an attitude of extreme scepticism but it's very interesting to me that a man of this type would point this out. You get back to the - use all your devices of criticism as far as you can and you cannot develop anything reasonable as to what the original Gospel is that does not still have in it the supernatural Christianity - not a simple teaching but a God-given (7.75). And so this is the central thing in all the Gospels, it's what Jesus did on the Cross and Mark is interested in what he did otherwise also. The other Gospels are interested in addition to that in His discourses. Mark, comparatively less, much less, in the discourses. Mark presents Him as the one can do for us what we need and certainly that is the part that meets our need. We find it in all of them. But it's stressed in Mark. And all of us come to Him as Savior, as those who are absolutely lost need a Savior, and finding the one who is able to accomplish the great redemption for us. Now it's very interesting how Scroggy in this book of "Guide to the Gospels" which I mentioned to you, which has a tremendous mass of material on the detail of the four Gospels - he compares verse with verse and section with section, made tabulations and lists, and you could put two or three years studying all the material in this and it would be very valuable. It's interesting though how - what he thinks of the outline of Mark. He says the plan of this Gospel is very simple and Chapter 10:45 may be regarded as the key to it, "The Son of man came (a) not to be ministered unto but to minister (b) and to give His life a

Mark

ransom for many." And he suggests that a section of the Gospel of ~~XXXX~~ deals with (a) and a section with (b). In other words, His ministry and His giving of His life. But then he says with these two main parts are three shorter ones, these being respectively at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end so the briefest outline is - and he gives an outline in five parts then - which I think is quite interesting. First the preparation - 1:1-13 and then second the main part under the first half of that verse - "not to be ministered unto but to minister", second the ministry in Galilee 1:14 to 9:50; that is, the rest of Chapter One and through Chapter Nine. Then he considers a third part, The Journey to Jerusalem in the 10th Chapter. And then the Passion Week - the next five chapters - eleven to fifteen - "and give His life a ransom for many". And then he says "the consummation" - I think personally "the resurrection" would be just as good or better - Chapter 16:1-20. That's 5-The Resurrection-Chapter 16. 4 is the Passion Week- Chapters 11 to 15. 3 is The Journey to Jerusalem - Chapter 10. (You see all of these are complete chapters.) But then 1 was the Preparation - 1:1-13 and 2- The Ministry in Galilee- the rest of Chapter 1 and all the chapters through Chapter 9. Of course this is true of all the Gospels that the last week makes a unit by itself - a separate section. Now the Gospel of Mark as we noticed has a sort of a jerky, sudden style. It jumps from deed to deed. It is interesting though that this Gospel of Mark which presents the great doer, the one who accomplishes, does not present us a picture of any sort of a mechanical doer. It is not one who is free from emotion by any means who is described in the Gospel of Mark and that I think is a very interesting fact. No man who accomplishes much is simply a machine. He has His emotions and the victory over himself is often a greater task than the victory over the things outside of himself. And the leading of other human beings is as a rule a greater task than the manipulation of material things. Jesus' great miracles where He made the waves stop and where He healed diseases and so on, showed His power as God but the greatest power in what He did was in His healing with and handling of human beings. I happened one time on the train to run on to a man who told me that he became the - he was an elderly man, he had just retired recently - but he said that he had begun in his early life as the purchasing agent of a small company and then he said that

Record 1

as he had grown in the company and gone forward in it, the company had been growing until when he retired as president and then chairman of the board of the company, the company was then a hundred million dollar corporation. It is not one of the great companies of the United States of course but is one, the name of which I think would be familiar to all of you because you see its advertisements a fair amount. But this was interesting that as he told me how - I said, "My you must have had interesting problems and interesting experiences with a growth like that". I think they had one plant when he entered it and now they have plants in I think fifteen different states - some pretty large plants in different states. And I mentioned about their growth and their dealing with problems and their getting scientific men and trained engineers. "Oh" he said, "you can get technicians. You can always hire technicians. But you do an awful lot of work in keeping ahead of the technicians and in understanding them or else pretty soon you find that it's their company and you're working for them instead of they're working for you." And it just struck me as an illustration of this that dealing with material things, the dealing with machinery, that is a vital part of life but in the end it is the dealing with human beings that is the most vital part of life. That is true of any sort of business or investual work and of course in the Christian ministry we are dealing with the most vital thing about human beings - their relationship to God and those qualities which make their lives worthwhile or make them to become an utter failure. Well, the one that Mark presents, the great servant

End of Record 1

that Mark presents is not simply a manipulator of mechanical things. He is one who has personality and ~~XXXXXX~~ whose greatest acts are His dealings with human beings. Scroggy notices this having particularly brought out in Mark the way that Jesus looks around, He says this occurs six times in Mark, "He looked round about" meaning a slow searching gaze. It occurs only once elsewhere in the New Testament except for these times in Mark. And then he mentions how Mark so often speaks of the gestures of Jesus, the exhibits, the particular things that He did in connection with His emotions, with His miracles, and His expression of emotion - He groaned, he turned, saw(sought?) His disciples, sitting down He called the twelve, He took a little child and set it in the midst, He took it in His arms - all this sort of expression. The emphasis in Mark on Jesus' grief and anger, His love and pity, His wonder and His sighs, His infirmities such as hunger and weariness. And especially noticeable he thinks are Mark's references to Jesus' anger which is perhaps stressed more in Mark than in any other of the Gospels. You get to know perhaps the personality of Jesus in a way almost more in Mark than in the other Gospels because you see Him actively doing things rather than quite so much listening to Him expounding things as in the other Gospels. Then in connection with His actions Mark has many little details, not the little scientific details that Luke is so interested in - the name of the city, the name of the disease - but the little incidental details of what is done, like the man with demons living among the wild beasts, the men that bring the ~~paralytic~~ paralytic digging the hole in the roof, the disciples plucking the ears of corn, when the 5000 were fed their seating them in ranks by the hundreds and by fifties - all these little incidental references to precise detail of the events in Mark, render it perhaps the most vivid of the Gospels in its description of the events in the life of Jesus. I think it's very wonderful that Mark is so short - it's only 16 chapters. You can read it straight through with much less effort than any of the others which are all somewhat longer and it is a very worthwhile thing to go right straight through it and get the picture, the picture of the servant, the picture of the accomplisher, but the picture not just of a mechanism, the picture of a real, vital personality who did these things then and does these things for us. Now "D" would be the Gospel of Luke. I already mentioned that Mark has in it ~~more~~ the greater part of the Olivet discourse so that although it

has comparatively little of other discourses, it does have a great deal of this particularly interesting discourse, the great Apocalyps we might call it. Now the Gospel of Luke we have seen is the Gospel that shows the man. We have the face of a man in Ezekiel and over in Revelation we have the four beasts with the man named there as third. And the Gospel of Luke Scroggy divides very neatly into His Advent, His Preparation, His Ministry, and His Triumph. Trouble with that division is that the Ministry is by far the longest section of it. The Triumph of course is the last five chapters. Well not all of the last five, but the greater part of the last five. (Student question) Yes - the Advent, the Preparation, the Ministry, and the Triumph. Now the Ministry here is much longer than all the others put together. It would perhaps be a more even division to put the first and second together and divide the Ministry in two parts. He does divide the Ministry in two parts near the end of the ninth chapter but the Advent he considers as being Chapters 1 and 2 and this deals with the preparation for His coming and with His birth and growth to manhood. And then the Preparation - the next two chapters 3 and 4 and includes the first thirteen verses of Chapter 4; that is, the Preparation, it describes the forerunner, the Baptism of Jesus, the genealogy of Jesus and the temptation of Jesus. It's interesting how Luke gives the genealogy which Mark starts right off with, Luke puts over here at the end of the third chapter. Then - the Ministry of Jesus - Scroggy starts with Chapter 4, Verse 14 (I should say anybody would start it there after the Temptation) and he runs it through Chapter 19, Verse 27 and he divides this into two parts - the Galilean Ministry second - the Judean and (6.) Ministry - the Galilean Ministry running from 4:14 to 9:50. And then the last section he calls "The Triumph" of the Son of Man - this is made up of Chapter 19:28 to the end of 23 - that is the Passion Week - the preparation for the Cross and the account of the Cross and then the Resurrection is Chapter 24. And I think it's quite proper to lump these two together - the title "Triumph" is all right or as I described it to you before - I simply said "the last week of His life - his death and his resurrection". Now we have noticed something of the features of Luke's Gospel. I personally regret that in my own experience the Gospel of Luke seems to be somewhat neglected. I don't know why it is. I don't know whether it's because John is so unique

and so outstanding that we very frequently go directly to John - but the other three being more or less of a type, we start at the first and perhaps don't always get as far as Luke. I don't know whether that's it or I don't know whether Mark has this feature of being a short, very concise picture of His personality and Matthew being this great lengthy picture of his discourses, Luke sort of gets shunted in my experience to the last position. Several times off on a trip somewhere, I started in to make a very special study of the Gospel of Luke and each time it's been interrupted so that I have not studied Luke anywhere near as much as I have the rest of the Gospels. Now I don't know whether my experience is at all typical in that or not but I know that with most of the incidents in the Scripture, if you just mention an incident in the Gospels and ask me to find it, I'll find it much more easily as a rule in Matthew than I will in Luke. I don't know whether other people are like that or not. But I do think that we miss a great deal if we don't get to know the great treasures of the Gospel of Luke. Of course we're all familiar with the treasures of the first two chapters of Luke - the account of the coming of the shepherds in connection with the Nativity, the account of Jesus going up to Jerusalem at the age of 12 - that's contained only in Luke. Luke gives us perhaps the most human picture of all. Well it showed Jesus Christ as the man and there's so much in this approach that can mean so very much to us. And then of course that Greek feature of - that which would appeal to the Greeks should have a great deal that would appeal particularly to our own age with our emphasis on science and our emphasis on the esthetic. I imagine I am more influenced by Luke than I realize but it just does seem as if I am much more familiar with Matthew than I am with Luke. But Luke is interesting that of all the Gospels, except John, it starts earlier and runs on later. It has a more detailed account of the Resurrection than either of the other Gospels and it has a - it doesn't start with the preparations for Christ's birth but the preparation for the birth of John the Baptist. And it gives us more of the relationship and situations there. It is - it starts earlier and it goes later though it only has 24 chapters instead of the 28. Then in Luke we perhaps feel more than in others, the interest in all mankind that ties up quite naturally with its being the Gospel that presents Him as the man, presents the human and humanitarian aspect, the interest in individuals. We

find more of the touch on the interest in individual~~x~~ human beings. The word "sinner" is contained more often in Luke than in all of the other Gospels put together. He thinks more of the individual needing salvation. They all think of it but perhaps he stresses it a bit more than the others. You might almost take as the key verse for the Gospel of Luke, Verse 10 in Chapter 19, "Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost". The note of compassion, the note of sympathy, the great stress on forgiveness which we find in all the Gospels, we find very particularly stressed in the Gospel of Luke. We find 19 parables peculiar to this Gospel which are not found elsewhere and they include the parable of the Good Samaritan, the Lost Coin, and the Prodigal Son. Some of these parables which are among our favorite~~x~~ sections of the New Testament because of their great stress on the sympathy and universal interest of Christ, the friend of sinners. Well, I think the prayer of Jesus is more stressed in Luke than in any of the other Gospels, the insistence on the duty of prayer, its vital importance in His life given as an example ~~XX~~ for our life. Luke is the Gospel of songs. We've noticed the interest in the esthetic - the music of Luke. He gives the praise to Mary at the beginning, the lovely woman who became the Mother of Christ and Mary's magnifying the Lord for the blessings that He had brought to her. First we have Elizabeth praising Mary, giving her that praise which we should give her. Because the Roman Catholic magnifies her out of all proportion and makes her a divine creature which she certainly was not, should not keep us from giving her that recognition as a wonderful human being whom God honored by permitting her to be the human mother of His Son. The Magnificat - the Glory to God in the Heaven, on earth Goodwill to Men - many of these wonderful songs of joy, which occur in Luke - joy, rejoicing, happiness in the presence of Christ and in what He does for us. Luke is such a wonderfully human Gospel that it deserves a very great place in our lives and in our thoughts. There is a tendency often on the part of the ^{real}evangelical to put his whole emphasis on the Epistles and we certainly should put a lot of emphasis on the Epistles.~~X~~ The wonderful presentations of Christian Doctrine in them must never be neglected. They give us our clear statements of that which is vital in our Christian faith. But certainly the Lord has

wonderful lessons and teaching for us in the Gospels in the account of Jesus here on earth. And often the teaching in the Gospels is not quite as easy to get at as in the Epistles, not quite as straightforwardly presented, but ~~when~~ it's easy to just see the anecdote, just see the illustration and not get underneath it to the real meat but when you do it's always worth going after. Campbell Morgan was a great English preacher who gave a great deal of attention to the Gospels and some of his sermons and some of his books on the Gospel are rich in suggestions as to ways of making them live and see their vital truths.

End of Record 2

might suffice for now on Luke. I mentioned to you that the Olivet discourse, which is so prominent in Matthew and which is given quite fully in Mark, is also given quite fully in Luke. And here is a case where you have a vital message given in all three of them, given from their own viewpoint but yet to fully understand it, you get lights and interpretations from one upon the other which enable you to see its meaning much more clearly than you could possibly see otherwise. I had thought, as I said of going into the Olivet Discourse a bit today but I think it would be more valuable for us to mainly look at the Olivet Discourse after you have looked at it a little and had it in mind. So I'd like to ask you between now and our next class - I'll interject this right here because I've just finished speaking about Luke and we'll go on to John but John does not have the Olivet Discourse. It was already fully enough given in these three and there's no need of his repeating it. But I will ask you for next time to look rather carefully at the Olivet Discourse. Now the Olivet Discourse is contained in Matthew in Chapters 24 and 25 and there are parallel passages to Chapter 24 in Mark and in Luke. 25 has a small amount of parallel in Luke but not in connection with the other material. So while you might glance at Chapter 25 now in Matthew, I direct your attention particularly to Chapter 24 to note its similarity to the statements in the other Gospels. Matthew 24 then I wish you would look through rather carefully and I would suggest that you take each verse of Matthew 24 and list them one under the other on a sheet of paper in a column down with a little space between and then that you'd look through Mark 13 and in Mark 13 if you find a verse in Mark which is a pretty close

parallel to a verse in Matthew, put the number opposite under Mark. If you find in Mark that there is a verse which is fairly near but not quite identical, why put the mark with maybe a little circle around it and if you find a verse which has only very slight similarity but yet comes more or less in the same place, you might put it with a question mark. And then do the same with Luke ~~XX~~ 21. Do that with Mark and then with Luke 21 and see how the passages parallel each other. See what you find of words or of verses in Mark or in Luke that are not in Matthew and what you find in Matthew that is not in Mark or Luke. Then I would like you to look at the beginning of all three of these. With Luke 21 it begins not with the first verse but with the 5th Verse. But as you look at Verse 1 of Matthew 24 and Mark 13 and Verse 5 of Luke 21, you note what questions the disciples asked. Did they ask Him one question which Jesus proceeded to answer? Did they ask two questions? Did they ask three questions? What exactly are we told in each case was the cause of Jesus' giving this message right then? Now of course if there is a difference it does not necessarily mean there is a contradiction. I might tell you how somebody told me of a certain event and I can say, "You know it was interesting what so and so told me all about what he did on such and such a day." Now he might tell about it to somebody else and he might say, "You know Dr. MacRae asked me to tell him about so and so." Well, I might not mention I had asked him. I might just mention he told. There would be no contradiction between the two whatever but you would maybe understand the incident better if you had the fuller account and knew that I had actually asked. We rarely give things in full detail. Life is too short - we have to pick out that which is relevant. But if we want to make a thorough study of a matter we're interested in getting everything that is relevant and then we're interested in presentations of it from different viewpoints. So see how this came to be given and then see ~~XX~~ you find ~~XX~~ answer ~~XXXX~~ in each of these - How much of Matthew, Mark, and Luke relate to the particular questions asked. Do you find, for instance, that one of their questions is, "What's going to happen to Jerusalem? Is Jerusalem going to be destroyed?" Well, if they ask that question find out where the answer is - in what verses in each. I wish you would have that information before you

on a sheet of paper next week. I'm not sure whether I'll collect it or not. I might and might not but at least have it in front of you so that we can discuss it - the answers to these specific questions and the parallel of these. And where you note something omitted in one, see what conclusion it gives, how it fits in with the purpose of the evangelist or how it effects the purpose of the discourse. Then you get this understanding of this in mind and we'll be in a position to go on and to discuss it reasonably together. But one thing I'd like to ask is this - they of course are interested to know when these things are going to be and one thing they're particularly interested in is when is the end of the age? When is it going to be? Now does Jesus say in the year 1972 at 5 o'clock in the afternoon the Lord is coming back - that will be the end of the age? Does he say just as soon as you find that the Egyptians close the Suez Canal and do not permit any shipping to go through it - then you know that the return of Christ is right here? Does he give you here a definite answer to this question, either in a date, in an idea of the approximate amount of time that will elapse, or does he give you a particular thing which when you see it happen, then you know that the end of the age is right there? There is one thing that you find quite prominently, in Matthew at least - you find it in the others also - but it's very prominent in Matthew - the Exhortation to be Watching. Now if you feel like it ~~xxx~~ - some of you have not had a great deal of Greek yet, so I'm not going to assign for this a study of the Greek words used where we're told to watch. If you want to, even without much knowledge of Greek you could make an interesting study. Look in Young's Concordance at the Greek words translated "watch" in this passage, where the disciples are exhorted to watch for they know not the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh. And then look in the back of the Concordance and see how these words are translated elsewhere. Do these passages teach us that we, while our Lord is gone, are like people here who are expecting somebody to come pretty soon and so we're running to the window every two minutes to look to see if we see him approaching. Are we people who are watching the clock to see just how soon this is going to happen? Or is our great order to constantly look for signs in order that we shall fix the date when He will arrive? What is meant

by these statements to watch for you know not the day nor the hour? Now that I'm not giving as a specific assignment - I would if this were a Middler course. Perhaps I should say that one who is not a Junior should be able with the additional training to work faster and cover more ground than any not a Junior should certainly improve in their discussion - they should certainly improve a consideration of this ^{of the} ~~the~~ matter of ~~watch~~. To the rest I'm merely suggesting. But this I would like to ask for everyone aside from the meaning of the word "watch" I would like everyone to bring us in a statement on this - Does the teaching of the passage in connection with the exhortation "to watch" indicate what the attitude is meant to be that He defines as "watching"? Does the context show? Supposing that I were to say to you, "I am going down to Philadelphia to get some things and I will back some time between four o'clock and six o'clock tonight. I would like you to watch for my coming so that you will be sure to meet me at the gate down here. I want you to watch." Well now that would indicate pretty definitely I wanted you to keep ~~running~~ down to the gate every few minutes to see if I were there yet or else to get up on a high place here to look and see if you saw sign that I was approaching~~x~~ - If I were to say, "I want you to meet me at the gate". Now if I were to say to you, "I'm going down to Philadelphia and I will be back sometime between four and six. I don't know just when I'll get here but I want you to cover all the Hebrew you possibly can before I get here so that I will find you ready to show considerable progress in Hebrew over what you have as yet." If I were to say that, it would not indicate that I wanted you to be running down to the gate every few minutes to see if I was coming. If I were to say to you, "I'm going to leave these domestic animals here with you. I will take care of them when I get back but I want you to watch that they don't stray off the ground and ~~that~~ that they don't get tied up with the ropes they're tied with so they can't eat." If you were leaving them every few minutes to run down to the gate to see if I were coming, you would certainly not be doing what I had asked. So see if you find in the content here what this watch means and you might make a brief statement about it there. And we will look at this Olivet Discourse later. Now we'll look on then to "E" - the Gospel of John and we have noticed that the Gospel of John is like the eagle that soars overhead. It is also the fourth one, the additional

one, the extra one. There is doubtless a meaning in numbers sometime. You can use anything as a figure of something and you certainly can use a number as a figure of something. But if you're going to insist on carrying numbers to the ultimate and making numbers always have a meaning, wouldn't it be strange that after you had numbers, the sacred number, three Gospels, then that years later somebody would get busy and write a fourth one? It sort of wrecks the symbolism of it, doesn't it to have not three Gospels but four. If three is the sacred number, every sermon is supposed to have three parts and so many things are supposed to be in threes - here you have four. There is an extra. Of course as a matter of fact the three are a unit, the three belong together. The three give three different pictures of the same one. The fourth one carries it a step further. The fourth is written later and there is much in the three Gospels that is tremendously important that is not contained in the fourth Gospel at all. As you read the three Gospels you would think that one of the things that Jesus did more than anything else was to tell parables. You look at the fourth Gospel and you don't find any parables at all. Well, what are you going to do? Do you have a contradiction here between the Gospel picture that shows Jesus as a teller of parables and the Gospel picture that shows Him telling no parables? Are the parables of no importance or John would have given us some of them? Or is not the answer, the other disciples had already given them? They are of tremendous importance but they had already been dealt with and John does not need to duplicate what's already done

End of Record 3

~~THE~~ A very interesting thing though is that while you have no parables in John, you have a unity with the three Gospels which present the parable telling er, ~~er~~ in that John presents Him as a man who made much use of imagery and of illustration. It does not give this particular type of illustration where He tells a little story to bring out a truth but it abounds in similes and in metaphors. "The new birth" - the precise words are not used in the other Gospels, though the teaching is certainly there very clearly. The comparison of the Holy Spirit to the wind, ~~THE~~ when He says He is

the shepherd, He is the bread of life, He gives them a living water, He is the vine and my Father is the husbandman. You have the figurative approach, the approach that uses images in such a way as to convey a meaning with a clarity ~~XXXX~~ and a vividness far beyond what literal language can do. There's nothing necessarily obscure in figurative language. Some people tell you they take all the Bible literally and when they're saying that, they either don't know the meaning of the word "literally" or they don't know anything about the Bible. When I was in college, we had a professor there who used to begin his required course by asking, "Is there anybody here who believes in taking the whole Bible literally?" And of course there were a lot of people who did. Immediately he would say, in this good Presbyterian college, "You take the whole Bible literally, do you? Well now when it says that the Israelites went into a land flowing with milk and honey does that mean that milk and honey were flowing down the streets?" "Oh, kno, of course it doesn't mean that!" "Well, you don't take the Old Testament literally then, do you?" Well then he'd say, "I see that some of you don't take the Old Testament literally after all. But maybe there is somebody here that ~~XXXXXXXX~~ doesn't believe in taking the Old Testament literally but believes in taking the New Testament literally. Is there somebody like that?" Well by this time people were cautious and comparatively few would raise their hands. A great many would for the first question, now a rather few would. But you would get two or three hands up always so he'd pick one and say, "Oh, you take the New Testament literally but not the Old?" And they'd say, "Oh, yes". Well, he'd say, "It says when they came to Jesus and told Him what Herod had said, Jesus said, 'Go tell that fox'. Does that mean that Jesus thought the Herod was a four-footed beast?" "Oh, no, of course it doesn't mean that." "Well, you don't take the New Testament literally then, do you?" "No." Well now everybody sees that the Bible's not to be taken literally at all so let's just forget the Bible. He didn't say this but this is the thought. We'll just forget the Bible and we'll go on and use philosophy and really decide what life really is about and he would go on and with that subtle influence he had he'd just destroy the faith of individual after individual. Now after being in the college a good many years he went to the University of Chicago and taught in their divinity school for a while.

to when it actually happened - Jesus sat with the disciples on the Last Supper and He took a piece of bread and He said, "This is my body." Do you think any of those disciples there thought that He was saying that that was His body in His hand instead of the body being what was sitting there and holding the bread? I'm sure nobody ever dreamed of such a thing. He was giving a symbol. He was giving an image. And this symbol often conveys meaning very clearly, very plainly. YOU say, "He was a lion in the fight" and we know exactly what you meant. Nobody thinks you mean he went out there and used his fingernails to scratch the enemy or chewed them up. Nobody dreams of such a thing - you mean he had courage, he had tenacity, he had singleness of purpose - it gives you a picture - "He was a lion in the fight" - much better than any kind of literal language but it's every bit as clear. And John's images are, I think, clearer often than the images in the parables because the parable imagery is developed to the extent it has other imagery and sometimes it's difficult to tell how much of it corresponds to some truth and how much of it is just to develop the parable, while in John's imagery just about every part of it has a specific meaning. So the beautiful imagery of John is one of its outstanding features even though it has no parables. Well, we'll look a bit more at John next time and then we will look at this matter of the Olivet Discourse and I hope you will all have the material in front of you for ~~xxxx~~ consideration.

Well, we were speaking when we got together last time, about the Gospel of John and in the Gospel of John, we noticed that we do not have any of the many parables which we find in the synoptic Gospels. It's very interesting that all of these are missing from the Gospel of John. It does not mean that to John ~~XXX~~ Jesus was a different sort of a speaker than the others, but that he was giving a different aspect of His ministry and these are tremendously important but they were already familiar. Probably when John wrote there was hardly anybody who received his Gospel who was not already familiar with at least one of the other three Gospels - probably most were familiar with all three and consequently there was no need of his repeating the parables. But that doesn't mean that John is a literal-minded Gospel that just gives facts and statistics.

Nothing of the kind. John is the most theological Gospel of all. John is writing for Christians who are interested in an understanding of the deeper meanings of things. The Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans were coming to know about Christ. They were gradually learning about Him. They had to get the outstanding teaching, the more obvious things had to be impressed upon their consciousness. Now John is able to take that for granted and to go on, while reiterating many of the most obvious things, to go on into matters that the others were not yet ready for. And so we find that John adds much to the others though never contradicting them in way. John does not have the parables but he does have a great deal of imagery and we had a few remarks about the nature of figurative language which are tremendously important because they relate not merely to the Gospel of John but of the entire Bible. Figurative language does not necessarily decrease clarity. It may even add to clarity. It tremendously increases beauty and it may increase clarity. Figures used poorly can of course produce obscurity, but figures used well increase clarity. I think that's very important to have in mind. Too many people are ready to throw something aside, "Oh that's just figurative language. That's just symbolism." Well symbolism used wrongly or not understood may lead to obscurity but symbolism can be used to tremendously increase clarity and definite understanding. If it weren't for symbols we would be much less advanced in just about every science, in every field of study. Now the imagery of John is very extensive and very beautiful. There is a great deal of symbolism especially in what he says about Jesus. Jesus is the bread of life, the light of the world, the door of the sheep, the good shepherd, the resurrection and the life, the way and the truth and the life and the true vine. All these various figures used about Jesus, found only in John, but they are very helpful to us in increasing our understanding of ~~XXXX~~ Christ. Then a very interesting thing is that the Gospel of John is perhaps richest of all the Gospels in characterization. The other three Gospel writers would seem to be so occupied in presenting to us the great, tremendous character with whom they had come in contact, that the other people in them are more or less incidental. We learn a little about the apostles, we learn something about their characters, something about other people from Matthew, Mark and Luke. But our great overwhelming interest in the three Gospels is

with the person of Christ. Now in John we go deeper into the majesty of the person of Christ than we do in any of the other three and yet in John we have a clearer characterization of the other people than we have in any of the other Gospels. It is a very valuable thing to take up different Apostles. Take Thomas, for instance, see the various references to him in the Gospel of John. You may not have very much in any one of them but they throw such striking sidelights on his character. You can take a number of the different Apostles and trace them through John and see the little things they say and what is said about them and see how much light it throws on their character and their personality and how much they are types of people you come in contact with today. Do the same with other characters in the Gospel of John. Here is a very interesting summary which Scroggy has on Page 450 of his Guid to the Gospels. He says here, "The great revelation of character and in some sense these people all represent all people who come into touch with Christ - John the mystic, Peter the impulsive, Andrew the missionary, Philip the inquirer, Thomas the cautious, Nathaniel the guileless, James the zealous, Judas the obscure, Judas the traitor, John Baptist the austere, Nicodemus the seeker, Pilot the worldly, Martin the anxious, Mary the worker, Mary Magdalene the devoted, Nazarus the low, Theipus the unscrupulous, (14.5) Arithmea the brave, Mary of , the follower, Annis the intriguer, Barabas the robber, Mary Mother of Jesus the blessed, woman of Samaria the insensible, the nobleman the the paralytic the helpless, a woman the follower, the blind man the forthright, his parents the cowards, Jesus' aunt Sabome the ambitious, Simon Iscariot the unfortunate father, Malcut the victim". Now I don't know

End of Record 4

these different ones. We won't have time in this class to go into these but I think just reading that rapid summary gives you an idea of how, just with a few words, that characterization of each of these people comes out. And they stand, as he says, as a sort of a type of all people who come into touch with Christ. A few words or acts lay open the soul of most of these in the light of Christ's presence - the vividness, the vigorousness, the life of these cannot be mistaken for

(1.). And so a study of the Gospel of John from the viewpoint of characterization is one of the most fruitful studies that we can make. Then in addition to individuals there are various groups of people in John who are sketched with vividness and precision (1.25) take up the different groups of people and you can see the picture that we have of them in the different portions of the Gospel of John. Now there is another very interesting thing about the Gospel of John - the distinction between it and the Synoptics is that in the Synoptic Gospel, you have Jesus gradually coming to be recognized as the Messiah. You find that it is not until the confession of Peter that the disciples realize that Jesus is the Messiah and gradually the light dawns, gradually they come to understand about it, who He is and it is brought to our attention thus. And they are adapted thus for enabling the Greeks, the Romans, or the Jews to gradually become acquainted with this wonderful character and come to know the marvelous things about Him until you come to realize the full greatness and significance of His personality. John is different. John is written for the Christian. John begins with the pre-existence of the Lord. It's spoken from the viewpoint of Christ the Lord of Glory right from the very beginning. And some critics have used that as an attempt to say that John is not historically reliable at all but if you will go through the Gospel of John carefully you will find that while there is an utter difference in approach and attitude this way in John from the other Gospels, that the difference does not consist in a contradiction, but in the center of attention. The other Gospels deal with the disciples and with the people as they gradually come to see who and what He is. John deals with Him and shows you - John the Baptist says right in the first chapter, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world". You don't

find that brought out at the beginning of the other Gospels. That doesn't say that John didn't know it, that God hadn't revealed it to John the Baptist, but the other gospels don't tell so much about the great witnesses of Christ, they rather deal with the people as they gradually come to learn more about Him. And so you will find that there's a different attitude within John but the different attitude is brought about because the emphasis is on different people - it's on the Lord, it's on God the Father, it's on John the Baptist, it's on the great witnesses that God (4.)

to testify to the fact that He was indeed the Son of God. You have plenty of scepticism ~~XXXXXX~~ in John but the scepticism in John is more the worldly people and the Jews who are opposing Him as they denounce Him rather than the disciples who were sort of inbetween, gradually coming to realize who He was. This picture of the disciples isn't brought out in ~~XXX~~ John the way it is in the other (4.25). And so for the one- they're two ways of approaching-the one way to ~~xx~~ gradually see how Jesus revealed Himself, the other is knowing who it is that's been revealed and what to back and start again with John the Baptist and see the witnesses right from the very beginning to His character and to His Glory. And so in John you have Him as the Incarnate Son of God right from the very beginning. John sees it, the witnesses proclaim it, it is brought home to the reader right from the very start and we come to know Him better and more intimately through John than we do through the others. And of course John has those wonderful discourses in the upper room which are not given in any of the other Gospels. They are not the proper approach to the unbeliever. They are messages given to the believer. It was just a little group of disciples by themselves who went up there for the Passover feast in Chapter 13. Before that we had much unbelief, much question, much doubt, much criticism of Jesus. But here He is just with the disciples and starting in Chapter 13 He talks to the disciples and gives them those great messages for their own souls. Now perhaps 13 is pretty well paralleled in considerable amount in the Synoptics as the Passover feast begins but then we have in 14 that wonderful message which He gave to the disciples of their relationship to Him. Now there you get a glimpse of the fact that the disciples were not yet fully understanding who and what He was. Philip said

"Lord show us the Father and it sufficeth." Jesus says, "Have I been so long time with you and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" Here you see that the deciples were only gradually coming to know Him but the Gospel itself knows it right from the beginning as God in

(6.) And so you have these wonderful statements in this 14th Chapter including the promise of the coming of the Holy Spirit. And verse 26, the authentication in advance of the New Testament, "But the comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." To me one of the most humorous, if it were not tragic, books I've ever seen in my life is a book which when I was in seminary was required reading in connection with the course in Gospel history. It was "In the Days of His Flesh" - a, who's the author of it again - I imagine none of you are familiar with it, "In the Days of His Flesh". It's quite a striking picture of the life of Christ and very well written on the whole but in the introduction to it he tells how uncertain we are - he swallowed a great deal of the higher criticism ~~and~~ - and we don't know so much about what Jesus did and these Gospels are maybe much that's unhistorical and so on. He makes tremendous mistakes

(7.5) critics and then after he's done that quite a ways he says, "Yes, but when you get into the Gospel of John and you read the messages of Christ, something burns in your heart and you know these are true. You have no doubt this is actually the Word of Christ." Well, if you can have something burn in your heart and know that these words are true, that something here, this is the actual Word of Christ. What did Christ say, "The comfort ~~XXXXXX~~er which is the Holy Chost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance whatever I have said unto you." The disciples often failed to understand. There was much they didn't know. They were very much confused as they went about their duties. But Jesus promised them here, just before His death, that the Holy Spirit would bring to their remembrance the true fact on these things and we have the guarantee here that we will be given Gospels which will give us the exact facts of what really happened, ~~xxx~~ and the promise that they will be inspired of the Lord and free from error but he will teach you all. He has many things to tell them that they can't

bear yet, they're not ready for yet. But that the Holy Spirit will come; that is told us over in Chapter 16, Verse ~~X~~ 12, "I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now. However, when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he ^{shall} hear that shall he speak. He shall show you the things to come." There were things Jesus wanted to say but they weren't ready but the Holy Spirit will tell them these things. So there is the authentication in advance of the Gospels and of the rest of the New Testament. Jesus has much to give them that is important but they're not ready yet. The Holy Spirit is going to give it. And it's very nice to have a red-letter New Testament with the actual words Jesus spoke in red letters. It's wonderful - these very words our Lord spoke. But it doesn't mean they are any more inspired than the other parts of the New Testament. They're not any more true and they're not any more important. They are extremely important but so also are the words that the Holy Spirit gave through the writers of the New Testament books after the death of Christ. In fact in some ways they're more important because they give many teachings which Jesus was anxious to give but they weren't ready yet to understand them and they could be given them after they knew the facts about His death and resurrection. Then they could go on. They'd just be nonsense before, they just wouldn't understand them. And so much is of even greater importance after His death and this is the authentication of it in advance so I think these verses are tremendously important - Chapter 16, Verse 13 and Chapter 14, Verse 26, are the most important verses in the Bible as far as the inspiration of the New Testament is concerned. We looked at II Timothy 3:15-16 - that doesn't say anything about the New Testament. "All scripture is inspired of God and is profitable." What scripture is he talking about. He says, "I'm so glad, Timothy, that from a youth you have known the sacred scriptures which are able to make you wise for salvation." What sacred scriptures did Timothy know from a youth - the Old Testament. Most of our New Testament passages about inspiration are dealing with the Old Testament and certifying that the Old Testament is true and free from error and do not directly say anything about the New Testament. But these two verses here put the whole New Testament in the same category with the Old

Testament and therefore entitle us to include the New Testament under the meaning of those verses even though in actual content they are only referring to the Old Testament, not the New. So you see how tremendously important these verses

(11.5), tremendously important. Well now the ~~xxx~~ upper room discourse - Chapter 13 - largely paralleling parts of the Synoptics but Chapter 14 entirely distinct from the Synoptics. And then Chapter 15, "I am the true vine, my Father is the husbandman." The wonderful teaching about the relation of Christ to the disciples, not given in the Synoptics at all but so important for the one that knows Him. 15:16 - "You have not chosen me but I have chosen you." Some people find predestination hard to believe, they find effectual calling hard to believe but here it is. Jesus teaches it. "You have not chosen me but I have chosen you and ordained you that you should go and bring forth fruit." It is His selection, it is nothing in us deserves

(12.). We are all unprofitable spirits but if we are able to do anything worthwhile in His kingdom, it is because He has chosen us and ordained us that our fruit should be . So we have these wonderful messages in Chapters 14 and 15 and 16 and then that marvelous high priestly prayer of Jesus'

. This of course is truly the Lord's prayer. The prayer in Matthew 6 and in Luke is the disciple's prayer - it is the prayer that the Lord gave the disciples - but this is the prayer that the Lord prayed - this one here. Now the terminology is established - there's no use trying to change terminology. The Lord's prayer is the prayer the Lord gave us that He gave the disciples but the prayer the Lord used Himself is this 17th Chapter and it is truly a wonderful revelation of the heart of God, the heart of the Lord Jesus Christ who is God. And here again you have your predestination - Chapter 17, Verse 12, "While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name; those that thou gavest me I have kept and none of them is lost but the son of perdition: that the scripture might be fulfilled." It is all part of God's plan and yet that doesn't excuse anybody from his responsibility. We are condemned because of our sins, because of our wickedness. It is not any fault of God's we are condemned but it is entirely to the credit of God that any of us are saved. Well we have the 17th then

Record 5

ending with these wonderful inner-room discourses which are distinctive of the Gospel of John. And then in John as we've already noticed; we have a fuller account of the ~~EXISTENCE~~ very beginning - way back before the existence of the world He was - and then we have at the end this extra chapter. We have the Resurrection told in Chapter 20 and it seems to be the end of the book - Chapter 20, Verse 30 - "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of His disciples, but these are written that ye might know, might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and that believing ye might have life through His name" ends Chapter 20 and would seem to end the book. But then we have 21 added - we have an appendage in John. We have another
(14.5) in the Resurrection which is ^{not} told in any of the other Gospels

End of Record 5

and giving us this marvelous event when Jesus caused them to catch all this great number of fish and when He gave His message about feeding His sheep. It's one of the marvelous chapters of the Bible but again a chapter for the Christian, not an evangelistic chapter - a chapter for the Christian and a very wonderful one. Now this is a hasty summary of certain things in the gospels and then there are a few special things that I wanted to speak of - looking at various Gospels together, so we'll make "F" - Special Consideration of the Olivet Discourse. "E" was John, "F" is Special Consideration of the Olivet Discourse. Now the Olivet Discourse, as we have noted already is a discourse which is found in three Gospels. We have it in Matthew, in Mark, and in Luke. It is perhaps the longest discourse we find anywhere in Mark. The fact that this discourse is given so fully is certainly evidence that it is the Lord's will that we consider it as of very considerable importance. And so I think it would be well for us to look at this discourse and see it in the three Gospels and see a little bit about what is so important that it will be given fully to us. So I asked you to make a list, a tabulation and a comparison of them. And as you go through it, one thing that you can't help noticing is how often this word "watch" is used in it. It's used in all three of them. So before we look into the content of it, specifically, ~~XXXX~~ we'll just take a second to look at this word "watch". We find it so many times - "watch, for ye know not the day nor the hour when the Son of Man cometh". Well what does it mean. We find that the word, "watch" in the New Testament is used to translate five different words. Now there is "to watch" - just to look at something and there is "to watch" in the sense of guarding something. Those are two rather common uses of the word "watch" today. "Watch him that he doesn't get away" and "to watch television - you can go over there and watch television if you like". Well now that's quite different - you're not trying to keep the television from getting away. You're not guarding anything, there's nothing of the kind. You simply are looking at it. That's the modern use which I don't think you find in any of these unless it is in Matthew 27:36 - "And sitting down they watched Him there" - they watched Him being crucified. Is there an idea there of guarding or simply of being present and seeing what is happening? I think that - well, it is said

about the soldiers that they gave Him vinegar to drink and sitting down they watched Him there and set over His head the accusation. So that would not be the disciples watching, that would be the soldiers watching. So I think it probably means to guard and the Greek word (4.) is translated in the New Testament "to observe, to watch, to

preserve, to reserve, to hold fast" and it would have the idea of a compound of it is ~~XXXX~~ translated "watch" five times and "observe" once. And a good example of it is Acts 9:20 - "for they watched the gates day and night to kill him". Here they weren't just looking at something incidentally but here their attention was focused upon, they were watching in order to see if he should get away so they could grab him quickly. Now it is neither nor that occurs in the Olivet Discourse. Neither of these occur. But the two words that occur are

and

is used four times in the New Testament, always translated "watch" when it occurs and - "watch you therefore and pray all of us", "for they watched for your soul", take ye heed, watch and pray" - that doesn't tell much about the meaning of

But there is a noun from it which is used in II Corinthians 6 and 11 where Paul speaks of all that he has done for the church. He speaks of his fasting, he speaks of his being imprisoned, he speaks of his labors, and he says "in watching oft" and it doesn't mean that Paul was out guarding somebody, watching lest somebody get away or anything like that, or watching for somebody's coming. It means that he was working late into the night. It means that he was traveling long hours. It means that he was going without sleep. It means vigilance, wide-awake watching. That is the thought rather than the thought of looking for something to happen. Yes?

(Student question) The references were in Acts - to the noun? II Corinthians 6:15 and 11:27. That used in connection with Paul there I think is pretty good evidence that

(6.25) means to be wide-awake, vigilant. But

means exactly that and there our evidence is very

clear. is translated once "to be vigilant", once

"to wait" and 20 times "to watch". And here in Young's Concordance you have the figures given in the back for the number of times that a word is translated a certain

way in the King James version which is very helpful in Bible study. And then here under "watch", under (7.) they give the instances of this. "Watch therefore for ye know not what hour the Son of Man cometh", "Tarry ye here and watch awhile" - Matthew 26:38. Matthew 26:40 - "What could ye not watch with me one hour?" He went up to Gethsemane to pray, He left the disciples, came back and they were fast asleep and He said, "What could ye not watch with me one hour?" He means be awake with me. He doesn't mean be watching for the coming of the soldiers - they had no reason to think the soldiers were coming. That didn't enter into their consideration at all there. "Blessed is that servant whom the Lord, when He cometh, shall find watching" - Luke 12:37. Well let's look at that - in Luke 12:37⁵ we find that it says ~~XXXX~~ "Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning and ye yourselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when He shall return from the wedding; that they may open unto Him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching". Well what does that mean - running to the door to see if He's coming, how soon He's going to get there, just ready to open it the instant He rings the bell? "Verily I say unto you that He shall gird Himself and make them to sit down to meat and will come forth and serve them and if He shall come in the second watch or come in the third watch and find them so, blessed are those servants". If He comes at any moment and they're just at the door ready to open it for Him, they're watching - is that what it means? Well look on down to Verse 42 - "And the Lord said, 'Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.'" In other words what they're doing isn't running to the door to open it the instant he gets there - ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ they're so busy trying to figure when he's going to get there, they haven't time to do anything else. But they're on the job taking care of the necessary things within the household, "giving them their portion of food in due season". It is the one who is administering His word, carrying on His task, who's wide awake and at the job - "blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing". This word

(9.5)

means to be wide-awake, to be on the job. It doesn't mean to be looking for something to happen. I think that's very important for the interpretation of this passage. First Thessalonians, 5:6 - "Let us not sleep but let us watch", "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith (10.). It means be wide-awake, be vigilant, be on the job. Well we took that up as introductory because the word occurs so much in these passages. But now we find the three passages in Matthew, Mark, and Luke in which this is given. Now if you look at the Gospel of Mark first - because it's the shortest of all, we find this in the 13th Chapter. And there in the 13th Chapter we read the beginning ~~XXXX~~ "And as He went out of the temple, one of His disciples saith unto Him, 'Master see what manner of stones and what buildings are here!' And Jesus answering said unto Him, 'Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.'" When did that happen? In 70 A. D. Well did they ask Him when it would happen? Did he answer 70 A. D.? Well, let's see. "There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Now how many of you think it happened in 70 A. D.? Only one, two, three. Well when do the rest of you think it happened? Who thinks it didn't happen in 70 A. D.? When do you think it happened? (Student - "I think He's referring to Himself") "He went out of the temple, one of His disciples saith, 'Master, see what manner of stones and buildings are here!' Jesus said, 'Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down'" You think He was referring to Himself in that sentence? (Student comment -) Yes, that's right in that case He certainly was referring to Himself but let's look at that other case - what's the reference to it? Do you remember? (Another student comment) Here we read that He threw out the money-changers. "He said 'Take these things hence and make not my Father's house, an house of merchandise" John 2:16. What's He referring to as His Father's house? Is He referring to His body? He certainly is referring to the temple there, isn't He? "Make not the temple a house of merchandise" and His disciples remembered that it was written, 'The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up.' Then said the Jews, 'What sign showest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things?' Jesus answered and said unto them, 'Destroy this temple'". Well now that could refer to the

temple they'd just been looking at. But it could refer to some other temple couldn't it? One or the other. "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, 'Forty and six years was this temple in building and wilt thou rear it up in three days.' But He spake of the temple of His body." Well above He said, "Take these things hence. Make not my father's house an house of merchandise." Then He was talking about the literal temple. Then He says, "Destroy this temple. I will build it up in three days." Now he's talking about the temple of His body. So he talks here within five verses - one time about one, one time about the other. So he could be talking about either one. But it's not likely he was talking about both - it's one or the other. It's likely one or the other. Now in the case we're looking at here in Mark we find that He says to them, "See these great buildings. There shall be not left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Well do you think there He's talking about the temple there or about the temple of His body? (Student answer) Today there is maybe one wall where you have maybe a hundred stones one above the other but that's all. (Student - well isn't that one stone upon another?) Extremely literal. It would mean that there's still going to be a day when the temple will be torn down so there won't be even these few stones that won't be torn down. You think that's still going to be that way. (Student - There is a possibility) There is a possibility. Well it's not much to lay upon - a possibility, that ~~XXXXX~~ the whole, everything will be wiped out. The only way I can think that the rest would be destroyed would be with dynamite. I'm sure nobody would ever bother to go in there and knock those stones down that are left. For one thing the ground is raised up so that ~~X~~ it's inside of ground that is much higher. I don't know what the purpose would be. I don't know why anybody'd try it unless you ~~XXX~~ dropped a bomb

End of Record 6

Yes, I think that's true. The Jews have not had a temple in which to worship since 70 A.D. And out of that great and beautiful temple which was built then, at least 95% is absolutely There is not one stone on another. Now there are a very few stones in place left to show us what a great building (Student question) Not at present. (Student question) I can't imagine their doing it because today you have the old temple of Solomon completely gone except for just the few stones that make one wall which has been the Wailing through the years. And then above those, inside that, you have the level raised so above those is just the level of the temple area and in it there is a beautiful mosque which was built in the Middle Ages with the whole income from Egypt. All the revenue from Egypt for eight years went into the building of that one building. It's one of the most beautiful buildings anywhere in the world and a marvelous historic Islamic mosque - one of the three most sacred in the world - and that they would ever tear down that building - the whole Arab world would rise. And it is in Jordan - the Jews at present, since 1948 - no Jew's been able to come anywhere near the Wailing. If any Jew was within a block of that Wailing Wall he'd be torn within a couple of minutes. There's no possibility of their getting there. Before that they were always coming to the Wailing Wall. Today you can reach your fingers between the stones of the Wailing Wall and pull out little bits of pieces of paper with Hebrew on them where the Jews have put prayers, but they've all been put in before 1948 - absolutely. (Student question) You mean on earth? ~~XXXX~~ If they're doing that nobody on earth knows about it. I'm sure there'd be an insurrection in the whole Arab world if anything like that were being started. Well this passage here then - he says, "See these great buildings. There shall not one stone be left upon another that shall not be thrown down." To my mind he's saying, "You see these great wonderful buildings? Well the time's coming when they won't be here." And to imagine another forty years in which those great buildings stood there and then at the end of those forty years, 95% of it was destroyed. A few stones remain as a foundation for a platform on which there was a heathen temple for a while and then a Mohammedan temple. And it remains that way for 2000 years. And then those few stones in some way get destroyed but that's what he's talking about to them. It seems to me that (4.) not very good

It seems to me that when He said these great buildings here are to be destroyed - when 95% of everything there is utterly destroyed and for 2000 years they have no use of it, that that would be a fulfillment. In fact the early Christians certainly took it that way. They took it as a great proof of the fact that the Scripture was true, that these prophecies had been fulfilled. Yes? (Student question) Well, we're getting on to that. (Another student question) Well, there may be a possibility of something like that. Whether there is or not, at least it seems to me that the first immediate thing that's talked about is the destruction of those buildings - that these buildings are going to disappear. Now He is referring to some things that happen afterward. But to how great an extent that refers to these buildings would be a matter for investigation. Yes? (Student question) Yes, their great emphasis is on this great wonderful building and He says these buildings are going to be destroyed. It seems to me that is the primary thought. Now there are other thoughts of course. He deals with many matters but the primary matter is the destruction of the temple in 70 A.D. It doesn't seem to me that you can get away from that. That that is what the disciples were thinking of. They were thinking of those great beautiful buildings and Jesus said, "Yes, look at the beautiful buildings but they're going to be gone. They're going to disappear completely. And they did 40 years later. The temple of His body they destroyed and He raised it up in three days. These great temples forty years later were destroyed. Will they be raised up in 2000 years? Well that's another question. But what he's saying here is they're going to be destroyed. And that is the thing that would be in the disciples mind when they heard this. And if anybody who stood there with Jesus and heard Him say, "See these great buildings. There shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down." Anybody who would hear that and then 40 years later would see the terrible devastation and ruin there where these great buildings having utterly disappeared and just a few foundation blocks left, would certainly say, "My how truly it has been fulfilled what He said." And if somebody else came along and said, "Oh no. This isn't it. This is only 95% of it gone. They're are a few building blocks left here. After all He wasn't talking about what's happened now. He's talking about something that's going to happen 2000 years from now." They'd say, "Well, what's the

use of arguing. If you can't take what He says as being fulfilled in this, well how do we know about anything?" I think they would be just baffled forty years later if somebody said, "No, this isn't it". Well here's what He says, "There will not be left one stone on another won't be thrown down." And then these men came to Him and they asked Him privately, "Tell us when shall these things be? What shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" And then you find the same thing of course at the beginning of Matthew - Matthew 24 - you find it introduced there with a little fuller introduction. He says (Matthew 24:2) "See ye not all these things? Verily I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down. And as He sat upon the Mount of Olives the disciples came unto Him privately saying, 'Tell us when shall these things be and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?'" Now they're adding other things here. And so not only these things but "the sign of thy coming and the end of the world". And then He goes on. In Luke 21 He starts with the words - after he speaks there about the woman giving her gifts - some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts. He said in Verse 6, "There shall not be left one stone ~~xx~~ on another that shall not be thrown down and they asked Him and said, "Master, when shall these things be and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass." And then He went on to tell them what the signs would be when these things would come to pass. Now you look on in Luke and you find that these things will come to pass - it says in Verse 20 - "When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains and let them which are in the midst of it be brought out. Let them that are in the country/^{not}enter thereto for those are the days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe to them that are with child or them that give suck in those days for there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people." What's He talking about? What is He describing? The ~~stage~~ siege of Jerusalem - that's what He's describing, isn't it? I don't think anybody can question that. Verse 22, 23 - here is the siege of Jerusalem - because He goes right on and says, "and they shall fall by the edge of the sword and shall

be led away captive to all nations and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled." So here He has described the destruction of Jerusalem and it's going to be trodden down of the Gentiles. Now this is given in Luke which is written for the Greeks. But in the other Gospels they ask Him when will these things be and He never says Jerusalem's going to be trodden down again. He doesn't say that in Matthew and He doesn't say it in Mark. He doesn't say Jerusalem's going to be trodden down of the Gentiles and He doesn't say that ~~XXXXXX~~ they're going to be taken off and sold captive to all nations. And I think that surely the reason why Luke gives it in plain language and ~~XX~~ Matthew and Mark in more hidden language, is because Matthew and Mark are both written by Jews - Matthew directly for Jews, Mark written for Romans but by a Jew - probably would reach the attention of the Jews a lot quicker than Luke would and ~~XXXX~~ he says, "When will these things be?" and they go on to say about them but they don't in plain language say that Jerusalem is going to be trodden down of the Gentiles. They do not specifically say it to those two. They don't want a sentence that will immediately infuriate the Jewish reader. He reads this sentence and he is just shocked at it, and maybe won't read any further. The thought is there, the idea is brought out clearly but he doesn't give the same sharp, clear sentences about it. Now Jesus doubtless spoke that sentence to the disciples but He said the thing at some length and Matthew and Mark in writing it get the idea across but in a way that's a little less offensive to them. While Luke, writing in the first instance for the Greeks and not so many Jews reading it immediately, he comes right out and says in plain language what the others say in a little more hidden language. Yes? (Student question) Well, that we find also in Luke I believe - don't we almost word for word? Let's see where is that? Yes. That is also given in Luke previous to the description of the destruction of Jerusalem, isn't it? And I would think that this destruction of Jerusalem is a part of that - "nations rising against nations, kingdom against kingdom, great earthquakes in many places." He says in 12 that "before all these things they shall lay their hands on you and persecute you, delivering you up to the synagogues and into prisons, being brought before kings and rulers for my name's sake." And all that

Record 7

happened

(13.) (Student question) Oh yes, there was a great earthquake that opened up the prison in Philippi and they were able to come out. Now they continue afterwards - but they started before. Yes? (Student question) Well that is a rather difficult section of Revelations - I wouldn't want to build anything on that. I'd want to take other things and then build Revelations from them rather than ~~vice~~ versa . (Student question) Well, that's what we want to get into but we'll have to stop for now - we'll meet at 2:30.

End of Record 7

I think all of you are aware that I've made a bit of a change after 27 years in the system of teaching Hebrew this year. It's somewhat experimental. 27 years ago the first time I taught Hebrew, I proclaimed very strongly in my class that if a person did not put four hours of study for each hour in class, they could not learn Hebrew decently. And I said I don't care how poor a student you are, if you'll put in four hours study for every hour in class, you can get Hebrew. I don't care how good a student you are, if you don't put in four hours outside you won't get it well enough to stick with you and be worth much. So I insisted on that. I taught Beginning Hebrew for seven years and then a man took over from me and he taught it for a number of years and another took over from him and he taught it but in the whole 27 years we always insisted on that until this year. And then this year I became - maybe I became over-confident, I don't know - but I had an idea that I had a new approach which would make it possible instead of putting in 20 hours, to put in 12 and get the same effect. And that was by first getting the letters absolutely thoroughly and solidly and getting them in groups so that other people were stimulating you to work fast and get your eyes accustomed to those letters - and that maybe with 12 hours in class, you could get the same benefit as 20 hours of which four was class and 16 private study. That's what I've been hoping we'd be able to do because if we can, it saves you 8 hours to put on other things. And so that is what we've been aiming for this year. But I have not, in the schedule, put the 12 hours in every week. I ~~XX~~ think the first week was only $10\frac{1}{2}$ hours and then the last couple of weeks Mr. Bixler pointed out the importance of exercise, and he's certainly right on that, so we cut off a bit more (2.5) and it being less than 12, I just hope that it'll be enough. I do feel that you should at least get the rest in good solid work. And if we can't get it this way, we'll have to revert to the system used the previous 27 years. But I hope not. I'm still hopeful we can do it this way. But now today the way it's raining, Mr. Bixler tells me there can't be any athletics anyway, so today at least we can have the extra half hour. So will you please pass the word on to Mr. Dunzweiler and Chaplain Myers not to go by the notice that says at 5 o'clock to swing off for athletics but to get the other half hour and we'll hope that will make enough difference that we really will succeed this way and not have to add the eight

hours of private study that we've had in past years. That'll give an extra half hour for Hebrew and I hope you can get them that they can read it right off. I don't care about understanding it, pronounce it right off like they can in English. If they get to that point why they will then be able to learn the language quickly and easily because Hebrew grammar is simple. There's nothing difficult in Hebrew grammar. But if you have to do it all by your ear without using your eye, then you're in an impossible situation. But it's when the eye recognizes things and remembers them easily that the Hebrew Grammar is very, very simple. Without that it becomes very difficult. So that that extra half hour today I hope will make a big difference with our ability to really master the Hebrew.

Now we are looking at this Apocalyptic Discourse and we notice the importance which is given to it in the Bible in that it is given at such length in all three Gospels - all three synoptics. We noticed how in Matthew and in Mark it - in Mark it is given at length. Matthew has so many discourses in length that it doesn't prove a great deal to have this one too but Mark has so comparatively few that it does prove a good deal. We noticed the beginning of Mark with its one statement relates to the temple. We noticed the beginning of Matthew broadening it out a little bit, "What shall be the sign of ~~they~~ coming and of the end of the world?" Now as we looked at that one in Mark at the first place we noticed the question, "What is the temple here to refer to?" And that is always a good question to ask as anything in the Scripture. I think that one of the basic rules of Scriptural interpretation is this: look at the Scripture and see what is taught clearly and simply. Then stand on that and interpret(?) other things in view of it. If you find other things which clearly contradict this, then compare the two and see which is the correct interpretation. But take the clear things of the Bible and explain the obscure ~~with~~ with them. Don't take the obscure ~~with~~ to explain the clear. There may be some very vital point that will have to be proven by a great deal of intricate study. But if so, don't take it as a starting point. Start in with the things that stand out and are clear. We looked for a minute at that in John 2 where He said to the - where He spoke about the temple, we noticed in John 2 and He said they should not make

His Father's house a house of merchandise. And then He went on to say, "Destroy this temple" - they said, "What sign showest thou unto us seeing thou doest these things?" And He said, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." Was He talking now about the temple He'd been talking about that they weren't to make a house of merchandise or was He talking about a different one? Well the first natural interpretation is that He's talking about that one he'd been talking about. But there's also a possibility it's a different one. He said, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." What was the point of it all? Was He talking about what was going to happen to the temple they'd made a house of merchandise or was He giving them a sign that He had authority. They said, "By what sign do you do these? Give us a sign to show what authority you have to do these things." His sign was, "Destroy this temple, I will raise it up." Well, the writer says He spoke of the temple of His body. "When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered He had said this unto them and they believed the Scripture and the word Jesus had said." In other words Jesus said - they said, "What sign do you have that you have authority over God's house?" He said, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up." Well, you couldn't tell from that statement whether He meant the temple or whether He meant the body which is the temple for the Holy Spirit. You couldn't tell which of the two He meant. But when He raised up this one in three days they took it that's what it means. There is a definite fulfillment. It was given as a sign to prove that He who had authority over a living structure, the body, also has authority over the inanimate structure, the temple. Both of which were temples of God. Mr. Berger? (Student question) I only see one word in the context. In this class I don't want to go into questions of the original because some here have had a lot of Greek and some have had very little. And anything that involves with the original I want to leave for more advanced courses than this one. But in this particular point I question if anything in the original would affect the interpretation of this. I think you can take that statement and you can interpret it either of the two ways. But the point of it was a sign, an evidence. And so when He is raised from the dead, the people said, "He predicted

this. He said 'in three days I'll raise it up'. Here's the greatest proof you could have of His authority - that His body was raised up after three days." Well now over in this passage in Mark here. We notice at the beginning of Mark that He says they say, "Just look at this tremendous building - this temple." And Jesus says to them, "You see these great buildings. There shall not be left one stone on another that shall not be thrown down." Is He there talking about the temple or talking about His own body? Well, His body wasn't composed of stones, it couldn't be in a figurative way hardly - the body spoken of as not one stone left on another that shall not be thrown down. It's pretty hard to see how this could refer to anything except the temple. ~~XX~~ He says, "You see these great buildings. There shall not be left one stone on another that shall not be thrown down." For 2000 years that temple has been in ruins. There's nothing but a few stones over on one side to form a parapet on which there's a Mohammedan mosque. Otherwise that great beautiful structure was gone. Why did He say this to them then? Was it just to satisfy curiosity about the future. We don't often find the Lord just simply satisfying curiosity about the future. That is rare in the Scriptures. The predictions of the future are given for a purpose. He said, "Destroy this temple. In three days I'll raise it up." What was the point of it. The point was an authentication, a proof of His authority. Here He is giving an authentication that He is the Lord of Glory who knows the future. They say look at this wonderful thing. He says it's all going to be destroyed. 40 years passes and it is destroyed. Nearly 2000 years and we can see it in that condition. There is a proof of the fact that He knew the future and therefore was the Lord of Glory. Because no ordinary man could know the future. And the early Christians, from 70 A.D. on, used this as one of the great proofs of the fact that Jesus was God and that the Bible was inspired, that it predicted the destruction of Jerusalem and the overthrow of the temple. Now if somebody wants to come along and say, "No, He's not talking about that temple at all. That temple will be destroyed, it'll be gone for 2000 years. Then there's another temple going to be built and that's going to be destroyed and He's here talking about that. Well you're getting into something that's so far off

I don't see how it could be a proof of His authority, how it could be a proof of the inspiration of the Scripture. It certainly would show that all the early Christians from 70 A. D. on were wrong in one of their great evidences to the truth of the Scripture if that was in. How you could call a new temple built 2000 years later, if there should be such a one, "these beautiful buildings" that He points to would certainly be a stretch. I don't say it's impossible, that interpretation, but I say it's so remote that it seems to me that the other is much the more natural, normal interpretation and certainly to be accepted unless there's absolute proof forthcoming that it is not right and that this refers to another one. It seems to me that unless there is absolutely convincing proof which I don't know where it is, I don't know anywhere in the Scripture there's clear proof that another temple is going to be destroyed - I don't know of any references to destruction of a temple prior to the Lord's return - of any clear references at least of anything of that sort that's going to happen. There are predictions how before His return there's to be a great attack on Palestine but it's going to be repelled by His coming. There's no evidence of any temple being destroyed just before His coming that I ~~XXX~~ 've ever heard of. And it's highly questionable whether there's any proof anywhere in the Scripture that a temple is going to be rebuilt before His coming. There may be statements that might look in that direction but certainly no clear proof that I know, of anything. Revelation is a book which has some very clear things in it and some very obscure things. And we must go very slow about proving anything that's clear somewhere else by something obscure in Revelations. Anything that's really clear in Revelation naturally we can prove things relating to other books by. But now here He says, "See these great buildings. There shall not be one stone left upon another" and to the early Christians it was one of the great proofs of the fact that Jesus was God and that this was God's book that He predicted the destruction of Jerusalem and it came to pass as He had predicted. Well now this is all that is said starting this account in Mark. They come and they say, "Tell us, when shall these things be? What shall be the sign when these things will be fulfilled?" And then He goes on with this great Olivet Discourse. Now let's look over at Luke. In Luke 21 we find that it begins looking up he sees the rich men casting their

gifts in the treasury and He sees the poor widow casting in two mites. And He says, "This poor widow's cast in more than they all." He has seen the difference - that it isn't the amount but that it is the spirit back of it that matters in anything you can give to the Lord." And as some spoke of the temple, how it was adorned with goodly stones and gifts, He said, "As for these things which ye behold, the days will come, in the which there shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." And they asked Him, saying, "Master, but when shall these things be? And what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?" That in Mark and Luke is the introduction to it. In Matthew the question is a little longer and doubtless all that Matthew gives was spoken but Mark and Luke felt that this was sufficient of introduction to understand what followed. That doesn't say that what follows mightn't go beyond the question but it does show that it's not necessary to have more to understand what follows. Now we'll look on then and we see what is said in both of these passages, I mean in these three comparisons. We might continue with Luke

End of Record 8

As we look at Luke here, that in Luke there is a definite answer to the question, "When will these things be and what sign will there be when these things come to pass?" He says to them, "This is not going to happen ~~XX~~ immediately". Somebody might think the day after He was crucified, Jerusalem's going to be destroyed. He says, "No, there's a period of time. Nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom. There'll be earthquakes, famine, pestilences and all sorts of things. Before these they'll lay their hands on you and persecute you delivering you up to synagogues and into prisons. And you'll be betrayed by parents and brethren but there shall not a hair of your head perish." Well some of them were killed, some of them were burned at the stake, some of them were thrown to lions - "but there shall not a hair of your head perish". What does He mean by that? He means nothing can happen to you except the Lord permits it. He doesn't mean that no Christian is ever going to be injured. He certainly couldn't mean that because that certainly wasn't true in the very beginning. And what is the sign? Then He says here, "And when you shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies and know that the desolation thereof is nigh." There's the answer to the question. "When shall these things be and what sign will there be when these things shall come to pass?" "When you shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." Here's a definite sign and a definite answer - "then know the desolation is nigh" X- An answer to their question. "What sign will there be when they come to pass?" He says, "Then let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains; and let them that are in the midst of it depart out; and let not them that are in the countries enter thereinto. For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive unto all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." X So here is a definite command then. When you see the sign - Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then flee quickly. And the early Christian history tells us that when ~~the~~

Jerusalem was taken, very few Christians were injured because when the Roman armies began to come into Judea and began to come around Jerusalem, the Christians fled. They read in the Gospels, "When you see the sign, get out" and they got out. They fled away, they fled to the mountains, they departed out and those in other places didn't come into Jerusalem. And these terrible woes came on the Jews and if you read the story of the Roman conquest, it must have been one of the most frightful things that ever was, terrible fate they went through. "And they fell by the edge of the sword and were led away captive to all nations." But the Christians were largely not involved in it because they'd gotten out and followed the predictions of Christ and followed the sign that He gave as to when these things would come to pass. And so this is then the assurance that He gave them in answer to the question, "When will it be these things come?" He says, "Not for a while yet - not for a while. There are going to be upheavals, there are going to be wars, there are going to be tumults, there's going to be persecution. It won't come for a while." But there's a definite sign, "When you see Jerusalem compassed by armies" then there's a definite sign and when that happens then you are to flee from Jerusalem, flee from that area so you'll be safe. But then you might say, "Well then, what happens next? Jerusalem is destroyed, the temple is destroyed. Does that mean the end of the world is there?" "Well, no," He says. He says, "~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Jerusalem is not just destroyed and then the Lord comes back. There's going to be a period after it is destroyed in which it is trodden down of the Gentiles. How long is that going to be? "Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." Well, we don't know how long that is - He doesn't say. But at least it has continued now for a good many thousands of years. 50 years ago, 100 years ago, somebody said there were Jews that had enough money - individual Jewish families - to buy all of Palestine and yet they couldn't set foot on the temple area because the Mohammedans who held it did not allow any Jews to enter upon it under any conditions. When I was in Jerusalem in 1929, a Gentile on payment of \$5.00 could go into the temple area, but a Jew couldn't go in

under any conditions - they were not allowed. And all the Jews could do for many hundreds of years now, was to come up to those few stones that made what they called "The Wailing Wall", and to wail in front of those stones, and put their little pieces of paper with the Hebrew letters on in between the stones, with the prayers on them, and there they wailed. And up above them on top of this platform was that great mosque of Omar and the Arabs looking down on them. And now since 1948 they can't even get to that, they can't come within, I believe, half a mile of that. The Wailing Wall has had no wailing on it for eight years because no Jew can get anywhere near it. Well that is - the times of the Gentiles then are still going on - and at present for a period of nearly 1900 years, Jerusalem has been trodden down of the Gentiles. So He says, "When Jerusalem is destroyed, don't think that that means that Christ is coming back immediately because there is a period after that - there is a space of time." But He passes over this time rather quickly now doesn't He? Verse 24 - "They shall fall by the edge of the sword and be led away captive to all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; Men's hearts failing them for fear; for the powers of heaven shall be shaken and then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." The Son of Man is going to come in a cloud with power and great glory but there's going to be a space of time - at least 20 years let's say - between the fall of Jerusalem and His coming. Actually it has spread on to nearly 2000 years. So then He says, "When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh." Well, what does that mean when these things begin to come to pass? When they begin to have nation rise against nation? When you begin to have earthquakes, when you begin to have persecution, when Jerusalem begins to fall? It sounds pretty much, this does, like a general exhortation doesn't it? When you see trouble and difficulty, you'll know the coming of Christ is that much nearer. You know that all this is going to happen first. Lift up your heads and rejoice in Him because though you see trouble about you, you know that His return

is certain. But how nigh it is in God's sight is an instant from the creation of the world to the return of Christ. But how near it is - it's a little nearer than it was. "And then He spoke a parable: behold the fig tree, and all the trees; when they shoot forth you see and know yourselves that summer is nigh. So when you see these things come to pass, you know the kingdom of God is nigh. Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled." Now that is a difficult verse - "This generation". Some take it to mean "this race" - that all this is going to happen when Christ is on earth - when all those who are living then are living - they take it as meaning that the Jewish race will last until His return. Now maybe that's right. Some others take it as meaning the fall of Jerusalem will be within a generation. And it was - 40 years. It's rather difficult to know for sure what's meant by this 32nd verse. But He goes on to say, "Take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and the cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye therefore and pray alway, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Well that's the end of it here in Luke, of what's given here. It's much briefer than in Matthew. There are other parts that Matthew gives that are given in Luke ~~7~~ 17, but it's not connected up here with this. But this account in Luke would seem to have certain main theses - First, Jesus is proving his knowledge of the future by predicting the destruction of Jerusalem. He says this destruction will not come for a long time. It will be preceded by great misery. There is to be a sign so the Christian can know when it's coming and get out and not be hurt by it. And after Jerusalem falls, then there is a period in which there will be some rather miserable situations. He doesn't say how long the period is but there is a period then which contains and which ends with the Son of Man coming in a cloud with Power and Great Glory. And we are not to become careless with the long passage of time. The long passage of time is not to make us get careless and forgetful but we're to know it is sure. "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away."

So we are to watch, to be wide awake, to be vigilant, that we may be accounted worthy to escape all these things. That is to say, we are to watch in the sense of keeping our eyes on the Lord and on the doing of the tasks He gives us, not that He gives any sign here whereby we may know when He's coming back. He gives a sign whereby they can know when to get out of Jerusalem before it's destroyed and that's the only clear sign that He gives here, isn't it? Well now if you take this Luke and Mark and Matthew and compare them, we find that Matthew is much longer and it is very interesting to compare them. We might start at either end because the comparison runs through and they're only a few places where it is at all questionable as to how they compare. But I think first it would be well to glance at Matthew. Maybe we should glance at Mark first because it's a shorter one. Matthew is the longer. Let's look at Mark and see the general stress in Mark. In Mark here we find that it begins as in Luke. The question is - He points out the stones, these great buildings are going to be destroyed. They say, "Tell us when shall these things be? What shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled?" What things be - the destruction of Jerusalem. Well He starts just as in Luke that there are going to be upheavals, wars and kingdom against kingdom, then persecution - just the same order as in Luke. "And the Gospel must first be published among all nations and when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye speak because the Holy Ghost will give you wisdom." And He goes on and speaks about the flight from Jerusalem, the flight, and pray the flight won't be in winter. And then toward the end of the chapter He gets on to the actual return of Christ. He says - Verse 26 - "then shall they see the Son of Man coming in the clouds with great power and glory and then shall He send His angels and shall gather together His elect from the four winds." That hadn't been mentioned in Luke there. That's discussed in Luke 17, not in Luke 21. "Now learn a parable of the fig tree" - we had that in Luke 2 - "This generation shall not pass, Heaven and earth shall pass away:" ~~XXXXXX~~ Then here's a verse wasn't in Luke - "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son, but the Father. Take ye heed, watch and pray; for ye know not when the time is. For the Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and

gave authority to his servants and to every man his work and commanded the porter to watch. 'Watch ye therefore, for ye know not when the master of the house comes' (and this word "watch" means "be vigilant", be wide awake) 'whether he comes at even, midnight, or cockcrow; lest suddenly he find you sleeping.' And what I say unto you I say unto all - watch!" So the big word in Mark here, just touched on in Luke, but stressed much more here is "watch". Be wide awake so that He will find you doing the work that He has committed to you, when He returns. Now look at Matthew and we find that Matthew is still longer than Mark and Matthew has these same emphases in it that Mark had. But this emphasis which Mark stressed a good bit more than Luke, Matthew stresses a good bit more than Mark. The emphasis that you don't know when the Lord is coming back. Be wide-awake, be vigilant, be serving the Lord, and never

(14.25) for being constant in your service to Christ. Well I've had people say, "Why should He say ^{watch} isn't it silly", some people say, "that we should be asked to be watchful for the return of Christ as a motive to being active in Christian service. Shouldn't anybody that has been saved by Christ be so grateful that that's enough to make Him active in Christian service? Why does he need another motive like this? Well, the Lord knows that anybody who has been saved by Christ

End of Record 9

got to be active and vigilant in the Lord's service every instant. But strangely enough they aren't. Strangely enough, people have been saved by Christ and yet they get careless and neglectful and they won't serve Him as they should and they get lazy and they get interested in their own pleasures and get interested in arguing about little tiny points that He doesn't care a snap about, that He certainly doesn't emphasize in the Scripture and they waste time and effort arguing about these instead of advancing the Gospel and winning souls for the Lord. And so the Lord has given us other motives in the Scripture. He says to us, "You should be grateful." He died for us, we should be ready to live for Him. But He gives another motive. He says, "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro about the earth observing the good, observing the wicked." He's always observing everything. God is right with you. He knows all the time what you're doing. Well, goodness! With a motive like this, shouldn't that be enough? Two motives now. And yet He doesn't stop at that. He says we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. We must account for every idle word. He says there's a judgment of our deeds after we're Christians. Well there's the third point. And yet that isn't enough. You'll find Christians who are not on the job, not serving the Lord as they should. They get careless and indifferent. Every Christian who ever lived does it. And here He gives us a fourth motive. He says in Mark two or three times, "Watch" Let him find you faithful. In Matthew He says it about ten times. Just look at the stress on this in Matthew. "Jesus went out and departed from the temple and the disciples came to Him to show Him the buildings of the temple and Jesus said, 'There shall not be left here one stone ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ on another'" ~~XX~~ And then the disciples came and said, "When shall these things be and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" Well now what shall be the sign? How are we to know when the end of the world is going to come? If we can just know. They're two things. Here is one thing - if we can know that tomorrow the Lord's coming back won't we be faithful from now on? Won't we be active? Won't we be right on the job? I remember once when I was in Bible School after I graduated from college - I went to Bible School for a year. And I remember one fellow said ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ in February, "You know I think it's very, very foolish to finish out this year. The best study I can make of prophecy

the Lord ought to come next April. Think of me wasting these next two months sitting here studying. Wouldn't it be more sensible for me to be out preaching every day?" Well it certainly would be. If you know the Lord's going to come in April and you go out on the street and lead some souls to the Lord, that's an awful lot better than sitting around studying isn't it for those two months. If you know the Lord is coming in two months you certainly should be on the job. Well the Lord wants you to be on the job anyway. He wants you always to be on the job. But you've got a life to live. If you know He's coming in April you should be out preaching these two months but suppose you know He's coming in April six years from now. Well you put in a year of study and you may get twice as much done in the next five years as you would in the six without a year of study. If you know that He is coming in ~~XXXXX~~ thirty years from now, maybe with three or four years of good study, you'll get twice as much done in the remaining 26 years as you will in the whole 30 without it. So that if you know that He's coming 30 years from now, you're going to make every second of those 30 years count for the Lord. But now you don't know He's coming in 30 years. Suppose it's a hundred years. And you may not live just 30 more years. You may live 60 more years. Well, you'll serve Him very faithfully for a year and then you get interested in something else and you kind of forget things for a couple of years. You get interested in this and that and you put in a few periods of active service but you're getting interested in other things and the Lord says here, "You are to plan as if you have a whole life ahead." For all you know there is 50 years to serve the Lord and if you know He's coming at the end of the 50 years, you're going to make every minute of that 50 years count if you can. If you know He's coming at the end of 20 years, you'll certainly make every minute of the 20 count. But you have no reason to think He's coming in two months and therefore to neglect the things that will make the rest of the 30 years more effective. So He said we must be watching because we don't know when He's coming. We must be active. But He says there's no way to tell when He's coming so ~~XX~~ there's never a time that you can say He's coming within two months but there's never a time you can say He won't come within three years. So look at the stress in Matthew. They say now, "Tell us, when shall these things be and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" Jesus says

right away, "Just as soon as you hear somebody say this, you know I'm coming." Is it? No, He says "Take heed no man deceive you for many will come in my name saying 'I am Christ' and shall deceive many. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ You hear, "Here's Christ. He's coming." Well you say, "Many will deceive ~~X~~. I'm not worried about it. If it's He, He'll find me faithfully serving Him. But I'm not going to drop my service for Christ to rush down to South American to find this man who says He's Christ come back to earth. If it really is, He will rejoice in my keeping on the true service to Him instead of my getting all excited and rushing over to Palestine because they say the Lord has already landed over there and I want to get there to see Him as soon as He comes. He says, "Take heed no man deceive you. Many will come in my name saying, 'I am Christ' and shall deceive many. You'll hear of wars and rumors of wars. See that you don't be troubled for this things must come to pass but the end is not yet. Nation shall rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom. There shall be famines, pestilences, earthquakes ~~XXXX~~ in divers places." What is He giving as the sign of His return. Is the sign of His return that somebody says, "Christ is just about to come." "No", He says, "that deceives you." If there are wars and rumors of wars? "No", He says, "There are going to be lots of these things. Nation rises against nation, kingdom against kingdom; all these are but the beginning of sorrows." How about it if there's persecution. Does that mean that Christ is coming right now? He says "They shall deliver you up to be afflicted. They shall kill you. You shall be hated of all nations for my name's sake. Many shall be offended and shall betray one another. There'll be many false prophets who'll deceive many. " So you have many of these things happen but that doesn't prove that the Lord is coming right now because there are more of them He says. So you cannot tell then. Now look down to Verse ²³ ~~23~~. "If any man shall say unto you, 'Lo here is Christ or there' believe it not for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets to show great signs and wonders insomuch that if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect." Have we had any sign yet of when He's coming? Everything we've looked at so far is something not to be taken as a sign. There will be many of these things. Don't get worried about it. They don't prove He's coming. Wherefore if they say to you, "He's in the desert", don't go forth. If they say, "He's

in the secret chambers believe it not because it's going to be a sudden thing as the lightning comes out of the East and shines to the West - it's going to be so sudden that you have no way of telling in advance when it's going to be. Then look on to the- on this matter we're looking at now - Verse 33 - again like in the other Gospels - "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away. But of that day and that hour knoweth ~~X~~ no man." When is it to be? "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man. ~~X~~ No not the angels of Heaven, but my Father ~~XXX~~ also." It's going to be sudden like the days of Noah. Everything was going on in ordinary fashion. They were eating, drinking, marrying and giving in marriage. All of a sudden - they knew nothing about it till the flood came and took them away. So shall the coming of the Son of Man be. "Two women shall be grinding at the mill, one taken, one left. Watch therefore for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." Be active in your service because you don't know when He's coming. Verse 44 - "Therefore be ye also ready for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." Be active, be on your guard because you don't know when He's coming. Verse 48 - "But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, 'My Lord delayeth his coming'". Verse 50 - "The lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him and ~~an~~ an hour that he is not aware of." Chapter 25 continues right on - here are the foolish virgins, they go to sleep and He says - the conclusion of it is Verse 13 - "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." How frequently in Matthew, over and over here, he has stressed this thought, "You do not know when the Lord is coming". What sign has He given that we've looked at of His coming? We haven't seen a single sign which will tell you when He is coming but we have had at least a dozen things pointed to as well they'll be this and this and this. There'll be lots of this. There is no way to tell when He is coming. That's the stress in Mark, the stress in Luke. You do know when Jerusalem's going to be destroyed. There's a sign for that. When that comes, get out. But as to the Lord's coming, you are to be ready all the time - "of that day and hour, knoweth no man". Well now there have been those who say, "Oh these frequent statements in Matthew, 'of that day and hour knoweth no man' and all that. All that means is during the last five years or so before He comes

nobody knows what day or hour it is but we know that it won't be until certain signs take place. Therefore we don't need to think of His coming now because there're all these signs yet to take place but when a certain thing happens, then after that, nobody knows the exact day or hour. So once that happens then we must begin getting ready." Well I don't think anybody would get that thought from Matthew as a whole here with its constant stress on the fact that there's all these things and we're to be vigilant all the time, serving the Lord, all the time, but of the day or hour, "watch ye, ye don't know the hour". But to me an absolute conclusive proof against such an interpretation as that of this is found in Luke 12. In Luke 12 we have a chapter in which the Lord is speaking to the disciples and He is telling the disciples what kind of men they should be. He tells in it, for instance, the parable of the rich fool. He tells of how this man got all ~~XXXX~~ kinds of goods and became very wealthy and He said in Verse 19, "Soul, thou hast much goods laid up; take thine ease; eat, drink, and be merry." But God said to him, "Thou fool, this night thy sould shall be required of thee." YOU don't know when God's going to take you. You can't tell. Here's a man who never dreamed there was anything wrong with him. He's like the man that was down in Texas-in Arizona yesterday. And he stood up before a Democratic dinner and he said, "How foolish it'd be to elect Eisenhower as President because he probably won't live out the four years. He's not in good health and he'll die and it'd be very foolish to elect a man like that." And as he talked everybody looked at him - a great, big, strapping, strong, healthy fellow and the comparison with the weak Eisenhower and this great, big, strong fellow in front of them drove their thoughts home to them - and just as he spoke he dropped over and was taken sick and half an hour later he was dead. At least that's what the inquirer said happened in Arizona yesterday. And it just brings home the thought of this chapter here that the Lord can take anybody and if you're not going to elect anybody President you're not sure will live the next four years, you're not going to elect anybody. We don't know who will live through the four years. You can't tell. God will take any of us when He chooses to - and He took that man even while He was talking. But here Luke gives this illustration and then he continues - the Lord continues showing

how they should trust the Lord. The Lord takes care of the lilies of the field and how much more will He take care of you? He is not talking about any one particular period. He's talking about His followers of all periods and then He goes on and He says in Verse 34 - "Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. Let your loins be girded about and your lights burning." This is the kind of people you are to be he says to the disciples. "And ye yourselves like men that wait for their lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh, they may open unto Him immediately. Blessed are those servants, whom the lord when he cometh, shall find watching." He doesn't mean running to the door to see if he's ready as the context proves. "Verily I say unto you, he shall gird himself and make them to sit down to meat, and come forth and serve them. And if He come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants. Verse 40 - "Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." Then Peter said, "My this is interesting that you should tell us these things to be 2000 years from now after they see certain signs, then they should begin to be like you've described here." Well certainly there's nothing in the context that says anything of the kind. He's talking to those people then as to what kind of people they are to be. "Be ye therefore ready also for the Son of Man comes at an hour when ye think not." "Then Peter said unto Him, "Lord, speakest thou this parable unto us, or even to all?" - just to the people that are going to live 2000 years from now or does it apply to us too? Well that's not what Peter says. What Peter says is, "Do you speak this just to us or does it apply to all of us?" Peter never dreamed but what he was included in the exhortation to watch, never dreamed of his being omitted from it. And so the Lord answered and said, "Who then is that faithful and just steward

End of Record 10

that faithful and wise steward whom the Lord will make ruler over His household, to give them their portion of food in due season. Blessed is that servant, whom His Lord when He comes shall find giving ~~EXERCISE~~ them their portion of meat, of food in due season." Blessed is that person, be it Peter, be it Paul, be it John, be it you, or be it me, who, when He comes, He finds giving out the Word of God and giving the spiritual nourishment that people need to grow in the Lord - not the person He finds running to the door every 10 minutes to see whether there are signs that He may be coming and to find out whether this particular thing or that particular thing happened that will make a sign that maybe His coming will be tomorrow instead of the next day or will be this year instead of 300 years from now. We are to look forward to His coming, we're to be interested in it, but we're to be interested in it as a motive for Christian service, not as a motive for curiosity as to just when it may be because nobody can tell. And every sign that we've noticed that He's given has been negative. There'll be war - yes, there'll be lots of wars. There'll be persecution - there'll be loads of persecution. All these things happen. People will say Christ is round the corner - yes, lots of people will say it. Don't get disturbed about it. You'll be safe for you'll be on the job. You give the food in due season and if when He comes He finds you wide-awake and doing this, that's what He wants to find. So we find here that this stress is continued here ~~XX~~ - very strongly stressed here in this chapter of Luke which has no ~~eschatological~~ ^{eschatological} ~~eschatological~~ surroundings at all. We have no right to infer that Christ was speaking of a period 2000 years in the future when ~~HE~~ He said this thing, because if He did the Holy Spirit would have made a terrible mistake in putting it in the middle of a chapter which has nothing about any surrounding situation but simply gives it as what kind of people those people there are to be. Well you might say Peter knew it wouldn't come in the next few years because he's told there are going to be wars and rumors of wars, tribulation, and all that. If, he would know it wasn't going to be in the next few years - but just how many wars it takes, you can't tell. And so you'd better start watching right now - start being the kind of people He wants you to be right now and

you won't know when it gets to the number of wars that there may be, or the amount of persecution that may be included before He comes. So Luke 12 to my mind proves absolutely that these exhortations which are repeated over and over and over in Matthew here - that these exhortations are addressed to all His people at all times. And if we find this stress over and over and over, it seems to me there's this that we can say - that as far as the Christian is concerned the unknowability of the time of the return of Christ is a motive which He intends us to have for Christian service at all periods from that very beginning on. Well somebody says, "Yes, but the last chapter of John says Peter's going to be crucified." Well then they know it can't come as long as Peter's living. Well they know it can't come till there've been wars and rumors of wars. So in those first few years you could tell it was a little while off but just how far? Suppose 20 years had gone by and somebody says, "My, we'd better be on the job serving the Lord. Suppose He'd come today?" Somebody else says, "What a foolish motive for service that you don't know but what the Lord will come today. The Lord can't come till after Peter's crucified." Well, that might be pretty good proof that He wasn't coming today if you were living in the town Peter ^{was} ~~XXXX~~ in. But in those days without telegrams, without rapid service, how do you know but what Peter in the next town was crucified yesterday? You can't tell. There'd be very, very few people who would be able to know because they'd seen Peter around that the Lord couldn't come that day. And of course after Peter was crucified, that sign was no longer effective. As far as John was concerned the Lord said to Peter, "Suppose I want John to stay until I come back. What is that to thee?" In other words you say, "Well, He can't come back now. John is still living." Well, it's true Peter's been crucified and he said he would but He hasn't said whether John's going to live till His return or not. You don't know. Once Peter was crucified nobody knew. But it is a motive ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ for Christian service that nobody knows the day or the hour and it is to be in effect right from the beginning except as those few things carry on that you know there's going to be a considerable amount of persecution and a considerable amount of wars and rumors of wars and so on. It is given

attitude
then as a motive, an ~~ADDITIVE~~ of Christian service that He desires us to have. Now in view of that, it impresses me that this we can say - when He comes there is no recognizable event which must take place before He comes - I think we can say that. If anybody could say for a little while, He can't come till Peter's been crucified, yes. But that only helps when you were near Peter. Well, they could say there must be wars and rumors of wars but probably within 15 years there'd been 10 of those. And that might be - you couldn't tell - that might be. Certainly the amount that they've had within a hundred years was plenty. Certainly within 400 years it was over-abundant - and the same with persecution. You cannot tell and there is nothing we have looked at here which is a sign of which you can say, "Until that takes place, He can't come." Now if there is such a sign in these (6.) that until that takes place, He can't come, why then this has no validity if it is something that hasn't yet happened. I know of only one thing in these chapters of which that is alleged. And if it is to be interpreted that way, then it certainly contradicts the strong emphasis of the past, and the strong emphasis of Luke's . And to me that is the very, very strong reason against interpreting anything in that . Now as you compare Matthew and Mark and Luke, you see verse after verse comparing. And many people interpret it this way. But it is inherently very improbable because you find certain verses of Luke which are ~~XXX~~ almost verbatim certain verses in that section of Matthew and Mark. And more than that, because you find that the one main question with which the whole thing starts, "What is the sign of these things? When will these things come to pass? The destruction of the temple which is specifically dealt with here, according to this interpretation, is just passed over in absolute silence in Matthew and Mark with absolutely no reference whatever to the destruction of Jerusalem. And it seems very strange if that were the case, that they would have bothered to give you that as a question at the beginning of the (7.75) nor the main question, as they went on. It seems to me that there is a pretty big presumption that this section should be considered together - a ~~XXX~~ pretty big presumption for it. And if you consider it together, there's these reasons to consider it together, then you do not have something

stated here in Matthew and Mark that absolutely contradicts the main trend of all the teaching here. And the main point that you start with, left out. You see your main things are first. The temple's going to be destroyed - what's the sign of it? Well, the sign is given and when you see the sign, please hurry up and get out and the Christians did it. And the Christians in Jerusalem would be more apt to be the ones to read Mark than the ones who read Luke. And yet according to this theory Luke's the one that gives the sign and Matthew and Mark don't give it at all. They're told to flee in all three places ~~XXXX~~ but this flight people say refers to something way in the future. It doesn't refer to the destruction of Jerusalem at all. But that's the first big emphasis in the chapter and according to this theory Matthew and Mark had nothing to do with it. And then the other big thing in the chapter - the destruction of Jerusalem

(Apparent record overlapping)

We were looking last time at the Apocalyptic Message of Christ and I didn't want to let that go too long to finish it up so I thought we had better go ahead and have our meeting today even though there was the mistake I made in the announcement of it. We had looked at the message contained in Matthew and Mark and Luke and we have seen how, particularly in Matthew and Mark, there is this strong note of "watch", "watch and be ready". We notice this in Luke also and in other portions of Luke, then in the Apocalyptic Discourse . It's given as one of the qualities which the disciples are to have. Now I personally am very strongly convinced that it is vital that we not only stand on whatever we find in the Bible but as far as possible we find the emphasis of the Bible - that when the Holy Spirit stresses something, two or three or four times, that means it's important. I do not think we are right to build a great deal on one obscure verse somewhere in any connection - that's a great danger. There have been great movements built on one verse some~~XXXX~~where. Anything that the Lord wants stressed He's apt to give at various places and to dwell upon and to make it clear that this is of importance. Well I don't think that one can take this in mind and look at chapter 24 and 25 of Matthew without coming very strongly to the conclusion

that the thing that is stressed in these chapters about the end of the age and the return of the Lord, is that we do not know when it is to be but it is to come at an hour that we think not and that this is a motive for being on guard, being on the watch that we do not fall into laziness, that we don't fall into worldliness, that we do not become slack in doing His will and giving out His word. And that seems to me to be so stressed in these passages and as if - if there were any question that this is only something that refers to a few years at the very end of the age and not to an earlier time, I would think that would be completely set at rest and conclusively set at rest by the Gospel of Luke with its statement in Luke 12 where there's no eschatological surroundings in the chapter whatever - it's strictly talking about what kind of people they are to be and He gives this as a motive for constant watchfulness. So that that seems to me should be a basic thing in our interpretations of the chapter. I do not think it right to take two or three verses to explain away clear teachings that are repeated as this is a dozen times, that are stressed, that are made so clear that there is absolutely no question that that is what is said. Now those are then the main emphases of these chapters. The first emphasis is Jerusalem is going to be destroyed and you are to have a sign when Jerusalem will be destroyed. Luke tells us very clearly when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, don't wait, flee, get out. Don't bother with anything, just get out as fast as you can - and I can well imagine that the people who waited around - some of the Christians said when they saw the Roman soldiers coming and they said, "Our Lord told us to get out when this happened and we're going to get out." And some of their Jewish friends said, "Oh, you don't need to be in such a hurry. The Romans aren't that much worried about us. They're not going to make that much fuss and anyway, we've got a pretty strong army. We're going to win our freedom from them this time." The Christians said, "Well our Lord has said to get out. The sign He gave us 40 years ago - we better act upon it." And some may have followed their advice. But those who didn't follow their advice very soon found themselves so shut in that it was absolutely impossible to get out. There was nothing they could do. They were just caught there in one of

the most terrible debacles in the history of the world. The misery of that destruction of Jerusalem was simply indescribable. And while there were individuals who survived it, they survived it with terrible suffering. And the Christians avoided it by obeying the sign that was given them. But He has not given them a sign like that about His return. His return is something which they are to be careful that it does not catch them forgetful of their duty, forgetful of the tasks He wants them to do, but that it finds them on the job and alert, giving out the food in due season. Yes? (Student question) I would say that the statement about the army surrounding Jerusalem is specifically referring to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. I don't think it has any reference whatever to the last time. We are told that in various places there is to be a time in the last age when armies will surround Jerusalem. I don't know of any statement that Jerusalem's going to be destroyed or anything like that, but that there will be armies coming, that it will be attacked and all that, that we are told. But we are not told as Christians that we know the Lord won't come till armies surround Jerusalem. We're not told that. We are told, "in such an hour as you think not, the Son of Man

End of Record 11

two distinct subjects which are discussed in these chapters - two distinct subjects, and we have quite a different approach to the two subjects. Jerusalem will be destroyed. When? We're not told when but we are given a sign. When you see the sign, get out. Then we are told that the Lord will comeback. When? You don't know but see to it that He finds you faithful when He comes. Maybe it will be near, maybe it will be far. The tone of much of the language would suggest it might be right away but then we're told nation will rise against nation and kingdom against kingdom. We know there will be a space of time. But all that could be fulfilled in thirty to forty years. But we don't know how soon. We don't know how long. Yes? (Student question) The siege began, that is the rebellion began about A.D. 66 and ~~it~~ it was under Nero right after the revolt began. And Vespasian was the general. And Vespasian's son Titus was his assistant. And Vespasian conquered section after section of Palestine but he still had a lot of

work yet to do when ~~XXX~~ Nero died. And they had three emperors one after another succeeding him in the course of a year and a half. And each one of them was assassinated because he wasn't up to the job and the people simply - he had more enemies than he could control. They needed a strong hand in Rome and people sent the word to this strong general in Palestine, "Come back and establish order here. You'd better take over the emperorship." So Vespasian took a group of soldiers with him and left his son Titus in charge. So the actual conquest was by Titus and Titus was in charge perhaps a year before the final destruction. He was in actual charge at the time of the destruction. He took the booty back with him and in Rome today right a short distance from the Colosseum there is a big arch. Most of the arches in Rome have got two different holes through them - they're double arches like the letter "M". But this is like a big "N" - a single arch. On the walls of it it has pictures of the Jews being led in triumph through the streets of Rome and it shows the candlesticks from the temple and various things from the temple in Jerusalem. It is a favorite picture to take in Rome - a picture of the Colosseum through the arch of Titus. Because you can stand right near it and look right through it and see the tremendous Colosseum through the arch. And many people have their pictures taken there by the Arch of Titus - it's one of the clear landmarks of ancient Rome that's there today. Titus would not have been the conqueror of Palestine if they hadn't had the situation in Rome that called for his father to go and assume the emperorship. His father would have been the conqueror but his father became the emperor and then he was the conqueror. (Student question) Titus followed Vespasian and was emperor very briefly. This conquest of Jerusalem in A.D.70 is one situation in the first century of which we have very good information, much better than we have for many events in the first century because of the fact that when the Jews revolted, one of their generals in northern Palestine was a young Jew who had a great historical sense and a great interest in his people and a young man who had studied the different types of people in Jerusalem. He had gone out into the wilderness and lived with a group of Essenes for a time to learn how they lived. He talked with the Sadducees, he talked with the Pharisees, he knew a

lot about all these different people. He was much interested in all these details. And then he was a general of ~~XXX~~ one of the armies, one of the first conquered. And after the army was seized and he was taken prisoner, then Titus took a fancy to him. And he was with Titus through the rest of the war. And so this Jew, Josephus, who was then about 30 to 40 years of age, became a good friend of Titus. When the war was over instead of taking Josephus to march as his prisoner, Titus took him to Rome as a friend. And Josephus had a fine home in Rome. There is a story that Titus gave him the official temple copy of the Bible - whether that's true we don't know. But he doubtless did give him many things at least from the conquest of Jerusalem. And Josephus in Rome found himself sort of looked down on by the Roman people and so he set to work to prove he was just as good as they were and he wrote a book called the Antiquities of the Jews. In this he told the history of the Jews from the creation of the world, basing it upon the Old Testament and where the Old Testament doesn't give full detail, he fills in from his imagination. Like when he gets Saul, the Bible tells us how Saul was pursued by the Philistines and Saul killed himself or had his armor-bearers kill him - probably partly both in order to escape from the Philistines - well, Josephus tells us what Saul said. It's like Hamlet, "To be or not to be". "Shall I kill myself or shall I let myself be taken prisoner." He's got quite a soliloquy there which, of course, is all pure imagination on Josephus' part. So there is some good imagination and some good copying from the Old Testament in Josephus' History of the Jews. It is of no value as a historical document because it has no source except the Bible and whatever's in the Bible, you've got there already, you don't need to get from Josephus. And whatever he's added to it is just his imagination, no more valid than ours. But Josephus wrote another book - he wrote several books. This other book I'm not sure if he wrote before or after his Antiquities of the Jews - and this other book was the history of the Jewish Wars. And that's altogether different because there Josephus is writing of the things that he, himself saw and participated in. And in this he describes Jerusalem as it was before the conquest and he tells of the different types of people in Jerusalem and about their habits and their customs and their views and when you get into these matters you are dealing with a first-hand witness. And so that is a

prime historical source. And then when he tells about the war and about the privations of the Jews and all of that, he is writing as one who knows at first hand. He did not suffer in the privations but he had plenty of contacts with others who did. The Jews considered Josephus as a traitor - actually there's no evidence he was a traitor, he fought bravely but he was conquered. But after he was conquered he became a friend of the Roman conqueror and that the Jews never liked so the Jews historically have detested Josephus and have not paid any attention to his book. But a Jew in the Middle Ages took Josephus' book and rearranged it some and rewrote it and the Jews call that Josippin. And Josippin has been a book the Jews have read a great deal though they wouldn't read Josephus - but it's based on Josephus. But from Josephus we know about the events in Jerusalem at this time pretty definitely and completely. We have much more accurate information on them than we have on (8.25) rebellion because there was no Josephus present then to write that material up for us and to preserve it. And then of course Josephus' writings got preserved for us because of the fact that Christianity came to the fore before they disintegrated. There probably were other men at Rome like Josephus who had come from other countries that the Romans conquered who wrote histories of their people, some of them have been preserved, others haven't. But in their case as Christianity became dominant, there might not have been the interest in some of those to copy and recopy them. And the old copies would disintegrate and go to pieces and many of them are probably lost - a great part, the great bulk of the literature of ancient times is lost. But Josephus - the Christians were interested in everything about the Jews and about Palestine, so the books were copied. And if you get a book that was copied into the fifth or sixth century, then there's a good chance of our finding it somewhere even if we don't have it now. Because the best copies from that time on were made on animal skin. But in the first four centuries the copies were made on papyrus and papyrus will disintegrate in most cases. You take all our literature today. 99% of everything that is in America today - if we were all removed from the country and if there was no destruction, no atom bombs or anything, but just the people removed. Somebody coming here 500 years from now, they'd all be gone, there'd be just nothing left. They wouldn't even know we were literate except

for a few things that are actually marked in stone. Our paper will all just completely disappear. Papyrus is better than our paper but it would disappear too. But the parchment lasts. Yes? (Student question) The Jewish Wars, yes, the account of the Jewish Wars. That is a prime historical source. Well now this Apocalyptic Discourse then you see, is not a simple discourse. But as with any matter, it is good to look at it and see what is the purpose of the author and what are the primary things in it. Then you can often get further light on secondary things. But we have found here the primary thing is first to tell the disciples Jerusalem will be destroyed. "You need not suffer in the destruction. Here's how to avoid it." And that saves the Christian from suffering in the destruction - most of them fled immediately at the beginning of the war, as soon as the armies got anywhere near Jerusalem and they were spared from it. And it gave a wonderful proof of the fact the Bible was true. And I am sure that from 70 A.D. on, one of the greatest things that helped in the spread of Christianity was people heard about the destruction of Jerusalem and they read the prophecies Christ made about it and it was an important proof of the fact that God had written the Bible, had predicted what would happen and it had come to pass as predicted. That is the first great thing in this discourse. The second is there is an end of the age when the Lord Jesus Christ is coming back and you don't know when it is so you watch and pray lest you enter into temptation. You watch and be vigilant that when He comes He finds you on the job. That is the big stress that is stressed over and over in this chapter in Matthew, and that is stressed in Luke in passages having nothing to do with specific eschatological connections. Now I want to compare the chapters a little bit. I don't want to take too much time on this because after all this is a survey course rather than a course in detail in this section. But it's of value to us not merely for the contents itself but as a method of help in comparing other passages which you'll want to go into that are in the different Gospels. And so as we compare them we look at the beginning of the passage and then let's look on through a bit and see how they compare in the different Gospels. You have in - I have a pretty good conspectus here - if I can lay my hand on it. Otherwise we can easily do it without that. I don't just remember the page on it here. Here's a brief one. The beginning is in Matthew 24 - 1 to 3 and the parallel is Mark 13 - 1 to 4. We

have this beginning - Actually for the Gospel to go to the whole world you'd have to go in every generation, wouldn't you? There are many sections of the world which have had the Gospel given to them all over which they don't have it at all. And there are other sections which have never had it in the past which have it a great deal now. It varies tremendously and I don't see how we can fasten anything specific on this phrase "Then shall the end come." It would seem to mean this message isn't just going to be in Jerusalem here. You're going to go out and take it and it's to go widely before the end comes. But that you can say, "Here is - just as soon as you get over this area, then it comes." There's nothing like that here. The big stress in the whole chapter is "YOU don't know when it's coming. You can't tell." Yes? (Student question) "Then shall the end come." I would say that this means that the end - you can't say when the end is but you must preach the Gospel to all nations and the end won't come before God feels that it has been preached to all nations. I would say that. But as to how completely it has to be preached to all nations, or how constantly, or to what grade of proportion of the nations - that's in the hands of the Lord. We just don't know.

End of Record 12

They return pretty much to the environment of tradition. They were not allowed to a great extent to get into the city. There may have been some but that is there wasn't the severe repression of the Jews after 70 that there was after 130. After 132 Hadrian made a law that no Jew could come within 16 miles of Jerusalem under pain of death. There was no such law before that. But the Jews were pretty well scattered and they weren't able to do any extensive rebuilding of Jerusalem immediately after 70. (Student question) Doubtless some came back - perhaps not much immediately but in the course of the years they began to drift back and then of course there came a big rush back just before the Rebellion. They made a concerted effort to establish it again. But now we have then these comparisons here and we find we have the same discourse very definitely with a very close word for word similarity in many sections of it. But now we find that in Luke, he goes right on after - I should say

first in Mark and in Luke, in both of them, He goes on to tell them as to what they are to do when they are persecuted. That they are not to prepare the thing that they are to say in their defense, that God will give them that message. We find that in ~~MARK~~ Mark 13:11, 12, 13, telling how they'll be persecuted by members of their own family. We find it in Luke ~~XX~~ 21:14,15,16,17 - in that space. We find that in Mark and in Luke - a very close parallel. That is skipped in Matthew. It doesn't enter in there in Matthew. But you notice the close similarity in Mark and in Luke. Mark says, "But take heed to yourselves for they shall deliver you up to councils and in the synagogues ye shall be beaten and ye shall be brought before rulers and kings for my sake; for a testimony against them. And the gospel must first be published among all nations. But when they shall lead you and deliver you up take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost. Now the brother shall betray the brother to death, and the father the son, and children shall rise up against their parents, and shall cause them to be put to death. And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake but he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved." Luke says in the parallel, "Settle it, therefore in your hearts, not to meditate before what ye shall answer for I will give you a mouth and wisdom which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist. And ye shall be betrayed both by parents and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends and some of you shall they cause to be put to death and ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake but there shall not an hair of your head perish. In your patience possess ye your souls." Now how do you fit Luke together when he says, "Some of you shall they cause to be put to death --- but there shall not an hair of your head perish." Two verses apart. If you just had, "Not an hair of your head perish" alone you might say Luke says no Christian need fear that he'll be killed in a persecution. He can't be. There won't even a hair of his head perish. But two verses before it, Luke says, "Some of you shall they cause to be put to death." So we have to interpret, "There shall not a hair of your head perish" "except as God permits it". "There will not a hair of your head perish" because you can't help yourself. It's because God permits it. We have to interpret that there or else - it's not merely that he contradicts the

other Gospels, he contradicts himself two verses earlier, if you don't take it that way. But that is very close in Mark and in LUKE - that particular section, not right there in Matthew, but it comes after the part about the Gospel first being published in all nations which is ⁱⁿ Mark but not in Luke. And then Mark and Luke continue right on. Luke says, "And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains and let them which are in the midst of it depart out and ~~XXX~~ let not them that are in the country enter thereunto for these be the days of vengeance that all things which are written may be fulfilled. But woe to them that are with child and to them that give suck in those days for there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people and they shall fall by the edge of the sword and shall be led away captive unto all nations and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled. And there shall be signs in the sun and the moon, signs in the stars, and upon the earth, " and so on. Well now note the close parallel of Mark. Mark says, "But when ye shall see the abomination of desolations spoken of by Dani~~el~~ the Prophet, standing where it ought not, let him that readeth understand. Then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains." Luke says, "Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains". Luke continues, "and let them which are in the midst of it depart out and let not them that are in the country, enter thereinto. " Matthew continues, "and let him that is on the housetop, not go down into the house, neither enter therein to take anything out of ~~XX~~ his house. And let him that is in the field not turn back again for to take up his garment." Luke says in Verse 23, "But woe unto them that are with child and unto them which give suck in those days for there shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people." Mark says, "But woe to them which are with child and to them that give suck in those days and pray that your flight be not in the winter for in those days shall be affliction such as was not from the beginning of creation which God created unto this time, neither shall be."~~XX~~The parallel between these passages is very close. Luke is talking about how they are to escape from the Roman attack. Mark uses almost identical language. Only where Luke says that "when you see Jerusalem com-

passed by armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judea flee to the mountains." Mark uses the word "desolation" slightly differently. He says, "But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, standing where it ought not, let him that readeth understand, then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains." So that the command to flee when you see these signs is identical in the two. The language is almost identical. It comes right after the same preceding material. In Luke it is dealing directly with the subject with which the discourse started. He says, "All these buildings will be thrown down." They say, "When will this be?" He says, "When you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies, flee to the mountains." In the other one He says, "When you see the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not, then let him that is in Judea flee to the mountains." It tells in both of them, "Woe to them that give suck in those days" - those that can't flee, and so on. The parallel between the two is very, very close. Now there are those who say, after the three Gospels go along parallel up to this point, then Luke proceeds to give the answer to the question with which the whole discussion started. Matthew and Mark simply ignore the matter that the discussion is about - skip clean over it. Jump forward thousands of years, deal with something entirely distinct and say nothing whatever about that but give exactly the same advice that Luke gives about the fall of Jerusalem, they give about something that is going to happen at the end of the age. Well now we cannot dogmatically say that that is an impossible interpretation but I think we can say that that is an extremely unlikely interpretation. If Matthew and Mark were not going to say anything about the destruction of Jerusalem, it is very strange that they should start their discourse with the question about when Jerusalem is going to be destroyed. It is very strange indeed. You would think that if for some reason that was going to be left out of their discourse, that the question in the beginning would be given in a shortened form, only including the part that deals with the answer. Then it was very strange that the language as to what you're to do in this situation would be used in almost identical form - in Luke regarding one situation and in Matthew and Mark in another. In the third place it is very strange that information about the destruction of Jerusalem should be

given only in the Gospel which is to the Greeks, who knew little about Jerusalem, and should be passed over in the two Gospels that were written by Jews, one of them specifically for the Jews, and the other one in the first instance for the Romans who conquered the Jews there. That would be very strange indeed. And so while we cannot say that it is impossible that after proceeding right along parallel, one of them deals with the immediate situation and the other one just jumps forward thousands of years into the future. It is not impossible but it certainly looks extremely unlikely. And when you see how close the parallels are between the two, then in addition to that, you find that as you take up the big emphasis of the passages, you find that in Luke the emphasis is on this - the destruction of Jerusalem is something that you can tell when it's coming and get out of the way and not be hurt by it. The return of Christ is something which you are not to know when it comes but you are to be ready, serving the Lord effectively, so that when it comes He will find you effectively serving. It's a very different kind of an exhortation. And this other exhortation, which deals with the return of Christ, is stressed in Matthew as nowhere else - even more than in Luke. And then to say that in Matthew we find nothing about the first emphasis, the one on the destruction of Jerusalem, but instead find something about the return of Christ which would seem to quite sharply contradict that thing which is stressed in Matthew more than ~~anywhere~~ in any other about the return, that would be a very strange situation indeed. Now what is meant by this term, "the abomination of desolation"? That is something which is very difficult to say. It is very hard to say. But if the parallel is that when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies you are to flee to the mountains and when you see "the abomination of desolation standing where it ought not as spoken in Daniel the Prophet, let him that readeth understand," - when you compare these two, it would seem quite reasonable to think that in writing to the Greeks in a Gospel that will mainly be read in countries quite a distance from Palestine, there is no difficulty in speaking right out plainly and directly and clearly. Otherwise they won't know what you're talking about. And they read it and then they find when the thing happens how precisely it is fulfilled and it is a wonderful proof to them of the accuracy of the divine prediction. But to the man who is in Palestine, on the one hand it is good for him not

Record 13

to have something in his Gospel which is quite so explicit so that when ~~XXX~~ a copy of the Gospel happens to fall in, or not happen - it is deliberately shown in order to win you to Christ - they resist and it's immediately obvious that this is sufficient. This is unpatriotic. They may say, "Well we don't care whether you're Christian or a Jew. Your religion is up to you. But after all you're of Jewish race. You should be patriotic. You should want Jerusalem to have its freedom. You should be against the Roman oppression and then you're distributing a book that says there's no use resisting the Romans. It's going to be destroyed. Jerusalem is going to be trodden down of the Gentiles and the Roman armies are going to destroy the city. Well if you can say the same thing in such language that the Christian as he reads it knows exactly what is talked about, he understands it. But the person who casually looks at it doesn't immediately get aroused to make an attack and bring charges against them in the courts - why, you served the purpose.

(14.5) The "abomination of desolation"

is a

End of Record 13

on putting up some Roman insignia or something which may have contributed a great deal to arousing the Jews to the point of desperation where they would revolt against the far stronger Romans and faced the terrible disaster that came to them which could have been predicted as probable because their force was so much inferior to that of the mighty Roman Empire. You might say it's like the Hungarians today. The Hungarians have been subject to terrible torture and oppression by the Russians for a dozen years and they have submitted to it, they've gone on. All those who could escape and find a way to get out have been very happy to take advantage of it but the rest have submitted. - But finally the time comes when the oppression becomes so brutal and so terrible that they just ~~XXXX~~ can't stand it any longer and they just give way.

Well now something like this may have been the thing that entered it. But it fits with the emphasis on the deliverance from Jerusalem and it doesn't fit with the emphasis on the being faithful in your service to God so that when Christ comes He finds you watching. Yes? (Student question) What do you see connection between in Matthew?

Well, Daniel is speaking ~~XXX~~ about (4.5), ~~The~~ Syrian Emperor who put up abominations in the temple. That's what he's specifically talking about in the book of Daniel and he also looks forward to the but he describes the abominations which took place under X

There's an interesting thing - Daniel mentions Alexander the Great, he mentions his successors, he's goes on verse after verse after verse describing one successor after another for a period of about 200 years until he leads right straight up to

(5.25) and he's got a verse or two about each of these. And there's absolutely no purpose in describing these heathen rulers unless it's to lead up to . And he gets up to and he describes the things that did, which are accurately stated that he did. And there are those who say because it mentions "abomination of desolation" in connection with , it must be that after he describes all these rulers before all of a sudden he jumps forward to

and says nothing in the world about (5.5)

And if so there'd be no point at all in mentioning all these others. Now the words "abomination of desolation" is used in three places - this is only one of the three. But in this one it is describing what (5.75) did and it may be very similar to what the Romans did. It may be very similar. Now there's a great deal there we don't know anything about. But the parallel is very, very close. But the vital thing isn't that we know what all these details mean. The vital thing is that we get the big emphases of the chapter. And the first big emphasis is when you see Jerusalem surrounded with armies, flee, save your lives - and they did. And they were able to point out to ~~X~~ the whole world how Jesus Christ predicted the destruction of Jerusalem 40 years ahead of time and how their lives were saved when their friends and neighbors were killed because they followed the information ~~He~~ had given in the Book and fled to the mountains and got out. And then the second big emphasis repeated over and over and over in Matthew, ~~XX~~ somebody says, "I'm Christ. Christ has come!" Don't pay any attention at all. Here's a big war - you think the end of the world is now. No, it isn't. Wars, crises, upsets, people who claim to be Christ - all that doesn't prove the second coming is here. The second coming the father has put in His own power. There is no sign to tell you when it is - you are to be ready for it at any time. It may come very soon, it may be a long ways off but the big emphasis there is "be ready~~X~~, be watching". And those are the two big emphases. And that the second big emphasis should be contradicted by a very obscure statement which is parallel with a clear statement of the first emphasis - and the first emphasis never mentioned in Matthew and Mark - it's not there - would be very strange indeed. Well we didn't get as far as ~~I~~ was hoping to today and I won't be able to meet with you next Monday but we'll continue.

I'm sorry ~~XXXX~~ I haven't been able to see you for some time. It's partly due of course to the Day of Prayer which cut out one of our days and then I had to be in Chicago last Thursday. But we'll be able to meet again this afternoon at 2:30 and that will catch us up a little bit. We looked at II - The Gospels and under that we took the Gospels in

general and then we took each of them separately. And then we were looking at the longest of the discourses that is recorded in as many as three of the Gospels. And we were just taking a survey of this Apocalyptic Discourse. For the purpose of survey we can't go into it in great detail. All we can do is get the main features. But we noticed that the main features are first that there are really two questions with which it starts. Now whether "The sign of thy coming" and of "The end of the world" should be made two or three, might be a matter for interpretation but I question whether in the minds of the disciples it would be more than two. So I think that we can say that whether it should be two or three that would be a matter of interpretation of the second one which would come on comparison of it with other parts of the Scripture. But at present we are not going to compare this with things we get in the Epistles and Revelation. We are surveying the New Testament and we will come back to this if necessary some when we get there but we won't look ahead to there for this time. You have to use some sort of orderly progress and I think this is the most orderly way to do it. So we will say that at the present point in the survey, as we look at it, we see that there are definitely two questions, whether the second one needs to be subdivided into three or not. But it starts with the first question based upon the fact that they are looking at the buildings of the temple. And they are seeing the greatness of Herodian Jerusalem. They are seeing these beautiful buildings of this city which gives the Jews a center to which they come, a center to which people come to sacrifice and to worship from all over the world wherever they are scattered. Probably not over a third to half of the Jews were living in Palestine at that time. The rest were scattered all over the world. There may have been more Jews in Alexandria than there were in Jerusalem. Alexandria was perhaps the greatest center of Judaism at that time. Although the city would be two-thirds of it not Jewish, it was a tremendously large city and it was a very great Jewish settlement there. But this was the Jewish national headquarters. It was the headquarters of their religion and they were all proud of these great buildings that were its headquarters - this great temple and the buildings by it. And it all starts from Jesus pointing to these things and saying this is all going to be destroyed. It will be so completely destroyed you'll say there isn't a stone resting

on another. There'll be no part - in other words - of this temple which will be useable. It will be a wreck. And I don't think it's in any way a detraction from that to recognize that a part of the wreck remained a place where the Jews came and lamented through 2000 years. One side of one wall standing there, not as in any sense a part of the temple anymore - there's a Mohammedan mosque above it - but they call it The Wailing Wall to which they came and lamented the glory of the great temple that was destroyed. And so Christ pointed to this and said, "All this is going to be destroyed." And then they asked Him, "When will this happen and what will be the sign of your coming?" Very evidently they thought when these great buildings are destroyed then Christ will come and set up His kingdom. But He proceeded to tell them, "No, the things are distinct. The destruction of this is one thing" - His return is another thing. And in these discourses He puts His stress on two various elements. First - when will this happen, when will the destruction of the temple happen? Well, there is a sign. There is a sign. When you see this sign, get out. Get away from this area. Flee quickly. Don't hesitate. Don't stop. You may get caught in the seige and if you're there and the seige is under way, you will have a time of most utter misery - probably no people in the history of the world has ever had greater misery than the Jews suffered at that time in this long and terrible seige and then the terrible disaster at the end of the seige. Don't take any ~~XXXXXXXX~~ chances, get out just as quickly as you can. I remember hearing of a man who was in the Christian work up in China. He was a Chinese himself and he was doing a very excellent work among students there. And then I heard that many people who had thought so highly of him were criticizing him and didn't think so well of him and the reason was that he had moved down to HongKong. He had left China and they said he should have stayed here. And he said the Communists have taken Manchuria and are moving forward and I have a family and I want to get them where they're safe - he moved them out. And there were others who criticized him very severely for moving them out. But then I heard about others not long afterward who escaped just barely ahead of the Communists and others who did not escape at all who on trumped up charges were taken and were killed many of them and their opportunity of service greatly cut down and I haven't since that time heard anybody criticizing this

one man for having gotten out a little sooner than the rest did. There are situations in life like that where a thing closes in and where if you are caught in it, then it is your duty before the Lord to stand and bravely confess Him and take the consequences. But where it is not necessarily your duty to stay and to take the consequences and to get out and be able to serve Him somewhere else

End of Record 14

Queen Mary became Queen of England after the death of her brother, Edward, the most of the Protestant leaders in England immediately fled to the continent. The people who were in official positions - the bishops - stayed in England. Mary was Queen for three years and in the course of those three years most of those bishops were burned at the stake and they nobly and bravely testified to their faith in Christ as they suffered for His name. And the people who saw them suffering were greatly impressed with their noble stand for Christ and the way they died for His Cross. And then in the providence of God, Mary herself died and was succeeded by Elizabeth, Elizabeth, who had a great liking for the forms and ceremonies and pomp of the Roman Church but who could not herself go over to the Roman Church without making her own Mother to be not Queen and she herself to lose any right to be the successor to the throne. And so she gave nominal adherence to Protestantism all her life and she supported it to some extent - never very wholeheartedly. Well as soon as Elizabeth became Queen, the people who'd fled before Mary became Queen, began coming back and soon you had a great number of fine Protestant leaders who were able to go through the land preaching the Gospel and England became a great Protestant nation. Now if these people had all stayed there and had all died in the persecution, there would have been no-one to build up the (2.) that succeeded. And in the light of history I think we can say they were very wise when they saw Edward was on his deathbed and Mary was next in line, to get out and to be safe. Christ says to these disciples, "When you see these things coming, get out of Jerusalem, get out of Judaea. Flee to the mountains. Get away where you will be safe." And for

subsequent decades ~~XXXX~~ after the destruction of Jerusalem, it was one of the great evidences of the truth of the Gospel that these Christians had read this in the Gospel and had gotten out and were safe while the great mass of the Jews in Jerusalem and that area went through the terrible suffering and the great bulk of them were killed. This was one of the great evidences of Christianity in succeeding years.

Yes? (Student question) Yes, well this command wasn't given to just a few leaders.

This was given to all the - Yes, well particular cases have to be considered

(3.5). And there are cases where one is best and cases where the other is best undoubtedly. And undoubtedly the bishops of the Church of England did a great service by staying taking the persecution

and establishing a foundation so the work went on. But if all had stayed there would have been no-one to lead thereafter. And there would have been no Protestant movement at all. But in this particular case, it was the Lord's will they should flee - a definite order, no question in this case. He gave His orders, He gave them forty years ahead of time. He gave the orders for two reasons (1) that they should know what to do when the crisis came (2) that they would have something to show as an evidence that truly God had spoken in the fulfillment of the promise. And that was His great purpose and it continued for the next two or three centuries - that was one of the great themes of Christian preaching. Jesus predicted the destruction of Jerusalem. It was destroyed as He predicted. He told the Christians how to escape from suffering in it and they escaped following out the directions which He had given. Yes? (Student question) Yes, that was just 80 years after that. First emphasis then in this Olivet Discourse - this destruction is coming and it is not coming at once. There are going to be wars and upheavals and a world-wide preaching of the Gospel. There is going to be an outreach of the Christian work and there are going to be upheavals in the world but it is coming and when it comes, here is a sign so you may know and escape from it. And then we have it fulfilled and this wonderful evidence given of the truth of Christianity that Jesus was able to predict this 40 years ahead of time and to tell them how to es-

cape from it as they did. Then ~~XXXX~~ Jesus went on in His discourse to deal with the the second question they asked, "What is the sign of your coming~~X~~ and of the end of the world?" Well His answer to that is, "You are to be ready for my coming whenever it may be but you are not to know when it is. You are to be watching in the sense of being vigilant, being active, being at the work." He gives the specific statement, "Giving them their food in due season." Master comes and finds the stewards giving out their food in their season, blessed is that faithful steward whom the Master finds doing so when He comes. He will reward him for it. That is the way we are to be found and are we to say, "Well, the Lord can't come now - why worry about it?" No, there is not time at which you can say He can't come. On the other hand somebody comes and says, "Well, Jesus has landed down in Arabia and He's on His way up here. Let's go and meet Him." He says, "No, don't pay any attention. When people give you signs, when they say" - as they did - was it in 1881. Who was it said, "In 1881 to this earth the Lord will come"? And thousands of people sold everything they had and got white garments and put them on and went up upon the hills here in order to be ready to meet Him when he arrived. And the morning came, the sun came up, and the Lord didn't come and all the people went back. And all their stuff was gone and they had said that Christ was coming and He hadn't come. And they should have read the Scripture. He says, "In such an hour as you think not" the Lord is coming. You can't predict when He's coming. You don't know. Dr. R. A. Tory told me ~~XXX~~ one of the great Bible teachers of America was speaking at a Bible Conference at which Dr. Tory was speaking - this was back in 1924. ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ A little before that - about 1920 I believe. This man was to give a message at a certain hour in the Bible Conference and he told ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ someone (Dr. Tory's was two hours before) "DR. Tory will give his message but the time the Lord is coming is just between his and mine so we won't get to mine at all." He was a great Bible student, he had studied the New Testament very carefully and the Old Testament and figured out the exact time. ~~XXXXXX~~ When the Lord didn't come then, he studied his calculations over very carefully and ~~XX~~ decided he had made a mistake. It wasn't that year it was three years later. I remember hearing three weeks before that he said, "Three weeks from now, that is the time when the Lord is coming or the whole base of the Biblical prophecies fails."

Well, the day came and passed and the Lord didn't come. And he could have been spared all that trouble if he had read Matthew 24 and 25 which say over and over and over, "Watch for in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh." When they say He's here or He's there, don't go out, don't pay attention. There are wars, yes, but this is only the beginning of sorrow, this isn't the end. You cannot tell from any particular situation that the Lord's coming. First question, "When is Jerusalem to be destroyed?" He doesn't say when but He gives them a sign so that they can get out when it comes and not be injured. Second question, "When is He coming?" He wants them to be ready when He comes and He gives them no sign. He tells them that things will go on in certain directions - the more wars you see, the surer you can be that it's getting nearer. The more upheaval you see, the more difficulty - and one parable that He gave in all of these accounts of the Olivet Discourse is the Parable of the Fig Tree. You see the fig tree begin to put forth its leaves and you can see that summer is nigh and many Bible students think that that picture's Judaism again beginning to put forth leaves. Well we find within our last generation the Jews going back to Jerusalem, building up a national home there again. Maybe that means the Lord is coming very soon. Maybe it means on the other hand that they will have a century or two of building it up and getting everything really going way beyond anything they have yet before the time. It certainly is a remarkable sign that the coming is nearer than it was. But it does not say how near because as He says, "In such an hour as ye think not" and over in Luke 12 with no eschatological connections at all He said to Peter, "This is the kind of people I want you to be. People who are ready whenever their master comes because 'in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh'". And He stressed it that that was to be a motive in their lives. So these are the two big emphases in the Olivet Discourse. The emphasis first on the destruction of Jerusalem for which He gave a sign and which was used in the Christian preaching for two or three centuries after as a most wonderful evidence that Jesus actually had been divine and knew what He was talking about when He predicted these things in advance and told how they could escape. And secondly the assurance that they were not to take anything as a sign that His coming was definitely near. Because there were developments which would go on and on and on. But the specific return was to be a sudden, unexpected

thing that they could not tell when it was to be and before it comes there would be all kinds of wars and upheavals and turmoil and tribulation and all sorts of difficulties but His coming is sudden and unexpected and they are not to know just when it is. Now as you study the presentation of the Olivet Discourse in the three Gospels, you can get a good deal more out of it than this. But in order to fully understand it, you have to have the (11.5) that the Epistles on. And of course this is not a course in eschatology or is it a course in the Olivet Discourse. All we are doing is surveying now but we'll return to it for a little more survey after we get to that . But now I just want to bring out these main - there's just one more that I've already mentioned that I want to bring out and that is that as you look at the passages and compare them step by step you find verses which are almost identical and emphases which are almost identical, showing how generally the three accounts follow along even though certain parts are fuller in one than in another. But you get to the part where Luke so explicitly says that when they see Jerusalem surrounded by armies then they're to flee to the mountains - "Let him that is in Judea flee out - - - - and woe to them that give suck in those days" - anything that holds you back and makes it difficult for you to go. And you find in exactly the same space, with the same general things told before and after it, you find the statement in Matthew and Mark that when "ye shall see the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet standing where it ought not (let him that readeth understand) then let them which are in Judea flee into the mountains and let him that is on the housetop not go down into the house ----- Woe to them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days! And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter" etc., etc. And it's parallel to the passage in Luke exactly but the terminology is somewhat different. In ancient times as Christians pointed to how wonderfully Jesus' prediction of ~~XXX~~ Jerusalem had been fulfilled and saw the precise literal statement about it in Luke and found this statement in Matthew, they tried to explain how this "abomination of desolation" here would be parallel to Jerusalem surrounded by armies. And some said the "abomination of desolation" is the bringing in of the eagle of the Roman Army, the symbols of the legions, the symbols of the heathen - religious leadership of the Roman Army - bringing them into

the temple. And others said, "No, this is the great Roman army being on the soil of Palestine where they should not be, where these heathen armies should not have been" and there was some disagreement as to exactly how it would work out in the

End of Record 15

Matthew said, "Who so readeth, let him understand" which certainly suggests that this is a rather cryptic thing that would not necessarily be fully understood until the time came. It's interesting that Luke, which gives it so plainly, is the Gospel for the Gentiles which wouldn't be so much read in Jerusalem as Matthew and Mark. Matthew and Mark which would be there, have this more cryptic language which the one who read it with insight to see what it meant, might have no doubt what it meant, but the casual outsider who picks up the books in order to find something to attack them on, would not find here something that would make him mark them out as unpatriotic through saying Jerusalem is going to be destroyed and that might be why this sort of language is used. In recent years there has been a tendency among many to say - in Matthew and Mark this passage is not parallel with Luke but Matthew and Mark though they start in with the prediction of Jerusalem's destruction and the question is asked, "When is this going to be? What's the sign?" - they just skip that altogether and only deal with the end of the age and this deals with something at the end of the age. That seems, I would say, inherently very improbable and especially improbable when you get the full similarity of some of the verses with the passage in Luke, but especially improbable that Matthew and Mark written for the Jews and the Romans would neglect altogether the big matter with which the thing starts. So that I would incline to think that the historic interpretation of this point is better than that which has been more common recently. But I would not want to be dogmatic on that. It is possible that there is some way in which this part is to be interpreted as still (2.25) though it seems the other is more likely. But whatever way one takes it, the two great emphases of the passage are this: First - destruction of Jerusalem, a sign given so Christians may escape. Second - return of Christ, you are not to know when it is going to be but what you're to do is to

be vigilant and on the job serving the Lord so that whenever He comes, whether it be within the next few years after the death of Christ, whether it be as He says, "in the first watch" (which would be in ancient times), "whether it be at midnight" (in the Middle Ages at 1000 A.D. many decided the end of the world must be coming - 1000 years after Christ and there were many who went out and were ready for His coming then) or whether it come a little later in 1881 or in 1920 or maybe in 2316 or whatever the date might be. Whenever it might be, we should be ready and serving the Lord effectively. I was shocked to see a book written by a man - I think that members of his family are among our great missionary leaders of modern days. But one member of the family went to the Bible to figure out just when is the end of the age to come and he published a book which had thousands and thousands of mathematical figurings in it - figuring through the Old Testament and the New to try to figure the exact basis so as to know the exact time when the Lord was coming back. Well it's much better to spend your time doing that than wasting it in riotous living. But for a man who really knows the Lord, He doesn't by "watch" mean try to figure out just when he's coming, when he's told us nobody is to know. But He means, "Giving the food in due season to His people" that when He comes He will find you at that. Now there~~XX~~ are some other emphases of less importance than this, less stressed than this - these are the emphases greatest stressed in this chapter. Some others which I'd like to come back to a little as we get some material further on in the Epistles. But I have given you a survey of the four Gospels. I have shown the great emphasis in all four of them on the death of Christ and on His Resurrection. I've stressed their similarities and yet their differences, their unity and yet their diversity, and I've taken this one longest discourse that is in three of them to look at it in general. You can look similarly at all the discourses of course and there's great value to be gotten from the careful study of John's discourses for the Christian - the inner room discourses. And of course John's give us the foundation for belief in the canon of the New Testament or belief that there is to be a New Testament like the Old. But I think that the background I've given you is sufficient for a general survey of the Gospels, all we dare take this time. And we'll move on to Roman Numeral III. I was introductory I believe and II was the Gospels and III will be the Acts and I put just one book in a section because

the one book is so different from anything else in the New Testament. This one book which we call Roman Numberal III - the Book of the Acts - it's not the only historical book in the New Testament. There are really five historical books in the New Testament. As you know the Old Testament-~~about~~ half of it is historical. We have our first section with five books and our second with twelve which are historical in the Old Testament. Then our next is five, our next is five and our last is twelve are not strictly speaking historical. But we have 17 books including many of the longest books of the Old Testament which are specifically historical. The New Testament we have five and just as we divide the historical books of the Old Testament into the first section, the five books which are the foundation - the books of Moses - and then the twelve, the books of the continued history after that. Here we have the books which are the foundation, the four Gospels. And then we have the one book which shows what continues after that - the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. Luke begins the book with the words, "The former treatise have I made of all that Jesus began both to do and to teach" and this continues what Jesus did, but this is what He did through His Apostles. You might similarly say Acts is what Jesus began to do through his followers, through His people. And the history of the Christian Church since continues, not the Scripture, but the history of the Acts of the Apostles - the history of Jesus' dealings, His doings in the world after His resurre~~ction~~ through those who are His. And so this second division of the New Testament, the one-book division, the second of the two historical sections, the Book of Acts is a picture of the beginning of the Christian Church from its start with only a few men there in Jerusalem until it reaches the capital of the great empire of the day~~x~~- you might say the capital of the world though there were great sections of the world that weren't in it - it was the capital of the greater part of the well-organized world of the day. And so the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome might be a title for a ^(the?) book. It is not a full history of the Christian Church during its first thirty or forty years because the other Apostles are hardly mentioned in it. And there must have been a tremendous amount of valuable, important Christian work done that's never mentioned in this book. It is the history of the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome. It is the history of the beginning of the Christian Church showing the means by which it changed from a little group of a few people in Jerusalem to

groups of a few people scattered through the greater part of the then known world. It is the history of the metamorphosis from a little group to many little groups, from one very tiny area to a much larger area, from a group of men who were very uncertain what is ahead to a group of men who were going forward, carrying out the Lord's command, serving Him and watching for the return of His Son from Heaven. Now the Book of Acts most naturally divides into two parts. The first twelve chapters make a unit distinct from the last 16 chapters and the difference is principally because of the man who is primary in it. You might almost call the first twelve chapters the section of Acts which deals primarily with Peter. And the last 16 chapters is the section of Acts which deals primarily with Paul. Now after Chapter 12 Peter is occasionally mentioned but very little. He is comparatively lacking in prominence in the book from there on. It's almost never that he shows up - just a few brief mentions of Peter hereafter. Previous to this time we have quite a few mentions of Paul including one whole chapter devoted to him - Chapter 9. So you can't make a rigid division - 1 to 12, Paul; 13 to 28, Peter. But you can say 13 to 28 is almost exclusively about Paul. And that you see is almost two-thirds of the book almost exclusively about Paul. And 1 to 12 is about the Apostles and the Disciples in general with one chapter on Paul - the rest on various men but Peter by far the most prominent. Now for a more detailed outline, it might be desirable to take the first chapter and put it as a unit by itself because the first chapter is quite distinct from what follows. I think it would be perhaps well to say that the first chapter would be the disciples previous to the descent of the Holy Spirit. The first chapter tells what happened before the coming of the Holy Spirit. This shows us the attitude of the Disciples, it shows us the foundation, their situation, and yet it is not sufficient to explain everything that follows because the Holy Spirit was a great vital factor. When did the Christian Church start? Well in one sense you can say that it started in Genesis 3 when God made the promise that the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ seed of the woman would bruise the serpent's head. Everyone who trusted that promise and followed Him was certainly a believer in Christ and that might be considered in a sense as the beginning of the Christian Church. Stephen himself in Acts 7 speaks of the Church in the Wilderness where the Israelites were coming through the

wilderness. Certainly, all those who have ever been saved, have been saved through Christ, there's no other way. And anyone who is saved through Christ would be a part of his Church. And yet there is a sense in which there is a definite difference between those who know of the events more specifically, more detailed - they know about Christ personally than anyone could before the time of Christ and so in a sense you might say that the Christian Church began when Jesus began to get Disciples, to take them with Him and to teach them these things specifically. But there is the most important change ~~XXXXX~~ between the time of Eve and the present. The most important ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ specific change in the Christian Church certainly was the descent of the Holy Spirit because at that time there was a new factor introduced. Previous to that the Holy Spirit had been active in the world but He became active to a greater extent among the followers of the Lord at that time than before. And so that is in a very real sense, the beginning of the ~~Christ~~ Christian Church, the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. And at that time we have the establishment of the movement of Christians with their Lord not visibly with them but going out in His name to spread His Word. Yes? (Student question) Yes, there's an interesting question. On John 20:20 - did the disciples then receive the Holy Spirit and at Pentecost the Holy Spirit become manifest to others or did He then promise that He would receive it later? I think there can be difference of opinion there. But certainly - another thing I think to notice is that the Holy Spirit did not come in the sense that "I was in Chicago yesterday and I came here this morning." He didn't come in that sense. The Holy Spirit always was in the world. The coming of the Holy Spirit is not a coming in the sense of a movement from one place to another. God is everywhere. The Holy Spirit is God. The Holy Spirit is everywhere. I think it's a good terminology - the Holy Spirit came, the Holy Spirit descended. But what it actually means is that He took possession in a greater way. Well the Holy Spirit in a way controls everything - through Him God made the world, through Him God controls all the forces of wickedness, today He controls everything. But He expresses Himself in us in a particular way. He takes over possession of us in a particular way and that is His coming. Well now He may have taken possession of the Disciples in a very definite way in the upper room and He may have earlier done it. But in this very special way at Pentecost, I think there is something which

so that we are justified in considering Acts I as a separate division of the book, which we would call the Christians before Pentecost. And in this chapter it is very easy to see that there are two divisions to be kept - the first of them is the Christians with Christ personally present and the second is waiting for Pentecost. Those are the two divisions of the chapter and they divide of course exactly at Verse 11. 1 to 11 is the first division which is Christ personally present with the Disciples after His Resurrection. And the second from Verse 12 to the end of the chapter is waiting for His coming - for the Holy Spirit's coming. Well now the first part is I think a very important part of the Bible - these 11 verses. This is surely your foundation of your Christian Church. The Church is built on the whole Bible, it's built on the Gospels, but here the story of the beginning of the Christian Church basis, starts with this very vital passage - Verses 1 to 11. And so we're interested to see what the emphases are in ~~XXXX~~ this passage. Well the first emphasis in them is the Resurrection of Christ - that we find in Verse 3, "He showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them 40 days and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God." Here is a period of 40 days in the course of which, Jesus is much of the time visibly present. They were given many infallible proofs of the fact that He had risen from the dead. Who was the skeptic in modern times who said the Christian Church began from the crazed imagination - or from the imagination of a half-crazed woman who dreams that she imagined that she saw. Well that's not the teaching of Acts. The teaching of Acts is that Mary Magdalene was only one of many who had seen Him and that they saw Him repeatedly during the course of the 40 days and He spoke with them of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God. That it was a series of meetings and it is pretty difficult to think that people could face torture and death and could preach in such a way as to win thousands of followers and could spread their message through the Roman Empire based on the imagination of one woman or even on the imagination of twelve men. And this teaches that during 40 days the fact was being drummed in upon their consciousness so that they would never look back on it and think was it just a dream. Did I imagine that? But that it was definitely something that was strong in their consciousness of their experience. It was real to them that He was raised from the dead. And the Christian

Church is founded in a very real sense on the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. That is the greatest festival in the Christian Church - the Resurrection from the dead because it is one which we observe not once a year but once a week - the day of the worship of God which was so rigidly kept by the Jews for thousands of years on the 7th day of the week was changed to the first as a remembrance of the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. And so the Resurrection of Christ was celebrated once a week in a very special way. And it is the foundation of the Christian Church - the Resurrection of Christ, "To whom He showed Himself alive after His passion" - the Resurrection of Christ - God's sign and seal that what He said He was, was true and that what He did was effected in His death on the cross for men's sake that it really had accomplished the purpose it set out to accomplish. Well then we find here that forty days He talked to the Disciples. He had talked much to them before but He said, "I have many things to tell you but you can't bear them now." Well the Holy Spirit would tell them many new things but here He told them many new things already in these 40 days. And in these 40 days He discussed with them the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, He drove it home to their minds, and being assembled together with them, He commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, -----for John indeed truly baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence." And they heard all this and do they immediately say, "Well now how shall we divide up the world to preach the Gospel? Shall three of us go this way, three that, three the other? Shall we make a definite plan? ~~THE~~ Shall the body of the Apostles meet together and vote as to who goes this way or who goes that way or just how we work it out to carry out this work of the spread of the Kingdom of God has been presented?" Well we find in Verse 6 what their question was. "When they therefore were come together they asked of Him saying, 'Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel?'" And there are many people today who ~~HE~~ say that the Jews were expecting an earthly kingdom and that Christ devoted a great part of His preaching to showing them that this was entirely wrong, that there was no earthly kingdom coming. That what was important was the change in the hearts of men and that is all that is important. There never would be an earthly kingdom and that's a crass, Judaistic concept which they should get away from and realize the spiritual nature of His teaching. Now it is true that His teaching is

very spiritual. And it is true that the nature of the heart is the most important thing in the life of everyone of us. But is it true that the idea of an earthly kingdom is something that the Jews were entirely wrong in and which would never come? Well forty days He spoke to them of things pertaining to the Kingdom of God and if during those forty days He was constantly telling them "The Kingdom of Heaven is within you, it's a thing of your spiritual attitudes, it is not an earthly thing at all. It is a thing that is a matter of ~~xxx~~ how you treat one another and so on. It will never be an earthly kingdom." If he taught that for forty days and then at the end of the forty days they turned to Him and said, "Look, Lord wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" Don't you think He'd of said, "What's the use of talking? Might as well just quit. Haven't I told you this a hundred times ~~xxxxx~~ already that there is no earthly kingdom to Israel." Philip Morrow, a lawyer who became a Christian, and wrote some fine books in defense of the Scripture and in studying Christian doctrine, toward the end of his life he went off strongly on this tangent. He wrote a book called, "Avoiding Jewish Fables" or something like that. He said this Jewish idea of an earthly kingdom is entirely wrong. He said it's not Christian at all and it's not taught in the Scripture. Well, it's what they asked after forty days and is that His answer - "Can't you understand anything I'm giving you? Don't you know that this is an entirely wrong concept? It's going to be a spiritual kingdom. There is no earthly kingdom." But the answer He gave was this in Verse 7 He said, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power." That certainly is the exact opposite to saying there's not going to be any earthly kingdom. In fact it implies there is going to be. It doesn't say there is but there's not the slightest rebuke for having this concept which after forty days of His teaching they would deserve a strong rebuke for having if it was an incorrect concept. But His answer was, "It's not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power." The thing for you to do is not to be worrying about knowing what is the time when the Lord is going to restore again the kingdom to Israel. That's not your task to worry about when it is to be. ~~THE~~ Your task is to do the task that the Lord assigns to you and to be vigilant, to be on guard, to be active, to be giving them their food in their season, ready for it when He comes. And so He says, "It is

not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power but you shall received power after the Holy ~~XXXXXX~~ Ghost is come upon you and you shall be witnesses to me both in Jerusalem and in Judaea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." And so here we have our great commission. What is their part? What is our part? To take the power of the Holy Spirit and use it to witness to Him. To witness to Him where? In Jerusalem and in Judaea and in Samaria and to the uttermost parts of the earth. If you say this here you might say to witness to Him in Elkins Park and in Philadelphia and in the rest of the United States and to the uttermost parts of the earth. He starts where they are and He spreads it out and out and out. And there is absolutely no justification in this verse for saying, "All that matters is that we get the Gospel to the uttermost parts of the earth" and it's very foolish trying to spend your time or effort trying to get it out in Jerusalem or in Samaria or in Judaea." There's nothing of that kind here. He starts where He is and moves out and crossing the ocean never made a person a missionary. It never did. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ If a person is not a missionary here, they'll never be a missionary anywhere else. If a person is not actively spreading the Lord's word here now. It's very, very silly to think of spending money to go to some other country because it will not be easier but harder to do it in the other country than to do it here. And the world in which we are to be missionaries begins where we are and spreads out. And we are to have an interest in all portions of it - the near and the far. And so He gives this great commission and you might say, "Now here was their idea - are you going to restore the kingdom to Israel? He says, 'No that's wrong.'" Well He doesn't say it's a wrong concept. He doesn't say that. He says, "The times and the seasons the Lord has in His own power." But then He goes on. He gives the great duty which they have to preach the Gospel. Had this been shunted aside and forgotten - the future thing? Well, it would look like it. And the Christian Church, a great part of it, has acted that way. But that's not the way the chapter goes on. He ends up with the great stress on the task. But then He suddenly disappears into the Heavens. Suddenly goes up and a cloud receives Him out of their sight and as they look steadfastly toward Heaven, two men stand by them who say, "You've just heard the great commission. Now get busy and go out and practice it." But that's not what they said. The two men stand by them and

they say, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into Heaven? This same Jesus which is taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen Him go into Heaven." I heard a sermon once on the coming of the Lord. A man said the coming of the Lord is when a person is converted. That's the coming of the Lord. Second - when the Holy Spirit comes into the life. That's the coming of the Lord. Third when a person dies and goes to be with Christ. That's the coming of the Lord. Fourth when the League of Nations was set up - see this was before there was a United Nations - that was the coming of the Lord - it was a big step forward in the world - it was a coming of the Lord. Whenever you get any great social progress, any great movement forward - that is the coming of the Lord. Well Acts here definitely denies all such assertions. "This same Jesus who is so taken up from you into Heaven, shall so come in like manner, as ye have seen Him go into Heaven." Very ~~explicitly~~ explicitly, "The great commission is your task. That's the thing you're to be at - that's the thing He wants to find you doing, not looking for Him wondering how soon it's going to be, looking for signs. But He wants you to have in mind that He will come, that He will come at an hour ye think not. He wants you to know it's a fact, to be ready for it when He comes, to have it as a great part of your expectation." And so we have the great commission given as the last words He spoke but we have again the stress on the return and watching for the return just before they go back to Jerusalem. And so these eleven verses are certainly tremendously important as laying the foundation for the emphases which we should have in our Christian life. Well we continue here at 2:30.

End of Record 17

This morning we began our discussion of the Acts of the Apostles. I'm giving the Acts a Roman Numeral III corresponding with the II that I gave the Gospels but we will spend much less time on it than we gave the Gospels. I'm giving it this main heading because it is a very important section. It is worthy of a great deal of attention and so I think it should have an important heading in the outline. But I am not going to spend much time on it for several reasons. One is that this course in Survey of the New Testament, while it is a survey course - it is not a course in which we are going into detail on difficult problems or on involved points at all, but a general survey - yet it is not a survey for those who know nothing about the New Testament. I would think that most, probably all here, know a good bit about the New Testament and the probabilities are that most of you know a good deal more about the contents of the book of the Acts than you do about certain of the Epistles. And so we don't need to spend as much time on that which is best known to you. Another factor of course is that you are doing some very special study~~XXX~~ of Acts of the Apostles now in connection with Church History and while that is not going in any full way into it, it is reading it through and studying certain things in connection with it. So we won't need to take much time here in our survey, but I do want to stress its great importance in the New Testament - not nearly as great as the importance of the Gospels because they give the foundation. Our faith is based upon what Jesus did in His earthly life. In a way it's not as important as the Epistles because they give what the Holy Spirit taught~~X~~ much of which was even more important than ^{a good bit of} what Christ gave in the Gospels. He had other truths very important to give but they could not bear them yet. And yet Acts is the foundation of our Christian Church and it tells how it all got started and it show us the men in action in the early days. And so it is of very great importance to us. Now we spoke a little bit about the outline of the book and we noticed that it can be very readily divided into two parts because from Chapter 12 on it ~~XXXX~~ is exclusively devoted to Paul. That means two-thirds of the book is exclusively devoted to the deeds of Paul and that which was connected with them. But the first eleven chapters of the book, one of them is devoted to Paul and the rest of them to other people. You can't say that everything of Paul is after because we have one full chapter before but ~~XXXX~~ neither can

you say that everything before is about Peter because there are other characters who are extremely important in that. No-one is anywhere near as important in the first eleven chapters as Paul is in the last 17 chapters of the book. But the first chapters tell about the establishment of the church prior to the beginning of the work of Paul. You could take the book and arrange it in general according to the outline of the command to the Apostles to be witnesses in Jerusalem, in Judaea, Samaria, and to the uttermost parts of the earth. But it would not arrange precisely under those heads. From 12 on you could put to the uttermost parts of the earth because it is mostly Paul's work outside of the Israelite area. But before that it is almost entirely Jerusalem through Chapter 7 and Samaria and Judaea would be only in the Chapters from 8 through 11 and comparatively little of that would deal with Judaea - a little of it would but two-thirds of a chapter would deal with Samaria. So while that in general it follows the outline of that command, it does not do it in any precise way. We noticed that Chapter 1 can be considered as a division by itself because it is the history of what happened prior to Pentecost, history of the Christians before Pentecost and the real work of the church begins at Pentecost. This first chapter is a very strange chapter in that its first half would seem to be as important as anything in the whole Bible. You might say all the foundation of the work of the church from Pentecost on, you can find expressed or implied in these first 11 verses here. But from there on - Verses 12 to 26 - is a section which receives in Bible study an attention that is about as little as any part you will find of the New Testament. It is certainly not stressed. ~~XXX~~ Some of it is a little difficult to understand. It is simply a section of their waiting. Now somebody said to me, "Why did not the Holy Spirit come immediately? Christ ascended into Heaven ~~XXX~~ forty days after His Resurrection and now they have to wait ten more days for the coming of the Holy Spirit. Why did not the Holy Spirit come immediately?" Well, that could be very readily answered with this statement - that the Day of Pentecost was the appropriate day for the Holy Spirit to come. That was a day of a great Jewish Festival when great multitudes would be there to see it - it would be an easy time to reach them. In addition to that the meaning of Pentecost, the first proofs, seems to fit in very nicely - the whole phraseology of the description of it in the Old Testament fits in with that which

happened here - the beginning of the outreach of the Gospel. And so Pentecost was a very appropriate day for the Holy Spirit to come and well worth waiting ten days for. And when we say that then, someone can turn the question around the other way and say, "Well then, why did Christ ascend to Heaven ten days before Pentecost? Why did He not ascend the day before Pentecost or that day? Why did He ascend 10 days before?" In other words whichever way you look at it, there is an interval of ten days between the Ascension and Pentecost. Does that mean that the Holy Spirit will always require a period of prayer before He comes and a period of fasting, a period of special preparation before He comes? Well that is a conclusion which could be suggested from reading this. The Holy Spirit came, ten days before that they had been in prayer, waiting for Him, therefore whenever the Holy Spirit comes, people must wait for ten days and pray before He comes. That is the sort of a hypothesis, the sort of a conclusion, a sort of a suggested result that is always in place to suggest in connection with any passage of Scripture but is always out of place to state dogmatically until you have looked elsewhere to find either a positive statement of the Scripture that that is the divine order or to find that there are other cases in which it has been that way. And of course two or three aren't enough to prove it. You go to the American Medical Society and you say a man had a certain disease, they gave him a certain medicine and he got well of it and that happened in ten cases. Now don't you think that this should be given by all doctors to people that have this disease? Here it's proven, it cured these 10 cases. Their answer will immediately be, "Until we have a couple of thousand cases where it did it, we will not think that we have evidence that is enough to speak with any definiteness about it whatever. There are too many other things that could enter in to explain it. Maybe these particular cases ~~XXX~~ would have gotten well altogether apart from it. Or maybe they are unusual cases in which there is some special reason why it works here that wouldn't apply in other cases. You can't prove a thing on two or three cases. But in this particular case we have 10 days of waiting before the Holy Spirit ^{came} and we look on ahead and we find many other cases in Acts where the Holy Spirit came and I don't recall any one of them where there was ten days of waiting and praying before it and several where there very specifically was not. So it would be made quite positive that ~~to~~ draw a rule like that from one case

where we have many other cases which were quite different, would be an utterly false method of securing truth about any point. We can say then, they did not wait and pray for the Holy Spirit after they were Christians for 10 days, before the Holy Spirit descended in order to show us how we should do - because you move right over to the story in ~~EXAM~~ Acts 10 of the conversion of Cornelius and before they've even been baptized, the very first time they hear the Gospel, the Holy Spirit descends upon them and Peter said, "Can anybody forbid water that these be baptized who have already received the Holy Spirit the same as we do," showing that the order was not a fundamental part of God's plan and that the waiting was not a requirement for the reception of the Holy Spirit. Well then why was there a ten-day break between the Ascension of Christ and the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost? Why did Jesus arrange it that way? I can think of an illustration that I think would be somewhat helpful at this point. We had a student here from Chile. He came up to this country to study engineering. He studied in an engineering school but I believe he was midway in his course or less when he was converted and became a very ardent Christian and began to take active part in Christian work and he decided that he wanted to give his life to the Lord's work rather than to engineering. He got his bachelors degree in engineering and then he came here to seminary. So he was here several years studying the engineering and then he was here four years with us in the seminary and he finished up the seminary course here and was ready to go back ~~XX~~. And there was a plane which was going down to an International Council meeting in South America and we had secured special rates because of having quite a number going at the same time - we were able to get about half rates on it. So that the rate on the plane was no more expensive than it would be to go on a boat. And you go on the boat and you take three weeks to a month getting there and you go on the plane and you leave here today and you're there in two days. And I said to him~~X~~, "Well, now here's a chance to go on this plane, no financial loss in so doing and you get there right away so hadn't you better do that?" He said, "No I want to go on a boat." And I asked him why. And he said, "I've been in the United States for all these years, been working and studying up here, now I'm going down there, back among my own people to serve the Lord down there in Chile. To be picked up out of this environment today and set down there tomorrow - today dealing with American people,

American customs, the American approach, all that, and dealing with it as a student - set down there as a minister in a Chilean Church with the whole Chilean background and everything two days later. I want a little break in between, I want a little time to adjust myself and to get my personality and my mental attitude and everything back into the frame of mind for the situation down there." Now incidentally I was talking with one of the missionaries from down there just a couple of days ago and I asked him how this fellow was doing and He said, "You know the first year and a half ~~XX~~ down here he didn't do very well. He was sort of inbetween. He was neither a Chilean nor an American and there were all kinds of problems and things that came up and he made a sort of a failure of his first year and a half. Then he got out of that phase and now he's one of our most effective men down there. Very excellent." But there was the transition that had to be made and he was much better off to have a month to make it than to do it in two days but in his case it took a year or two to get it really fully made. Now supposing that Christ ascended to Heaven and the next day the Holy Spirit came. What would the Apostles say? They'd say, "Jesus Christ was with us yesterday. We were talking with him. We were walking along." Well then people would say, "Well, is that so? Well, when can we talk with Him? How will we see Him?" "Well, He's gone now. You won't see Him but you come and believe on Him." They would be under the shadow so much of that impression of having so recently been with Him that to bring people in now, bring 3000 people in on the day of Pentecost, to be with these men who just the day before had been with Jesus, they would wonder, "Why~~X~~ don't we see Him, why don't we talk with Him?" The Apostles would always be talking about what they had just been saying and doing with Him~~E~~. The ten days was necessary to make the transition in their minds, to make them accustomed to the thought that His earthly visible presence with them was ended. Now it was a spiritual presence with them. Now it was the great things He had done they were preaching rather than the personal intimacy with Him in the flesh. And now the Holy Spirit was to take the things of Christ and bring them to their hearts and to their remembrance and give them truth as they went forward. A break was necessary between the two vital phases of their experiences. And the ten days therefore in the experience of the disciples was an extremely important thing. We read in the New Testament that the things in the Old Testament happened for our admonition. They're examples to us and it is true. Everything in the Bible is an example to us but we must study into it and see what in

it it is that is an example. And usually it is the principle involved that is the example rather than the precise physical matter of the particular relationship.

End of Record 18

I think it would be worth mentioning though it's one I'll give again in Church History before the end of the year. There was a group in North Africa in the early fifth century A.D. which was called the Circumcellionas - a people who wandered about through the country and they were very fanatical in their particular views. And they used force to bring other people to their particular sectarian views. And they took the Bible very, very literally and very rigidly. And since Jesus said to Peter when Peter cut off the High Priest's servant's ear, "Put up thy sword" they said we mustn't use swords. So they carried big clubs with which they bludgeoned everybody who wouldn't get in line with what they wanted. But they didn't use the sword you see. Well there's a great danger of that in our taking from the Bible that we will take the words in a literal sense which misses the thought. It is to see what the principle is that is meant in these words of the Bible. And often that principle has to be translated into the situation of our own particular time. What is the principle involved - that is the vital matter. And it's all too easy to get to figuring up numbers and precise literal detail which might be very important for the particular situation but might not be anything for our example. But the principles are always vital for our example. The principle here is a vital one - that before taking any big step in Christian work it is good to get apart with the Lord for prayer, for consideration, for making the transition in our own thought, in our attitude and getting ourselves properly ready for it. And that will apply to anything in the Lord's service and not just this matter of the Holy Spirit. But as to when the Holy Spirit will come we find in Acts Him coming at many different times. I like also the statement about it that someone made. He was asked, "Have you had the second blessing yet?" He said, "Yes and the third and the fourth. I'm up to about the fifty-sixth now and I hope I'll have a good many more before my life is over." In other words the Christian life is a succession of blessings. It is not a continuous one. We have our ups and we have our downs. We are not just on a

steady line - most of us. But we have very special, wonderful experiences with the Lord. But we don't want to try to live in an experience we had ten years ago. We want to be looking for new experiences as we live close to Him. Well, this is true the Apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit repeatedly in the New Testament. The Holy Spirit fell upon them and the place was shaken and they went forth with boldness to preach the word and the same people were filled and filled and filled again ~~XXX~~ as everyone must be who is truly following the Lord. But the initial coming comes in different circumstances with different individuals in the Bible - some right at conversion. Some there's a very wonderful experience sometime after conversion - a fuller consecration, a fuller sanctification to the Lord. And in Cornelius' case it was before they were baptized as an earnest of the fact that God was receiving them as true believers immediately. Well these last verses then of this chapter are far less important than the first ones. They tell us first about the Apostles coming together there with the women and prayer and supplication. Then they tell us how they had a meeting and Peter had an idea and he stood up and presented it. And Peter told them how Judas had died - and there's a critical question - How did he die? We have the account in one of the Gospels and we have the account here and the tales at first sight don't seem to fit. ~~XXX~~ People have tried to explain how they fit together and when you get two accounts of anything from different people, they're almost sure to be apparent discrepancies which usually can be explained if you get into the facts of the matter. If you take two trustworthy people and they describe to you something that happened you can be quite sure there'll be variation of details and there may be no contradiction but simply they've seen different aspects. There's always that possibility even ~~XXXXXXXX~~ apart from one of them remembering wrong - there's a different emphasis, a different aspect which make a person think that there is an actual contradiction. Or sometimes you can immediately figure out just how the two fit together so there is no actual contradiction. In other cases you can't figure it but you can know that if they were honorable people and they haven't misremembered, there is a way to explain the apparent contradiction. Well he explains about Judas' death in order to bring out the fact that it is written in the book of Psalms, "Let his habitation be desolate. Let no man dwell therein and his bishopric let another take." And so he says we need

somebody else to take Judas' bishopric, Judas' office, Judas' place of importance in the work of the Lord. Now you notice how he bases what he does upon a quotation from the Old Testament. And it's a very interesting study in the Book of the Acts to see how the Old Testament is used in the Book of the Acts. If a person had never heard of the Old Testament and they started to read the Book of Acts to learn from it how the Christian Church got started, they could not but be impressed with the fact that the Apostles did not claim to be bringing something new. They were presenting that which was taught and predicted and set forth in the Old Testament. And I think it's very important to have this clearly in our mind - that Christianity is the fulfillment of the Old Testament, not something new. And the Apostles are constantly basing what they give upon the Old Testament. That is to me the pernicious thing about the Revised Standard Version. The Revised Standard Version New Testament is on the whole a very decent translation. There are things I don't like about it but on the whole it's a very decent translation. But when you take their New Testament and you put it in the same volume with the Old Testament and you put a heading over it, "The Holy Bible" and then you present the New Testament men as saying, "This is true because the prophets said" and saying what they say the prophets said as it is in the Greek and then they have a footnote in every case, which we don't in our King James Version but which they have in every case, a footnote referring you to the Old Testament passage. And you look up the Old Testament Passage in the same book and you find that isn't what he said at all. And you will find in case after case after case that they quote - Peter will say this is so because the Old Testament says this - you look it up in the Old Testament and it just isn't there - and they give you the quotation. Well that makes Peter out to be a liar. It makes the New Testament writers out to be either knaves or simpletons - one or the other. And when you put it together in one book - the Old and the New Testaments - it is in my opinion blasphemy to call such a book a Holy Bible. It is an unholy Bible because it is a Bible which for anyone who will read carefully what it says, is presenting Christianity as the work of either knaves or simpletons - one or the other. Well this act of Peter's here - he said, "We should select somebody to take the place of Judas." And then we read they appointed two. Peter said, "We must have somebody who was with us all the time Jesus went in and out among us beginning from the baptism of John. One must be or-

dained to be a witness with us of His Resurrection." They pick two and then they didn't say, "Let's have a popularity contest. Let's see which of these fellows we think has the nicest personality." They didn't say that. "They prayed and said, 'Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show which of these two thou hast chosen that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship from which Judas, by transgression, fell that he might go to his own place.' And they gave forth their lots and the lot fell on Matthias and he was numbered with the eleven apostles.' Well sometimes people say, "This was a human act. This was a fleshly act. This was a wrong act of these men. God utterly disregarded it - Paul was his choice for the 12th Apostle. But there's no such statement anywhere in the Bible. There's absolutely no such statement anywhere. And it seems to me that ~~we~~ it is rather dangerous for us to say that we should go through what the Apostles did and say that what we like that was God's will and what doesn't seem right to us - well, they made a mistake. What's our basis? We're making our ideas the basis rather than the Word of God. Not to say that the Apostles were perfect by any means. I believe they made mistakes. I believe they definitely were wrong in various instances. Paul withstood Peter to the face - which was right and which was wrong? They certainly weren't both right. The Apostles made mistakes. They did that which was wrong. But we are only given a selection of the Acts of the Apostles and I believe we can say that the Holy Spirit picked out for the history of the beginning of the Christian Church, He picked out to give us instances of what happened that is vital for us to know. And if it's vital for us to know because it was wrong, I believe He says so. I think He will either definitely indicate it or He will give us at least pretty solid evidence on which to construct an inference to that effect. But in most cases He will label it definitely if it is to be considered as wrong. And so in this case I believe that it was the Lord's will there should be twelve Apostles standing there as witnesses of the Resurrection and that the place of the one should be filled by another one and that is what they did there. Now someone may ask the question, "Yes, but did God bless the work of Matthias in later years as He did the other 11?" The answer is, "We don't know anything about it." Out of the 11, how many do we know much about their future - not more than three or four. Above that we know nothing about their later life. Some of them God may have used very greatly. Others He

may have used very little. We know practically nothing about it. But this is not a section which seems to us to have anything like the tremendous ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ epical (epochal?) importance that those first eleven verses have - or that Chapter 2 has. So Chapter 1 then is a unit by itself - the Christians before Pentecost. And then in Chapter 2 we have one of the great epical (epochal) chapters of the Bible - the account of Pentecost and it begins with the account of the great miracle which was worked there. And I think it is vital to stress that this was a miracle of the ear rather than a miracle of the mouth. It was a miracle of the ear. Now it would have been possible for the Lord to have had 150 men standing up there and each of the 150 talk in a different language and to have had a lot of microphones in front of them with radios which could be given out to the 10,000 people in front of them so that all of these people who came as we read here - where do they come from? "There were Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judaea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans, and Arabians." All these different languages and many more. "We hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God." Well all these people are scattered there in front of them - 10,000 people hear them talking and if every one of these 10,000 had a radio on and had a selector thing so he could pick between 150 stations and everyone of those stations heard one of the 150 Disciples speaking in one language, so they had 150 languages spoken there, this would be a miracle of the tongue - the Disciples speaking in all these different languages. But the people who stood up there would seem to have been just the 12. I suppose the others were around but the 12 would seem to ~~XX~~ have been those who stood up there. And suppose it had been 150 instead of 12. How would the people, the 10,000 get divided up into the 150 languages to have them near where they could hear the man speaking their language. It's very clear that all of these people, they said, "How hear we, every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?" It's a miracle of hearing, not a miracle of speaking. It's not that they spoke in all these different languages - that wouldn't have done much good unless you divided the crowd up in the first place and have the little groups in the different places and have them each go to a group and talk to them. But it is a miracle of hearing that all of these people were enabled to hear what the Apostles said in such a way that

everyone heard it in his own tongue. They didn't hear something that was simply an unknown (14.5). They heard things that they could clearly and definitely understand. ~~THE~~ It is not the same thing that is described in Corinthians where Paul says that if a person speaks in an unknown tongue there must be an interpreter present who can interpret. Here there was no interpreter. Here they heard it directly. It was a miracle of hearing

End of Record 19

Fourth verse? Said, "They began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. " Yes, yes, (answer to student question) they were speaking with various languages but the people who were hearing heard them in many more languages than they were speaking in. (Student question) Yes, I guess double. It was certainly a miracle of speaking but it was primarily a miracle of hearing. Yes. And it is unique I believe in the Book of Acts. I don't recall anything that is similar to this. We have Paul speaking in Corinthians about the speaking with tongues and there it seems to have been a matter of speaking so that when people heard it and didn't know the particular language they were speaking, they couldn't understand. But here everybody was able to understand. I think though there's a lesson for us here. What attracted the people immediately to Christianity? They heard in their own tongue and it's a wonderful - if you're going to speak to young people, you must talk in young people's language. If you're going to talk to people of a certain type you must use language they can understand. If you're going to talk to people in any part of the world it is worth-while to take the time and effort to learn to talk so that they can understand you. God could simply take His word and put it right into our minds by a miracle but He does not choose to do that. He chooses to give it in words and He wants us to be His messengers, to take this thought and put it into the words that are understandable to the people to whom we talk. And the great part of the work of a Christian minister. A man told me he went to a church one time and began to preach and he said that he preached on the theme that salvation is a free gift. There is no way we can earn it and he said he spoke for 10 Sundays straight on that theme and he said there was a man, one of the leaders in the church who sat right in the second row every single Sunday and he said the tenth Sunday all of a sudden he saw that man's face just break out into a big smile. Afterwards he said the man came up and he said, "Pastor, I got a new idea tonight I've never thought of before. I can see now that ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ salvation is absolutely free. There's no way we can earn it." He found the way that time to put it in the language that that man could understand. He expressed it in the way that he could get. We spend years in grammar school, in high school, in college, and in seminary and a big part of our effort is learning to understand the truths that other people give us, learning to understand language so that

we can read books and get what's there, so we can go to the Bible and get what's there. It's not enough then for us to go out to people that don't have that learning or don't have the spiritual experience we have and simply repeat to them what we've heard. The biggest part of our work is to put it in language that will get it to them, in a way that they will get the understanding and get the emotion (3.75) to put into words. God worked this miracle here at the beginning of the Christian Church and God worked many miracles then which He does not ordinarily repeat today. But we cannot accomplish any of these things unless He is actually working in and through us and using our work for that purpose. So this great miracle then got the attention of the people and then I suppose when Peter stood up and lifted up his voice that they all understood him in their own language. And he spoke to them and he said, "We're not drunken as you seem to think. This is an illustration of what the Prophet Joel said God was going to do at various times. "I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh: And your sons and your daughters will prophesy. Your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams." And he said that this is what He is doing. He is giving us this wonderful blessing of seeing the vision he has for us and passing it on to you. So then he went on to tell them about Christ and he told them about the life of Christ and then he told how Christ had died but He had not stayed dead. God raised Him up, "having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible He should be holden of it. David said, 'Thou wilt not leave my sould in Hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.' Men and brethren may I freely speak to you of the patriarch David, that he's dead and buried. (So this can't apply to David) But David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh, he would raise up one to sit on His throne. He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, His soul was not left in Hell, neither His flesh did see corruption." And here we have a footnote in the RSV where he quotes from the Old Testament and says, "Thou wilt not leave my soul~~X~~ in Hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see~~X~~ corruption." The RSV translates it this way and refers you back to the verse in Psalm 16 and there they translate it, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol nor suffer my flesh to remain in the pit." And they get rid of the corruption, put in the word, "pit". The Hebrew word is translated "pit" I think three times and "corruption"

about fifteen times. Both are possible renderings, different roots that fall together in the same form there. Without any footnote to show that they have picked one of the two arbitrarily - they picked the one which rules out the Resurrection and worse than that makes Peter either an utter ignoramus about the Old Testament or one who consciously twists and - and Peter builds his whole declaration of the foundation of Christianity upon that verse here. And the RSV denies it. And that to me is one of the worst passages in the RSV. The worst thing in it is this twisting around of this verse on which Peter and Paul base their message. Paul does later in Acts 13. But it is equally sad to see some commentaries by very, very fine evangelical Christians on the Psalms who will take the verse and there they'll try to say this must be David's talking about himself. David is describing his own experience and by a spiritual analogy Peter applies it to Christ. That's not what Peter says. Peter says David is dead and buried. This doesn't apply to David. David was talking about Christ. And it seems to me that it is vital that we recognize that when Peter says that David talked about Christ, that's what he was doing. He was talking about Christ and not about himself. And yet as I say some very fine commentaries adopt methods of interpretation which sharply contradict the interpretation of the New Testament. Well this was a great sermon and a sermon which had great effect because we read that 3000 souls were added to the church on that day. And then we read how they continued in the Apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayers. "And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles. And all that believed were together and had all things common and sold their possessions and goods and parted them to all men as every man had need." And you think that is a picture of what they did. Is that a picture of what all Christians should do? Well you can't tell you have to go on and find further evidence of it. Your first reaction is - that 's what they should do - certainly most of us. But is it all or is some of it simply what they did on that particular occasion? Well Chapter 3 - it's interesting here. Here were the Apostles appointed. Now what did the Apostles do? Did they say let's get together and map a campaign? How are we going to carry on the witness in Jerusalem? How are we going to carry it on in Judea? How are we going to carry it on in Samaria? We will appoint Peter to

do this area. We will appoint Paul to do this area. John will do this area. How did they plot it all out? Well in this case we find that even though~~X~~ these were the men God had appointed, the Apostles to be the leaders and the foundation of His work, we find that it is an unexpected situation which brings the next step forward. Peter and John are going into the temple and God works a miracle. They hadn't planned that certainly. It wasn't a definite program. It was the Holy Spirit taking hold of men and using them for His purposes. And so they find themselves in a situation here and Peter heals the lame man through the power of Christ and immediately everybody comes together and Peter gives them another sermon. And this sermon had two effects. One effect is many people come to believe on Christ but a second effect is that opposition is aroused. We were up in

(10.25) in Scandinavia and Dr. Hedegard was holding his conference there for the Scandinavian countries. He had people there from all the Scandinavian countries. And we had quite a group of us from the United States and we were having meetings there~~XXXXX~~ and reaching many people for the Word of Christ. And then we got a paper from Stockholm, the capital, which on the front page had a big blast at this terrible divisive group which was meeting there in (10.75) It was quite a terrible blast at us. Dr. Hedegard said, "Praise the Lord. The devil is bothered by what we're doing and is starting opposition. If there'd been no opposition like this we'd wonder whether we really were serving the Lord effectively." If you really serve the Lord you're going to have effectiveness and you're also going to have opposition aroused. One of them alone is certainly not proof that you are accomplishing the Lord's will. You're going to have both. But he had both of them here and so Chapters 3 and 4 go on together - the healing of the lame man and what followed - an extension of the Gospel reaching many people, yes, but also a calling together of the Sanhedrin and bringing Peter and John before the Sanhedrin in order to stop them from presenting the Gospel anymore. And the answer was to preach the Gospel to the Sanhedrin, to tell them there is not salvation in any other name, for there is no other name under Heaven whereby we can be saved. And they are in a quandry whether to try ~~to~~ stop them with force or whether ~~if~~ if they do that they'll arouse so much opposition that its better to let them go on and hope the thing will die out by itself. And so they let them go and I guess they regretted it very much later.

But when they let them go and they came to their others then we have this wonderful prayer where they pray to the Lord - the prayers of this first part of Acts are wonderful. They're well worth a study. "Lord, thou art God which hast made Heaven and earth and the sea and all that in them is. Who by the mouth of thy servant, David hath said, 'Why did the heathen rage and the people imagine vain things? The kings of the earth stood up and the rulers were gathered together against the Lord and against His Christ.' For of a truth against thy Holy Child, Jesus, whom thou hast annointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done. And now, Lord, behold their threatenings and grant unto thy servants that with all boldness they may speak thy word, by stretching forth thine hand to heal that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy Holy Child, Jesus!" And the Holy Spirit falls on all of them again and they spoke the word of God with boldness. A coming of the Holy Spirit here which was not the result of a period of tearing and prayer in this case, but the result of a bold stand in the face of persecution and refusing to surrender to the efforts of Satan to stop them. And the chapter ends with the introduction of one of the great men of the New Testament, a man named Joseph but the Apostles called him "The Son of Consolation" - Barnabas. And so Barnabas - the Son of Consolation, takes all of his property and sells it and gives it to the Apostles. And he went on the rest of his life laying everything at the feet of the Lord. He was one of the great men of the New Testament but not one of the Apostles. And then Chapter 5 is the first chapter in Acts that we've had that is not a unit. In fact I wonder if Chapter 5, Verses 1 to ~~XX~~ - no - well it's hard to say just where it should be. But at least it would seem as if the first part of this chapter is so closely tied with what precedes that it is not a good place for a chapter division. And yet it does fall into the way that the discipline in the church here led to revival. When they ~~XXXXXXXX~~ could outline from their midst - or when the Holy Spirit struck Ananias and Sapphira dead - there was an extension of the Gospel. Multitudes came to them but then again the opposition of Satan was aroused and they were brought again before the Sanhedrin. Well we continue there Thursday afternoon.

End of Record 20

In our survey of the New Testament we have looked at some of the outstanding features of the Gospels. We are only surveying. We're trying to get certain basic foundation principles which are vital for your further study of these books. I think it's very important in any kind of study that you do the two types - the survey type and the intensive type. If you just survey in any subject you may make very bad mistakes. On the other hand if you just do intensive close work, you don't get very far. And either type of study done by itself is apt to lead to very serious errors. But we have to combine the two. It's much better to use some of one and some of the other than to try to do half way inbetween all the time. Because you must survey a lot of material in any subject and you must get parts of it very, very thoroughly if you're going to be able to understand the other parts properly. Now in the Book of Acts-we're not going to spend a great deal of time on Acts for the reasons that I stated last time. I have been looking at the first chapters of it. We noticed that Chapters 1 to 7 deal entirely with the activity of the church in Jerusalem. And these 7 chapters have always seemed to me to be particularly interesting. I'm afraid that I've put several times the study per chapter on these than I have on the later chapters telling about Paul's journeys. And yet in the chapters about Paul's journeys there are all sorts of important, vital principles every bit as important as these. But these are extremely important. And they do give us matters that are vital for our church life and for our relation to Christ all through. And we looked just at the end of the last hour at the beginning of Chapter 5. Now I hope nobody was shocked at the statement I made that the chapter division here seems to be at the wrong place. "Don't we believe that this whole Bible is God's Word?" I've heard people say, "I am ready to accept everything in the Bible. I'm ready to swallow the covers because the cover says 'Holy Bible' and I believe it's the Holy Bible." Well I certainly believe it's a Holy Bible - at least that any honestly made translation is the Holy Bible. But I am not ready to say that I accept everything in any translation because any translation of the Bible is an interpretation inevitably. I don't care what the translation is or who did it or how fine a person it was that did it, a translation cannot be identical with the original. Some people have difficulty in the New Testament where it quotes the Old and they find that what it says is different from what it says in the Old. They say if you believe in verbal inspiration, why doesn't it say exactly what's in the Old. Well you can't say

exactly what's in the Old unless you quote the Hebrew words. If you translate it into Greek, your translation is different. It cannot be the same. Rarely does a word mean exactly the same in two languages - rarely. And certainly when it comes to an expression - use of expressions is entirely different in any two languages. If you say "a friend" in English we know exactly what you mean but you translate into German and it doesn't make sense to a ny German or vice versa. The German word "Freund" is very different from the English word "friend". Yes? (Student question) If you want to - it depends on what you mean by "true". If the Lord makes a statement in Hebrew and the New Testament gives you a statement in Greek, as a statement of what Divine Truth is, it would be just as true because it's God's Word just as much as the Old . But if the purpose of the New Testament is simply to quote what somebody said in the Old, and the point of it isn't that this is a presentation of truth but that this is what the man said, like where you often quote Satan or a wicked man or even a good man who's not inspired, then if you're going to say exactly what he said to be 100% true you'd have to say it in Hebrew because in Greek it isn't exactly what he said. The words just won't mean exactly the same thing. And the expression won't mean exactly the same thing. It has to be an approximation. And being an approximation, I think that it is the case that in the New Testament where an Old Testament passage is quoted that the vital thing in the quotation is that it give that idea which is in the original which is the idea that is under discussion. Now it won't necessarily on every related idea give exactly what is in the Old Testament - because you can't. You do in some things, you won't in others. So I think that is a vital point in our understanding. Yes?(Student question) No, because languages won't do that. You take a thought which is expressed in German in a page and to express that thought just exactly in English as it is in German would probably take you 10 pages or vice versa. (Student question) Yes, it could be done if necessary. For instance if you say in English, "That man is a friend of mine." Well all you mean is I have met him some time. That's all you mean. I said to my landlady in Germany once, "That's a friend of mine." She said, "Why a friend of yours? Where did you ever know him?" "Why I met him yesterday." She said, "You met him yesterday and he's a friend of yours?" She couldn't understand it. "Well", I said, "What do you mean

by friend?" Of course she didn't know any English. I was talking in German. "Oh", she said, "a friend is somebody that you say 'du' to." In German "thou" is "du". If you address them as "du" that's a friend of yours. Now you can't translate that into English. A friend is somebody you say "du" to - you say thou to. There's nobody living today - in English - who says "thou" to anybody except the Lord. So according to that definition we'd have no friends except the Lord - which is true in the real sense. But in German it is somebody you know so well that instead of addressing them by the polite form, "Sie", that you use to everybody except close friends, members of the family, small children, domestic animals, and God - for everybody else in German you use the polite form "Sie". It would be very impolite to call anybody "du" unless they were a very close friend. Well in English they just don't translate it - it just means nothing in English. And I said to her, "How many friends do you have?" And she said, "Oh I had one but she died years ago." And I said, "These people next door" - one afternoon she'd be over having tea with them and enjoying a nice chat with them and the next day they were over in her place - they were very intimate as far as I could see. I said, "Would you call them friends?" "Oh no, just very good acquaintances." Well now you see to translate that into English - "That is a friend of mine" - from English into German or from German into English, to get the exact shade of meaning would take you a paragraph to explain exactly what you mean by it. And that is true because words have a difference of meaning in any particular language from their use in another language, a different area covered. The word "table" in English will describe this and the German word for "table" will describe this and neither of them will apply to this but there will be certain types of furniture that we wouldn't call "table" that perhaps they would call "table". And so the area included in the word is different. But that's not nearly as important in the difference as the difference in forms of expression. In English we say, "I will have" - you go in a restaurant and say, "I'll take a ham sandwich." In German they would just say, "I take it" - they use the tense very different than ours. In German they say, "I ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~^{am} here two years." We say, "I have been here two years." The tense use is altogether different between two languages as close together as English and German. And Hebrew and Greek are as far apart as almost any two languages can be. Their whole useage, their whole approach, their

whole thought structure is very, very different. And so you can take any idea and you can express the fundamentals of that idea from one of these languages to the other, but to get the exact significance - you couldn't give a translation, you'd have to write a full page of discussion. And so your translation will give the thing that is related to the subject under consideration or it will give a general approximation and that is really the best thing you can do in a translation. Well that 's a matter of translation. That's really not vital to our present, immediate problem but yet let's relate it to it. You look at the Bible. What is the Bible? Well this a group of English words - these English words are an attempt to translate the Hebrew and Greek and they're very good but they cannot do it exactly. Because there's no such thing as an exact translation of anything from one language to another. You would have to have a - to tell exactly what the Hebrew and Greek mean you'd have to have a series of commentaries. You'd have to have a big set of books, as big as an encyclopedia to discuss the precise meaning of each Hebrew and Greek expression and term and what it is that a person thoroughly familiar with Hebrew and Greek should get from reading. I've had people say to me, "What's the sense of studying Hebrew and Greek? I can't expect to make a better translation than those great scholars made." And I say, "Certainly you can't. You probably can't make half a translation as those people could make. But you can read it in the Hebrew and Greek and you can immediately get certain ideas exactly that are there from that, that you would have a hard time expressing in English. Once you know some Hebrew and Greek those just stand out and hit you in the face - those obvious ideas there that you just can't put into English in brief form in a translation for a person to get who knows English and doesn't know the other languages." And so in my opinion, important as it is to study Hebrew and Greek in order to be able to take a difficult passage and get in the precise shades of meaning and difficult problems, in my opinion it's ten times more important to study Hebrew and Greek to get the simple basic thought structure of those two languages so that you can look at a passage in Hebrew or Greek and get the thing in it that is perfectly obvious to anybody that knows that language but that is almost impossible to express exactly in English. So that the value - it is very valuable to have a precise

knowledge of (11.) but the value of having a good general knowledge so you can read thereof rapidly, that's the main thing is just tremendously valuable - much more important than the other. But now as we look at it here, we have here a translation and a translation cannot be exact. We have punctuation marks put and the punctuation marks are interpretations - there are not punctuation marks in the original. We have a verse division here and the verse division was put in some time in the Middle Ages. It was not in the original and we have a chapter division and the chapter division was probably put in in the 13th century by an English archbishop who put it into his Latin Bible and from the Latin Bible it was taken over by the Jews and put into the Hebrew. So our division in our English Bible of chapters is an earlier division than the Hebrew Bible division into chapters. But in the Hebrew division in nine-tenths of cases they have simply followed our division. But in about one-tenth of cases for some reason or other they prefer red a different division. So there are cases where your Hebrew Bible has different chapter divisions than ours - but it's a comparatively small number. Well now this chapter division, the archbishop put in according to tradition, as he rode on horseback between his pastoral calls. And as you see where he put them in some cases - I was looking at a case in Ecclesiastes this morning where you have a poem about 20 lines in length and he's put a chapter division at the end of about 7 lines. So you have a chapter which has some prose material and then a poem on a different subject - and 7 verses of that comes at the end of that chapter - then you have a chapter division. Then you have the other 13 verses and you have 5 or 6 verses utterly unrelated. And there's a case over in Isaiah where one of the major divisions of the book comes right in the middle of a chapter and such a marked division that you'd almost think anybody reading that chapter would see that this is a tremendously important division. And yet the chapter is made so it just covers over the last part of a section of about 20 chapters and the beginning of another section of about 20 chapters. So some have said that when the archbishop was riding they think probably when the going got rough he got confused and put his divisions in a bad place. Campbell-Morgan says 9 cases out of 10 the chapter divisions are wrong. I think that's too extreme. I don't think they're wrong anywhere near that. But I do

think there are many, many cases where they are very poorly put in. However, it seems to me that the value of a chapter division is a means of finding references easily and for that viewpoint they're wonderful. We can give a reference and go right to it and find exactly the same verse and we can do it quickly and so our chapter and verse numbers is a tremendously valuable tool. And it's much more important that we have uniformity in it than it is that we have them done the best way possible. Even when they're wrong I think it would be foolish to try to change them now because you'd lose that great value of ready reference and quick finding. But I do think it's very important that we recognize that they are uninspired, they are a later addition, they are purely a matter of convenience. Some cases they correspond exactly with divisions of thought and other times they have nothing to do

End of Record 21

impressed with noticing in the Book of Hebrews how nearly every chapter seems to start with a verse and you could just as well end the chapter with But whichever you do, you understand the chapter a lot better if you I recommend that when you study the Bible you - in any study you make of a chapter, that you start three or four verses before it and you run through it and make your own judgment whether it is a reasonable stopping place or whether

And so in this case, we have this fifth chapter which goes right on after the last part of the fourth. The story of what Barnabas did is the necessary background for what Ananias and Sapphira did. Now if you're going to have chapter divisions and try to make them the best possible, should you start the chapter with Barnabas and lead on into Ananias and Sapphira or should you have the chapter continue through Ananias and Sapphira and then start a new one when you get to a new section. Well along through here we have several sections that really belong pretty closely together so it's really rather hard to divide this material into chapters divisions. And I don't think it matters much where we make it. I think the important thing is that we see where the real divisions are.

And this Ananias and Sapphira incident follows very closely on what precedes and this incident with Ananias and Sapphira is very important to show us how much the Lord is interested in honesty in our church dealings, in honesty in the avoidance of hypocrisy.

(2.25) who killed Ananias and Sapphira for their hypocrisy does not mean that God will kill everybody who is a hypocrite in the church. There are people who are hypocrites for years and nobody catches on for years and years. I was down in Wilmington, Delaware one time - I knew someone who was implicated in a situation in which he was arrested and on account of my friendship with him, I went to the court to see what happened. I'd never been in one of those courts before like that but I was tremendously interested there to see this judge who sat up in front there with his judicial costume on and the case I was interested in was the last one in the morning as it happened so I heard all the rest of them before it. Here someone would come up and he would try to deal in a reasonable way with the whole situation, try to help this fellow out and try to help that one out - he was sort of acting God in a way. He was trying to apply justice and righteousness to all the situations and to deal with the people involved and the individual accused and so on. You couldn't help admiring his very evident effort to really do what was best all the way through it. And I left the court with a considerable regard for the judge and for the way he had done what was so very wise ~~XXX~~ in handling so many of these minor cases - and the way he just seemed determined to do the best thing ~~XX~~ for all. You can imagine my shock six months later to read in the paper that this judge had been ~~XXXXX~~ found to have in his private law practice to have a large sum of money which he was supposed to have taken care of for an estate and he had embezzled it from the estate and the result was that he was dropped from the judgeship and imprisoned and Delaware's one of the few states that still has the whipping post or at least did then - I don't know whether ~~XX~~ it still does or not - and in the paper it said there was a question whether he would be publicly whipped for what he had done or not. And the way that this judge who had given every evidence of being such a fine man and ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ making a real effort to do what was right - and then seeing this wickedness he fell into and how he was punished - it was quite a shock to me. And yet it's well to remember that everyone of us falls very, very far short of the Lord's desire. And it doesn't prove that the judge was

really a hypocrite in all these things he was doing. I think that he was trying to do what was right and what was best but he was a man like the rest of us and he fell into a very serious thing. God does not kill everyone who ~~XXX~~'s like Ananias or Sapphira by any means. But at the beginning of the church there, He gave us a clear evidence of how He feels about hypocrisy and how He feels about that sort of thing, as a warning to us. He won't deal with it in this life necessarily but He will in eternity and He shows us how vital He thinks it is that we root those things out first from our personal life and second that we try to keep them out ~~the~~ church just as far as we possibly can. And of course ~~XXXXXX~~ the most important thing in the story of Ananias and Sapphira is to show us how very, very important it is to keep sin out of the official dealings of God's people and to have some sort of real discipline among God's people to root out real sin like this from among them. That is the most important thing in it but there's another very interesting thing and that is this - that as you casually read through Acts up to this point you find how the Disciples have all things in common, you find how nobody claimed something was his own but they had everything in common and everybody brought in what they could get and gave it out to those who had need. You would almost say you have a Communistic society here and then you read about Barnabas at the end of the previous chapter and you read that Barnabas "having land, sold it and brought the money and laid it at the Apostles' feet." And you might very well gather from this God's will is that His people form Communistic societies in which each one will work and do his best and each one will receive what he needs and it will be handled by the community. It sounds like a very beautiful idea. I was in New York one time ~~XX~~ going into one of the places there where there were a lot of people talking. There was a man up on a soapbox there and he had quite a crowd and I heard him say this, "What is Communism? Why Communism simply is that the property, the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ well-being, the religion of the people of the community shall be managed by the community." Sounds beautiful doesn't it? The community determines those things for the people. But is this God's will ~~X~~ that that be done? Is that a Christian plan necessarily? Is it God's will that something like that be done ~~X~~ In this world as it is in order to carry anything ~~XXXXX~~ like that out, it requires compulsion, it requires force. And when you put that much force in people's hands all sorts of wickedness almost

inevitably comes in. But as you read Acts up to this point you might think it was. And now here is Ananias and Sapphira - they kept back part of the price and the Lord struck them dead. Now in Russia today if you steal 50¢ from a communal organization, like anything that's a crime against the state, that is far worse than anything you do to an individual. A crime against the state is the worst thing you can do. And here they held this back and didn't hand this money in and the Lord struck them dead. Does that show that the Communistic ideal is the ideal that we should follow and try to have in our churches? Well I think it is very important that we notice exactly what is said. Peter said, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to keep back part of the price of the land?" You say right away, "Oh, it was his duty to turn in all he had, wasn't it?" Well, read ahead. Peter says, "While it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart? Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God." And so we have it explicitly stated here that Ananias had no responsibility whatsoever to sell his land. The land belonged to him. It was his private property. He had a perfect right to keep it. There is nothing in God's plan for the early church or for any church ~~XX~~ which would require that Ananias sell his land or turn it over to the church. "And after you sold it", he said, "the money was in your hands to do with what you wanted to. You didn't have to give this money." It was the lying to the Holy Ghost, it was the hypocrisy, it was the pretending that he was giving everything when he was giving a part. If Ananias came and said, "I've sold some land I had and I'd like to give a third of it to the church," it would have been wonderful. But if he says, "I sold it. Here it is" and he's giving a third and keeping back two-thirds, he is lying to the Holy Ghost. It is hypocrisy. And so this passage of Ananias and Sapphira here keeps us from misunderstanding of the early portion of the book, keeps us from misunderstanding, from thinking that it teaches a Communistic system as the right or desirable system. That is what these people did to some extent. And we are given an account of what they did. But as to what was right or wrong it was entirely up to the individual. There was no compulsion as Peter makes very clear here. And a friend of mine who is considered by many as a very fine Bible interpreter has made this statement that it is his opinion that the fact that all through the rest of Acts we find people

taking up collections for the Jerusalem Church, bringing money up for the people in Jerusalem, he thinks is an evidence that actually the Jerusalem Church as a result of this Communistic system which it entered into fell into need and difficulty and ^{all the} other churches which didn't adopt this system had to come to its rescue. Well, we don't know enough of the whole situation to know whether that is true or not but at least it's possible that it's true. But the first five chapters you could easily draw an inference and say, a Communistic system for the church is what is God's will. Here is Peter's explicit statement which shows that it was not the case at all, that this is one of the many matters in which it is God's will that we see what works, that we find out what is expedient and that we reserve the right of the individual to use the system that he thinks desirable and bring no compulsion upon one individual to bring him into a particular economic system. Well so this Ananias and Sapphira story as you see, is very important for various reasons. And then we continue in Chapter 5 and we find that again the Disciples were arrested and brought before the clerk and make a wonderful testimony before the court. The Lord takes them out of the courts freely, rescues them and then they are brought back and they are criticized and they make a wonderful testimony and then Verse 34 we have Gamaliel standing up and Gamaliel making a statement, "Now what are we going to do? Here is God's word - (Acts 5:38 - and now I say unto you refrain from these men and let them alone for if this counsel or this work be of men it will come to nought; but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it lest haply ye be found to fight even against God." I've heard people quote this. Here is something you say is wicked, it's harmful. Well, we shouldn't oppose it. Look what the Bible says here. It says don't oppose it lest you be fighting against God. If it's not of God it will come to nought. Well does everything that is not of God come to nought? Eventually yes. When our Lord comes back He will put an end to everything that is not of God but in the meantime there are some things like Mohammedanism and Christian Science and Russelism which have spread and grown strong and powerful, which are very definitely not of God but which are opposed to God's teaching and yet which nevertheless are grown strong. This is God's Word these two verses, yes, but you cannot take a couple of words out of context. This is not telling you what God's will is. This is telling you what Gamaliel said.

And who is Gamaliel? Gamaliel was the leader among the leader among the Pharisees. Well this leader among the Pharisees may have some very good ideas and Gamaliel's counsel may under certain circumstances be well worthy of careful consideration but it's only a man's counsel and it says in the Bible, "The fool has said in his heart there is no God" - we can't just take the words, "There is no God" and say ~~the~~ the Bible teaches there is no God - that's what the fool thinks. Pretty good indication it's wrong if the fool says it. But if Gamaliel thinks it, it is not an indication either that it is wrong or that it is right. It is an interesting fact that Gamaliel presented this view and like any view that any human being presents, it must be considered on its merits and it has definite merit in many circumstances but there are other circumstances in which it's definitely wrong. And it certainly is God's will that we should consider a matter very carefully and oppose that which is contrary to His will, support that which is clearly in line with His will, and the matters of which we cannot be sure - Gamaliel's policy might be a mighty good policy to adopt - where we can't be sure but we should try to find out. So that I think there's a good warning in this chapter against taking a quotation in the Bible as a statement necessarily of God's will. It is inspired which means it is true. What is true? It is ~~true~~ true that Gamaliel said it. But whether what he said is true or not is not proven.

End of Record 22

Gamaliel here - the Pharisees claimed to be close students of the Bible, they claimed to follow the Scripture. The Sadducees were the rationalists and it was the Sadducees who preached about Jesus.

The Pharisees were among the opponents

And here it is the Sadducees who are persecuting and we find a good many Pharisees who believe

And the attitude of the Pharisees in general was

an occasional one like Paul, who though he was a Pharisee felt that it was right that it was right that he would step in and persecute the church. But most of the persecutors were Sadducees. But Mr. Shellabarger

is right - the Pharisee is not standing up to his professed belief that you should take the Word of God

He was simply making a rule on the basis of expediency. And I think his rule is a good one if we are to apply it to that of which we cannot be sure. It is a very good one for those things which you are uncertain about but certainly we should do everything we can to find out whether something is in that group which we should fight and oppose or whether it's in this side that we can with God's Word But it's very good to put things in the middle line that we neither oppose nor

Well then, in Chapter 6 - you might say this is the second chapter on Church Government. In Chapter 1 we have material on Church Government of great importance. It's not particularly clear in Chapter 1 ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ what its bearing is on Church government but it's a basis on which discussions can be raised - very important discussions. In Chapter 6 here we have church government, we have the murmurings of the Grecians against the Hebrews "because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations". Wherever you get human beings together you're going to get murmurings. But the thing is that when the murmurings get such that you have a group of people who are being thrown together by their agreement in the murmuring then here these Grecians are thinking, "Well it's because we are Jews who have come from another country and these Jews who live right in Jerusalem here they're sort of sticking together. Ten or twelve years ago people from a very, very fine evangelical seminary were telling me how more of their students came from one particular Christian college than from any other source and they said that those people from that college made sort of a clique. And they said that all the student officers were people who came from that particular college and that that college when they had any

(3.25) or anything, they planned the thing and the others were sort of outside it. And when I heard that story about that, I was so happy right after Faith Seminary had just started its year that year and I heard that story from somebody who had been at this seminary and left it - and that was one of his criticisms of it - which after all I thought was a rather inferior matter for ~~going~~ staying away from the seminary but he felt quite aroused by it. And I was very happy to notice that though our school was only two weeks in

progress, here were two or three new students hanging together all the time and one was from one college and one from another and the other from a third. And any tendency to cliqueishness like that, that year at least, was certainly not here at all. But you find that in anyplace that there is a tendency to the development of cliqueishness. It certainly is right to have friendship with people one has known before - no reason in the world one should break up friendships but when you get cliqueishness where people, because of some background in common, begin to take a stand, you have danger of some difficulty arising and here you had it. The Greeks said, "We are being unfairly treated. Our widows aren't getting as much as the widows of the Hebrews. And what did the Apostles do? The Apostles selected seven men, all of them with Grecian names. The Apostles said, "All right, we turn it over to you folks. Now you do it." They had confidence in them that they were good Christian people and ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ their people were being aroused and thinking they were being wrongly treated. He said, "All right, you take it over. You do it. We'll trust you." And it was a very fine instance of the spirit that we ought to have and if we can show that spirit early in a development like this, it can often prevent the development of real splits and divisions within a group. Yes? (Student question) The multitude, yes. Well, who were the multitude? Yes, well now was the whole multitude largely Greek? My guess would be in Jerusalem here that the Greeks were probably not over a third of them but the Apostles said to the multitude - now is it the multitude that - let's see, "Wherefore brethren, look ye out among you seven men" ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Who are the ones to look out - it's the multitude of the Disciples. "Look you out among them". Well I would incline to think it most likely that at least two-thirds of these Disciples were Hebrew rather than Greek. Of course they were all Jews at the multitude that did the selecting proceeded on this basis, "The Greeks are the ones who are complaining. Well, we'll turn it over to them." And I believe, if I recall correctly, that every one of the seven has a Greek name rather than a particularly Hebrew name. Now of course you can't be sure of that of all of them, but certainly of a good many of them - their names are Greek. And whether this was the good sense shown by the Apostles or the good sense shown by the multitude or whether the Apostles made some suggestions to some of the multitude and they carried it out - we're not given full details. But that's what happened - it was the

Greeks who took over the job when the Greeks were saying they were unfairly treated. Yes? (Student question) Well, yes. That's a thing we don't have a discussion of in the Scripture and so just how great an extent lot might be used in a situation like that, we're not told. But I think in the case of Matthias there's this to notice - they said there were certain requirements - he must be a man who has been with us right from the beginning - he must be a man who impresses us as a good witness, a man who would be fitted to do this work. Well, from among the group they picked two - they said either of these two has the qualifications. Now which of these two should we have? So then they prayed the Lord to show which of the two/^{it} should be and they gave forth their lots - and it was a selection between two who were adjudged to be a good selection. It wasn't like Athens where they used to pick their mayors by simply taking lots of all the citizens - take all the citizens names, put them in a hat and draw one and he was the mayor of Athens for the next year. Of course you see the people of Athens were thoroughly democratic and ~~XXX~~ believed one citizen was just as good as another and therefore could be chief of police or dogcatcher or mayor or whatever the lot happened to fall on. But I don't think that that is anywhere taught in Scripture or desired. But the lot was a selection between two alternatives where human beings did not have any wisdom on which to make a selection. I think, myself, that ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ it is the Lord's will on any problem that we should use our brains and make the best selection we can, the best decision on any problem that comes. But when we have a problem on which a selection must be made and on which we do not have the data to make a reasonable selection, then I do not think it's His will we worry and fuss and fret and try to get more and more information as to which to do. I think in a case like that, just to grab one or the other and go forward is His will. Twenty years ago I used to have - thirty years ago, I guess - an awful time making small decisions. I remember one time when I had a small decision to make and it was very foolishly done and yet I couldn't help myself - I mean I didn't have the wisdom in the situation to do any better. I was in Palestine and I was invited to take a trip on the Dead Sea for 10 days and Dr. Albright who was head of the American

School of Oriental Research there said to me, "My that's an unusual opportunity to take two or three hundred people to rent the boat and go travelling on the Dead Sea for 10 days like that. You'll see things that you just wouldn't see otherwise. It's a very fine thing." And I told them I'd be very happy to go. Then a couple of men from Yale came through and they had been excavating in the Upper Euphrates and now they were going to make a trip down to Petra and they had an empty seat in the car and they wanted to know if I'd like to go. Well I said to Dr. Albright, "Here's a chance to go to Petra and I've already said I'll go on this Dead Sea trip. Do you think I'm obligated to stay on the Dead Sea trip?" He said, "No, they have enough people without you but I think you'd be very wise to stick to the Dead Sea trip. There're lots of chances to go to Petra - anytime you can get a chance to do that." Well I've never had one since. "You can always get a chance to go to Petra but a Dead Sea trip like this you have to get a couple of hundred people together that want to do it and it's very rare - you'd better ~~XXXXX~~ seize that." So I said to the men from Yale, "I won't go with you, I'm sorry." So they started off. And the very next day I got word to go over to the place where the main group was that was planning this dead sea trip. Well I went over and they got all the party together and they said, "You know it's only February and some of us have been thinking it's pretty cold down there on the Dead Sea. Let's wait till May when it's warm." By May I was to be back in Berlin. So if they waited till May I couldn't possibly go but nearly all the others were people resident in Jerusalem - so that's what they decided to do. And now the Petra party'd left the day before so I lost out on both. Now there I couldn't possibly have foreseen that. I was faced with the alternatives and I made the best selection I could. I've made neither trip ever since - I never had the opportunity for either one of them. But I was faced with the alternative and I didn't know what to do and I made the wrong decision but I made the best decision I could. And along in those years then I used to be terribly bothered with little decisions. "Would you like to do this with us?" "Well, I'd love to" but the minute I'd start, something else comes along that's better. And on the other hand if I turn this down, the other thing doesn't come along. And so whether to do it or not, I used to find it most difficult to make little decisions where there

wasn't sufficient evidence to know what to do. So I found a way to cure myself of that. I simply cast lots. But the thing was this. I found that if the question is should I go here or here and there are great advantages in both and either I do, I can't do the other, I cast a lot and the lot says this - immediately I said, "Oh, I wish it'd gone the other way. I'd so much rather do the other." So that my indcision was just as bad as ever so I found a way to cure it. Whenever I had a decision on which I did not have sufficient evidence on which to make a sensible decision - I think we should always make on evidence on deciding the pros and cons- I think that's the Lord's will for us when we have the data but when we don't - I reached this conclusion. I said in such a case I will cast lots and do the opposite of what it says. So I would just automatically, I would flip a coin and do the opposite of what it said. I knew before I started I was going to do the opposite. And that cured me completely-after about a year of that I didn't have to bother anymore. I think I learned to make little unimportant decisions just on a quick way and stick to it - because you didn't have the data on which to decide. Well, now here we had - in the first place which of these men was (13.) Matthias or the other? Now there ~~is~~ the possibility that~~XX~~ it's tremendously important which was chosen. But if so, these men have no way of knowing why it is. One of these men may prove to be a terrible hypocrite. One of them may prove to be a wicked man but they have no way of knowing. On the other hand it may not matter which at all. Maybe it's important to have twelve men ~~X~~ who have these qualifications - either of them has it, either of them could do it. Well it may not be at all important, it may be tremendously important. And so they gave forth their lot and they prayed to the Lord to show - and I believe in that important case the Lord did show which He wished to have there that time if it mattered. And if it didn't matter, simply one was selected. Maybe either one of them would have been perfectly satisfactory. I think that it is important that we recognize that ~~any~~ decision in life may be a tremendous

End of Record 23

Some people seem to think that they want the Lord to speak and tell them on a decision that's tremendously important but how do you know what are the tremendously important facts. Shall you serve the Lord in a church up in Connecticut or as a missionary in South America or as a missionary in Africa? Well it seems like a tremendous difference. And yet actually it may be no difference at all. I mean there may be reasons why your particular talents are needed in Connecticut or in South America or in Africa - there may be - it may be tremendously important. But the probabilities are it isn't the least bit important. The probabilities are that you can give a good service to the Lord in Connecticut or in South America or in Africa and ~~that~~ it isn't a ~~th~~ tenth as important where you go as what you do when you're there. And if you really serve the Lord with your whole heart, He has abundant need for you in all three places. And it may not matter in the least which you go to. So I think many of us tend to get much too excited about decisions that really don't make any difference. Because if we serve the Lord the best we can, that's tremendously important and ~~only~~ rarely does it matter where. There are cases where it matters. On the other hand any decision ~~XXXXXX~~ in life may be tremendously important. You say, "I go in this restaurant. Shall I have blueberry pie or apple pie?" Well, what difference does it make? Should I ask the Lord to show me whether I should have blueberry pie or apple pie? Well there's always a certain chance, not a great chance, but there's a certain chance that one of those two pies is poisoned, it's corrupted, it's spoiled, something wrong with it that'll make you sick, might even lead to your death. There's always that chance. And that decision as to which piece of pie you eat may be a hundred times more important than whether you plan to go to this place or that place or whether you plan to do this kind of work or that work. Only the Lord knows and so I believe that the Lord wants us to pray Him to watch over all of our decisions and keep us from making wrong decisions. And I believe He wants us to pray to Him and put everything in His hands and then have confidence that He will lead us ~~as~~ with the Pillar of Christ. But then that He wants us on each decision that we have to make to study very carefully what are the pros and cons and see what we can base it on and if we have a basis we are justified to base it on what we see. And if we do not have sufficient basis

just step out and go ahead, praying Him to stop it if we're going in the wrong direction. And you may spend 20 years preparing yourself for work in a certain country, that in the Providence of God is going to be absolutely closed to missionary ~~work~~ work, six months or a year after you get there and you've spent all that time there working on the language and there's nothing more you can do. Well I think the Lord will prevent that if you're following Him. I think that He will cause that you maybe will be preparing for another place where that year won't be wasted on language study that you can't use. But if we live close to Him, He will lead us with His (3.5) But He wants us to make decisions the best we can. Well now in this case, the Apostles believed that all of these people, or let us say that most of these people, were true Christians and were anxious to do what was right. The Apostles were falsely accused. "You are giving to the Hebrew widows better treatment than you are to the Greeks." Well, the Apostles knew the charge was a false one but they didn't try to defend themselves and make a big fuss about the fact that they were being wrongly attacked. They said, "We have confidence in the integrity of all of the group. Let the group pick out some other people and turn it over to them." And it would seem that it probably was apparent - I don't think the group there was ready to just go dead against the Apostles and say, "Well, these Hebrews are doing a (4.5) job. We'll turn it over to the Greeks." I think it was the Apostles' desire that it should be turned over to the group that was complaining - this particular work. It didn't effect the determination of the whole future well-being of the church or anything like that but it's interesting to notice they picked these men here to serve tables. The Apostles said, "It's not reason we should leave the Word of God and serve tables. You find seven men of honesty, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom and then we will appoint over this business, the ones you select, but we'll give ourselves continually to prayer and to ministry of the Word. And so they picked 7 men to be over the tables and after they picked the 7 men to be over the tables, ~~XXXX~~ the next that you read is that one of the 7 men picked to be over tables goes out and becomes the first Christian martyr and makes a stand for the Lord in the public preaching that is - we've got about as long a speech from him here as we have ~~XXXX~~ of any speech from anybody in the whole Book of Acts. And his name and his

example is one of the sterling examples in early Christian history - we're told far more about Stephen's death than we are about James'. James was one of the Apostles. And another one of these is Philip whom the Lord used to open up the work in Samaria and in Ethiopia. And these two of these deacons - it doesn't say deacons anywhere in the chapter here, "the seven", but later it speaks in such a way - it may be that this is the order we term deacon - at any rate, these two of the 7 appointed to serve tables, we are told of more real Christian work by them than we are of any of the Apostles outside of two or three or four examples. Now that's not saying that other of the Apostles may not have

(6.) but it is remarkable that the men picked to serve tables here, two of them turned out to be such great Christian leaders. It shows that a person shouldn't say that it's beneath him to do these menial tasks in the Lord's service. The Lord has all the tasks He wants done and the one who seems to be shunted into the position of less importance may, in the Providence of God, turn out to be one of those whom the Lord is using in the greatest way of all. But they select the 7 men and next we know we find one of these 7 is the first great Christian martyr and he is speaking with such a way that those who are not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spoke, suborned men to come and make false charges against him and he died as a result of the false charges. And in a good world in which a Holy God reigns, how can a man be killed, put to death as a result of utterly false charges. It does happen. Satan is the prince of this world and we need not look for righteousness and justice in this world. We must do everything we can to give righteousness and justice but we needn't be surprised when we don't get it. The witness to the Lord is far more important. We know there will be righteousness and justice when the Lord reigns. But in this world, in the Providence of God, Stephen suffered utterly unjustly and yet in so suffering, he gave testimony that was one of the great testimonies of the Scripture. And so now we have in Chapter 7, Stephen's survey of the history of the Jews. And as you read this survey you get into a few rather tough problems because there are some places where the statements don't seem exactly to correspond with statements in the Old Testament. And of course it's very easy to avoid any problem there. All you have to say is, "Well, this is just what Stephen said. That's not saying it's true. It's what Stephen said." But I don't think

we can get over it quite that easily because this is not just the statement of a man under any circumstances. When the Holy Spirit thought it worth-while to give as long a speech as this one, that was an important speech for us to get. And a man who was standing for the Word of God in this way - we do not say that any sentence in the Scripture by itself is true. It is true that Stephen said X it. But yet I think we are justified in saying that what the Holy Spirit quotes in the Scripture of what Stephen said will be true and free from error unless it is definitely labelled as otherwise by the Holy Spirit. And so when we find statements in here where there are historical problems we are justified in saying that what Stephen said is correct and there is the possibility of a textual error. But if we feel quite sure there's no textual error, then what he says is to be accepted as correct and the facts that he adds to the Old Testament are to be accepted as true. Now where there seems to be a contradiction, you will often find the contradiction can be resolved by assuming there is a fact with which you are not familiar or in some cases by assuming a very small textual error. And we won't take time to go into those particular problems in Stephen's speech but you notice the big emphasis in his speech is that these people have - as he said - "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One of whom ye have been now the betrayers and the murderers." He showed them that all through history it has been God giving His revelations to a people which was repeatedly turning against Him. And that's not just the history of the Jews. That's the history of all mankind. It's the history of the Christian Church. It's the history of all of us. We follow the Lord and then we turn and follow our own wisdom, follow our own ideas and next you find us fighting against those things that are his definite will - because they don't happen to please our particular likes or dislikes or desire for our own fame or for our own advancement or something. But it's the history - all through the history of the church. It is human nature arrayed against God. It is human nature arrayed against God. Well, we didn't get very far today but we covered some rather important points and we continue there next month.

It is difficult to know how much time to take on this book of Acts because if I had the idea that most of you knew very little about Acts, I'd almost want to take half a year on it. It's one of the grandest books in the Bible. It's one of the fullest in important things, basic things, and in addition all sorts of material where you can dig deeply into it and you're constantly discovering more. On the other hand if I was quite sure that most of you knew a great deal about Acts, I would spend about 10 or 15 minutes on it and go right on because there are so many other matters that are so very important to survey that are doubtless less familiar to most of you. Consequently, not knowing the exact state of knowledge of the members of the class, but feeling quite sure that it varies tremendously - that some of you probably know a great deal about Acts and some very little - we'll want to move along fairly rapidly over a good many parts of it. Another thing of course that gives me courage to do this is the realization that you will be doing some work in connection with Church History with Acts though there you have specific problems you're dealing with. And there are a ~~XXX~~^{great} many very vital things in Acts that you won't get into at all in connection with that Church History. We noticed that Chapters 1 to 7 of Acts are strictly in Jerusalem and then 7 is the matter that causes their leaving Jerusalem. Christ told them in Acts 1 that they were to be witnesses to Him in Jerusalem and in Judea and in Samaria and to the uttermost parts of the earth. But through Chapter 7 we have not the least evidence of any active effort on their part to get the message beyond Jerusalem. Then ~~XX~~ at the end of Chapter 7 we find that the Apostles said, "Now the message has been given in Jerusalem to quite an extent, we shall hold a meeting of the Apostles, or a meeting of the church as a whole, and we shall consider and vote on whether it is time to take up the second portion of the divine commandment and begin carrying the message to Judea and Samaria. And we will for this purpose select such and such a person as the person best suited to begin carrying it out and we will order him to do it and thus we will proceed with the conduct of the work and the carrying out of the commission." Actually we have no evidence of any such thing here. There is no evidence that God ~~XXXXXXXX~~ appointed the church as an administrative organization to direct the progress of the Gospel in the world. The administrator is the Holy Spirit and the Holy Spirit directs the work and the Holy Spirit

raises up individuals to do the work to which He calls them. And the church watches to keep false doctrine out and watches to see what ~~XXXXXXXX~~ the people should be warned against as being the coming in of that which is not the purpose of the Lord and watches over the details of its own particular work in a particular area. But in this case the Holy Spirit worked through a persecution. You might say the Holy Spirit worked through Stephen in making Stephen take such a strong radical stand that persecution was inevitable

End of Record 24

Because we have nobody talking like Stephen hardly at all before Stephen and yet we have a good bit of persecution before that. So the persecution was inevitable. Satan would not have allowed the Gospel to get really going without doing what he could to interfere with it. Persecution was inevitable but Stephen's forthright attitude intensified it and the Holy Spirit used that to scatter the ~~NAME~~ Disciples abroad. And so Chapter 8 begins with the missionary agency which in this case was the persecution. There was a great persecution ~~XX~~ against the church which was at Jerusalem and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria except the Apostles. And the Apostles we have not taking the vanguard of the movement, no evidence of their making plans how to spread the work, but carrying on in the work they were doing in Jerusalem. And the Disciples who were scattered everywhere we read in Verse 4, "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word." They found themselves in these other areas and they proceeded to carry out the divine commission and to preach the Word. And then we find that the man who went to the city of Samaria - there's no evidence that he was selected or deputed by a church organization to do this, there's no evidence that any human being selected him for the purpose, the only selection of him that had occurred before this was the selection to wait on tables, a selection to take care of the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ distribution of the physical

(2.) He was one of the seven picked for that purpose. But he went down to the city of Samaria and preached ~~h~~here and we have a great revival which came about through the efforts of this man whom the Lord had appointed for the purpose. And of course that is true not merely in religious things but in all phases of life. God gives gifts and the men who have these gifts proceed to do deeds. When the government of the state or the administration of the church sets out to determine how the work shall be extended and how it shall be carried on, we find that their selection usually is far inferior to the selection that takes place when men step forward to whom God has given the gifts - whether it be in the religious sphere or in the economic or any other sphere. It is the other method which brings the results. And so here we have it - Philip going there and then the word comes up to Jerusalem - there's a great work going on in Samaria and the Apostles hear about the work in Samaria and how wonderfully the Lord is

using Philip and they rejoice in it but they say, "Now it is our place to go down and look the work over and see that the work is free from any tendencies which might lead to great injury. And so we can help out by arresting those tendencies before they go too far." And so the Apostles sent Peter and John down to look the work over and to see what was needed and "they prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet He was fallen upon none of them; only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit." There's no evidence here of a group of people tearing or waiting ~~XXXX~~ or praying for the Holy Ghost, nothing of the kind. In this particular case it was Peter and John came and laid their hands on them and immediately the Holy Ghost. Different method - we have many different methods in the Acts. There is no pattern you can find in Acts as to how to receive the Holy Spirit. There is one principle you can find as to how to receive the Holy Spirit and that is be fully surrendered to the Lord. That is the basic principle - get rid of self and the Holy Spirit will come in. But then we have down there Simon, this magician of whom we read in Verse 13, "And Simon himself believed also." Well when you read that a man believed also, how do you interpret that. "If thou shalt believe on the Lord Jesus Christ thou shalt be saved." Then "Simon himself believed also". It says he believed and we read elsewhere that "whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish but shall have eternal life." And so we are in a position where we have to do one of two things. We have to say this man Simon was a real Christian who fell into sin but who was a real Christian - or else we have to say when it says that Simon believed also, it means it looked as if Simon believed. But the words cannot be taken in the strict literal sense as they stand alone. You are in between the two alternatives on this particular problem. The fact that you find that Peter said to him in Verse 21, "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter for thy heart is not right in the sight of God -----for I see that thou are in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity." It's pretty hard to interpret those words and think that Simon was a saved man. But we find that in Verse 22 Peter had said, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee." And in Verse 24 Simon said, "Pray yet to the Lord for me that none of these things which ye have spoken, come upon me." And I

think a pretty good argument could be made from that for Simon being a man who was a Christian and his immediate reaction here is not to say, "Well now you're completely misunderstanding. You're wrong. I'm not that kind of man you represent me to be at all," and defend himself. He says, "Pray for me that I won't get it." I think an argument could be made that Peter is pointing him out as a Christian who has fallen into sin rather than as an ungodly man who is not a Christian. An argument can be made for it and yet Peter's language sounds pretty strong for that when he says, "Thou art yet in the gall of bitterness." And in the tradition of the ancient church, Simon was represented as being the leader of anti-Christian forces in subsequent years. Now that tradition is much later. We have a good deal about it in Iraneus but that is 150 years later and it is not impossible that the tradition should have developed from somebody reading Acts here - perhaps even superficially reading it, without being based on actual historical fact - it is not impossible. And yet when you have a tradition as widespread as that, you can't just cast it aside. I personally am glad I don't have to be dogmatic on the matter of whether Simon was a Christian who fell into sin, as every Christian does to some extent at one time or another, or whether when it says Simon believed also it means it looked to them as if he believed and doesn't really mean that he believed. But one warning that I think is very good to take from this is that I always claim that I am not competent to say whether any individual is going to have an

(8.) I am not. Now that doesn't mean I think the Roman Catholic position that nobody knows who's saved. I believe the Lord knows and I believe the person themselves should be able to know. But I don't believe that I am competent to tell who is a hypocrite, or maybe not a hypocrite but maybe somebody who doesn't understand and says they accept and they don't know what they're talking about. I've known people who go up to somebody and say, "Here's a dollar. Will you take it?" If the person will take it they'll say, "Alright now is it yours?" "Yes". "Well now here's salvation. Will you take it?". "Yes." "Alright, now are you saved?" "Yes". Well what does that mean? They don't know anything about salvation. I think it is very helpful to use some of those illustrations to get ~~XXXX~~ over the difficulty people have of understanding how we can be saved without any effort on our part. And illustrations are useful to get that thought

across but we have to get more across than just the thought that here's something free anybody can have. There has to be a realization of what it is, a real turning from sin and a realization that Jesus died for us and we are actually accepting Him as our savior. I believe that only the Lord can see - there are people I have known who have preached the Gospel, stood on street corners with eggs thrown at them, stones hurled at them, all kinds of treatment - stood up in the noblest, bravest way in preaching the Gospel and in later years have been denying the Gospel and tearing down the truth and opposing Christianity and whether these people were saved and then fell away into deep sin or whether they repeated words without realizing what they meant and in their actual heart were wicked and never had really accepted Christ - I'm glad that it's not my place to judge in each instance. But I think it is a mistake to say to anybody, "You are born again. You are saved." I would say, "If you believe in your heart that Jesus Christ died for your sins, if you truly have accepted him as savior, then you're saved." But as far as my judgment is concerned I would keep the "if". And I question if any human being today is in a position to say whether Simon was actually a saved man or a very wicked one. The early church - by early church I mean ~~XXX~~ 150 years after the time of Christ - the early church of that time considered him as one of the great leaders of Anti-Christian movements. I don't know whether any of you have read the book, "The Chalice" Silver ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ - it was a best-seller about two years ago. It has a very good presentation of the general background of that day - "The Silver Chalice". A few things in where it ~~XXXX~~ the writer's imagination rather runs wild but it gives a very good picture of Nero's court and the situation there and a pretty good picture of situations in Jerusalem at this time. But in "The Silver Chalice", Simon appears as the magician who is opposing Christianity and that is simply following the old tradition of the Christian Church which may be a true tradition but it may not be. We just don't know. And I have always found it difficult to get around this explicit statement, "Then Simon himself believed also." That's a pretty strong dogmatic statement. I think it is actually a stronger statement than Peter's statement, "Repent therefore of this thy wickedness. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter for thy heart is not right in the sight of God." Well what matter? It is not the matter of salvation he's talking about here but the matter of re-

ceiving the Holy Spirit and the two are so tied up together that Peter's statement is pretty strong. But it's not quite as strong as the previous statement. Yes? (Student question) Yes, yes, it is true there was an economic - (Student question again) Well, he may have been a very wicked man but I would not rule everyone that still has selfish attitudes, out as being a hypocrite because you will find that it is most sad in any Christian work to find the wickedness that clings to people that give every evidence of being real Christians and I think if we will turn our eyes on our own hearts, we will find that there is a different type maybe in each one of us from each other but we have a long ways to go for full sanctification. I think just the complete - I've mentioned I think in Special Hour, haven't i, that if you were to get - if somebody were to come in here and to guarantee that everyone here who brought evidence that that one had led a soul to the Lord, they would give \$5.00 - do that purposely - I believe you would find a lot of people in this seminary who would be claiming to lead people to the Lord and giving evidence. A lot of it might be good evidence too, much more than we give when they call for testimony of how the Lord has led you, without any such monetary thing as that - I believe you would find that the overwhelming mass of people here would be very active. Now that motive worked the opposite way in my part once and I think that was unfortunate. I was in college, in a fine Christian college then - now a thoroughly modernistic place - but it was then a fine Christian college and there were a great many very fine Christians at the college doing excellent witnessing in different types of work and I was very interested in debating, in public speaking, in different things and one of the professors said to me, "You need practice in speaking. Why don't you join a Christian Endeavor, get into their deputation work. That would be wonderful practice in speaking, do you a lot of good." Well you know

End of Record 25

immediately felt, what a terrible shameful motive that would be for going out with these groups speaking around at the different churches - in order to get public speaking practice. I should do that in order to carry the witness of the Lord not to get public speaking practice. And I was pretty busy with my lessons and other things and I never did join the Christian Endeavor group and never did go on those deputations except once in a while when they would come and specifically ask me to go. And I think I deliberately held back for fear of a wrong ^{motive} / / from doing something which I really wanted to do from a right motive. I needed a little more push perhaps to do it the way I should. But I wanted to do it from a right motive but I was afraid that the wrong motive would enter in. I didn't do it at all at that particular occasion. I think I'd have been better off on the public speaking and also on the service to the Lord if I had done it. But I think that there's a danger we have to look at from both directions - the danger of being so afraid we'll do Christian service from the wrong motive, we don't do it at all. But then on the other hand if we're not serving the Lord just as energetically without economic reward for it as we would be if we had it, there is selfishness in our heart that puts us in a position where it's pretty hard for us to (1.75).

Simon saw a chance to make some money out of this thing. Was he just a hypocrite from the very first he got into this, looking for a chance? I question whether these Jews fleeing the persecution, coming down there and talking about this queer new religion that had started, would impress a man as something that would give much chance of economic advantage. I question whether that entered into his originally joining them. Of course after he was with them ~~XXX~~ and he saw all these wonderful things all of a sudden happening he said, "Why can't I do what Peter and John do?" He saw a chance for material advantage. Maybe he was an utterly wicked man. I don't know. But the Lord judges, not I. But I think on all these things it's very vital we judge our own hearts as severely as we can and we pray the Lord to give us tolerance and kindness in dealing with others and help the other s to overcome the sin that's so easy to

(2.5) Of course there are times when you have to act like Peter and speak out forthrightly against a man's sin. And it's very important to do

that in the necessary. Somebody had a question?(Student question) Oh, well now Verse 13 says that "Simon himself believed also and when he was baptized he continued with Philip and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done." Now does that sound as if he continued an hour or two with them or he continued a couple of days, a couple of months, or years? You couldn't tell from that verse. There is a continuance but how long you couldn't tell from that. Now Verse 14 says, "When the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the Word of God", it doesn't say when Philip's report reached them - "I've been here two days and here's what I've done." He was not in that sort of a situation. He wasn't sending reports to them. The Holy Spirit had sent him there and he was working for the Holy Spirit. It would sound as if the message came to the Apostles indirectly. Maybe somebody was going up to Jerusalem right the next day and came and told them about it and maybe this work went on for three months before they knew it. Ordinarily the Jews and the Samaritans had no dealings. These men had fled from Jerusalem through fear of the persecution. They weren't running back right away. They might not go back at all until they heard the persecution's slackened. We cannot tell but it's entirely possible that there could have been an interval of I would think as much as 6 months - it's possible. On the other hand it might have been only a few weeks. I feel myself that it is very important in dealing with the Bible that we see what is not stated-in a way just as important as what is stated. Because then we do not hang an argument on an uncertainty. Of course that's where the scientists get us. Somebody reads the Bible and builds up a scientific conclusion which is not stated in the Bible which but/seems to them to be a reasonable inference and then this inference is proven utterly false and unscientific and people say the Bible's unscientific when the Bible didn't say that at all. And I think a great deal of our doctrinal controversy has come from our jumping to conclusions without sufficient Biblical evidence. The two principles I think are very vital - one is to see where the Bible doesn't speak just as carefully as where it does speak and the second is to see what the emphases of the Bible are and not your faith or your actions on an occasional obscure verse but on the things that are stressed and repeated and made important in the Scripture. (Student question) No, I would say if Peter said, "You are not safe!" then I would say definitely he never believed. But Peter says

"Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter." Now if Peter means by "this matter" in salvation - that is clear, that would settle the matter that he didn't believe. But if "in this matter" he means this matter of being able to put your hands on people so they receive the Holy Spirit, if that's what he means, then it would be possible to fit it with a real Christian who is falling into temptation rather than one who

(6.) If Peter dogmatically said it I would accept it without question. But I don't think that Peter has

interpreted as meaning he's lost though I do think that it sounds enough that way that I just don't want to decide the point. (Student question) But that isn't what he's talking about because it says just above it in Verse 16, "For as yet it was fallen upon none of them, only they had been baptized in the name of the Holy Ghost. Then laid Peter and John their hands on them and they received the Holy Ghost. Now when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money saying, 'Give me also this power that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.'" It seems to me that makes it absolutely clear that what Peter's talking about is not the coming of the Holy Ghost to everyone who believes because that must have been

(7.) but this would be a special

Wouldn't you think that would be

(Student question) Perhaps, yes. I think that was what people thought 150 years later un~~animously~~ and that may be correct. On the other hand I know real Christians who today are "in the gaul of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity" - I know real Christians who are. Now they may not be real Christians but I've seen such evidence of their being real Christians that I thoroughly believe they are and I pray that the Lord will bring them out of it - I pray that he'll bring them out of it soon. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ But if He doesn't bring them out of it soon, I think they're saved. I don't think they're lost. Because - I mean I might be mistaken but I have seen such evidences that it's pretty hard for me to

(8.) in certain individual cases. (Student question) Well, it would seem to me that we have to say that in Acts here the receiving of the Holy Spirit is a term which is used on a number of cases from receiving a special endowment for service which

showed itself in certain outward manifestations which are not ordinarily present. That the term is used in that sense here in a number of cases and in the case of Pentecost that didn't happen until the day of Pentecost. In this case in Samaria that didn't happen until Peter and John came down. But in the very next chapter we find it happened before they were baptized. And so it seems to me that that has to be something different from receiving the Holy Spirit for salvation because we are told that when a man believes, as soon as he believes, he is received unto Christ. He certainly has the Holy Spirit if he's received of Christ. But this means he has a special manifestation. This would seem to me to be a special endowment for service which manifested itself in some ways that were visible to the people. (Student question) They believe that something is a fact. But this says that when they believed Philip's preaching, the things concerning the kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women. Now Simon, himself, also thought Philip was right when there was one God and when he said Jesus had died on the cross for men's sins but he did not personally believe on Him in the sense of John 3:16, in the sense of taking Him as his savior, but they thought he had so he was baptized. I mean it can be that way but it's just a little bit twisty, a little too much for me to be at all sure of that. Well, it's interesting that the first great extension of the Gospel outside of Jerusalem took part through the activities of a man who was not one of the 12 Apostles, who had not been set apart for this special purpose, who had not been directed by the Apostles to do this for them, but a man who had been appointed to take charge of material things, but who was so filled with the Holy Spirit and the desire to serve God that he stepped out on his own and started this great work. And not only the work in Samaria but we read that the angel of the Lord said to him, "I want you to go down to the

(11.) down to the road that goes from Jerusalem to Gaza through the desert.

And he arose and went down and the Lord specifically directed Philip to the place where a very important man would come by. And here was Philip and probably Philip was thinking "How am I going to get people interested in carrying the Gospel off to Ethiopia and the distant parts of the earth and it's just fortunate that he wasn't so busy thinking about it - how to get other people interested in doing this - that he didn't look up and see the opportunity itself right there and then without going to Ethiopia to take the message to

Ethiopia, and to reach somebody who would accomplish more in Ethiopia than Philip ever could have, because this man already knew the language of the Ethiopians, he knew the customs, he had contacts there, and Philip talked to this man and Philip probably accomplished more in Ethiopia by these few minutes than he would have accomplished by a whole life of missionary work in Ethiopia - and then he had his life working where the Lord led him. But the Lord led Philip to go to this particular chariot where this important person from Ethiopia was, whom the Lord had already specifically prepared. The man was reading Isaiah and wondering what it was about and all Philip had to do was just to explain it to him and the man was very anxious to accept Christ. And we certainly don't expect to have many experiences like Philip had there in our lifetime but if we follow the Lord, we can expect some. We can expect that He will give us encouragement with such situations as that. And He will have to (12.75) ready and lead us to the place where we will give them an answer. So we have only one chapter in the Bible about - where Philip is the main character. We have two other chapters where he appears but only this one where he's the main character - but it certainly is one of the outstanding chapters in the whole Bible - one of the great heroes is Philip teaching. Yes? (Student question) Yes, there is a tradition but it's pretty difficult to tell whether it's a true tradition. 200 or 300 years after this time there were people ^{thumbing} ~~ESKING~~ through Acts - and the least suggestion of anything was enough to start a tradition. Of course there may be perfectly true traditions, on the other hand it could easily start if it wasn't - we just don't have evidence. The Ethiopian church claims to go back very early and it is their tradition that it was started by this and it may be a true tradition. We just don't know. We just don't have proof. You see, there's where we differ from the Roman Catholics. We believe the Bible is God's Word, it's true, it's dependable, and we believe beyond that that anything about the times of Christ has to be settled by absolute historical evidence before we're sure. The Roman Catholics claim to accept the Bible as God's Word, free from error and tradition which they say has been passed down in the church. But there's no evidence that there is any tradition that is dependably passed on from generation to generation through the years. They claim it as a means of defending their

views in addition to the Scripture. But most of these views can easily be traced to superstitions that sprang up in the Middle Ages for which there was no evidence at all. But 200 years after the time of Christ, people were writing Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, taking ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ every one of them, telling where they went and what they did, and all kinds of stories - and there may be truth back of some of them, and there may not be. You just can't tell. But this man, this Ethiopian was so anxious to get the Word and so interested, ~~in~~ ^{and} the Holy Spirit specifically led Philip to him and the whole ~~situation~~ would lead us to think it extremely likely that he ~~f~~ ^{church} founded the ~~XXXXXX~~, that he did a real work. I would think it extremely probably but I don't think there is a sufficiently established tradition to either add or detract to what we would get from

End of Record 26

(Student question)

This particular man was a Jewish proselyte, that's explicitly stated. He was "a eunuch of great authority under Candace" - he had come to Jerusalem to worship, and he wouldn't come to Jerusalem to worship if he weren't a Jewish proselyte. So the fact that he was a Jewish proselyte could mean that there were a great many others or it could mean there were only a few - we don't know. There was at least one and he was an important man. But we do know that Judaism was very widely extended at this time. There were Jewish groups all over, even in Carthage there were Jewish groups (1.) Ethiopia's a long ways away, it's a long distance from Jerusalem and there might have been quite a Jewish group and there might have been very little. There might have been on Jewish slave girl there who was a member of this family and reached this young fellow and told him about God and he became interested and went clear up to Jerusalem or there might have been quite a lot - we just don't know. But at least when the Holy Spirit went to all this trouble to get the message to him, and had prepared him so thoroughly, it's a pretty good guess that he started real work through him - but we have no dependable evidence. (Student question) According to the tradition, the church in Alexandria was started by St. Mark. That's only tradition - we don't know. That was their claim that Mark was the founder. I think there's a fairly good reason to think it could be

a good claim because if people were just picking somebody ~~XX~~ out, they'd pick one of the leading Apostles rather than to pick a young fellow like Mark that Paul wouldn't work with for a while. So that would look in favor of its being genuine. But of course it may not have been Mark. He was very well received in the latter part of his life and after all he was the writer of one of the Gospels. It may be just a (2.5).

We don't have very early evidence but at a fairly early time that was their belief that Mark had started that church. Of course Alexandria's a long ways yet from Ethiopia. You get to Alexandria and then you have a long ways over that distance. We're not sure whether this Ethiopia was what we now call ~~Abbysinia~~, which is south and east or whether it was what we now call the Sudan which the old Egyptians called Ethiopia which is directly south. But the Abbysinian Church was quite a strong church at quite an early time and had ~~X~~ translations of the Bible made fairly early in the Ethiopian language. But still fairly early - it could be 200 A.D. or it could be 60 A.D. Well this is a wonderful chapter, this 8th chapter. And it is a wonderful proof of the naturalness of the Book of Acts. It isn't the way somebody would just plan out a beautiful system - here's the Apostles, Jesus selected the Apostles - well we'll have Peter go and start the work in Samaria, we'll have John reach the Ethiopians, we'll have it all just the way you or I would map it out. It isn't - the Holy Spirit raised up a man who isn't the one you'd expect at all - he's one of the deacons - he's the one who did the work. And then we find the last 2/3 of Acts devoted to the greatest missionary work of all - a work that was done by a man who wasn't even one of the twelve Apostles originally. When Jesus selected the 12 Apostles and they're mentioned, He's never mentioned among them, in any of the lists. He's mentioned in the beginning of Acts here. He's a man who never knew Jesus in the flesh and a man who after he became a follower of the Lord, the others looked at him askance for quite a while and when finally they called him an Apostle in Acts, they speak of the Apostles Barnabas and Saul. Barnabas wasn't one of the twelve Apostles and they put him after Barnabas - and yet the Holy Spirit used him to such an extent that he was able to say that he was not behind the greatest of the Apostles in his accomplishemtns. And he wrote more of the New Testament than any other three writers put together. But we have him barely introduced to us in

Chapter 8 and then in Chapter 9 we have his conversion. And it's well worth the whole chapter to tell about the conversion of this wonderful man but it was many years after Paul was converted before the Apostles paid much attention to him. He was converted way over there in Damascus and he tells us in one of his epistles that after his conversion he went to Arabia and spent about three years there studying the Bible. That is passed over in Chapter 9. You would think in Chapter 9:26 when Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples and they were all afraid of him, not believing that he was a disciple you'd never dream there was a period of three years inbetween. But it just passed over it, don't go into those precise chronological details and Saul then after his conversion here - Ananias wouldn't believe he was converted. He said, "Lord this can't be so. It's impossible. This man is one who's trying to kill us. He's one of the greatest enemies of the faith." Well how do you know whom the Lord can convert? The man who's the greatest enemy of the faith today may be the one the Lord'll convert. He doesn't convert a great many like that but He does some and there's no case that is too difficult for the Lord. And we should not think one is too difficult a case to

(6.5) for who knows in what case God may choose to answer our prayer. But Barnabas we find took ~~XXXX~~ him and brought him unto the Apostles and defended Paul and He spoke boldly in the name of Jesus, and the Jews from Greek areas - they are the most fanatical of all, that's always the way, the proselyte who is fanatical. You find somebody in a particular denomination who thinks that if you're not in that particular denomination, you're just outside the pale. It's almost more important to be in that denomination than it is to be a Christian and you will rarely find the person who takes that attitude was brought up in a family like that. Usually he's somebody who came to join that particular denomination and he has the extreme zeal of the proselyte. That's very common. And the Grecians, these were the people who were so bitterly against Paul. And they went about to slay him. Of course he was one himself and that might be a particular reason of their dislike for him. So we read, "And when the brethren knew it, they brought him down to Caesarea and sent him forth to Tarsus." And now he's up there in Tarsus and we don't know how many years he was in Tarsus because we don't hear of him again for several chapters. And finally Barnabas is sent up to Antioch to see how the

church is getting on up there in Antioch and when he comes up there, he makes a trip over to Tarsus in order to seek Saul. He remembers this young fellow who spoke so zealously and seemed so interested in the faith and he went over there to Tarsus to see how he was getting on and brought him back to Antioch with him. And humanly speaking, if it wasn't for Barnabas what would Paul ever have done for the Lord? ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Barnabas, in Christian history, is a name that's not one-twentieth of the name of Paul, but Barnabas is the one the Lord used to present Paul to the Apostles when they all were afraid of him and wouldn't have anything to do with him and then after Paul was back up there in Tarsus and everybody had forgotten about him, Barnabas remembered and Barnabas when he got into the area, went and looked up Paul and brought him over to Antioch. And God used Paul in a way far beyond what He'd used Barnabas. But I'm sure there's special honor in Heaven for Barnabas for the part that he had in all the work that Paul did through the way he stood by Paul in those early days. And there are going to be many surprises for us in Heaven when we see some of the great men whose names have been all around the world for their wonderful work for God and how certain others that we don't hear of at all, were used of the Lord in a wonderful way at the crises in most men's lives to do the work for them that helped them to make their lives count for God. You can't tell - there aren't many of us whom God is going to use in ~~XXX~~ a world-wide conspicuous way like he did Paul. But no one of us knows how in a simple way of helping some other one, we may be that which will be crucial and decisive in the work of the Lord. So I think Barnabas is one of the figures in Acts that is too much neglected and is worth really considering here as an example to all of us. Well then you read in the book of Acts - Paul is the great Apostle to the Gentiles, and Peter is the Apostle to the Jews. But it is Peter who begins the work with the Gentiles. It's interesting isn't it? In Chapter 10 here we have the Lord specifically sending a messenger to Cornelius and sending a messenger to Peter bringing the two together. A divine, miraculous work in order to begin the spreading of the Gospel to the Gentiles. It is one of the great turning points. We have these in the Book of Acts - a tremendous great turning point. There aren't so many of them afterward. God works through His providence ordinarily but the little flame here, the little tiny flame of the Gospel that could have been put out, you might

say, with just a little bit of force, the Lord worked supernaturally and miraculously to get it really going, to get it really started. And then He withdraws this miraculous work in the main. He works in His providence in most remarkable ways but as a rule, the actually well-authenticated miraculous activities of the Lord, since the days of the Apostles are very, very few. He works through His providence but it's in the special ~~XXXX~~ crises like this that the Lord has chosen to (11.5) a miracle. You know the average unbeliever thinks the Bible is just a book of miracles. You open it up anywhere and you've got a couple of miracles on every page. Actually you can open up hundreds of pages of the Bible and never find a miracle. There are only a few particular times at which the Bible presents the Lord as working special miracles. And in-between you have long periods of Biblical history in which they're practically unknown. It is at the special crises that the Lord has chosen to do these things. Of course providentially He's working in a marvelous way in the life of everyone of us. But ~~XXXX~~ these special miracles in the Bible are just restricted to a few names. Of course the Roman Catholic Church takes the attitude you can expect to find there most any time. But I don't think that is the Biblical teaching. Some people think that they show their true faith by making the Bible just as miraculous as possible, finding just as many things in it hard to believe as they possibly can. I don't think that's the right approach to it. I think we must recognize that God chose to work these great miracles - and they are absolutely certain that they happened when He worked them but there are long periods when they didn't work any and there are many cases where God worked with His providence instead of supernatural work and it was just as much a sign, a miracle. After all there's no Greek or Hebrew word that means a miracle in the theological sense of a direct act of God. Greek and Hebrew words mean signs and powers - evidence of God's power and of His presence. And it's just as great an evidence of God's power that He would plan things from the beginning so that Now - an article in Times Magazine two weeks ago, told about a new book that's published and said that in this book it gives some wonderful archeological evidence of the dependability of the Bible and how the Modernists are going to be shocked by this but he said the Fundamentalists will be just as shocked by other things in the book. It

says for instance that when Moses smote the rock, that wasn't a miracle creating of water, that was a thin layer on the rock where Moses struck and it permitted the water to gush out and they think that that is just going to be terribly disgusting to Fundamentalists. Actually, what does the Bible say? Does it say God created the water there? It says "And Moses smote the rock and water gushed but." Now is it any more an evidence of God's power if God prepared that place so that there was a spring there in the ground which God had put there, knowing thousands of years ahead of time that the Israelites would come right to that place and that God caused that that water should wear away the rock inside at just such a rate that it would be just far enough along that when they got there, a good stroke from a stick would break it through and the water would gush out. Is that any less of an evidence of God's wonderful power that He should do that than that He should all of a sudden say, "Well here's the Israelites and they're up against it. They haven't got anything to drink. I'll have to create new water. God could do that if He chose and maybe He did. But if He chose to do it the other way, it is just as wonderful a sign of God's creative power and of God's presence, of God's reality. (Student question) I don't think there's any proof one way or the other. I don't think anybody knows where it was. I'd say it's a pure assumption but since the Scripture doesn't say which it is one way or the other, I don't see that it makes any difference which it is. But if proof were there that it was that way, it doesn't to me take away from the divine nature of the Bible. And there are many miracles in the Bible where it definitely says how God did it.

End of Record 27

The first seven chapters of Acts are in Jerusalem, then we have ~~XXXXXX~~ five chapters more before we get to the part that is almost exclusively concerned with the Apostle Paul. And these five chapters that follow are certainly a transitional section of the Book. The 8th is the extension of the Gospel through Philip, the 9th is the conversion of Paul, the 10th is the sending of Peter to the Gentiles. Now you might say, the Ethiopian eunuch, was he not a Gentile. Well he was a Jewish proselyte. So whether he was of Gentile birth, as seems most likely, or whether he was of Jewish birth, for which there is no evidence, it is a fact that he had come up to the temple at Jerusalem to worship. And so that would look to his being actually a Jew, whether a Jew by birth or not. And so this is the first one who is a definite Gentile - Cornelius. And this was a great turning point in the history of the church, and at this turning point the Lord intervened in most miraculous ways. He sent an angel to Cornelius, he sent a special vision to Peter, and he brought the two of them together in supernatural ways. But it's interesting to notice how He revealed the message to Peter. The Lord could simply have said to Peter, "Now Peter we're going to send the Gospel to the Gentiles now. There's a change now." Peter of course would have accepted the orders the Lord gave. But the Lord chose ~~XIX~~ here not simply to give Peter an order which Peter was to accept but to give Peter an understanding of a principle. And I think this is one of the most interesting instances of revelation in the Scripture. Revelation is the taking of an idea and ~~IX~~ passing it on from one mind to another. It's divine revelation when it is the Lord giving it to human beings. But all passing of information from one mind to another is revelation. Revelation is not just giving some words. It's giving an idea. Revelation deals with ideas. Inspiration deals with words. There's no such thing, in my opinion, as other inspiration than verbal inspiration. Because inspiration per se deals with words. But revelation deals with ideas. Well God could simply have given Peter an idea. "Peter, from now on the Gospel goes to the Gentiles the same as the Jews." But that's not what He chose to do. He could have just given him some words, just given him a command. He chose to give him an understanding of a principle and so He first put Peter in a situation where he would be prepared to understand the principle. He made Peter hungry. Peter was prepared for this specific revelation. He was placed in a situation where he was hungry. Of course, that's a

common thing to be hungry. But here he is hungry and having to wait. And when he's in that situation, the Lord brings the revelation. Now he'd been hungry many, many times in his life before and would be again. But God took advantage of the particular situation. And God very frequently uses something ~~XXX~~ naturally as a means for bringing ideas to His people. Here He seizes him in a certain situation - he's prepared him for it, he's hungry. Then He gives him a vision and the vision isn't simply a command which God passes on to Peter, but it is a situation in which Peter had to do some thinking. Peter sees Heaven open and a large container - this old English word "vessel", I just wonder if we ought to change it, it doesn't mean anything to people today, we think of a ^{boat} ~~body~~, certainly Peter didn't see any ^{boat} ~~body~~. Then we read about the vessels of the temple that were taken from Jerusalem and carried over across the desert - they certainly weren't ^{boats} ~~bodies~~ - there may have been some gravy boats among them but I think those would be the only boats. This old English word "vessel" is certainly not understandable today. A container appeared - it's often used though for any kind of an instrument. But he saw here this container and there were in it all sorts of animals. And he hears a voice which says, "Peter, rise, kill, and eat." And here Peter hears a command given. Now if God said, "I am the Lord your God, Peter. I am Jesus Christ your Lord. I am giving you a command. This is what you're to do." Peter would of course accept it and do it. But it's not made quite that clear to Peter that this is the Lord speaking. He evidently assumes it's the Lord speaking because he says, "Not so Lord" or master, whatever the word is used there - it's not the name of God specifically like LORD in capitals in the Old Testament. It might be just the equivalent of our "Sir". "Not so, Sir." But he hears a voice which tells a hungry person to go ahead and avail himself of food that is there. And immediately this hungry person seeing the food and feeling the inclination to use it, finds it contrary to all his background, to all of his previous knowledge to do it, and he answers expressing the situation, "Not so, Lord. I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." "I'm not going to be like Esau - Esau was hungry and he lost his birthright because he couldn't control his hunger for a little while. I'm not going to be like that. I've never broken the commandment, never eaten anything that is common or unclean." Well God doesn't say he should eat anything common or unclean but the voice says to him, "What God has cleansed, that call not thou common." And here is the

thought brought to Peter. There is a distinction between clean and unclean food. But God may enter into the situation and make a change and when God makes a change, then the previous natural situation no longer exists. The statement is made and this happens three times. So three times the Lord stresses the thought and brings it to Peter's mind. Now even with the great Apostle, Peter, the great leader of Christianity, a writer of part of the New Testament, the Lord's chosen vessel for the work that Jesus called him to - even he had to have the vision repeated three times. Don't get too impatient when you're trying to present the Word of God to people and you find that they don't understand what you've given them the first time you give it or even the third time. Notice how the Lord stooped to Peter's weakness and He gave it three times. Anybody's going to be a good teacher they've got to learn to repeat a thing five times over and then when a hand goes up and you're asked the very identical question to give the answer the sixth time, without the least sign of impatience or even letting on that you've already explained it five times. Patience is a primary requisite of one who is going to help others or to influence others. And certainly God showed it with Peter here. If it took three times to teach Peter it'll take ten times to teach most of us I'm sure. But Peter had this message given to him. The container is taken up again into Heaven, Peter wonders what all this means. And then the event occurs. Somebody comes and says that Peter has sent them but first the Spirit explicitly gives Peter a command now - Verse 20 - "The Spirit said unto him, 'Behold three men seek thee. Arise and get thee down and go with them doubting nothing for I have sent them.'" You notice the teaching of the Spirit here is not based upon feelings that Peter had - he was hungry. He doesn't change his whole life because he was hungry. We can have a vision or a dream and it can be the result of what we ate - the result of some idea that has come to us in our contact with others or something that we've done. We have to be very, very careful that we're not misled by our own impulses and feelings or by two things that accidentally happen to come together, putting them together and thinking that it is ~~an~~ divine information to us or divine direction to us. In this case the Spirit explicitly spoke to Peter and gave him the command. "Three men seek thee." Peter couldn't see the three men, he had no way to know there were three. Here was information given Peter by the Spirit and when he goes out he finds that it's exactly as said. There is a check on

the fact that this is divine information given - the precise number of men that he's told are there, are there, and the Lord has explicitly commanded, "GO with them, doubting nothing for I have sent them." So that here is the command which might be all that was necessary but God has revealed to Peter the principle involved. And thus we all of us have to be led along in our thoughts and in our ideas to reach the point that God wants us to be. He wants us to stand resolutely on the truth that we understand but He wants us to have our eyes open for new understanding that He chooses to give us through His Word. And so God has spoken to Cornelius. He's spoken to Peter. In this supernatural way He's brought them together but even here He hasn't simply used them as puppets. Even here He has dealt with them as rational beings ~~XX~~ whom he leads to understand what they're doing - not simply to obey like a puppet obeys or even like a soldier is told, "Go here, go there." God is dealing with those whom He wants to have understand ~~XXX~~ His will and use the brains that He has given them in carrying out the purposes that He has for them to do. And so he goes to see Cornelius and then the next thing I think that we should note is that after he spoke to them the Holy Spirit came upon them and ~~XX~~ it was evident that this had happened. They heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. They had no doubt that this was the actual coming of the Holy Spirit. You notice they heard them magnify God. They could understand then what they were saying. It wasn't just words. It was an understanding of what it was because they heard them magnifying God but they saw evidence similar to what they themselves had had of the Holy Spirit falling on them and Peter said "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" So they brought in some water and they baptized them in the name of the Lord after they had received the Holy Spirit which certainly is contrary to the idea that you have tarry or wait till after you are saved to receive ~~X~~ the Holy Spirit. They didn't receive ~~X~~ the Holy Spirit before they were saved but the manifestations that were given of the Holy Spirit's presence for service came to them before they had had the outward sign of having become Christians, of having accepted the Lord. It came immediately without any tarrying, without any waiting, without any specific prayer for it or anything of the kind. There is such a difference in the way in which the Holy Spirit comes in these differences in Acts that we must be very sure that there is not meant to be one specific program that everyone has to follow. If

there had been, there would not have been this diversity. The Lord gives all His people the Holy Spirit when they are saved undoubtedly but He certainly gives special manifestations of the Holy Spirit for service and He desires that all of His people have it, but the time of it may differ. So then Chapter 11 is the Council of Jerusalem. We hear a great deal about the Council in Acts 15 and a great many people talk about the Council in Acts 15 as if the purpose of the Council in Acts 15 was to consider whether the Gospel should be taken to the Gentiles. And I think this is a very important matter. It's an utter misunderstanding and yet it's remarkable how many good Christians have it. Even some good Bible teachers have the misunderstanding to think that Acts 15 is a meeting in Jerusalem to decide whether Gentiles can receive the Gospel. That is discussed in Chapter 11, not in Chapter 15. In Chapter 11 here we find~~XXXX~~ that the Apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard the Gentiles had received the Word of God and Peter came to Jerusalem and then they did what was the proper thing for the church to do. The church did not direct Peter where to go. They did not try to organize the matter in order to carry out the commission. God worked that through the men whom He raised up for the specific purpose. But the church there looked into what was being done to see if the commandments were being broken, to see if the doctrine that the Lord had revealed was being cast aside, whether something was coming into the church that was dangerous - that is the primary function of the church as an organization of Christians - the discipline to keep false doctrines and unChristian attitudes out - not to directing and organizing of the work which is done by the Holy Spirit

End of Record 28

such individuals as keep the _____ and _____ for the purpose. But some of those of the circumcision, that is to say; some of the Jews who were particularly attached to their Jewish traditions who were Christians, contended with Peter saying, "You have done what is wrong. You've gone in to men uncircumcised and you have eaten with them." And then Peter did what he should do under the circumstances, he gave them a picture of how it happened in order that they could see that actually he had not been going contrary to the Word of God. There is no question here of obedience to men's commandment. The question is the Lord's commandment. Had ~~HE~~ he disobeyed the Lord's commandment? The Lord has never given His church authority to lay down commandments for His people, to legislate for His people, but He has given it an authorization, a requirement that it should watch that its members follow the commandments of Scripture. And so Peter says to them, He tells them the story, he tells them first how God revealed this principle to him, then how God had specifically sent these men, had told him specifically to go with them, and then how as he was speaking to them the Holy Ghost fell on them as it had on the others. And he said that then he remembered the Word of the Lord, how ~~XXXX~~ He had said, "John indeed baptized with water but you shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Forasmuch as God gave them the like gift as He gave unto us when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?" Here Peter gives these four strong arguments to prove he had not done wrong in the matter. And when Peter has given the argument you notice what they did? "They held their peace and glorified God saying, 'Then hath God granted ~~XXXX~~ also to the Gentiles repentance unto life.'" They recognized the four evidences that Peter gives ~~XX~~ of the fact that God was working and that God was choosing to make a change in the Divine Order of bringing the message of salvation now - that He had extended it to the Gentiles - they also were to be brought into the congregation of the faith. And so this is the Council at Jerusalem which considers the matter of whether Gentiles can enter the church and specifically decides the matter. It's strange in prophetic circles and in groups discussing all sorts of things there is tremendous discussion of Acts 15 and very little discussion about Acts 11. And yet Acts 11 here decides the matter - which people talk as if was the subject under consideration in Acts 15. It is not. It is a different subject under consideration in Acts 15. Well then, the last part of Chapter 11, we have the church at Antioch. Here we are

in this transition section between Chapters 8 and 12. It is the transition section where our interest is still centering in Jerusalem but where we see the outreach of the Gospel to the Samaritans, to the Ethiopians, to Cornelius, and now to the people in Antioch. Antioch, by the way, was the second largest city in the Roman empire. It was a very important city and remained so for the next 300 years. Today there's nothing, absolutely nothing - it's completely disappeared but it was a very, very important city. And the news - the people, the church did not send to carry the Gospel to Antioch. It is still the persecution that God is using. And people went as far as Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch - far north of Jerusalem. They were preaching the word to none but Jews only but then some of them spoke to the Greeks also and there were a number of Greeks came together and they formed a church in Antioch and then the people in the church in Jerusalem sent Barnabas up to Antioch to see what was happening and to bring them encouragement from the church in Jerusalem from the Apostles. They didn't send one of the Apostles in this case. They sent Barnabas and Barnabas wasn't much more than there before he left them and went off to look for Saul. He remembered this man who he felt had real promise and was now lost to the cause because he gone off to his home and was no longer in fellowship with Christians and he went to see if there wasn't a place in God's work for this man, Saul.

Yes? (Student question) No, Verse 19 - the people went "preaching the word to none but Jews." But then in 20 - "some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, coming to Antioch, spoke to the Greeks" - the Hellenists. Well now it doesn't explicitly make out whether these were Gentiles or whether they were Grecian Jews. But I would incline to think they probably were Gentiles because the Jews they had been speaking to in all these areas certainly would have been Grecian Jews - they weren't just Palestinian Jews so far away from Palestine. So there might be some difference of opinion there but that would be my guess. This is after the bringing of the Gospel to Cornelius and it would be I would think a continuation of the same thing, though it isn't made very explicit here - that certainly seems to me the most likely interpretation. Well then at the end of the chapter we read that the people in Antioch sent help back to the church in Judea which had sent the message to them. This certainly is the Divine Order that those who receive the spiritual blessing should give of their material help to those from whom they receive the spiritual blessing. When you find

the missionary work all having to be supported from the home base, you can begin to wonder whether it is truly carried out in line with the Lord's desire. The missionary work should very soon be largely on a self-supporting basis - it certainly was in this case. Yes? (Student question) Yes. We won't go into that at length because in our course in the Old Testament prophetic books, we'll have several hours on it - but just a very brief summary now. Prophecy really is forthtelling. It is giving out the Word of God. But since God knows all the future it would be strange indeed if forthtelling - the Word of God did not also at times include forthtelling. Prophecy is not specifically foretelling but very frequently includes foretelling. In this particular case these men did foretell what was going to happen. Now ~~XXX~~ it is very clear when we study the Scripture through that there was much prophecy, much forthtelling, and doubtless a good bit of foretelling which is not included in the Scriptures. The prophets of the Old Testament include those messages which God gave which were intended not merely for His contemporaries but for subsequent ages as well. There doubtless was much more given which was specifically meant for the people then and not particularly necessary or helpful to subsequent ones. So in this case we are told that prophets came and that one of them said that there would be a great dearth throughout the world. He gave a prediction of the future which when it came to pass, strengthened their faith that it actually was God who was speaking. Doubtless he gave much more of this kind, praising God and giving the Gospel then on this specific foretelling. But it was given doubtless for a sign that God was speaking through him. Then the 12th Chapter - the last of these transition chapters, the last chapter in the Bible which has Peter as its principal character tells of the time when the king, himself, Herod decided to hurt the church and the first of the Apostles to die was James the brother of John, whom he killed with the sword. It's interesting that those two brothers - one should be the first of the Apostles to die and the other the last - James and John. But he killed James with the sword and then he proceeded to take Peter and put him in prison intending after the feast, to bring him forth to the people. And Peter was kept in prison but the church was praying that God deliver - and yet when He did deliver him, they couldn't believe it. God fulfilled the prayer and yet they just couldn't believe it had happened when it did. That's so often the way with our prayers

we pray that God will do something and we only half believe that He may do it and we may when our prayers are actually fulfilled. Well, we have this marvelous deliverance from prison which God worked supernaturally there - delivered Peter from the prison and then we are told how a little later, not right then, but a little later, Herod died in this terrible way that it describes. "But the Word of God grew and multiplied." And I would think the chapter division really ought to come a verse earlier than it does. Barnabas and Saul we haven't had mentioned for a couple of chapters and the next chapter's full of them. They returned from Jerusalem back up to Antioch and they took with them a young man named Mark, who was a nephew of Barnabas, and Paul didn't think there was much promise in this young fellow. But Barnabas who had seen the promise in Paul and had gone and gotten him, he saw promise in Mark too and in the end it proved that Barnabas was right in both cases. So Barnabas brought Mark with them and then in Chapter 13 or perhaps a verse earlier, there starts this second main section - perhaps you can say third main section. The first seven chapters - Jerusalem, then the next five - very important transitional section, and then 13 on - the section which is primarily (11.5) and primarily about Paul. There is no section of the first part in which one man is as prominent as Paul is in all the rest of the book. You might almost say that the Acts of the Apostles is the Acts of the Apostle Paul. Because from Chapter 13 on - the sixteen chapters of the book, more than half of the book is about Paul and his activities. But in these previous 12 chapters, Paul has been hardly noticed at all - quite insignificant and unimportant up to this point except for the one chapter which told about his conversion. And there is no mention anywhere in the book of Acts of the Apostles getting together and saying we're going to elect Paul one of us, we're going to make him an Apostle. Nor is there any mention anywhere in the book of Acts of God having given a supernatural indication that He was going to add Paul to the number of the Apostles - to make him one of the 12 Apostles. He is not listed as one of the 12 Apostles - it is only from his own writings that we learn that Christ revealed to him that he was to be on the same level with the Apostles. But now we have the missionary journeys of Paul and the first missionary journey is Chapter 13 and 14. This probably is the best known of the missionary journeys - I suppose because it's first. There are certainly many things in the other missionary journeys that are every bit as important as what

happened in this one, but the details of this are pretty well known, very frequently given I believe. It's interesting that Paul right near the beginning of this missionary journey, we find him in Antioch in Pisidia ~~XXXXX~~ speaking there and quoting the same verse in the Psalm which Peter quoted on the day of Pentecost. We find it here in Chapter 13, Verse 35 the quotation from the Psalm, "Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. For David after he had served his own generation by the Will of God, fell asleep and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption but He whom God raised again saw no corruption."

End of Record 29

It's the first verse that Peter uses in presenting the Gospel in his first great sermon there and ~~XXX~~ in the first great sermon given from Paul, it is the verse which is used to show that this is noX new thing but it is what God had predicted long before. And in the Revised Standard Version it is translated substantially as it is in the King James but it has a footnote which refers you back to the Verse in Psalm 16 and you look back there and it says, "Thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see the pit" which has nothing in the world to do with what Paul was telling - nothing in the world. Either Paul was completely and utterly in error in his understanding of the Old Testament or else the translators of the Revised Standard Version - one or the other. Well, the account of this first missionary journey is a very important one in many ways and I hope you won't rush through it in your work in connection with Church History when we'll note the many important things involved in it. But we won't stop over it now. We look at Chapter 15 - and Chapter 15 is the Counsel at Jerusalem and it is an extremely important chapter. In this Chapter 15, when I was in seminary, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ my last year in seminary, there was a student who was a graduate of a fine Christian college, a very strong pre-millennial college, and this student had had three years of seminary and just a couple of weeks before he graduated, he said to me one day, "This Chapter Acts 15 proves that pre-millennialism is absolutely false. Right in the Scofield Bible there is a footnote that says dispensationally this is the most important passage in the New Testament. Just plain Exegesis shows that this passage does not teach pre-millennialism at all." He became an ~~millennialist~~ millennialist, remained so a week and then

became a post (2.5). And that was the verse. Well personally I never thought it was the most important passage in the New Testament even if there was a footnote in the Scofield Bible that said dispensationally this ~~is~~ the most important passage in the New Testament. I felt there was abundant other evidence for pre-millennialism aside altogether from this verse. And I wasn't particularly concerned about that then. I knew a man later on when I was teaching in a seminary, a very bright fellow who came from a strong pre-millennial background, and he took a course in that seminary in the Prophetic Books of the Old Testament, which met five days a week through one semester - instead of three a week through a year as we do here - and half the semester in the Old Testament Prophetic Books was devoted to the study of Acts 15. This fellow was convinced by that that pre-millennialism was completely ~~wrong~~. And there have been many who have thus been influenced by the chapter. And I think it's important that we glance at the chapter and note that all such interpretations of the chapter, rest on the assumption that the matter under discussion in the Council at Jerusalem was whether Gentiles could become Christians. That is the assumption under such interpretations. And it is very plain in the chapter that that is not ~~what~~ was under consideration at all. That matter had been decided in Chapter 11. They are discussing a different problem now. "Certain men which came down from Judaea taught the brethren and said, 'Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.'" They were not saying, "You must not go into Gentiles and preach them the Gospel." They were saying, "These Gentiles before they become Christians, must first become Jews. They must be circumcised and become Jews and then they can become Christians." It was not saying that Gentiles cannot come into the church. It was not questioning that there might be great multitudes of Gentiles that would come into the church. But it was questioning how they would come in and saying that on the way, they must first become Jews - they must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. And so there is much discussion about this and Paul and Barnabas went to Jerusalem to the Apostles and Elders about the question. They recognized the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem, to whom Christ had given an authority in the church, an authority for the purification of the church, the protecting of it from the coming of false doctrine. Paul and Barnabas had spread the Gospel more than any of these Apostles had. They had done a great work for the Lord under the direction of the

Holy Spirit. But they recognized that it was up to them to go and convince the elders and the Apostles that they had not brought in false doctrines, that their teaching was not contrary to the Word of God. So they came and had this meeting of the Council in Jerusalem with the Apostles and the elders there. And there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, here which believed certain things which were Christians, were members of the Christian group, and they said it was necessary to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses - not that they could not become Christians, but that this is what they must do, must be circumcised. Now we have the Council Meeting and first they have the argument given from experience - what God has done. Peter didn't give it as something new, he gave it as something well-known to them, "Men and brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among us that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the Word of the Gospel and believe. And God, which knows the hearts, bear~~XXXX~~ them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost as He did us and put no difference between us and them. Now therefore why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the test of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear. But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved even as they." Peter declares salvation by grace which he had declared in Acts 11, declares again now that that is the way they were saved. The others were to be saved, there was no need of their becoming Jews first. And then Barnabas and Paul declare~~X~~ what God has done among them through the Gentiles and then James comes up with the really vital argument - what God is doing now is important but you may misunderstand, you may misinterpret. What works is not necessarily correct. There may be other factors that enter in. The signs and wonders which Paul and Barnabas claim God has done, that is a strong argument. The evidence that Peter claims was brought, nobody questions that - that had been decided in Chapter 11 - "a good while before" he says. But as to his interpretation of it here, there might be some difference of opinion. Now James says this looks to you like a big change but actually he says God declared hundreds of years ago that this was going to happen. God declared this was going to happen, it is to be expected. It is in line with God's Word. So James spoke up - this is not James, the Apostle, he had been killed. This is James, the brother of the Lord. James, who was not one of the 12 Apostles is evidently the one who gives the decisive word at this

council meeting. James says, "Men and brethren, hearken unto me: Peter has declared how God, at the first, did visit the Gentiles ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ to take out of them a people for His name." He uses this peculiar phrase - "to take out of them a people for His name." What does that mean? To take out of the Gentiles a people for His name? Then he goes ahead to give the evidence on it. "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written." Now all millennialists take this as meaning "After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is broken down" that I will set up the Christian Church. They insist that that is what this means. They even say, "How could a statement about the return of Christ have anything to do with whether Gentiles would come into the church or not?" Well, it isn't the question whether Gentiles shall come into the church. The question is whether Gentiles who come into the church have to be circumcised. That is the question. And if it's simply a matter of Gentiles being saved, you've got plenty of passages in the Old Testament, many of them much clearer than this one. But James wants a passage which deals with the matter of circumcision, not simply one which deals with the matter of whether Gentiles can be saved. And so he brings this passage, and this passage does not have in the Old Testament, the words, "I will return". The Old Testament says, "In that day I will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen". It doesn't say that "After this I will return and build again." Some of your Bibles will have a note referring that to another place in the Old Testament as if James simply took a verse that said "I will return" from somewhere and put it in with this and put the two together to make one verse - which certainly would be nonsensical. Certainly that's not what James was doing. James is putting the quotation from Amos in its setting. James is saying, "Amos is talking about the return of Christ." Amos says that in that day something will happen - the day he's talking about is the day when Christ returns. So he says, "After this I will return" which is not in the Old Testament here at all but it is his introduction to show when this is to be fulfilled. "After this ^I will return and build again the ~~XXXXXX~~ tabernacle of David which is fallen." The word "tabernacle" to us suggests a place of worship but it simply is a (10.5) the word here - it has nothing to do with tabernacle in the sense of a place of worship anymore than the Hebrew word says that Abraham dwelt in tabernacles with Isaac and Jacob - with

the same promise sounds as if he lived in church all the time. It simply means tent there, here it's a booth. The booth of David, the temporary structure that David put up which was fallen, God is going to rebuild. Well that is the setting up of His kingdom - the return of Christ. What's that got to do with the coming in of the Gentiles into the kingdom? Nothing yet. It's just setting the setting for it, showing its going on to give us that which does relate to it. He quotes from Amos this will happen, "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called." There are two kinds of people then who are going to come to the Lord at this coming. One of them is the people who are the rest of the Jews - "the residue of men". The other is the Gentiles - "on whom my name is called". Now he said in Verse 14 "first God visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for His name". James says when Jesus Christ returns, there will be Christians who are Gentiles. They have not become Jews. They have not been circumcised. They are still Gentiles but they are Christian Gentiles. In addition to believing Jews, when Christ comes back, there will be Gentiles upon whom my name is called. There will be two classes of Christians at that time. Now if we take the Gentiles who believe and make them become Jews, then we're having just one class - and God predicts that at the return of Christ there will be two classes. And if there are to be two at the return of Christ, then there's no reason we should now try to make them all become one and become circumcised. That is James' argument. And it is an argument which explains perfectly why it was not necessary to circumcise Gentiles. It ~~is~~ explains perfectly why that should be and the other explanation which was written a good deal and talked about a good deal actually has nothing to do with circumcision. Yes? (Student question) Well a mystery which has been hidden from the past ages is now revealed both to Paul and to James. (Student question) Yes, yes. But Paul explains some detail more clearly than James but the general principle was there in the Old Testament for anybody to see if they hunted for it. And James brought it out clearly

End of Record 30

So then we have James saying, "My sentence is that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God." This is the decision then. The matter of Gentiles becoming Christians without being circumcised and becoming Jews is not a false doctrine. It is not wrong. It is perfectly right and permissible and can be continued as has been. That is his decision. However, he makes a suggestion. He says, "My sentence is that we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols and from fornication and from things strangled and from blood." Why should they abstain from these things? 21 -"for Moses of old time hath in every city them which preacheth, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day." What does Verse 21 have to do with Verse 20? Yes, offense to a Jew. He says in all these places there are Jewish synagogues. In all these places there are Jews. Now if they find Gentiles who are eating things strangled and offered to idols and so on, it will make it much harder to reach these Jews with the Gospel because they will be seeing these people doing things which they have always considered as such terrible abominations that it will make it much harder to reach them with the Gospel. Since there are these Jews in all these towns, let's ask these people to avoid certain things which would cause offense to these Jews. Now I have heard the statement made that the council at Jerusalem gave orders to the church which the church had to obey, even telling them what they should eat. Well now that is a mis-interpretation of the facts. Because the passage the orders in is that it is not false doctrine to let Gentiles, who had become Christians, continue to be Gentiles and not have to be circumcised. That is the decision on the important point of doctrine of the interpretation of the Scriptures. And in Verse 28 we find the letter which they sent which makes it clear - "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ~~XX~~ ye shall do well. Fare ye well." Then over in Chapter 16 we find in Verse 4 that as Paul and Silas went among the churches "they delivered them the decrees to keep that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem." What are "the decrees for to keep"? They are the decision that it is not necessary to be circumcised. That is the decree to be kept - the recogni-

tion that the Bible does not require circumcision of those to become Christians. It is not an order given with the authority of the Church that they must not eat things offered to idols, things strangled, and so on. That is not the decree for them to keep. That would be legislating by the church which the church has no authority to do. And it is very interesting, if anyone suggests the contrary interpretation here, to turn over to Paul's letters to the Corinthians where the question is raised, "What about eating things offered to idols?" And if Paul felt that the Council at Jerusalem had given an order which must be obeyed, Paul would simply have said, "The Council has given an order. You must not eat things offered to idols. You must obey this!" But Paul discusses that for two or three chapters and never once mentions the order of the Council in connection with it - never once does. But Paul says that he has a perfect right to eat meat offered to idols. He says the idols are nothing. He says the idols don't exist - Gods - they're just pieces of stone. Therefore, they can't ~~XXXXXX~~ affect the meat, they can't injure the meat. They have a perfect right to eat meat offered to idols but he said, "If my eating meat offered to idols is going to give offense to others, and make it difficult for them to become Christians, then I will not eat it." It is a matter of expediency as to what will advance the Gospel most and discusses the matter of meat offered to idols on the purely objective basis, with no reference whatever to any command given by the church at Jerusalem as to what they should eat. So I think it is perfectly clear that there is no claim in Acts that the Council or the Church had a right to add anything to the requirements of God's Word or to take away anything from it - but that it did have a duty to guard the church against the entrance of that which was contrary to the command of the Scripture. And when there came a new view or a new attitude, to examine it carefully, to see whether it's in line with the Scripture or against it - and they decided this was not against the Scripture. And they advised them to avoid offending the Jews in their neighborhood and Paul says he will not offend the weaker brothers but he does not consider a decree, an order here which must be obeyed. Well that Council then is, as you see, extremely important and it does seem rather strange that this very important council here, which is in Chapter 15, should have included in the same chapter, the beginning of the second missionary journey - Verses 36 to 41. Surely it would have been

natural to end the chapter with the end of the Council which is at Verse 29 or 30 or to go on to tell about the carrying of the news from the Council to Antioch, and stop there. But the second missionary journey starts here at Verse 36 of this chapter. Paul and Barnabas have gone back to Antioch and they "continued in Antioch preaching and teaching the Word of the Lord with many others also." Now at the beginning of the first missionary journey, the Holy Spirit spoke to the Church at Antioch and said, "Separate unto me the ones that I shall designate for the work whereunto I have called them." The Holy Ghost said, "Separate Barnabas and Paul!" The Holy Ghost said, "I have called them for a particular work." The church didn't get together and plan out a work and give orders to Paul and Barnabas. They took their orders from the Lord but the church watched over to see that they were ~~not~~ not departing from the line of sound doctrine, from the line of the true teaching of the Scripture. Now there is no mention of the church taking any initiative in the beginning of the second missionary journey. Verse 36 - "Some days after Paul said unto Barnabas, Let us go again and visit our brethren in every city where we have preached the word of the Lord, and see how they do." Paul makes the suggestion. And Barnabas says, "Fine and we'll take John Mark with us." And Paul says, "No. Mark quit us on the previous journey. I won't take a quitter again. I've had enough of that fellow. I won't take him." "And the contention was so sharp between them" - that one of them said, "I'm going to make a complaint to the church and they will force you to take Mark with you." And the other said, "I'm going to make a complaint to the church and they will say, 'No, Mark shouldn't be taken'" Neither one of them suggested such a thing as that. If there is an offense, they go to the church, ~~not~~ if there is an offense against a brother, but a matter of administration, a matter of the way to spread the Gospel, the way to carry on the Lord's work is a matter for those individuals whom the Lord has raised up particularly for that activity to decide in line with His Word. And here we find that Paul and Barnabas had the contention so sharp between them that they simply divided their forces and instead of there being one missionary board before, there were two. Paul went in one direction, Barnabas took Mark and went in another. They prayed the Lord's blessing on each other and they went each in a separate section, each to do the Lord's work, but not trying to work together when they differed, not on

points of doctrine or on vital matters of the faith, but on the method of doing things. So they separated peacefully and went in different directions - Barnabas took Mark, so Paul chose Silas who had come from the Jerusalem Church up to Antioch and been there some time. And so he went in one direction and now we have the second missionary journey which reaches from ~~15:36~~ 15:36 until they go and visit different churches and even go into Europe for the first time, and then come back to Antioch again in Chapter 18:23. And there right in the middle of a chapter, we have the end of the second missionary journey and the beginning of the third.

And we'll meet again next Monday.

There's so much that is vital in Acts that it's very hard to skip through it but our purpose now is to survey. One thing that I've noticed very definitely in our surveying is the authority of the general church body - how was it exercised? And we find it exercised in guarding against the entrance of false doctrine. We find it exercised in examining ideas of doctrine which are introduced to see whether they are dangerous. We do not find it exercised in directing missionary activity but in examining it to see whether it is in line with correct teaching or not - but not in directing it. We have the Holy Spirit giving gifts to individuals and directing them in regard to the outreach and extension work of the church ~~XXXX~~ everywhere that it occurs in the Book of Acts, which is of course our history of how the Lord acted in the early days of the church. We looked at the first missionary journey, we looked at the Council in Acts 15, and then we noticed that the second missionary journey begins right after that, and the second missionary journey runs up to Chapter 18:22, because there they come back to Antioch. The ~~third~~ missionary journey, most interpreters agree, begins at 18:23 but how far it goes there is considerable difference of opinion about. And that is easy to see why it would be. I lived in Calumet, Michigan as a boy and I made a trip from Calumet, Michigan through the East here when I was eight years old and back to Calumet. You might call that my first journey. It was hardly a missionary journey but you might call it my first journey. Then I made a trip from there to Florida, for the winter, and back and then I made a trip from there over to Europe and spent a winter in Italy. But the

time came when I made a trip from there to California - that was in 1917. And when did I get back to Calumet - in 1954. Well you might say 1917 to 1954 was my fourth journey but actually of course you would not say that. I moved my base of operations from Michigan to California and I never got back for 38 years to Michigan. Now then from California I made various trips. I came east to school with a year in seminary in the East and went back to California - a year away. And then I had another year away - I had a number of those. But the time came when my base of operations was moved from there to here. Well now in a case like mine where I established a permanent headquarters and where I took a position in an institution, my headquarters was shifted. It's hard to say just when it was shifted because for a number of years I was teaching in the East here, my family was in California, I was living in one room - a rented room somewhere here. Was my home here or there? There might be questions. I could have legally held either position. After I married and made a home here then this was definitely my home. A good many of you - if you're married - the question is - is your home here where you're in school, is it the place where (14.) to which perhaps you are still tied and expect to come back? Just when the shift is made is often difficult to say.

End of Record 31

This first missionary journey they went around and they came back to Antioch and they reported and went down to Jerusalem. And the second missionary journey they ~~XXXX~~ went around and they came back to Antioch but they didn't stay very long. And then before long we find him in Ephesus for three years. And when he stayed three years in Ephesus the question would become - is his base of operations changed? Is this not a missionary journey anymore but establishment of a new headquarters? The first missionary journey is a definite unit. The second is probably a definite one but then he starts a third trip and you could count it the rest of his life in a way - Antioch was no longer his primary headquarters and his trip was not just going and stopping a few days in each place, because he stayed three years in one place, he was more or less an itinerant the rest of his life, working wherever he could serve the Lord most effectively. So that

you will find that different books will give different lengths for his third missionary journey and the question isn't which book is right. The question is what is the nature of it and actually once you see that we see that there is no such thing as saying dogmatically, "This is the particular length of the third missionary journey!" But the rest of the book we have a continuation of missionary work by Paul up to the middle of Chapter 21 - well in fact to the end of the book. But in the middle of 21 we find him in Jerusalem and now starts a period of when Paul runs into greater persecution than he had ever experienced before. In Jerusalem he makes a testimony which results in his being cast into prison and then he's carried off to Cesarea and he's there in prison for a number of years and it gives us his testimonies before the governors and then tells of his trip to Rome and the time at Rome - so that it's pretty hard to divide it into hard and fast divisions. It is the experiences of Paul and the book just stops when he gets to Rome. He gets to Rome and makes a testimony and the book stops. Acts is not a life of Paul but I think that a very good way of summarizing Acts would be the progress of the Gospel from Jerusalem to Rome - and when it gets there, the book stops. It is an account of the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, it's not the complete Acts of the Apostles. It is the beginning of the Church, things are under way and they went on after that. So it just stops in the process of things. It does not continue to tell us what happened because you'd have to continue up to the present day and on if you were to do that. Every part of Acts of the Apostles is very interesting and very vital and very important. I hope you will study it a great deal in the rest of your life. But unfortunately we have to move on as far as this survey is concerned and we will take as Number IV - the Pauline Epistles and this is a major section of the New Testament. And I explained to you very early in the course a theory which I heard as a boy which I liked very much. And this theory is that the Pauline Epistles are arranged in our Bible not by accident. You will find books in which the Epistles are changed around. They are arranged according to the time they were written. I even have a book that gives the Acts of the Apostles and after it goes a little ways then it introduces one of the Epistles because they think that that's when it was written. And then after it finished that, it gives you more Acts and

then gives you another Epistle and tries to fit them in chronologically. They are not arranged chronologically. There is this arrangement that the letters he wrote to individuals are at the end. If you don't accept Hebrews as being written by Paul, the letters to Timothy and Titus and Philemon are at the end. But the other letters to churches, they are not arranged chronologically ~~XXX~~ as to the time of his writing. They have been arranged in this order from very early days. Humanly speaking, it's pure accident how they got arranged. We have no evidence anybody arranged them. It's possible somebody did. Somebody thought this was the logical order to put them in. We don't know. It's possible somebody simply took the books he had and just started in copying them in a larger manuscript and more or less at random picked the order. We don't know. And consequently we have no right to say that there is a divine purpose in the order. But when we see the order arranged in general in line with what could be a very reasonable divine purpose, we cannot dogmatically say they're arranged this way but we can advance the theory that perhaps they are and I think it helps us to understand them to suggest a theory. And therefore I feel it's very reasonable to suggest the theory which I heard as a young man and which I passed on to you at our very first session. Yes? (Student question) You mean as to the order of the books? Yes, well that is my guess too. But I don't quite like the word, "believe" for it. Unfortunately that word, "believe" is a word which has two meanings in English - it has three meanings! I believe in Christ means I put my ~~XXXX~~ trust in Christ - there's no stronger word in the language than that. That's conviction, that's trust, that's confidence. Then I believe that the earth is round - that is a conviction founded upon evidence. But it is nothing like having faith in Christ. But then you say, "Do you think it's going to be a good day the rest of the day" and you say, "I believe it will be" and you're using believe in the sense that this appears likely. That's a very weak sense. Now Bernard believes this is this way. I don't think he'd say it's like his belief in Christ and I don't think he'd say it's like his belief there's one God or like his belief that Paul lived. He would say it is a good guess. (Student question) That is a very highly rated book - "Progress of Doctrines" by Bernard and if I were a New Testament specialist I would certainly have read it. I have not read it and I would hesitate to think that ~~XXXX~~ we ought to base an argument upon a theory as to the order because certainly chronologically they were written in a different order. I think

everybody agrees on that. It does seem to me that they are arranged in such a way as to present doctrine to us in the logical. But in the order of writing, I don't think there's anybody questions as far as I know that Thessalonians are the first written and they are the first written not dealing with the first doctrine, but ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ dealing with - evidently the primary doctrines the Thessalonians got so clearly in mind that they didn't need further explanation of them and it was doctrines which are vital but not the most vital on which they needed help. And then later on he gives - after these primary doctrines have become a bit more known and doubts and misunderstandings had begun to arise about them, then

(8.) But that they are arranged - it is a fact that the arrangement of them can be related to a very logical order and the order I suggested to you was that the first four of them deal with the matter of salvation primarily and that the next three deal with the matter of the Christian life primarily. That is to say the matter of progress in the Christian life, the life with Christ. And then that the next two deal with eschatology. And then that the latter ones deal with points of the progress of the Gospel and the development of the Church. Now that is the order in which they are and they're so rather definitely in that order, it would seem very likely somebody arranged them, but we just have no conclusive proof that they did. It might be that the Holy Spirit led people in an accidental way to put them together in a very reasonable order. But then in addition to that the suggestion that I heard - this suggestion may have come indirectly from Bernard for all I know - but the suggestion that I heard as a young man that within each group you can divide them, within the first two groups, according to the statement in II Timothy 3:16 that "all Scripture is inspired of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, and for correction" does seem very nicely to fit these first two groups. Romans gives the doctrine, I and II Corinthians, reproof for false actions in relation to this doctrine. Galatians corrects false thinking regarding this doctrine. Ephesians gives the doctrine, Philippians reproves false action relating to the doctrine and Colossians corrects false thinking in relation to the doctrine. And you can't separate these three but in general it's a pretty good arrangement. And then you have eschatology. Well this would suggest that Romans is primary and we'll call it "A" under IV.

Romans on the ~~XXX~~ basic doctrine is the one that presents the doctrine in the full, clear fashion. And I believe that everyone would agree that Romans is the greatest doctrinal Epistle in the New Testament. It is certainly - it might be logical that the Epistle written to the church in the capital of the Empire should be put first but it's certainly far more logical that the Epistle which gives the great, the fullest presentation of the most vital doctrine in Christian history, the foundation of all our doctrine, that it should be put first. It's not necessarily to be expected that such a letter would have been written to the church in the capital, because it would depend on local conditions of course, whom he'd write it to. ~~HE XXXXX~~ You'd hardly take that as a reason for writing to it but it might be that ~~XXXXXXX~~ there in the capital they had the people who were the deepest thinkers perhaps and the ones who were most in need of a careful explanation. It's hard to say. At any rate this book of Romans is such a wonderful book. I've heard people say, "We've got John 3:16. We can preach that. Why do we need anything else?" Well of course you have to explain John 3:16 - you need a lot else to explain it fully. I've never heard anyone say, but it seems strange someone doesn't, "We've got the Book of ^Romans, why do we need anything else?" We do have a great deal in other books but the Book of Romans is certainly the vital foundation of our doctrine of salvation. It is the clear presentation of it and it goes into its aspects more fully than any other book in the whole Bible. The book then is the first straight, clear presentation of this doctrine and it's very interesting - Martin Luther gave a series of lectures on this book and he gave his first series and somebody took notes of the lectures and somehow they got into the Vatican. And then his next series, he developed them more fully and then those were published two years before the Reformation began. And about 15 years ago a Roman Catholic Scholar issued a book in which he took the original notes of Luther's first lectures and tried to show that all his heresies were already in those lectures he gave several years before the Reformation began. I don't know what their purpose was in proving ~~that~~ because it seems to me it would disprove all their claims that he began the Reformation from selfish motives and would show that he got the teachings right out of the Book of Romans where they are. But they had the evidence and they presented it and

it is very interesting evidence and I think it's very vital evidence of the fact that Luther was moved by the Bible rather than by any temporary circumstances in what he did. Temporary circumstances led him to speak but the Bible gave him the things to speak about - and it was Romans more than anything else. Then Luther published this commentary on Romans and one day two hundred years later in London, a man who had been trying to serve the Lord for many years without much success - he'd worked awfully hard, very methodically, but he had very little to show for his efforts and he was pretty discouraged. He was sitting in a place in a little Moravian hall in London and somebody got up and said, "Here's something we'd all be blessed by" and read from Luther's preface to his discussion of the Epistle to the Romans. And when John Wesley read it he said, "I felt my heart strangely stirred when I heard that" and he dated his conversion from then. Now I'm not at all sure that Wesley was not converted and a Christian before that time but certainly that's when he received the impetus that made him a great servant of the Lord and it was Luther's discussion of the Epistle to the Romans that did it

End of Record 32

and it gave John Wesley that emphasis on salvation by faith which was the great vital point in the whole ~~Wesley~~ Wesley work and which is so unfortunately neglected by the Methodist Church nowadays but was so very vital in all its work up till a comparatively few years ago. Well this book of Romans then is one that anyone who is to be effective in Christian service should be familiar with, should know, should study a great deal, and should present. It's one of the finest books to hold classes in, in Bible facts, to teach people what Christianity really is. We won't be able this year at this time to more than make a brief survey of some of its main contents. I hope that most of you have considerable familiarity with it. There are various ways in which it is outlined as is quite natural because he did not sit down to write a theological treatise under heads - A, B, C, 1, 2, 3, - he did not sit down to do that. But he sat down to take these very vital matters and discuss them and present them. I've looked at various outlines and I was a bit surprised to find that in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible they had a terminology which seemed to me to be perhaps a little clearer, as hooks to hang on the different parts of Romans, than any other of the outlines that I looked at. And they divided into four parts of which one is just the conclusion and one is the introduction. But then they make the doctrinal part ~~XX~~, Chapter 1:16 through Chapter 11. And then the practical part, Chapters 12 to ~~XXXX~~ 15:13. And that's a very simple division of the book. Chapters 1 - after the introduction - through 11 is the doctrinal part of this great doctrinal epistle. And then Chapter 12 up to the conclusion - 15:13 - is the practical part. Now of course the whole book is intensely practical but it is discussion of doctrine and then the application to our lives. And I rather like that division there. ~~XXX~~ Most interpreters of the book agree that Verses 16 and 17 present the theme of the book. Right after the introduction he gives us the summary, the theme of the whole book. Verses 16 and 17 - "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith as it is written, The just shall live by faith." Here is the theme of the book stressed at the beginning. Before that it is his personal relationship to the people and how interested he

is in them and so on. But then here is your theme - and it's a very good way in writing if you can give a theme, a summary of the whole thing at the start. Some books do it and some don't, most don't. It's very nice that it's done here. And then the doctrinal portion of the book - this outline here in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible divides into two parts: A - the theology of salvation and B - the theology of history. I like that title - the theology of salvation - Chapter 1:16 through 8 and the theology of history-~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Chapters 9 to 11. Then the first of these divisions of the doctrinal part - the theology of salvation - he divides into two parts. He calls ~~XXXXX~~ small "a" under that - the theology of redemption X - 1:16 to 5 and "b" - the theology of the Christian life - Chapters 6 through 8. Some will say it is justification and then sanctification. I think this terminology is a little bit better because the justification and sanctification are not clearly separated in the book. But the theology of redemption and the theology of the Christian life I think is a very good way of putting it which gives you just exactly what's there without going into an attempt to make a decision on points ~~XXXXX~~ on which some interpreters will differ. Then the theology of redemption - which is 1:16 through 5 - he divides into two parts - the wrath of God and the righteousness of God. That's a very good terminology again I think. Now the Scofield Bible has substantially the same divisions in it but I don't think the wording is quite as neat. The idea is the same but - this wording is very neat - and that's why I like it. What he calls#the wrath of God, the Scofield Bible calls "the guilty world" and what they call "the righteousness of God" the Scofield Bible calls "justification by faith and Christ crucified, the alone remedy for sins". Now of course that tells you what it teaches and that's very good but I like the neatness of the comparison of the ones here. It's the same division exactly as is given here in the Hastings Dictionary of the Bible but the wording there is very neat - "the wrath of God" followed by "the righteousness of God". And then the "theology of the Christian life" the Scofield Bible calls that "sanctification, indwelling sin, and the gospel remedy". You see it's sort of a catch-all title. It means of course - well - what the Christian Life says - I think is perhaps a better way to give it though the other goes into more detail on what is contained in it. Then the

Scotfield Bible makes another division at the end of Chapter 8 which it calls "The full result of the Gospel". Part IV - "The Full result of the Gospel" just gives Chapter 8, Verses 14 to the end of the Chapter. I'm not sure that's necessary to make another division - I think it can very well simply go under the "theology of the Christian life" as the Hastings Dictionary does it there. Now we won't speak about the second part - "the theology of history" now. We'll look a little more at the first part. The salutation is a very beautiful salutation and it has in it of course many additional ideas. There are verses in it which by themselves/^{are} verses of real blessing. But the teaching of the subject of Verses 1 to ~~IX~~ 15, simply is introducing the subject to the people. It's very good in most cases when you write anything or when you speak, to give an introduction to establish a relationship with the people to whom you're writing. The Book of Hebrews doesn't do it. Hebrews starts right in to the middle of the subject. But most of our epistles do it. Most of them establish a point of contact - and Paul does that very well in the first fifteen verses. When he gives his theme in Verses 16 and 17, and then after he gives his theme, which ends with those words "The just shall live by faith." then he goes right into the subject of the wrath of God. I rather wish myself the archbishop had started a new chapter here because Chapter 1, Verse 18 on, is so different from what precedes, so utterly different. There's a very marked change there. It is going into the subject of the wrath of God against sin - "the guilty world" is a very good title for it too. The only advantage of "the wrath of God" is the parallel with "the righteousness of God" but "the guilty world" as the Scotfield Bible makes it has the meaning of why God's wrath is revealing against the sin of the world. And then in this section on "the wrath of God" or "the guilty world", Paul sets forth to prove that all Gentiles and Jews alike - he devotes Chapter 1 to the Gentiles and Chapter 2 is largely to the Jews - are in a condition of Judgment before God. I think there is much too much preaching that omits Chapters 1 and 2 of Romans. In the past there have been many periods in the world's history when everybody was so conscious of his sin, of his wickedness, that all you needed to do was to go and say, "Here is God's free offer of salvation. Take it." And there have been many people who have had a very difficult time ~~XXX~~ persuading guilty

sinner who were so conscious of the wickedness of their life, that they couldn't see how God could forgive them without their going into all kinds of misery, to persuade them that it could be just a free gift. Now perhaps today with Roman Catholics that may be the proper point of approach because with them, their church does lay considerable emphasis on the matter of sin and they have all the rites and forms they have to go through to get forgiveness of sin. And yet in the end there is a lightness toward sin among the Roman Catholics, but I think far more among nominal Protestants. Our life is in general so easy and so pleasant, at least in America today, that the sense of sin is not present to any great extent and I doubt if it was in Rome in the days when Paul wrote. And Paul devotes these two chapters to that point. And certainly a person can't realize the vital nature of salvation if he doesn't know what he's being saved from. The reality of sin. The tendency of our psychologists today is to ignore it - to say that after all you just want to get away from these guilt feelings that are injuring you. And yet if you read a little in psychology you find that what they find in the human heart is a wonderful illustration of the reality of sin. And I think you can get wonderful illustrations of the fact that this is really what is at the bottom of an awful lot of the nervous breakdowns and difficulties today. And many a psychologist tries to deal with them by getting you to turn your head away from it and forget there is such a thing as guilt. And it's not a very satisfactory way. But the fact of the guilt that they're trying to deal with is something that they often bring out. And some of the techniques they use I think we can ~~use~~ ^{learn} with benefit. Paul has used similar techniques here. He's talked in Chapter 1 about the pagan moralizers, the wonderful ideas that they have, and yet he shows what kind of lies the pagans, on the whole, were living. And the terrible sin of the pagan world is stressed here in Chapter 1 and he begins his section on the wrath of God with the statement that they are without excuse. There are three wonderful verses there which people have a great tendency to overlook today. The verses 19 and 20 particularly - the fact that the pagan is without excuse. You have some people today who in their very excellent and commendable zeal for foreign missions, take the rather illogical viewpoint that everybody in this country has heard

~~XX~~ the Gospel and doesn't need it anymore and the poor heathen have never heard it and all you have to do is go there and give it to them and they'll all just welcome it. And the fact of the matter is that in the heathen world and in America people are shutting their eyes to God and trying to put Him out of their heart and in it is necessary to convict people of sin. And in both cases the power of God is great unto salvation and it's only the power of God that can save a sinner in either place.

End of Record 33

so that he stresses here the fact that the pagans can see the invisible things of God from the creation of the world. They can see this so that they are without excuse. There's many a philosopher today who makes a wonderful argument to prove there is no God - but deep in his heart I think he knows there is one. I think he's kidding himself. I think he's trying to fool himself. But I don't think they have fooled many of our people into believing there's no God but I think they have fooled a great many of them into pushing it way back into their consci~~ousness~~ousness where it's not much of a fact. And the same is true of the pagan. Yes? (Student question) I don't think they are, no. But I think that some of our people perhaps are a bit more forgetful of them than they are. Yes. (Student question) We tend to have them dulled by the artificial things around us which ~~hide~~ hide them from us. They are a bit more conscious of the force of the elements. And of course they are conscious of forces which are beyond their control. We tend to feel that while there are engineers who can handle these elements, can build us houses where they won't hurt us, who can make a hurricane-safe structure, and they don't come so very often anyway, we tend to forget the power of God and yet ~~the~~ with all of our progress and science there's no one of us that goes very long without having someone he knows come into relation with physical difficulties that he simply can't handle - that get beyond us. And so we have that to bring us into consciousness of our weakness in the face of the universe. But the heathen perhaps has had a bit more of it. I think that's the main difference. (Student question) No, I think as Paul points out in this chapter here, they are without excuse but they have turned away from Him. We are without excuse, but we have turned away from Him. I don't think the evidence of natural theology brings many people to God but it does occasionally bring someone to the point where they are anxious to find out more. But in most cases they need a preacher to bring them to consciousness of their need of Christ and of the (3.). But there are cases where God works in most remarkable ways - no question about it - in the heathen world and in this one. But all are without excuse - because the natural world gives proof of God if a person will look at the proof. The heathen could look at the sun and he may think that it is an animal going through the sky that gets swallowed up at night but if he thinks very much about it, he realized that there are forces there which work

together in a wonderful way and he is without excuse for not finding himself in relation with those moral forces. (Student question) No, we don't want to worship Him 'cause we put Him out of our hearts. But we should want to worship Him. (Student question) Well there is that. There is, but men have put Him out of their minds and tried to forget Him. And of course the heathen religions to a very large extent, they try to satisfy the desire for worship with the substitution of something else. So there is the recognition of the need ~~for~~ ^{to} worship the universe - there's a great recognition of that but there's an attempt to force out of consciousness the true God, whose law is written in our hearts, and to substitute for it something that will keep down the feelings of our hearts and satisfy us. And that is in America and in the heathen world. And in any case in either one, the barrier that separates may be so thin that a finger can push through it or it may be so thick that you could slam it with a sledge hammer for years before making an impression. You can't tell in any case but God knows. And it's only the power of God that can convert a sinner. But the logical presentation that Paul gives here, that all are without excuse, that the things of God are clearly seen - His eternal power and Godhead - is something that needs to be made evident to our world, that needs to be brought out-in the heathen world and it needs to be brought out in America. And we have a tendency to neglect it. Particularly those who study a good bit of philosophy have a tendency to neglect it because the tendency is to think that because the philosophers say that there's no God, that therefore you've got to develop a very abstruse argument to convince them there is a God, when actually the evidences are here if we'll look at them. And they need to be emphasized. And Paul emphasized them here very beautifully - that people are without excuse but that they have turned away from God and they have filled their lives with wickedness and he describes the wickedness of the heathen world and it describes America just as well. It describes all the world apart from God. And then he turns his eye to the Jew and he shows that the Jew also is in sin before God, that the Jew ~~is~~ praises the law but he is not following the law. He is praising the doctrines but he's not living in accordance with them. And of course what he said about the Jew is equally applicable to the Jew today but it's just as applicable to the dead orthodox person today of which we have a good many - the person who accepts the doctrines but they make no dif-

ference in his life. Satan I'm sure is very orthodox and probably has a very correct understanding of the doctrine of the atonement but it doesn't save him. And it is possible to have a very thorough understanding of these doctrines and have it not have any effect on our lives. And so Paul's arguments here in Chapters 1 and 2, we're apt not to pay so much attention to as we do to the rest of the book because it's less pleasant for us and it seems rather obvious, but actually it's very vital, very necessary. And I think if you have a Bible class in the Book of Romans you'll find it very helpful to start with these first two chapters and make them clear. And I think in all our preaching it's good to deal with them. And what a wonderful ending that is to that second chapter, "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh, but he is a Jew which is one inwardly and circumcision is that of the heart in the spirit and not of the letter, whose praise is not of men, but of God." He says circumcision of the flesh is of no value, it's circumcision of the heart that matters. I think today he'd say to a great many people exactly the same thing about baptism. He'd say baptism of the flesh is of no value but baptism of the heart is what matters. That is circumcision and baptism are both of them external forms which are very excellent things if they present a truth which is believed in the heart, but which apart from the truth are of absolutely no value. And the tendency is to stress the external ordinance rather than to stress the inwardness. It's very interesting how Paul says this about the Jews, "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart." Now how different that is from the impression that some people get from some parts of Galatians as if he thought circumcision was a very bad thing, that it was a bad thing to be circumcised and that Judaism was a bad thing. Actually he says Judaism's a wonderful thing and circumcision is a wonderful thing. But it's a wonderful thing if you have the meaning of it and it is a worthless thing if it leads you to lean upon it and think you have something when that's all that you have. Well this section on the guilty world - the wrath of God - runs through Chapter 3, Verse 20 - and in Chapter 3 the first 20 verses, he is continuing the theme

that the ~~man~~'s wickedness is universal and that every mouth that the law says - those who are under the law, and the conscience says to those that don't have the law to express God's desire, in order that in the two ways every mouth shall be stopped and all the world may become guilty before the Lord. That's our first duty as preaching the Word - is to make all the world guilty before the Lord. They are guilty - but to bring them to their realization of their guilt. "Therefore by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Then at 21 he starts the new section, "The righteousness of God bringing redemption to all" or as the Scofield Bible entitles it, "Justification by faith in Christ crucified, the alone remedy for sins". This section on the theology of redemption running up to the end of Chapter 5 according to his division here - the Scofield Bible I think makes it the beginning of Chapter 5 - this section. The righteousness of God, the presentation of the basic things of justification by faith. He starts in in 3:21 defining justification, showing it's the universal remedy. It is equally applicable to the Jew and to the Gentile. It is ~~XXXXX~~ apart from ordinances and it is apart from the law. It alone is the only means of access to God. And then the third part, which the Hastings Dictionary here calls "The Theology of the Christian Life" the Scofield Bible calls "Sanctification: indwelling sin, and the Gospel remedy". "The Gospel Remedy" is a peculiar phrase. People often think of the Gospel as being simply the redemption. But I think it's very good how he says, "Sanctification: indwelling sin, and the Gospel remedy". The Gospel doesn't mean simply justification. The Gospel must include every phase of the Christian life. We can't divide it up and say "We're justified now that can be completely forgotten." We still need justification for our sins after we're saved. But this justification we have already received. As Christians we mustn't look for justification but praise God that we have it. But we must praise God we have it. The Roman Catholic Church has developed the absolution form whereby a person goes before the priest and confesses his sin and the priest gives him absolution. It gives a false understanding. But I think there is yet a true (14.) involved in it that it is vital that the Christian recognize the sin that he , that he look at it, that he see his guilt, and then that he recognize that in the atonement he has the absolution from it, that Christ died for it and that when he accepted Christ

this sin was forgiven. That doesn't cut down his sorrow at having committed it after he was saved but I think the recognition of the need of justification extending over our (14.5) is very vital, The recognition of the need and the thanksgiving that it is an accomplished fact. And so the Gospel continues and our justification continues to be a very vital point all through our Christian life. Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ

End of Record 34

Epistle to the Romans and we notice that a pretty good division of it would be Number 1 - Introductory (just the first 15 verses) and then Number 2 - Doctrinal part (and the Doctrinal part we divided into A - Theology of Salvation and under that Number I - the Theology of Redemption. And the Theology of Redemption - we have the theme - Chapter 1, Verses 16-17. Then the discussion of the theme we have two parts - small "a" - the Wrath of God and "b" - the Righteousness of God. And the Wrath of God is Chapter ~~1:18~~ 1:18 to Chapter 3:20 - and a very important section it is indeed, a section which merits a great deal of study not only for its presentation of God's judgment upon sin but also for its presentation of what we call general revelations. Not that there is ~~anything~~ in nature anything which would teach man that God is a loving God or that salvation is possible. Perhaps even it would teach that He is a just God, but certainly it would teach that He is a powerful God. It would teach His existence and His power and the reasonableness of seeking how to get in relation with Him. And then ~~XX~~ we find in our conscience a law of God written and we have a responsibility to find the answer to the problem there. And if anyone truly seeks to find the answer, I have confidence that God will bring him the answer. The Scripture says that all have sinned, "there is none righteous, no not one." But there are some who seek. But ~~the~~ one who truly seeks, I believe finds. Well then the Wrath of God - Chapter 1:18 to 3:20. Then we notice the Righteousness of God - 3:21 to 5:21. That is 2½ chapters here on the Righteousness of God - another term for that of course would be "justification by faith" - God's answer to the problem of man's sin. And it starts right out - the key presentation of the whole thing, "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets: even the righteousness of God which is by the faith of Jesus Christ." And then he goes on and explains what justification is and shows that it is nothing strictly new - in Chapter 4 he tells us that Abraham was justified by faith, that justification by

faith is something which was given to Abraham. It came to him but it is not restricted to those who are of the seed of Abraham. Because when Abraham was justified by faith, he was not yet circumcised. It says in Chapter 4:11 that Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." What then did circumcision mean? He says it was a seal of the righteousness of the faith Abraham had yet being uncircumcised - that he had faith in God, that God would save him through God's Grace alone and God gave him a seal of that faith, the seal of circumcision. But he received this justification by faith, not after he was circumcised but before circumcision was a sign of it - not the means of it but simply the sign of it. And then we have the Righteousness of God, justification which is apart from the law developed and its results explained in Chapter 5. Then that was Number I - the Theology of Redemption. Then we have Number II - Chapters 6 - 8 - which I like the Hastings(?) Dictionary - The Theology of the Christian Layman. It is not apart from justification but it is built upon justification. And consequently we do not leave justification behind - but we carry it out. We find its fulfillment in actuality. Because while justification has nothing to do with what we do, and is entirely based on what Christ has done, yet if justification is real, it will inevitably be followed by sanctification. And so how do we get sanctification? How do we get sanctified? Well we have the first way given here - that sanctification comes by union with Christ in death and resurrection. It's not by struggling against sin, it's not by giving in to sin, but it's by union with Christ. Chapter 6:1-10 deals with that very clearly - that sanctification comes by union with Christ in death and resurrection. Then Verses 11-13 - sanctification comes by counting the old life to be dead and by yielding the new life to God. You might say this is the same thing that we've just had. It is the same thing - but it is its outworking in our lives. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." We had a day of prayer about two years

ago where this was the theme and was wonderfully effectively given by Mr. Conant. Being dead to sin - the only way of sanctification, not a different way from the first - by union with Christ, but the outworking of it. And then III - by Deliverance from the Law through Death and by the Spirit. The two are so closely connected, you cannot separate justification and sanctification. You just can't but logically you can separate them. But they're inter-related so that in actuality you can't. (Student question) The second was by counting the old life to be dead and by yielding the new life to God. Sanctification - the statement's almost as long as the three verses - but it really is the gist of the matter and it would be too bad to just give a title that wouldn't express it. And then Chapter 7 continues ~~XXX~~ this discussion of the results of the method of sanctification, the results of justification in the life. And in Chapter 7 there is a section over which there has been tremendous controversy. What a picture there is, in the last part of Chapter 7 of the strife of one to obey God. And there are those who say this is a picture of the unbeliever. And there are those who say this is a picture of the believer. And all sorts of ink has been expended, and pages have been covered with the discussion and people have become very heated over insisting whether this is the believer or the unbeliever ~~XXXXXX~~ who is discussed in Chapter 7. And I personally believe that a very important principle in Bible interpretation is this - when you find a big argument over the meaning of a passage on which great and good men take both sides, ask yourself this question - what is there in common between the two sides of the argument? And very often you will find that what is in common between the two sides is far more important than what is in dispute between the two sides. Very often you will find ~~that~~. And if a matter in the Scripture is so vital that the Lord wants us to definitely understand it a certain way, He's apt to emphasize it and repeat it. He wants us to study and get all we can out of the Scripture but in our haste to get that where there is difference of opinion, we often miss that which is most important because it is rather

obvious~~E~~. That's one thing I am coming more and more to the feeling of about Hebrew and Greek - that in both Hebrew and Greek you get principles by which you can take some very obscure passages and you can study them very thoroughly and you can get points on which great and good men have differed and you can reach a conclusion which of them are right and all that is valuable. But it's not one-tenth as valuable as is the ability in Hebrew and Greek to take obvious facts and see that which is perfectly obvious to anyone who knows just a reasonable amount of Hebrew and Greek, but which you cannot get in any translation. It wont translate, it wont carry over. But it's there and it's easy to see. The difference between the Hebrew Perfect and Imperfect - you can't express in English exactly - but you can see it. Many a point you have to insert words in English to make the meaning clear. If you don't it makes no sense in English - but as to the exact words to insert, there may be difference of opinion. Well, once you know that fact you can read the Hebrew and see that fact. There are cases where the Hebrew can be 3rd Feminine Singular or 2nd Masculine Singular - which is it? You can't tell. It's not half so important to decide which it is as that you see that there's a possibility of both interpretations on that passage and that it cannot be 3rd Masculine and it cannot be 2nd Feminine. It's either 3rd Feminine or 2nd Masculine. And so when we come to this fact and we find in Chapter 7 here a picture of a man struggling, struggling to obey God and failing to the extent that he says, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" The important thing is not to decide whether this is a picture of the unbeliever or the believer, but to recognize that it's true in both cases - to recognize that the unbeliever is in a position where there is absolutely nothing that can deliver him from the power of sin over him, except the grace of God and to realize that the believer is also unable to gain the victory over sin except through the grace of God - that it is all of God in either case. And if you want to build a doctrine

that is absolutely unanswerable, you try to prove the description of the unbeliever here and somebody says, "No, it's the believer". Then you try to build a picture of the believer and somebody says, "No, it's the unbeliever". So you cannot build a doctrine ~~XXXX~~ upon it without finding it taught elsewhere and you do find it taught elsewhere about both. But you can get the practical help from it for either one because it fits both and applies to both. And as to whether explicitly Paul meant this one or that one - it describes both and it describes the situation of man at all times. Man is helpless apart from the grace of God ~~X~~ before he's saved. He's helpless apart from the grace of God ~~XXX~~ after he's saved. And the picture here in this seventh chapter is a marvelous picture of man lost in sin. The unbeliever lost in sin - he struggles, he fights, he tries to overcome and then he's just apt to give up and say "There's no use. We might just as well give in to it." But the believer also if he struggles in his own power, he gets nowhere. It is through the grace of God. What is the answer - "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." That's the answer either way - to the unbeliever to be saved through Christ, to the believer to reach sanctification through what Christ does for him. And then we have that glorious 8th chapter - and there are divisions of the book which divide the 8th chapter in the middle. Personally I think that 8th chapter is such a wonderful unit that I hate to divide it up.. Now maybe that's due to the habit of seeing it together. I've read it so many times as one great unit and I just hate to divide it up if we can possibly help it. The Scofield Bible starts a section called "Full Results of the Gospel" at Verse 14 of Chapter 8 to the end of the chapter and connects what precedes with the section on sanctification. If you take this title "The Theology of the Christian Life" I don't see why you can't keep the whole 8th chapter

I don't think it's so important where we make our division but that we see the progress of the thought. And the divisions are not as a rule watertight anyway. It's a gradual shifting from one subject to the other with sometimes a very sharp demarcation. We're in justification in general in the beginning of Romans, then we're in sanctification. In Chapter 8 you're getting to the end of this doctrinal section where you're reaching the heights of glory in the results of what Christ has done. There are of course different themes discussed in it. The first verse of it the Scofield Bible considers as the end of Chapter 7 rather than a beginning of Chapter 8. The fact of the matter is you can take it either way - it ties the two together. You don't want to separate it from either one - "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Certainly it doesn't make sense without Chapter 7. But neither does Chapter 8 make sense without it. It leads right into Chapter 8 which continues the discussion of the theme of Chapter 7 through the first half of the chapter. Then we get the wonderful results of the spirit within us crying "Abba Father" and in Verses 18 following, we get a glimpse of the wonderful future that God is going to work out. You don't have much eschatology in these doctrinal epistles before you get to Thessalonians that deal primarily with eschatology. But you've certainly got a very vital eschatological section here from Verse 18 on. You have the promise that the creation is going to be delivered from suffering and death. "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature ~~XXX~~ (and here the Greek word can just as well be rendered "creation") waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ (again "creation" - that is, if it's "creature" it means the bodily portion of the human being, which is the created portion of the creation. If it's "creation" it means our human body plus everything else. It refers to the material things with the principal emphasis on us

so either translation is all right. The two overlap here.) ~~was~~ was made subject to vanity." Our body was made subject to death - the whole creation was too. "not willingly but by reason of Him who hath subjected the same in hope. Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ (and here the same word is translated "creation" - it was translated "creature" before. When you say the "whole creation", you mean creation rather than creature. But the creature is a part of creation - so neither translation is wrong but it is good to just recognize that it's the same word.) groans and travails in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves, also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." - Is healing in the atonement? Certainly it is. We wait for the redemption of our body. As a result of the atonement of Christ we are to have bodies free from weakness, free from suffering, free from sickness, free from the possibility of death. It is in the atonement, it is won by the atonement, we would never have it apart from the atonement. Is complete sanctification in the atonement? Yes, we would never have it without the atonement but it doesn't come to us in this life and neither does complete healing come to us in this life. God may choose to heal any sickness we have but the creature is groaning, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God - and the time is coming when the whole creation will be free from the bondage of corruption in the glorious liberty of the children of God. I think that all Christians recognize that we are to have a Resurrection body which will be free from suffering and sickness and weakness. That we are to have that. And so the teaching of this section on the fact that we are to receive this Resurrection body is something on which all Christians believe but many overlook the other fact of it, that it's the whole Creation that groans and travails and that the whole Creation, not just our bodies is going to be delivered from the bondage

of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. So there is a promise here that the whole Creation will be delivered from the curse and it is the result of the atonement. Not to come now - it might come, it might come tomorrow, we don't know when it's going to come. It'll come when God chooses to give it to us - and that date is a secret which He has kept. He wants us always to be ready for it. But it's a wonderful promise and it's wonderful to have an understanding of that. Paul had a thorn in the flesh for which he prayed for a sign that God would take it away. God did not take it away from him. Well, if Paul couldn't pray well enough to get himself cured of illness, how do you think you or I can pray well enough to get ourselves cured? Well, if it's how well you can pray that'll do it - you certainly can't pray nearly as well as Paul can - but if it's a matter of what Christ's purpose is, it might be his purpose to heal any one of us from any particular illness - though it was not his purpose to heal Paul from this particular illness. So that we have complete sanctification guaranteed us by the atonement, but not in this life. We have complete freedom from the death which came as a result of the fall - from the imperfections of the human body - guaranteed as a result of the atonement, but it comes when Christ determines. And meantime we have a foretaste of both in that He is giving us advance in holiness in this life through the power of Christ and He may give us deliverance from any particular illness in this life, and He wants us to pray, but He wants us to pray that His will be done rather than to feel that we have a right to demand a freedom from suffering. There may be a suffering that He wants us to have for a purpose of His own. It may be His will that we go through it. Well, this is a wonderful chapter, this eighth chapter - the great climax of the doctrinal section of the Book of Romans. And ending with that wonderful passage, "What shall separate us from the love of Christ?" And he gives such a catalog of all the various things and he says none of these can separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord. And then that completes the doctrinal portion of the book. And then the next section is called in here "The Theology of History" - excuse me, that doesn't complete the doctrinal section. It com-

pletes under 2-A - "The Theology of Salvation". B is "The Theology of History" Chapters 9 to 11. From any viewpoint, 9 to 11 are a unit - I doubt if anyone in giving us an outline of Romans would give an outline that did not make Chapters 9 to 11 one group apart from the rest. I like the title here in the Hastings Dictionary for it - "The Theology of History" very well. It is an explanation of God's plan in relation to this matter of how we can be saved. "Theology of History" is not a full title but it gives the idea of it. It's called - in the Scofield Bible - part V - "Parenthetic - the Gospel does not set aside the covenants with Israel." I'm not sure that it's necessary to say "Parenthetic". It is parenthetic in the sense that we are discussing the Christian's life, the Christian's salvation, and in 12 on - we go on to the Christian's service. But this is certainly a vital part of the Christian's understanding. It ~~XXXX~~ deals with a problem and in solving this problem we get an understanding of ~~THE~~ God's plan which makes the whole Bible much clearer to us. And so this section, "The Theology of History" has five verses at the beginning in which the problem is presented. The problem is the problem of the rejection of Israel. And here is the problem - Verses 1 to 5 - "I say the truth in Christ. I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Spirit that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart for I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ from my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh who are Israelites. To whom pertains the adoption and the glory and the covenant, the giving of the law, the service of God and the promises whose are the Father's and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came who is over all God blessed forever. Amen."

In other words here are the Israelites who have had such wonderful privileges and through whom Christ came into the world and Paul sees Gentiles receiving the Gospel, Jews also, but more Gentiles than Jews. He sees Israel as a whole rejecting the Gospel, though many receive it. He sees it being received more greatly among the Gentiles. And so the problem that Paul takes up here is Israel's rejection of the Gospel - national Israel's rejection. What can we

do about this problem? He would that he "were accursed from Christ" from his brethren - that he could take their place because he feels so sorry to think of their not seeing what it means - the offer of Christ for salvation and being saved through Him. Well, the problem is studied in three relations. Hastings Dictionary here has a very good division-in relation to the past, in relation to the present, and in relation to the future. He compares the problem in relation to these three aspects. Now the past - what is ~~x~~ it - the promise of God. In relation to the promise of God - and he sees in the first place that the promise to Israel was never tied to mere fleshly descent - right from the start. That is brought out in Verses 7 to 13. It never was tied - Verses 6 to 13 rather - it never was tied simply to fleshly descent. He says, "For they are not all Israel who are of Israel, neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all children but in Isaac shall thy seed be called." The Scofield Bible has a very nice heading here - "The distinction between Jews who are mere natural descendants of Abraham and Jews who are also of his spiritual seed." This distinction is one which is not new in the Book of Romans. He's brought it out earlier - that circumcision really should be of the heart, not just of the flesh, that it is a matter, and has been from the very beginning, of the spiritual relationship to God and not of mere fleshly descent or of mere human rites and ceremonies. And then from Verse 14 on he shows that it always was a matter of the divine election. Verse 14 through 29 - that God saw a spiritual seed, not just a physical seed and that God has, from the very beginning, selected and elected those who would be saved. So we have this discussion about God's sovereign will here - this wonderful discussion here of the fact that God chooses those whom He is going to use for certain purposes. It's the greatest passage on the sovereignty of God in the whole Bible. It's one that some people find very difficult but it is a part of the Bible and it expresses God's sovereign action in salvation.

a paper once - 20,000 words on this section here - when I was a student in seminary. I won't bother you with it now - thought I'd just mention it in a few words. (Student question) No, it is not. But it's a section that opens up so do all the books of the Scripture - but particularly this book of Romans, any part of Romans you dig into, it's endless what you'll find. But then he goes on to discuss it in relationship to the present and relationship to the present - 9:30 to 10:21 - that's the end of 10. The present - the responsibility of the rejected. As far as the past is concerned, we've noticed God gave his promises, yes. But the promises were always meant for the spiritual seeking not for necessarily everyone of the fleshly seeking. And God always maintained His right of election in connection with His promises. Of course you can find endless illustrations of that in the Old Testament - where he chose the one instead of the other - not in accordance with mere blind will but in accordance with His wisdom. "Not for any righteousness we have done but according to His love and His wise plan." But now some people will take this and read it and they'll stop there and they'll say, "Now look at here - anyone can be saved if God chooses to save them. He's lost if God doesn't chose to save them. That's all there is to it." Remember when they had the Haystack Prayer Meeting up in New England? And these men prayed for the conversion of the heathen and as a result of it the First American Foreign Mission work was begun. And then they came to the church and tried to get people to be interested in the work. And one of the leading men got up and he said, "Young men, if the Lord chose to convert the heathen He'd do it without your help or mine." And of course the fact is that the Lord can do anything He chooses without your help or mine, but He chooses to use our help. He chooses to do things this way in this age. And it is true that those whom God has elected to salvation, He will save. And His Divine Election is a vital factor but there is an equally true other factor - the responsibility. And while God says that He will save whom He will save and He has entire power

over it, He also says that no-one is lost that does not fully deserve to be lost. And that anyone can accept Christ if they will. And if anyone will choose to seek, they will find. He will send them the message if they seek it. And so we have here then the present situation - the responsibility of the ones rejected that they have not followed the way that God desired them to come and made clear they should come. Verse 30 - "What shall we say then that the Gentiles which followed not after righteousness have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness of faith, but Israel which followed after the law of righteousness hath not attained to the law of righteousness? Why?" he says - and after what you've heard before you feel like saying "Because God didn't elect them." But that's not what he says - "Why? Because they sought it not by faith but as it were by the works of the law." It was because they sought it in the wrong way. And we can make the same mistake. We can seek salvation through forms and ceremonies, carrying on the outward observances of religion. You can seek salvation simply by reading the Scripture and going through the form of prayer and it will never save you. "Because they sought it not by faith" and then he shows how it was written right in the Old Testament - salvation by faith. "Behold I lay in Zion a stumbling stone and rock of offense that whosoever believeth on Him shall not be ashamed." And then he continues discussing Israel's mistake this way, Israel's doing the wrong way, not seeking salvation in the way that God desired them to seek it and he quotes from the Old Testament to show that it is the teaching of the Bible right from the beginning that by faith in God's provision can man be saved and only in that way. By faith in - we know it's Christ - before Christ's coming they didn't know the word - but they knew the substance of it - that it was God's provision and ~~XXXX~~ faith in that which God would provide anyone could be saved. Way back in the wilderness they raised the brazen serpent that whosoever looked at the serpent, when he was bitten, could be saved - to show him that by looking to God and accepting the provision God made, he could be saved. It's not just a promise somebody'll be able to do that in the future, it's a

declaration of how they could do it then. "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." That verse ought to be back in the doctrinal portion shouldn't it? It's an expression of redemption. But you don't leave redemption when you leave the doctrinal portion. It's all through - everything is based upon it. "For with the heart man believes through righteousness and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation" and then here we have this wonderful missionary passage in which he says, "How shall they believe - how shall they believe in Him whom they not believe, how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard and how shall they hear without a preacher?" They need to hear the message and then he says in Verse 20, "X Isaiah's very bold and says, 'I was found of them that sought me not. I was made manifest unto them that asked not unto me, not after me.'" Does anybody have a Revised Standard Version here by any chance? Godd - Mr. Caldwell could I see it for a second, please? Thank you. Oh no, this is the Revised Version. Yes, thank you. I mean the modern one. I hadn't seen it in that binding before - I was a little surprised. No that's the American Standard which is a very good translation. I wish it were more modern than it is - the English of it is still pretty old but it's a very good translation and somewhat modernized. But the Revised Standard Version if anyone had it I'd read you exactly what it is. I didn't think to bring mine in with me. But this verse here - it translates substantially as you have it here" But Isaiah is very bold and says I was found of them that sought me not. I was made manifest to them that asked not after me." Paul quotes this verse here to show that God predicted the calling of the Gentiles and the turning away of the Jews. And the Revised Standard Version gives us a good translation. But they have a footnote and it refers you back to the verse in the Old Testament which is here quoted - Isaiah 65:1 - and when you turn back there you'll read that Isaiah say, "I was ready to be found of them that sought me not." - which completely changes the meaning - completely.

When you do that, that's why I said in my article in Christian Life, it is a misnomer to call - to have the Revised Standard Version have on it "Holy Bible". Because it is not a Holy Bible - it can't be a Holy Bible - any Bible that accuses Paul of either being a liar or a fool, can't be a Holy Bible. And that's what it amounts to. Paul gives an argument that the rejection of the Jews was predicted in the Old Testament and says, "Isaiah says, 'I was found of them that sought me not'" and then has a footnote referring you back to the verse in Isaiah and then in the verse in Isaiah with not note of any difficulty or problem or anything, they simply translate, "I was ready to be found of those that sought me." And Paul says this proves that the rejection of the Jews was predicted in the Old Testament. Because he says, "I was found of those that sought me not" why he makes Paul either an utter ignoramus or a knave, one or the other. There's no way to get around it. The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament is a fairly decent translation but when you combine it with the Old, you make a book that is unholy because it translates the Old Testament in such a way as to contradict at place after place. And the New Testament writers build their arguments on what the Old Testament said. Over and over and over and in at least a third of the cases, they always give the reference - that's what our King James doesn't always do. But they do, they always give you the reference so you can't say they didn't realize it. It's right there. It's marked in the footnote and it differs in a third of the cases. And of course the reason is, they read the Old Testament and they said Isaiah couldn't predict the calling of the Gentiles. He never heard of such a thing. He never heard of Paul, he never heard of Christ, he must have meant something different. So they say it say, "I was found" but it must mean "I was ready to be found". And I've talked to several great scholars who just roll the words off their lips, " (10.) It has the meaning like the Greek "middle" - "I was ready to be". And I have yet to come across a Hebrew dictionary that says "Mitval" has the meaning "I was ready to be" And I haven't yet come across a Greek grammar that says that the Greek "middle"

has the meaning "I was ready to be" either. And yet these men who are real scholars just roll that off their tongue as if - why it's perfectly obvious it's like the Greek "middle" - "I was ready to be". I'm certainly no specialist in Greek but as far as I've looked into that, the Greek "Middle" is very different from that. And yet it's just a term - how easy it is to hide meanings under a term. And that is said and repeated today but actually I know of no evidence - now I'm not saying the Greek "middle" might not under some rare circumstances be susceptible to an interpretation like that. But it certainly - in the Revised Standard Version Old Testament I'd be surprised if you'd find five cases they translated that way. I'd be surprised if you'd find any. And the - certainly Paul didn't understand it that way and the Septugint translators didn't understand it that way. And Paul makes his argument here on the fact that ~~they~~ this was part of God's plan from the beginning. Isaiah predicts that the Jews who were seeking God would not find Him because they were seeking Him the wrong way. They were really seeking God but they were seeking to receive God's blessing through doing something for God instead of through accepting His free gift and giving themselves entirely to Him. They wanted to hold something back unto Him and that of course is the secret of all false approaches to God. And so the third portion of this, after having the past and the present, quite naturally the fourth is the future. The problem considered in relation to the future - and here this 11th chapter of the Book of Romans. And the 11th chapter of Romans says that this is part of God's plan, which we've already had presented, it is part of God's plan and it is part of God's election, part of God's plan, and the Jews had not sought it the right way but he says in verse 7 - the elect attained it and the rest were blinded. But the big thing he adds, he repeats in other words, the thoughts of chapters 10 and 11, but the big point he adds is a presentation of God's plan for the future. And here is where he goes beyond what the Old Testament revealed. He gives us what God has revealed to him and he gives it

in a wonderful figure here in verses 15 following he says that if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead? If the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy and if the root be holy so are the branches and if some of the branches be broken off" - some of the branches of what? Well it's quite evidently of God's people, of God's spiritual people, of that race, of that nation, of that group through which God is bringing His salvation to the world. "If some of the branches be broken off" - if a great number of the Jews refuse to accept Christ - they've been in the line of God's revelation, now they're broken off, they refuse to take the next step in line, to accept Christ. "If some of them are broken off and thou (he's speaking to you Gentiles) being a wild olive tree were graft in among them and with them partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree." Now what is he saying here? Was God's blessing on Israel and then He's quit blessing Israel and now He comes to the church? No. We have one continuous people of God. And this people of God, the election of Grace, those whom He chose for salvation included Abraham, saved by faith, and included the people in all ages who were saved by faith. And here is the people of God, which externally seems to be the whole nation of Israel though at all times there were those within it who were saved

End of Record 37

and we who are outside the people of God, we are grafted in with them. We partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree. What is our attitude to Israel to be? He say, "Boast not against the branches but if thou boast thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." We are the outworking of Israel. We are the carrying on of God's people. We are the further development of His plan. "Thou wilt say then the branches were broken off that I might be grafted in?" He say, "Well, because of unbelief they were broken off. He goes back to the second verse. "They were broken off because they did not seek it by faith. It's according to God's plan, it's His election and yet it is the result of their sin and their error. There's human responsibility. We had a man give us the Day of Prayer ~~speech~~ sermons down in Wilmington one time and in the course of it - I've forgotten what his sermon was about - but I remember one paragraph he gave that I was so impressed with. He told of somebody giving a sermon and in this sermon he talked about the sovereignty of God. And all the Calvinists present just smiled all over. And the Arminians looked kind of glum. And then he said he talked about the responsibility of man and he said the Calvinists looked glum and the Arminians smiled all over. But he said actually the Calvinists should have smiled both times because Calvinism is not a denial of the responsibility of man and a belief in the sovereignty of God. Calvinism believes both truths and if you put your emphasis simply on that truth which other people miss, and you miss the truth which they have in common with you, you'll soon get into a perversion. You'll get into an emphasis on one phase of Calvinism which is not Calvinism at all. But you look at Paul here and you take these passages on God's election, and how God chooses to do it this way and you get such a picture of God's sovereignty, there's nothing any Calvinist ever wrote that's any more Calvinistic than what Paul's written in Romans. But then you move right ahead a few verses and you find him saying, "Why are they lost? Because they sought it in the wrong way. Because they sought it through their own act. Because they did not choose faith - in other words their responsibility is there and

is vital and nobody was ever lost simply because God chose not to save them. Everyone who is lost is lost on account of his own failure to accept Christ and yet it is all ordained from the beginning of the world. Both are true and both are stressed by Paul. And if we stress either one to the exclusion of the other, we give a false picture. And so - and I don't know which of the two false pictures is the worst - either one is certainly contrary to God's will. And so he says here, "Well why were they broken off? Did God just choose you and reject them? That's true but that's not all of it because on belief they were broken off - "and thou standeth by faith. Be not high-minded but fear." But then he continues and says, "They also, if they abide not still in unbelief shall be grafted in for God is able to ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and were graft contrary to nature into a good olive tree, how much more shall these which be the natural branches be grafted into their own olive tree? For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved;" And so we have here the picture of the future that God is going to save all of Israel eventually. That all those who are living at a certain time in the future will be a nation born in the day, brought into the kingdom of God, brought into salvation through faith in Christ. And so we have here this problem of the rejection of Israel dealt with from the view of the past, the present, and the future. The rejection of Israel was only partial as expressed in verses 1 to 10 and was only temporary as expressed in verses 11 to 32. And then in verses 32 to 36 we have that doxology in which we have the wonderful praise of God's wisdom. It's a wonderful section with which to close this theology of history but it's equally wonderful to close the whole doctrinal section - the theology of the Christian life, the theology of salvation, the theology of redemption - a wonderful doxology, verses 32 to 36 - "For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things:

to whom be glory forever." And then in Chapter 12 you have the beginning of the practical part of this wonderful book of Romans. The practical part of the book reaching up to 15:13. And how much it has in it that is valuable to us in our practical Christian life and in our life together in the progress of the Gospel. And then those last few verses from 15:14 to 16:27 - the conclusion of the Gospel of the Book of Romans paralleling its beginning. Some people have thought this couldn't belong in Romans. This must be in Ephesians because how would Paul know this many people in Rome? He lived in Ephesus three years. He'd never been to Rome, yet how could he greet all these people in Rome? Well, you can make a pretty good argument it belongs in Ephesians instead of in Romans but as a matter of fact how do we know how many people he knew that had moved to Rome in that time? We have no way to prove it. And it is on the end of Romans and has been from the very beginning. There's no doctrinal point involved. If it should be, it belonged in Ephesians instead of Romans. There'd be no terrible harm done if we should find that out some time but I think it quite unlikely we'll find that out. That's a kind of an argument from ignorance. ~~SKXWE~~

So much for A-Romans and - not next Tuesday - next Thursday we won't take up the Corinthians-B - but I hope you all have a good Thanksgiving Thursday and a real good little rest over the weekend. We've been giving you a fairly steady schedule through this year. The Lord's work requires haste and we have much ground to cover. There's much to be done to get a decent theological course in three years and so I hope that you will take full advantage of the little vacation period. The first ten years of the seminary we had the full Friday after Thanksgiving but the last nine years we had vacation on Friday and - get a good rest and be ready to go at it again

We were still speaking about Romans the last time. I wish we had much more time to stress the importance of that section of the Theology of History - Chapters 9 to 11. That is surely a wonderful section of Romans - one which deals with so many matters that are of such great importance in our understanding God's plan. In that section he stresses the sovereignty of God and yet he stresses the responsibility of man. He stresses both of them and they both are vital. He stresses the continuity of God's revelation. God did not give one religion - the Jewish religion - and then give another one - the Christian religion. It's one religion. There is misunderstanding by Christians and there's misunderstanding by Jews. But the Old and New Testaments closely relate in the people of God - one people through the ages. The olive tree out of which certain branches are torn, into which wild branches are grafted, and then the natural branches are going to be grafted in again. There's so much in these chapters that is so very vital that I hope you will return to them again and again. And then the third section of the book - I'm using III as a subdivision of the outline. And of course in our main outline we're under Roman Numeral IV - the Pauline Epistles. But subdivision III of the book of the practical portion - Chapters 12 through 15. And whether to make it go clear through Chapter 15 or to make the end of the practical division somewhere in the chapter would be a matter of argument with the archbishop. Most interpreters think that the practical portion ends before the end of the chapter. I'm not sure it's necessary to make a division before the end. The last chapter is personal - regards to the people at Rome. Now he's speaking of his hope to come to Rome for some verses before that and so most people think that at about 16 or 17 you should make a division of ending the practical portion. Perhaps that would be good. Let's take it chapter 12, 13, and 14 and 15, simply the first 13 verses. And then start at 15:14 for the conclusion - to the end of 16. There's not a sharp division here. Sometimes you discuss a subject, you stop, you go on to another. Very often you make a gradual tran-

sition and that's what he does here. And so there's no sharp division - a division has to come right here - but there is a change of emphasis. He's talking about practical advice to the Romans and then he talks about the Romans as individuals, the Romans in particular. And so it's very practical the last part of the chapter but he is dealing with the Romans as a group and then in chapter 16 he's dealing with individuals among them whom he wants greeted. It's the salutation end of the epistle. And it has many little touches that are interesting in it, important to us in it. But the section previous to this conclusion section, the practical part, is so vital to our lives, it's one we must constantly study and deal with and make real in our lives and in the lives of the people whom God gives us to whom to minister. It's one of the greatest practical sections in the whole Bible. Romans - the greatest doctrinal book in the Bible, the greatest theological writing in the whole Bible. And yet it has perhaps the finest practical portions of any written anywhere in the Bible. Theology that is worth anything is related to life, it's related to practical service to the Lord, it must be so, and you find that here in Romans. So that Romans should be studied as a unit with all the sections related to each other and then each section studied as a section by itself. It is a carefully worked out theological presentation of the great doctrine of salvation, of justification, and of sanctification. It might almost be said to be the constitution of the Christian life - the Book of Romans. Now we go on to "B" - I've been using letters in the outline of the Book of Romans but now we go on in our main outline to B- First Corinthians. And in going from Romans to I Corinthians we make a transition that is very, very great - quite a change. And I think that the difference between Romans and I Corinthians (or you might say both the Corinthian epistles) is brought out very clearly in the point that we've already mentioned that Romans is the presentation of the doctrine. Corinthians is dealing with rebuke relating to this doctrine and Galatians is dealing with correction relating to the doctrine. Now of course these are not absolutely mutually exclusive. In

Romans he is interested in giving us correct interpretation and correct dealing and correct life but it is a logical presentation in a fully worked out reason structure of the doctrine - Romans is. Corinthians ~~has~~ also has very excellent explanation of doctrine and corrects ideas where they're wrong but it is in the main a rebuke, a dealing with people whose lives are not properly in line with the doctrine and urging them to come in line

End of Record 38

consequently I think we can say that the most personal epistles in the New Testament are I and II Corinthians. Now you say, "Yes? Is that true?

addressed to an individual." Yes, but they're telling the individual about his work in the church. There is some very interesting personal material in I and II Timothy but not a great deal. Philemon is addressed to an individual and is telling about another individual but it is dealing with a comparatively small phase of the life of Philemon and it is dealing also with a comparatively small amount of material, even though extremely vital material, in the light of Onesimus, who is being sent back to Philemon. But in I and II Corinthians we have individuals. We have a church which, holding to the truth, desiring to follow the truth is falling into attitudes and actions which need rebuke, which needs to be urged to come in line with the truth which they already know. And the result is that I and II Corinthians are perhaps the least-particularly II Corinthians - are perhaps the least orderly of any of Paul's epistles. They're more personal. They are - I Corinthians is very logical in its general structure but within each section of it you have the strong personal feeling. You have it all through II Corinthians. He is dealing with problems which have aroused his emotions. He is greatly stirred. ~~It is one thing~~ ^{It is one thing} to present the truth to people. It's another thing to come to them and see how they are wondering in their lives from the truth that is presented, and

try to get them to bring their lives in line with the truth which they already know. And so Paul is writing I and II Corinthians in a situation of tremendous emotional upheaval in relation to his attitude toward the Corinthian Church. He's disturbed. He's upset. And he's anxious that the thing be ironed out. And so this is a very important and effects the whole attitude of the Apostle and at first sight you say, "Well, he's all excited about some temporary situation. He deals with the situation. He sets the church right." If you're interested in Church History it's tremendously interesting to learn about the situation and what the Apostle did about it. But let's spend our study and thought on the logical presentation of the doctrine that he gives us." But that would be a false conclusion to draw. It is a conclusion which might easily be drawn from the general nature of the epistle but when you get into it, you'll find that though Paul is dealing with temporary situations of a particular church, they are situations which occur and reoccur in all groups of Christians. Perhaps not often in quite as aggravated a form as here but yet sometimes any one of them does in as aggravated a form as this and all of them are situations into which any church may easily fall. Consequently it is extremely valuable for us to learn about them and be on our guard against them and know how to deal with them in any group with which we are connected, before they become too serious. And so I Corinthians then is important in its subject matter to us even though it might seem to be a temporary situation of one church. But it is important to us even more than that. Far more than for that reason it is important to us because of the way that Paul deals with these problems. These are problems which he relates to the great vital doctrines of salvation. And he relates them to it in such a way that you can select from I and II Corinthians all sorts of little passages where Paul deals with one aspect of salvation or another aspect. And even though he's applying it to the local situation, he perhaps explains it more clearly or drives it home more fully or brings out certain aspects of it or certain vital relation-

ships of it in a way that it's done nowhere else. And so for a logical presentation of the Gospel, go to Romans, not to Corinthians. But for a mine of gems, passages short and long dealing with very vital aspects of the Gospel, you will find it hard to beat Corinthians. The very fact that it's more personal, it's dealing more with particular situations, makes various portions of it have almost a greater grip upon us, on our emotions, ~~and~~ a greater ability to be used as a text to open up these great fields than even some of the sections in Romans. Romans is the place to start, not Corinthians. 25

But Corinthians are epistles which are worthy of a great deal of study and many, many sections of which are worthy of memorization and of being dealt with very especially for their own sakes. Now this first Epistle of Corinthians is ~~an~~ epistle in which there are two main aspects of the logical division of the book. There is such a difference between the two main aspects of the book that we would be tempted to divide the book into two sharply separated portions and there have even been those who have suggested that it's really two different epistles, that they were written at different times and have been united here together. I don't think it's necessary to assume that at all. But I do think that Chapter 7, Verse 1 gives us a major division of the book. Chapter 7, Verse 1 says, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me" and then he goes on. Well, now it is not proveable that this introduces all the rest of the book. But a very good argument can be made for it - that this introduces all the rest of the book. The first part of the book would be introduced by Verse 11 of Chapter 1 - "For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren by them which are of the House of Chloe that there are contentions among you." I think we are safe in saying that I Corinthians, Chapters 1 to 6 deal with the matters which Paul has heard about the Corinthians. And Chapter 7 on probably clear to the end of the book deals with the questions which the Corinthians themselves have raised of Paul. And so you see it is not a division like in Romans according to differences of doctrine, vital progress in subject matter which logically fits together to give

a coherent understanding of the whole faith of God's truth - it is not that, it is a division according to a situation, according to the way that the matters came before Paul that he's going to deal with. They are probably all of them, certainly all of chapters 1 to 6 and a great part from 7 on, probably all of them deals with matters which Paul understands to be problems in the Corinthian church. And consequently he deals with these problems and he takes up first the things he's heard and then the things that have come to him in letters. Now did Paul get this letter and say, "Now I've got to get busy and write them answers to these questions. I'm glad these people are coming to me with these problems. They've written, they want to know what to do about this, what to do about that. What's the truth concerning this matter. I'm glad they've come and I'm going to write them an answer to it but I'm terribly busy here." Probably he was in Ephesus at the time. "I'm so busy with all the concerns here. I hope I get to this letter next week or the week after, maybe next month, maybe it'll even be next year. I hate to keep them waiting but if it's necessary, they can probably wait." And then these people of the household of Chloe tell him about situations there and he gets all ~~disturbed~~ stirred up and aroused and he says, "My, I should have written that letter before about those questions. Here are some matters even more important than those questions." So he starts in and he deals with the problems he's heard and then he goes on and he discusses the letters. Now that's conjecture. We know nothing about it except what is contained in the letter in I Corinthians. We have no other source of information. But the study of the letter shows us very definitely that at 7 there is a division. And study of the content makes it very reasonable to consider that the whole first six chapters deal with what he has heard from these people. They're not questions that would be raised in a letter. While everything from there on can very well be considered as reasonable answers to questions asked of him. And that is a great help in understanding the answers. Sometimes we have to figure out from ~~what~~ he says, what the

questions probably were. And then we can understand the answer. The question is not impossible to figure out so he doesn't bother to give it to us. I'm always glad in an examination when people copy the question at the beginning of it - especially if I have one or two papers to mark separate from the rest, it's nice to have the question stated right there though I, of course, have the printed paper with me so if it isn't there, it's no great handicap. But reading a thing cold when you don't remember what the questions were - it's vital to have in mind what the questions were and then you can make a fair judgement - how the answer is. Well Paul mentions some of the questions but others we have to infer. So we have these two divisions. Who are these people, the House of Chloe? It is thought most probable that Chloe was a merchant. He may have been a man in Ephesus, he may have been a man in Corinth. But most probably he had representatives who were going back and forth between the two cities. And consequently Paul had a chance to get up-to-the-minute information from these people. Perhaps there were two very fine Christians among Chloe's agents in Ephesus who had been won to the Lord by Paul and who were attending his services and who were sent down to Corinth on business and so they go and get in touch with the Corinthian Church. And they find warm, Christian fellowship and they're so happy in it that they find the church is all in commotion and upheaval and there are difficulties and troubles there and they get very much bothered about it and they come back and they tell Paul all about it. And it gets him very much bothered. On the other hand they may have been people who belonged in the church in Corinth and came up on the trip to Ephesus and then they sought Paul and they told him how disturbed they were about the situation. At any rate Paul felt that ~~ix~~ he had sufficient information to know what the situation was pretty definitely and he felt that he must write them right away and must try to straighten these situations out. And then whether he got the letter after he decided to write them or whether he had the letter in hand and hadn't yet answered it, we don't know. But 1 to 6 is Paul dealing with what he's heard about the Corinthian Church and probably

7 to 15 is Paul dealing with what he has been asked by the Corinthian Church. So those are the two main divisions of the book. Now in the first division, Chapters 1 to 6 - under that perhaps we might make an outline called Roman Numeral I - Paul's Discussion of What He's Heard About the Corinthian Church. And 7 to 15 will ^{be} Paul's Answers to Questions Raised By the Corinthian Church. And then in 1 to 6 we might call "A" - Chapter 1, verses 1 to 9. Some outlines of the book would consider this simply an introduction to the book. But I think it is more particularly an introduction to the sixth chapter. You better call it "Introduction" in any case - A - Chapter 1:1-9. But it is a very vital introduction because he lays the foundation for the discussion that he's going to give.

End of Record 39

Let's look at those nine verses: "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother" (Sosthenes is probably the man that writes down what he dictates but he includes him with him in the salutation which is a very humble act on Paul's part and a very courteous act to associate this man with him in this epistle.) "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus." You read on a little you wonder if many of them were sanctified but you notice he calls them "them that are sanctified~~XXXX~~ called to be saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both their's and our's: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ. I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ;" He's all stirred up because these people are divided up with contentions, they're at each other's throats, they've got terrible immorality among them and were going to law before the heathen against each other. And yet he starts, "I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ." These people were utter reprobates, there was no hope for them. Why should he bother to write them? The reason he bothers to write them is because they are people whom the Lord has ~~TAXXX~~ delivered from sin. They are a great treasure of Christ's and he is entirely sincere and when he says, "I thank my God always on your behalf." He's entirely sincere but many, many people wouldn't bother to do it. They would just go right on to give their rebuke. But the apostle here gives us an example. When you find it necessary to rebuke somebody, when you find it necessary to oppose somebody - of course if you are opposing those who are outside the fellowship of Christ, that's one thing. You are protecting the church as you can, you are opposing the forces that would wreck it. But when you are differing with those who are really Christ's, it is well to think of the things you agree with them, and to think of the points you have in common, and of your real love to them, and have that in your mind as you deal with them. And very frequently

it is very well to express it first. And when you have to differ with people, if you can first express your agreements with them, you're much more apt to find them ready to give a willing ear to the differences. And you, yourself, are more apt to understand the real bearing of the differences if you've related them to the points in common. And so he says, "I thank my God always on your behalf for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ that in everything ye are enriched by him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: so that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ:" This is strong language isn't it? They must have been a very fine church just fallen into a bad situation. "Who shall also confirm you unto the end" - Paul has confidence that God is going to work out the problems. God is going to make them blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. God is faithful, by whom ye were called unto the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." Paul has confidence in what's going to happen. And he expresses this and expresses his love for them and his interest in them as he starts, and then proceeds to show the things that are bothering him so much. And so verses 1 to 9 are an introduction, not in the sense of just a way to get started, but they lay a foundation for what he is going to discuss later. And then "B" is the first problem he's heard. In verse 10 he gives them a general exhortation regarding this problem. And then in verse 11 he declares what the problem is - "For it hath been declared unto me of you, ----- that there are contentions among you." Someone says I am of Paul. Everyone of you says one of the following things: (Certainly no-one said all four of them.) I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas, and I am of Christ. That the church is divided up into sections and into factions. I had a friend once who after his second year in seminary went out to take a church out in the hills out in California - this was in the old days when we were in the Presbyterian Church U.S.A. and there was this little church up in the hills there and he went there for the summer and he told me later, "When I got there I found there were 16 families and 16 factions in the church." So he had quite a time that summer trying to reconcile some

of those factions. But it's perhaps not as bad when you have that many factions as when you have less and the feeling is more bitter. But here are these Corinthians, they're in the one church but they're dividing up into groups. This group says, "We're followers of Paul" and this group says, "I'm a follower of Apollos." These say, "We follow the true doctrine of Peter, the Apostle who was nearest to Christ. We get our doctrine from him." And others say, "We don't like this business of following men, being for Paul, Apollos, or Cephas. We're just Christians, we're just following Christ." Which is wonderful - "I of Christ." We ought all to be of Christ. But evidently the way these people said that was such as to say, "You people aren't of Christ. You're exalting a man." Now of course if the other people really weren't of Christ then this Christ party was the right party. But the way Paul expresses it makes it rather clear - he puts all four of them on a par and he says that it is an entirely wrong approach. And so this is our first problem, our first matter that Paul discusses of what he's heard - divisions in the Corinthian Church. Yes? (Student question) Yes, that is a very good question and the answer to it must be gained from the words of Corinthians because we have no evidence elsewhere. I mean we could have evidence, there could be something in Acts that would throw light on it. This we can say - of the four named here - Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ - Christ had never come to the Corinthian Church in person. There was no one in the Corinthian Church who followed Him because He had come there and spoken. That is distinct from the others. Now Paul had been there. There are people who are following him ~~XXXXX~~ from personal contact. Apollos had been there and evidently Apollos with his great eloquence and his thorough understanding of Greek philosophy was able to present Christianity in a way that made some people say, "Oh this man Paul, he's all right if you like him but we like the way Apollos presents the truth." And Paul thinks Apollos is a grand man. He's not saying, "Apollos is wrong and I'm right." He's saying, "You shouldn't make divisions over who follows Apollos and who follows Paul." Cephas Peter is not mentioned in Acts as ever having gone to Corinth. Now maybe he went there. Maybe he went and they heard him speak and some liked him particularly but it would seem much more likely, in view of our having no evidence he ever went there, that somebody had come there who had been with Peter. Perhaps somebody had heard him on the day of Pentecost and said, "There's the real doctrine. That's what we should follow is Peter there. Paul and Apollos - these are just upstarts. They don't have the real truth like Peter did." It

would seem as a good guess that some individual who was closely devoted to Peter, through having had contact with him at some time, had built up a party there. Though the other is possible - we just don't have evidence. And with Christ it seems most likely that the interpretation I gave is the correct one - that people in saying, "We are of Christ" which would in itself be excellent, were saying it in such a way as to say that all these other parties were wrong and actually making themselves a sect as much as any of them if not more. We have that today - we have groups today that claim to be Christians in terms that seem to make out that other people aren't Christians when they may be very fine Christians but there are other very fine Christians too. We have not so many in this area - there are a few in this area - but there's a very large denomination group in the central states and down toward the South, a group which was formed over a divergence of opinion on certain doctrinal views. But one of their leading points was that denominations are all wrong. We should just be Christians and so they call themselves Christians and are one of the narrowest of denominations actually but they use that name. "You've got to take our view right down the line on doctrines and if you do you're Christians too." Well they have many very fine Christians among them. Unfortunately modernism is coming into their group as it is into all of the denominational groups in recent years. But that particular part of their approach is unfortunate because God works in many different groups. And we don't help ourselves by saying that other true Christians aren't Christians. Yes? (Student question). I am not familiar enough with the group to know that - doubtless of certain portions of them at least that's true. (Student question). I don't know how large a portion of the group that is typical of but evidently at least a portion and of course that's definitely wrong. (Student statement) Well, thank you for that word about them. I don't want to condemn a whole denomination without more than I know about it but certainly any individuals of whom that is true are definitely departing from the Scriptural Truth at that point. And I do think there is that - I have no doubt there is that tendency in the group as a whole. But I doubt if they would have grown to be quite as influential a group as they have if they had not among them been a good many real Christians people, at least at some time in their history. And just how many there are now, I don't know. Yes? (Student question - it's definite then that this trouble at

Corinth is not related to doctrine at all but merely personalities and procedures. Because Paul doesn't mention anywhere in the first chapter of any wrong doctrine.) Yes. As far as this particular problem, of this division, there is no evidence that Paul felt showed any real difference of doctrine. There might be differences of understanding of doctrine in which actually perhaps neither one would have a clear understanding. (Student - it was a lack of love on their part.) Yes, that's right. It was the human tendency to follow people. A man said to me the other day, "I'm thinking about a very serious question. I'm trying to decide what group of men I'm going to work with all my life. And it's a very serious question." I said to him, "You can't decide that question. I don't think you should try. Any group of men can change. All men are fallible. You decide what principles you want to stand for, what doctrines you believe in, and then if you can find a group of people that hold those doctrines and hold those principles, work with that group. But that group may change. You're not tying yourself up for life to work with any particular group." I don't think you should. I think Christ wants our allegiance to Him alone. I think we show our allegiance to Him by working with others. But we don't want to get so tied to any group of individuals that they come between us and Christ. I think that's very important. And here Paul felt that these divisions were something which were utterly out of place here. He felt that they should all be looking to the Lord and not even - even the Christ party there he felt was showing a sectarian spirit which was utterly wrong. So he discusses this matter of the division within the church as his first problem here which we probably should say he continues from 1:10 up through 4:21. That's a long section - four full chapters except for the introduction - on this one problem.

End of Record 40

Naturally touches on other related problems but he comes back to this again in Chapter 3, Verse 22, "Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, ("all things are yours: let no man glory in men" - Verse 21) or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come: all are yours and ye are Christ's and Christ is God's." And he ends this section with a very strong warning to them, "What will ye? Shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness?" He rebukes them very, very strongly for their factionalism here, a factionalism which is in some cases causing people to refuse to take Paul's teaching and Paul's direction on matters of great importance on which doubtless Paul and Peter and Apollos would have agreed. But when you refuse to take Paul, you refuse his authority and others refuse Apollos' authority and others refuse Cephas' authority, you have no way to get the order on these matters which is needed. So long as the three of them are standing together for the Word of Christ, these people should not put up a barrier that, "We don't take directions from this one." These directions should be from the Lord but they should not let the spirit of factionalism keep them from getting the Lord's Word wherever it may be. Yes? (Student question) Yes, there's a very great danger of that. The fact that Paul says they should not be divided into factions, following these men, doesn't mean that people shouldn't take a strong, clear stand for the Word of God and for all men who are standing for the Word of God and against those who are not. And on lesser questions we have to take our stand with men who accept the Word's teaching and against good Christians who are wrong on a certain point. ~~WE~~ But we take it on a viewpoint of the principles involved, not of the man. We can have great confidence in a man's wisdom, a man's judgment, and consequently have a tendency to follow his judgment much more than other men in whom we don't have that confidence. But yet we have to be critically examining his judgment always because any man can make wrong judgments and the Lord won't forgive us if we follow what is wrong simply because a very fine man has taken a particular viewpoint. (Student question) Yes, on that particular point and then one has to consider how important the point is. It's vital to make clear one's difference. But if there are much more important points which are being presented which will interfere with the impact by making too big a stand on this, it's well then to very gently express our differences but keep it from interfering with the impact. (Student question) Well, in that case it

would be necessary to differ very definitely. Well, this is that first division and I would recommend to every one of you to read and study and think about this division a great deal because it will effect all of us in our lives and in our attitudes. And in any group you get into anywhere, think this matter through here and be prepared on any problem that comes up to decide whether it is a matter of principle or a matter of personality. And stand for the love of Christ toward all personalities. But stand four-square on all vital principles and on secondary principles make your stand clear but consider whether the secondary principle is worth in any way interfering with the effectiveness of the primary principles. We have to stand with people we differ from on secondary principles, in order to advance the primary. And we have to decide in each case just what the situation is there. Now a man comes to me and he's a modernist minister and he says, "They're trying to put in a saloon right here, half way between your church and mine. Can we get up a petition together against it and can we go and appear before the city hall and object to it?" Well the matter of belief in Christ is far more important than the matter of whether a saloon comes into the town or not. But here is a particular matter which we're both interested in and which our standing together on will not confuse people and make them think we stand together on more important matters. And here's a matter where we can cooperate. We can sign this petition together. We can go together to the city authorities, we can object to the coming of the saloon and it is altogether proper that we should do so. On the other hand there may be an issue which he wants me to stand with him on which, if we do, we will confuse people by leading them to think that we stand together on more important issues and it is impossible to do it even though we agree on the lesser issues. Those are very vital problems that have to be thought through and Paul is not dealing in detail with them here but he's dealing with the big problem of the spirit of factionalism. And it is a problem which gets into every group of people everywhere at some time or other. It's a most amazing thing - I've gone through it several times in different places - and you'll get people who have some very minor difference of opinion, or perhaps there's a personal matter - jealousy of one another - something on which you have a group of a hundred people. And these hundred people - you could name fifteen issues and they'd divide fifteen different ways. You'd find all kinds of different divisions among them. But a

thing gets started where a few individuals get a strong animosity toward a few other individuals and pretty soon people begin lining up and lining up and lining up and taking sides - and next thing you know you have people who are all united on maybe fifteen points on which maybe on half of the fifteen the bulk of them would never have stood for it but they've gotten this spirit of ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ ^{factionalism} and they explain everything to fit in for those individuals they like and against those they don't like. And you get that spirit of factionalism. If the thing begins in your church, get after it with these four chapters. Deal with it strongly. Try to break it up. If you can't break it up and it gets developed you get to the time when rather than staying together and fighting forever it's much better to say, "You folks go over there and we'll go over here and let's each serve the Lord and let's pray that the Lord will help us to forget these personal things so that maybe He'll bring us back together eventually. But at present, when there's these attitudes toward each other, the best thing to do is to go on and serve the Lord separately rather than to try to work together when these attitudes have developed. But that had not reached that point yet at Corinth. It was at a point here in Corinth where this very strong exhortation of Paul's might ~~have~~ effectively put an end to this. And so he does not see any necessity of dividing the people up over these matters, but of leading them to see the folly of this sort of factionalism. And then the second problem that he takes up - the next problem here is a matter of immorality in the church. A special case of immorality. And to this matter of this special case of immorality he devotes the Fifth Chapter - Chapter Five - a special case of immorality. Well now we don't know the name of the man involved here. We gain a little from II Corinthians about what happened later to him but we don't know the full detail of it. But it is a matter of great importance here because everyone in the Christian Church is going to run onto problems of this kind. And how are you going to deal with them? It's very easy to go to one extreme or to the other extreme in dealing with these problems. And so Paul's dealing with it is of great importance for us in our Christian life and particularly in our organization of Christian life. There are other passages where he deals with the problem of our own personal avoidance of these things but here he deals with the question, "What is the church going to do when it has this sort of a thing coming into it? And he urges a definite separation. He urges a definite dropping out of the member from the

church so that it will be clear that this is not recognized in the church - this sort of thing. This immorality here is a case which is evidentially legally recognized. Some say this is perfectly legal. He says however, "It's such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles that one should have his father's wife." Has had a second wife who is perhaps no older than the man's son, perhaps younger, and there's been a divorce. And now the son has married the woman who has been divorced from the father. And he says this would not be so much as named among the Gentiles but in the church there evidently this man is claiming to be a real member of the church, a real Christian. He says that this is perfectly right what he has done. But Paul says that the church should judge it and should clear this thing out from among them. Verse 13 - "Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person." The connection between this and what precedes is simply a connection that there are two problems in the Corinthian Church. They are evidently unrelated. I heard of a church a few years ago where there was a big division in the church and there were two factions in the church and they ~~XXXXXX~~ differed on several different vital issues. And it would be easy on one issue to say this group's entirely wrong, this is right. But the trouble is there was another issue of less importance where that group was right and this group was wrong. But there was a clear line on several issues. And a man went in there and preached to them and dealt with them and tried to understand the situation and he said I have come to the conclusion that the real issue here in this church is the man who was minister here, who left two years ago, before the last minister, he had a separation from his wife. And half the church is convinced that Mr. So-and-so was right in the separation and the other half is convinced that Mrs. So-and-so was right in the separation. And that man was gone two years though the woman was still in the church. But he was gone two years. They'd had a new minister who'd been there two years and who had left and the church was just at sword points on many different issues but the real cause of it was this question - was this man right in that his wife had been such an unsatisfactory companion that he had to leave her or was this woman right that this man was utterly wicked in leaving. And that was the division and they got to where anything the others said, they were against. In this case that does not seem to have been the case. As far as we can gather, Chapter V here was not the cause of the division in the Corinthian Church. But it

was a problem which could have become a cause but was an isolated problem. And so that is the problem here discussed and it comes back again - this same one - in II Corinthians. The church is moved by what Paul says and acts on what he says and then he's afraid they've gone too far, they're dealing too harshly with him and he asks them to be a little milder. You'd never guess from this chapter he'd be mild with them. He evidently felt that here is this terrible thing that these people are just sitting down and paying no attention to and I've heard about it and something should be done. Then the people get all excited and deal with the thing in wrath and he says, "Yes, you should deal with it but not in wrath - but in love. Don't let the man get utterly discouraged and disheartened. I believe he is a true Christian. He made a very serious error there but I believe he is a true Christian and you want to win him rather than to guide him by what you're doing. But you were right in excluding him from your services until this matter was cleared up. " Well then the next problem is - Chapter 6 - is the matter of appeals to heathen courts. It starts at the beginning of Chapter 6 - well, we'll continue there this afternoon -

End of Record 41

We were looking at this First Epistle to the Corinthians - and looking at the first part of it - the problems which Paul had heard about them and which he is discussing. We took A as Introduction - not really one of the problems but the way he began the discussion of them. And then B - Divisions in the Christian Church and C - A Special Case of Immorality, Chapter V. And then D - the matter of Going to Law Before the Heathen. And sometimes the book is outlined in such a way as to consider Chapter 6, the whole chapter, as dealing with this subject. But if you do that you have to assume a great deal it seems to me about the last part of the chapter. I think it is probably better to say Verses 1 to 11 is all that really deals with this subject. Verses 1 to 11 - in a way you might almost say more Verses 1 to 8 but I think we can safely take in 1 to 11 in it because the connection of these three verses is rather close with what precedes. Paul is exasperated at the Church of Christians in Corinth - with the two members of the Christian Church there going to law in front of unbelievers and thrashing out their personal objections and difficulties there before the unbelievers. He says why don't you take the weakest man in the church, the poorest man in the church and set him up to judge you? Wouldn't that be better than going to the unbelievers. He doesn't say the church should establish a system of judging its members. He doesn't say anything of the kind. He's not talking to the church. He is talking to the individuals in the church. And he is feeling that they are bringing reproach upon the name of Christ by bringing their personal difficulties out before the heathen world in this way. He says why don't you get the very poorest of your fellows in the church? Put them up and have them judge you and think that you will get a truer judgment than go before the unbelievers in this way. I was once connected with a church where there came a big split in this local church, a big division with the leaders of the church mostly on one side and the minister on the other and the great bulk of the people agreeing with the minister. And the leaders of the church had the church in their hands and actually I think the minister had pretty close to a majority but maybe not quite. But I tried to get them to bring it together. And I went to these leaders of the church and it was involved over a matter of what the minister was supposed to have said about one of the women and a criticism he was supposed to have said of her and some of them were very much incensed and thought that he had done utterly wrong in that, while actually what he had said if you took the precise words probably was quite true to facts. But if you took the implication, maybe if you took the

tone of voice he said it in, it was quite wrong - I don't know. But I tried to get them to get an impartial body from the church selected - or get any group. I tried to get this group of them to say to the minister, "Now you pick some from the church and let them judge this matter - precise details on this." And for a while it looked as if they'd agree to it and then they were afraid that they wouldn't get a fair deal and in the end the church split. But I think it's exactly along the line that Paul presented here - to get away from this party spirit and to look at facts clearly - see exactly what the true situation is. And so he says, "You ought to be able to trust your brothers. Pick out the poorest of them but give them the situation and agree to do what they say." There's a great deal in civil life of this sort of thing being done lately. There's an organization called the American Arbitration Association, I believe, which has been formed within recent years and all sorts of matters, some of them involving tremendous sums of money are now submitted to them instead of having to go to law - and they examine the facts, reach a conclusion, and they save tremendous lots of time and effort and bother and many important things are being settled by that sort of an arrangement. Now Paul is just in passing recommending a deal like that but then he says, "Why don't you suffer wrong? Why don't you suffer yourselves to be defrauded rather than to take these personal affairs and go into courts before unbelievers to have them settled there." I don't know if any of you have read Laturnd's (?) life story - but in that book which came out ten or fifteen years ago I was greatly impressed with his story of a case where one of his fellow members of the church treated him very, very, very wrongly. And I won't take time to go into details now but the impression you get as you read it is that here was a situation where Laturno had every right to go to the civil courts and to seek a large sum of money from this man who had been his partner and had treated him so wrongly in this situation, but they were both of them active, witnessing members of this church and he felt it would bring shame to the name of Christ for them to appear before the public in such a way. And so he just let the man take these things, which he had wrongfully taken from him and the book says that in the next year, Laturno himself went on to receive most unexpected opportunities and to make several times the amount he had lost while the other man lost everything that he had so wrongly taken from him. In that particular case the Lord vindicated His justice, honored the man who let himself be de-

defrauded. Paul does not say, "Always let yourself be defrauded. Never go before the courts." He says nothing of the kind. He says, "Why don't you suffer wrong rather than to make a shame before the unbelievers." He wants us to deal in justice and truth but he wants us to very often be willing to give up what might be our right if we avoid reproach to the name of Christ by so doing. Well, this is a brief section I think - Verses 1 to 11 and then Section E - the last section of this ~~introduction~~ part on what he'd heard, is a very difficult one to know just how to outline it. Chapter 6, Verse 12 to 20 - is it a conclusion to this whole section? Is he dealing particularly with this matter here? Is he dealing with the eating of things offered to idols? Some have taken it that way but there's only one verse that really deals at all directly with that and in that even it's a matter of implication perhaps. I have expressed it this way - "Sensuality versus Matters of Expediency." Now I don't know as that's a very good title but I think summarizes what's in it. Paul is drawing in these verses a clear distinction between those things which are wrong in themselves, those things which do tremendous harm to the church and to the individual. And he deals very strongly with these matters but in introducing it he says, "All things are lawful to me but all things are not expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any." And I think what he is saying here is that there are matters in life, like the matter of eating food offered to idols, which are matters of expediency. And under certain circumstances it may be tremendously important that we abstain from them. But there are other circumstances under which we do not have to - and it is a matter of individual decision. But that there are many other matters that are matters of absolute right and wrong and in which it is vital that we follow what is exactly the right line. And it is far better to consider everything as matters of ~~w~~right and wrong, than to consider everything as matters of expediency. But it brings great confusion into our lives if we don't draw a distinction between these two sources. And the one who gets to considering everything a matter of expediency soon has no absolutely sharp lines in his life and he gets into all kinds of error and wrong. But on the other hand there are those who draw a sharp line and pretty soon they draw that sharp line on absolutely everything and that is not good. There are many points at which honest Christian people can differ greatly. And

there are points on which the same person can take two different attitudes because there are two different situations. And you have to consider the situation. And so he starts out with this, "All things are lawful to me but all things are not expedient". There are all sorts of things in which I have the right to decide and nobody has the right to draw lines for me. I must consider the situation and the Lord judges me on whether I make a right decision or a wrong decision. But then there are other things - as he goes on, the latter part of it - there are other things in which the issues of right and wrong are absolutely clear and it is vital that we make the right decision on it. In a way this is a sort of a transition passage. If Chapter 7:1 didn't start, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me," I'd almost be tempted to make the division between the two parts in the middle of Chapter 6. I think perhaps that's worth considering whether it might conceivably be back there, though his reference to the questions comes at the beginning of the next chapter, I think it's more likely the real division is at the beginning of the next chapter. But let's consider the beginning of the next chapter as starting the second main part of the book - Roman Numeral II - Questions Answered. And here - just in passing - on this point, we notice that again so often transitions are not sharp and abrupt. Very often we lead into the next section so the end of one section lays principles for the next and the new one may build on the first. So sometimes your division is like the tide of the ocean, like the shore where sometimes - where does the ocean end and the land begin? ~~XXXXX~~ Well, there are many places along the coast where's there's as much as a hundred yards' difference between low tide and high tide. And people are out here on the land - their children are sitting there playing in the sand - they're definitely on the land. And a few hours later it's deep water there. That doesn't mean that the difference between ocean and continent is relative and nobody can tell whether he's in the ocean or on the continent. But it does mean that the line between the two is not a hairline but it is a line sometimes as much as a hundred yards wide. And that is true very often in the Bible - that sometimes we have hairsharp transitions and it's very vital that we see that right at this point we stop this section and go on to this. But there are many other cases where the one leads into the other, the one lays the foundation for the other. And that is true in life of the greater number of transitions. You cannot tell exactly a sharp point. Well now the

second part of I Corinthians then - Paul is answering questions. And naturally his attitude is a little different now. He has been quite heated as he dealt with their problems, and rightly so - these are things he had heard about them, they were things that could cause great harm in the church. "What do you go to law against each other before the heathen? How dare you do a thing like that. It is commonly reported that there is immorality among you and such as is not even mentioned among the heathen. I hear from the House of Chloe that there are divisions in the church - that you all say this." He is excited about these things. But now he is more objective, you might say, in his manner as he takes up the questions that they have asked. Some of these questions there's been a bit of an attack on what he said and there's a bit of feeling in it still. But in general it's more objective - this second part of the book - Chapter 7 following. And the first question they ask him about is - various questions related to marriage. And so we'll make that A under II - Various Questions Related to Marriage. And here he does not state the question~~s~~ but it is quite evident in this seventh chapter that he discusses one question and then another question and another question and we try to infer what the questions are. And there is a difficulty along in the chapter that he discusses that if any man has a virgin - and it's generally considered that that means has a virgin daughter. But it is a little bit difficult to know exactly what the social relationship was that he's dealing with there. A man's relation to his unmarried daughter and so on, whether he should have her marry under certain circumstances or prevent it under certain circumstances - there is a section there that is a little difficult to be precisely sure about. But of the chapter as a whole it is easy to see that they have asked specific questions. Some say, "Well now" they say "here we are trying to spread the Christian Church and the Lord may come back tomorrow or the next day. Isn't it better that we shouldn't have marriage. That we should simply everyone devote his whole attention and effort to advancing the church and to leading people to know the Lord?" And Paul says to them, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me: It is good for a man not to touch a woman"

End of Record 42

can devote himself entirely to the Lord's service and not ~~NE~~ have to give time and energy to relations with women. He says he can perhaps accomplish far more in the Lord's service so he says, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman. Nevertheless" - in most cases it is far wiser that a man shall be married. And then he goes on to discuss the way a man is made and his needs and the normal life which is the Lord's will for most people and he says that there are circumstances under which a person can render greater service in the single state but that ordinarily the normal life is the life which will be the more honor to the Lord. And so he gives a very fine balanced discussion of this matter here and then he takes up, "Now concerning virgins" - Verse 25 - he gives his judgment - ^{"I have no commandment of the Lord.} ~~"I~~ give my judgment". There's no hard and fast rule the Lord has laid down, "This is what is right and wrong in this situation. Here is a matter of expediency. I give you my judgment for your guidance as the Lord wants you to handle each situation on its merits." But as he is giving this consideration of this very important aspect of life, there are little incidental touches in which he brings in matters of our relation to Christ and of our duty to Him. And so in all of Paul's sections, no matter what he's talking about, we find little side remarks that throw tremendous light on our relation to Christ. Well that's the first of the questions - those relating to marriage. And there are some verses in this chapter which everyone should read and ~~ponder~~ ^{ponder} for his own life. There are other verses in it which ought to be presented to every congregation so that people will have these viewpoints for living the Christian life. There are other verses which are very difficult to know the precise meaning - good for you to study some time. But don't let the difficulty in understanding certain difficult things in it, keep you from getting the great blessing of the many things in it that are clear and vital for us. But now the second problem he takes up is the eating of meat offered to idols - Chapter 8 through the first verse of Chapter 11 - to 11:1. And here we have ~~four~~ ^{three} chapters - 8, 9, 10, and the first verse of 11 perhaps should go with what precedes. But we have three chapters here which deal with this problem of meat or food offered to idols. Right away somebody will say, "Why on earth does Paul have to write three chapters about food offered to idols. The Jerusalem Council settled that matter. They were told that they must not eat meat offered to idols and now Paul devotes three chapters to it. Why doesn't he just say, 'Here's what the church has decided. Here's the law. Take it.'" Well, not only does he not say, "This settles the

matter"and be done with it. He doesn't even refer to it. In the three chapters he makes no mention whatever of the decision of the Jerusalem Council that they should avoid meat offered to idols. And I think that is sufficient to make it absolutely clear that Paul did not understand that the Church at Jerusalem had laid down laws for Christians. The Church never thought of itself as having any right to lay down laws for Christians. The Council was settling a matter of doctrine where there was a danger of false doctrine coming into the church which would require that the Christians be subject to the whole law of Moses. And the Council decided, "No, it is not necessary that the Christian be subject to the law of Moses." It was a doctrinal matter - keeping false doctrine out of the church. And then they went on after that to give advice - that since there were Jewish communities scattered throughout the empire, it would be a good thing for the Gentiles to try to avoid doing things that would bring offense to the Jews - such as eating meat offered to idols or eating things strangled or the blood. And that was a matter of expediency, of advice to them in a particular situation. It was not considered as a binding law. If it had been, certainly Paul would have at least referred to it here. More likely he ^{would have} ~~said~~ said, "Well, the law's been laid down by the Jerusalem Council on this. Here it is. And that settles it." But he never once refers to it in this very well balanced section of Chapters 8 to 10 here, which may seem to us not particularly important because we don't have the problem of eating meat offered to idols, but which is extremely important to us because the principle with which he deals is a principle of great importance to all Christians at all times. What about those matters in which there is no clear right or wrong? What about these things? Shall we try to find a definite absolute standard in the Scripture which we must follow? And Paul says, "No. If there's an absolute standard in the Scripture on anything we must follow it. It is very vital." But Paul says there are great many things in life which are matters in which you have to settle the matter in relation to the situation. You find here a weaker brother. He's going to be injured by the act you do. Don't do it. He says while the world stands I won't eat any meat at all if my brother will be offended by my doing it. He is willing to make any sacrifice to keep from offending the weaker brother. When I was teaching at another seminary, before I came here, one of our students was ordained. And I believe I

gave the sermon and the man who was president of the faculty ~~there~~ gave the charge. And in the charge I remember his saying this: That in his first charge there had been a man who thought it was very wicked for a minister to go fishing. And so he felt it was his duty to go fishing. And so he went fishing on every possible opportunity there to show his liberty to fish if he wanted to. Well, I didn't think that was in line with Paul's spirit here at all. I think there might very well be a situation in which a man had an idea which was wrong on a minor point and it would be much more sensible to conform to his judgment on the minor ~~XXXX~~ point than to make an issue of it and to lose the opportunity of a witness on a major point. If there is a major point, we have to stand on it regardless of what happens. But on a minor point we can act in such a way as to advance the kingdom of God and to avoid offense. And if a person feels that fishing is sinful and wicked and we're convinced it's not, we might have a long talk with them and convince them of it - that might be all right. But if you're going to give a series of a dozen sermons to prove that fishing is all right, you may think it's a good thing for this one person but you're wasting the time of all the rest of your congregation. They should be given to developing their spiritual life and teaching them to know ~~XXX~~ the Lord better and it would be wrong and sinful for you to do ~~ghat~~. The principles of these chapters are very much worth our study even though the particular situation is one which has now passed away. And then the next question which they ask is Chapter 11:2-16 - What clothing shall women wear in church? What is the proper clothing for women to wear in church? I don't know if that's the way they worded it. But anyway there were some of them who said, "Paul, our people here are free from all the silly pagan ideas round about us - the idea that they keep their women all shut up and put away and the men do all the thinking and all the important things. And the women have no part in anything. Shouldn't our women come into the church ~~and~~ on just exactly the same basis as the men do?" And Paul says there is a certain basis for the heathen idea even though the heathen carry it to an extreme which is utterly wrong and unscriptural. He says there is a difference between the man and the woman. If you have a custom in the community which is not wrong in itself or harmful in itself, it is not necessary that you cause the heathen to be shocked and offended with the way you're doing, utterly contrary to their customs. And so he recommends in this matter that the women conform. He recom-

mends up to Verse 15 that the women keep their heads covered and the men have their heads uncovered - there be a difference between them, there be a definite precedence to the men in the services and these things. And he lays down a rule which is quite different from the pagan idea in Corinth where they keep all the good women shut away in the homes and they never see anybody but their husbands and then if the husbands want somebody to talk to that is interesting and educated a bit, they go out with some immoral woman or a group of immoral women maybe in the various saloons and places like that. And the women have no chance to develop themselves. He says that is wrong - the women come to church, the women take part - but the women keep their heads covered, keep the veil on over their head and do these different things which will not shock the Corinthians the way it would if they ignored all this. However, he says in Verse ~~XX~~ 16, if any man seem to be contentious, if somebody wants to make a fight about this, we have no such custom, neither the church of God. He says if somebody wants to say, "What's your proof that women have to wear veils in church - this isn't hats, this is veils. Well, he says just forget it then. Is this a matter of expediency. We are fitting into the situation here in order to keep from raising offense among the people around but we're certainly not insisting upon it. If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, he says. This is purely a matter of expediency in the local situation. And then D - the next question - is the question about the Lord's Supper. And in this one you wonder just a little bit whether this is a question or whether this should be back in the first part. This is Chapter 11:17-34 and he doesn't discuss the question here how often the Lord's supper should be or various questions or whether the Lord is personally present in it - various questions that have been argued through church history ever since - but he says to them there are some of you that get drunk at the Lord's Supper. And he says there are people who come there and ~~XXXXXX~~ this has an effect upon them there and there are people who are gluttonous in the amount they take at the Lord's Supper and there is a shame coming into this very sacred rite in your services. Now that is a little hard to fit just under questions. It would seem perhaps that here he's talking about the women and then he remembers this thing which might have gone in the first half of the book. But he exhorts them about the Lord's Supper and stresses that it is a divine institution and "often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death, till He come." So he says you should examine yourselves to see if you are dealing in a wrong way with this very important part of the Lord's

service. If any man is hungry, let him eat at home, he says. Make the Lord's Supper a service of remembrance, not a time when you are filling yourselves up. Of course the way we observe it, you couldn't possibly do that on the amount they give you - in any church I've ever been in. But evidently the custom was quite different there. It was a sort of a meal which they had together and it became a time of satisfying their bodies rather than a time of remembering the Lord.

End of Record 43

previous have started. And so even though D here ~~seems~~ seems as if it's more what he's heard that he's criticizing, rather than answering questions, yet 12 is getting back to questions again. "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren" - he's taken up these various questions concerning this and that and "now concerning spiritual gifts". Well, what about them? And now he goes on on the spiritual gifts - Chapters 12 through 14. He spends three chapters in discussing spiritual gifts. And here is a wonderful thing. A question has been asked of Paul about spiritual gifts in the church and discussing this question the thought occurs to Paul, "Well, now this is all very important about the spiritual gifts in the church but it would be good to bring out the fact that important as these are, the love toward the brethren and towards all men is more important than any of them." And so right in the middle of his discussion of spiritual gifts he devotes thirteen verses to the greatest praise of Christian love that has ever has been written. And of course probably this chapter has been memorized as much as any chapter in the Bible. And how many of those who memorize it realize its relation to the context - that it's a sort of an aside as he discusses the answer to a question presented to him by the Corinthian Church. And of course that's the typical thing of this book here. He is rebuking the people for their errors in life in connection with the doctrine of salvation and in the course of it he has so many little asides that are so tremendously valuable. And a fellow told me once in college about a book that he read in philosophy. He says the book doesn't amount to much but his footnotes are wonderful. He said there are so many suggestive and interesting and valuable things in the footnotes. Well what Paul says to the Corinthians does amount

to a great deal and the principles he gives them are vital for us but in some way the asides and the incidental things are almost of more importance for us than the main things that he's presenting in these particular letters. And this is one of them, this wonderful thirteenth chapter - he says concerning spiritual gifts ~~XXXXXX~~ remember they are given us by the Lord. And the Lord gives one one gift and one another gift. And he says if the Lord has given you one gift, don't you look down on the person that has the other gift. Dr. Wm. F. Albright was head of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem for nine years and he told me of one time when he heard about two men who were coming to Palestine. ~~and~~ And one of them was a great archaeologist, a great excavator. The other was a great student of the Babylonian language who had made wonderful discoveries in the interpretation of the text. And Albright was greatly interested in both areas. And he looked forward to seeing these two men. And they were both going to stay at the American School and he looked forward so much to his pleasure in the association with them, he naturally took for granted they'd have equal pleasure in each other's association. So when they got there he introduced them to one another. He told me that he introduced one to the other and he said, "This is this great excavator who~~x~~ excavated these various cities and this is that great language student who discovered these things about the meaning of the Shaphail(?) and the Hithtial(?) and so on." And he said one of them looked at the other and said, "Oh, a digger." And the other looked at the first and said, "Oh, a language man." And each of them had a great gift which he was using and very honorably, but they looked down on the other's gift which they didn't have. And the same thing can be true in the church. The Lord will give one of us one gift and one another gift. If a person does not have the gift of hard study, careful application, getting into the Scripture and finding exactly what the words mean, God may have great work for him to do. He may be able to use him in other lines in Christian work. It's nothing against a man if he doesn't have the particular type of mentality or application that can profit by the work that we have here. I don't think anybody should look down on a man who's greatly used of God, with a different sort of training. Neither should he look down on a person who can use the type of training that we're trying to give here. They're different types of ~~XXXXX~~ people, different types of gifts, and I believe that anyone who ~~XX~~ can assimilate our work will profit by it and be more valuable in the Lord's service. But

if we find out soon after a man's come here that he doesn't have this particular ability, why I don't think we're doing him any service to let him stay on and try to help him to drag through things that he's not up to. There are very few like that. I feel that most anybody who has the brains to get through college can do our work if he will apply himself. But one time we had a man a few years ago, one of the nicest fellows you ever knew in your life. Oh, he was a grand chap - a fine personal worker and a fine Christian fellow. And he was getting just about 70 in all his lessons. And nobody liked to think of suggesting that he drop out of school because he was such a grand fellow and somebody said to me, "Well he went to this fine Christian college, he did good work there. And if he could do that he certainly could do it here." And I said, "Well let's see what his recommendations were there. I can't imagine Dr. So-and-so recommending him highly ^{to come here} /if he couldn't get more than 70 in our work." "Well, they did though." I said, "Let's get his letter." So we got the letter from Dr. So-and-so and he said, "Oh how we hate to lose this man. He graduated from school here. He was with us for five years and a half and he graduated and we so hate to lose him. We don't know how we'll keep our boiler running without the help that he's giving in keeping things going well around the place. His scholarship is nil." And that was his statement about him. Well, he was a good, well-meaning man. He might serve the Lord very well but he wanted our training. But my guess is he would have spent ten years with us, gotten through every thing on 70's , and the value he'd get out of that - I just didn't think we were doing him any favor whatever to encourage him to stay. Now that was not the gift the Lord had given this man. He was a grand fellow. He didn't have that particular gift. Those who have shouldn't look down on him and he shouldn't look down on them. And Paul points out here God gives the gift of prophecy to one man, to another faith, to another wisdom. He gives these different gifts but he says the one who has one shouldn't look down on the one who has the other but we should all work together to serve the Lord. "Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret? But covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet shew I unto you a more excellent way." And then he gets onto a matter that more important than any of the gifts is the spirit of love which the Lord wants us to have which is the badge of the Christian, which if we do not have all else is worthless. "Love

never fails; but where there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away." But the spirit of true Christian love is the greatest of all. "Now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity." But that doesn't mean faith and love aren't tremendously important - but they're worthless without this one which is the greatest of all. And let no one of us say that he has the full Christian love the Lord wants him to have. And let's go easy about criticizing others on how much Christian love they have. We may not be showing the spirit of love in criticizing others for not having the spirit of love. God only can judge the heart. But let's us judge our own heart and let's look to Him to make it a reality in our lives that we have the true spirit of love toward all the brethren. Well then Chapter 14 - "Follow after love". Now what a shame that the King James Version has put in the word "charity" here instead of "love". The Geneva Bible, which most of the Christians used before the King James, had the word "love" and the Greek word "agape" is translated "love" about half the times in the King James and "charity" about half the times and there's no way in the world to make a distinction between the ones that they translated "love" and "charity". X The same word is used - "God is love" - the King James doesn't say "God is charity". But in this chapter they put in the word "charity" which was I think a very, very unfortunate thing for them to do. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ "Follow after love and desire, spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy." And then he shows the difference between speaking in tongues and prophesying and he says I have spoken in tongues more than you all but he says I'd rather speak one word that can be understood than to speak any amount that can't be understood. And he says let's not speak in tongues unless there's an interpreter present. He says don't speak several at a time. Speak one at a time and only when there's an interpreter present who can explain what is presented so that it will be for the edification of the people. "Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues. Let all things be done decently and in order." And then Chapter 15 - Section F - he doesn't introduce as being a question but it doesn't seem to have much connection with what precedes. And I think in view of his having answered questions right along up to this point, that it's quite reasonable to consider this as also a question that they've asked him about the doctrine of the resurrection. What about it? Do we have bodies raised from the

dead? Or do we simply go and live as spirits through eternity? What is the situation on that? There isn't much mentioned specifically in the Epistles before this. We have no evidence that the Apostles went into this very specifically in their words, in most of their sermons. Probably this was another question they asked. What about it? Will we be raised in our bodies? And so Paul devotes this chapter to discussing that question and he introduces his discussion of it with reminding them of the gospel. What is the Gospel he says - that Christ died for our sins according to the Scripture and that He was buried and that He rose again the third day according to the Scripture, and goes on to show that Christ's Resurrection was bodily, physical, literal, even though a different kind of body than we have - a body not subject to corruption. But then he says, "You ask if we're going to rise. Why if there be no Resurrection of the dead then is Christ not risen. If Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain. So having demonstrated that Christ was raised from the dead, he says, "Even so we also will be raised from the dead." And this chapter's subject isn't the Resurrection of Christ. The subject of this chapter is "The Resurrection of the Believers". But while discussing the Resurrection of the Believers he gives us the greatest passage on the Resurrection of Christ that we have outside the Gospels - which is very interesting, again an aside, an incidental thing to introduce the subject on which he'd been questioned, and yet in so doing he gives us one of the great passages. That's typical of Corinthians. I and II Corinthians - so many wonderful passages which are simply asides or incidental or sub-arguments and yet are so remarkably valuable for us. That's why I and II Corinthians need really more study to master than Romans does. And you don't get as much from it - Romans is primary - but you get wonderful things from it. They certainly are great books. And so this great passage on the Resurrection of Christ is introductory to a much less important thing. But a question had been asked - our resurrection, and in discussing our resurrection then he shows the course of events and he gives here the order - Christ, the firstfruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at His coming; and then after His kingdom, then when He delivers up the kingdom to God, even the Father, He must reign till He's put all enemies under His feet, then comes the time when the wicked dead are raised. And so he gives us a general outline of the future here - it's an incidental thing. It's not his

primary purpose here. The primary purpose is to show ~~XXX~~ the Resurrection. And then there's the conclusion - oh, no, - one more section - G - is the "Collection for the Saints - 16:1-4. Just four verses, but he starts with the same phraseology, "Now concerning the collection for the saints" and it would seem that he had been criticized on that score. Most interpreters of the book think that there were some in Corinth who were saying, "What's the point of this collecting money for the people in Jerusalem? Why don't they get out and work and do something for themselves? Why should we save money for them?" And then there are people probably who say, "How do we know that Paul gives this to them? We'd better send a committee along to watch him." And so Paul says, "Here's what I want you to do. I want you to save your money for it so that when I come you have it ready

End of Record 44

personal ending to the book and even there an occasional verse inserted that is of great help to all of us. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong." Just inserted in the middle of the conclusion. Little interesting things even in his conclusion. But it finishes his discussion of the main theme and that is B - I Corinthians. C is II Corinthians. And II Corinthians is the most personal and least orderly of all of Paul's Epistles. In this Epistle we have what we found in I Corinthians even to a greater extent. It would seem from what we gather in II Corinthians that the great mass of the people in the church were moved by Paul's first letter, decided to accept what he said, did what he urged, and it was quite successful. But there were two groups in the church from opposite sides that opposed him very strongly. And they would seem to have had all kinds of criticisms of him - who's this man, Paul, who's claiming a special Apostolic authority? The Lord didn't appoint him. And look at how he's changed his plan. Look how feeble and infirm he appears. Are we even sure he's a Hebrew at all? And how do we know that he could be trusted to take this money? He didn't bring any credentials anyway from the Apostles. And what about his visions ~~in~~ and revelations? Isn't there a touch of madness in them? And all these questions that were asked by a few people in Corinth. And so when Paul

writes his second letter, we find in the letter that most of what he said in the first letter had been accepted by the bulk of the people. In fact they had thrown out the man who had married his father's ex-wife. They had thrown him out and Paul's afraid they dealt too harshly with him and tells them, "Don't just abandon him, no. Discipline him, yes, but try to win him back. Try to win him to real repentance and don't be too harsh with him." And we find in the letter that they had accepted most of what Paul urged but that there evidently were a few there who were agitating strongly against him. And the agitation would seem to have been directed to quite an extent against his claims to be an apostle and his claims of authority. And so in this letter more than in any other in the New Testament, even Revelations, he stresses his claim to be an Apostle and his right to speak and what he has done. He says, "Bear with me in my folly that I boast a little bit. It's necessary for your sake." And then he tells of all he's done and what visions the Lord has given him, how the Lord has used him, and how the Lord has blessed him. He does that in order to get a hearing for his message. And certainly here we have an absolute denial of the attitude that some people would take - humility and self-abnegation is far better than promoting oneself. Clearly taught in the Scripture but some would take the attitude, "Well, if people oppose you, just bog down and give them what they want. Leave it in the Lord's hands. And that is a right attitude as long as it is your personal name, your personal reputation, your personal reward that is involved. But when it's a matter of the truth of Christ, Paul stands right up and tells them who he is and what he's done and how much he's sacrificed for the cause of Christ and what blessings God has given him. And he gives reason after reason after reason in here why they should listen to what he has to say. He is not fighting for his own honor or for his own reputation or for his own support. He says, "You don't have to support me. I raise my own support. I have a right to but I haven't done it and I don't intend to." He is not fighting for that. He is fighting for the truth of God. And when he fights for that he brings every argument to bear on it in order that on these vital things they recognize the truth of what he's presenting. And so II Corinthians is a very hard one to outline. But it is like I Corinthians, one that has very important truths in it and it's one of the great books of the Bible.

C in our outline stands for Corinthians of course. And we noticed that II Corinthians is the most personal and the least orderly, you might say, of Paul's letters. That it is to say, that it is not like Romans, a reasoned discourse, taking a doctrine and expounding it and presenting it to us in a fashion to give us an introduction to and a thorough understanding of this doctrine. It, like I Corinthians, is Paul's rebuke to those who are erring in connection with this doctrine. And in connection with the rebuke he has many statements of different aspects of the doctrine, many references to it, many wonderful isolated verses. And so there's a great deal from it that we can take out and apply to our own situation or needs at any particular time. They're two of the greatest collections of wonderful material in the Bible - I and II Corinthians. But as a book to be studied to gain ~~XXXXXXXX~~ a rounded understanding of a doctrine, Romans is the doctrinal Epistle. And I and II Corinthians are the ones of reproof. And we need that reproof - we all of us do. We get value for ourselves from studying these but we sometimes need it more than other times. We're in a situation sometimes where it's very germane and others where it's not nearly as applicable. Romans is always applicable and of course there are many verses in I and II Corinthians which are always applicable. And so II Corinthians is not nearly as easy to outline in logical fashion as is Romans. And yet it divides itself quite naturally into three main sections. The first of those sections is Chapters 1 to 7 - more than half the book, you see. It's pretty hard to think of a decent title for this section because - I explained to you already what the evident purpose of it is - that it is to show his joy over the fact that the Corinthian Church has accepted what he has presented in I Corinthians, But to warn them against going too far in relation to certain portions of it, and to show his displeasure that there were elements in the Corinthian Church which were objecting from one extreme or the other extreme to that which he presented - and to try to give an answer to these elements. And even though the church, as a ~~whole~~ whole has taken the actions he desires and there is very definite improvement, yet, in the course of that improvement very evidently these groups that have opposed it from one extreme or the other extreme, have said some pretty harsh things about Paul and his ministry and his purpose and it is necessary not only to answer the attitude of these, but to remove from the minds of the majority of the church who were following Paul, the harmful effect that has been made by

these attacks upon him. And so this is the burden of the first seven chapters - this is the situation. But how to entitle that, I don't know. The Schfield Bible entitles this first section, "Paul's Principles of Action". Well that's a good general, catch-all title. It's probably as good as any other. I haven't thought of any better one. But I don't think it tells you as much idea of it until you know what it is. I don't think it gives much idea of what's really involved. ~~XXXXX~~ Let's see if either of these gives a better suggestion for this first part. Purvis doesn't even try to give a title for it. This is the Davis Bible Dictionary, the 4th revised edition which was issued in 1927 and is quite old now. There's probably no better one-volume Bible dictionary though up to the present time than this. There's a 5th edition of it which has a different title, the Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, in which Dr. ^{Davis'}~~XXXXX~~ successor at Princeton, Dr. Gamin, has revised it. And to read in the Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, to read the preface, you would think that the book had been thoroughly gone through and very carefully revised which would naturally scare you because Gamin is a good bit of a liberal and Davis was very conservative. If you go through it however, the great part of your scare is removed because you find that his thorough revision consists in the main of changing the Scripture references, the order of the references, which Davis arranges according to the logical order - he changes them around to make them go in the order in which the references appear in the Bible. There'll be eight references that Davis gives on a matter - he'll give something from Ephesians and then from Galatians and then maybe from the Psalms and then maybe from Peter and then Genesis and Exodus. Well this'll change it around and make it Genesis, Exodus and so on. My guess is he got a couple of students to go through and change the order of all the references. Then the Davis Bible Dictionary has the chapter references in Roman letters and the verses in Arabic. Gamin has changed them all into Arabic. He says in the front that particularly in the field of archaeology has he made great changes in the book. I found that where the Davis Dictionary has two columns on the archaeology of Jerusalem bringing it up to 1910 which was pretty old in 1927 when he wrote it, Gamin instead of bringing it up-to-date when he got his issue out, simply left out the section on archaeology of Jerusalem altogether. I found four great - he says in the front that he owes much to Dr. Albright and others for his information connected with the book. I looked up four archaeo-

logical excavations in Palestine that Albright conducted, which were of great importance and found them not even mentioned in the material which Gamin had put in. He has in connection with Babylonia and Egypt, a couple of rather nice summary articles which he inserted which weren't there before. And strangely, he's inserted quite a good new article on the fall of man, which is not covered in the earlier one. But if this were the only difference between Gamin's and Davis', why we'd say it's worth getting the later one for the sake of the Arabic numerals. But that'd be the only thing. Because the re-arrangement of the references is injurious rather than helpful. It's not particularly important. We'd say the new edition is better. Even the pictures are practically all the same - few changes, very few in the pictures. But unfortunately there's one other type of change Gamin has introduced. And really the changes are-not one-twentieth of the book is changed. But the changes he's introduced are very strange. Davis will have something like this - I don't know or remember now the precise ones but this is the general type he's done. Davis will give arguments to show the Book of Isaiah is one book written by one author. These arguments will be reprinted with not one word in 300 changed, little change to it. And then you'll come to the end and instead of saying, "Therefore we can be sure that the Book of Isaiah was written by one writer", he will say, "However, it is much more scholarly to believe that the Book of Isaiah was written by several writers, one of whom wrote at about 700 B. C., one about 500 B.C. and one about 300 B.C." And he'll end up with a critical view but very strangely, before he gets to it, he repeats a lot of Davis' good arguments against ~~xx~~ the critical view. It's a queer combination. On II Peter he has introduced an article denying its authenticity. And there are a few points like that where he's introduced critical points and critical evidences. But as a rule he's just made the conclusions critical without changing the article. So the book is unfortunately quite a hodge-podge. And it's very fine that the excellent Davis dictionary, the fourth edition, has been reprinted and this reprint which the Baker Company has gotten out is, I believe, identical to the edition that came out in 1927.

End of Record 45

first edition of his book out, he got his colleague, Dr. Purvis, who was Professor of New Testament - very unfortunately Purvis was Professor of New Testament for only about three years. He was an excellent scholar. He's written a book on Apostolic History which is excellent and his articles in here on New Testament subjects which have his signature after them - G.T.P. - are mostly very excellent. But Purvis, I think he needed more money than he could get, and he was a pretty good preacher and he was called to a great big church up in New York. So he resigned his professorship and went there and I guess he worked too hard with the requirements of that big church and in about a year or so this great man died. And it was a great loss to New Testament scholarship. He was a very Godly man and a fine servant of the Lord. And his articles in the Davis Dictionary on New Testament are particularly good. But when it comes to Corinthians the Scofield Bible says, "Paul's Principles of Action" for the first seven chapters. Well, that doesn't give you much idea does it? But what do you think Purvis does? Purvis just throws up his hands and doesn't give a title. Purvis says it is the least methodical and most personal of his divisions. It falls, however, into three divisions. Now number 1 - now don't try to write it down. You would find it impossible. Many of you have this Davis Bible Dictionary. If you don't you certainly all have access to it. He says 1 to 7 in which, after grateful recognition of God's goodness to him even amid trial (Chapter 1:1-14), he vindicates himself from the charge of vacillation(1:15 to 2:4), bids them not carry too far their zeal against the offenders(2:5 to 11) , and describes the spiritual (3) (4:1-6), suffering (4:7-18), hopeful (5:1-9), (5:10-11), Christ, Himself(5:12-17), ministry of reconciliation (5:18-21), with which as a co-worker of God he has been instructed(5:22 to 6:2), in which He had appeared Himself (6:3-10), on the ground of which He appealed to them(6:11-18), and in their acknowledgement of which he found boldness and joy(Chapter 7). Now I think Scofield's title, "Paul's Principles of Action" is a little simpler. But Purvis' running summary of it gives you a fair idea of what he does in the section. And it's quite useful and really very nicely done. But I think for an outline I'm going to give you the Scofield title, "Paul's Principles of Action" but think of what - it's sort of catch-all title and for its real meaning you have to get what is underneath it and Scofield has it quite nicely outlined, what is underneath it. Unfortunately the first - he has four subheads under that,

the first of which, unfortunately, has a title that's another catch-all. It is number 1 - The Explanation. Now that's 1:1 to 2:13. Now here's what Purvis says about 1:1 to 2:13 - section 1 in which after grateful recognition of God's goodness to him even amid trial, he vindicates himself from the charge of vacillation, bids them not carry too far their zeal against the offenders. That's what Purvis says. And that gives you more of an idea what is explained under the heading - The Explanation. But this is the presentation of the situation and Paul's fear they may go too far in following what he told them in I Corinthians, his fear of that, and yet his defense of himself against criticism - for instance, that he is vacillating and hasn't come to them when he promised to, and so on. Well that title then, The Explanation, we can take up to 2:13 and then I think Scofield has given a very good title for the next section - number 2 under Roman I - The Ministry (2:14 to 6:10). He gives the title first where Purvis calls it "The Ministry of Reconciliation". But he gives all the subheads first and then gives you the title at the end. Now here is a description of the ministry. And surely this is very vital for every servant of the Lord because Paul here in a situation, dealing with the needs of this difficult church - and you're going to find difficult churches wherever you go - if they've got people in they're going to be difficult. The ministry of dealing with these people, helping them, and blessing them, presenting God's Word to them - he discusses that from 2:14 to 6:10 and discusses various sections about his ministry to them which should be an example of our ministry. And under that Scofield has put subhead "a" - Triumphant (2:14-17). The Ministry Triumphant. "Now thanks be to God, who always causes us to triumph in Christ, and makes manifest the savor of his knowledge by us in every place." Can't you just imagine Mr. Hawks, his first day in that little church, with that situation he faced there of seeming impossibility of accomplishing anything and sitting up on that porch, not knowing where his lunch was coming from or anything. Can't you just imagine him repeating this verse, "Thanks be to God which causes us to triumph". I forget what the verse was he said he repeated but it certainly expressed the same thought as this. He felt God had called him to that particular place at that particular time and was going to work the work - and God did work a work. And Paul begins the description of the ministry with its triumph which we must have before us or we never will go forward. If you go into the ministry in order to make money or get fame for yourself, if you're lucky, you can get them. And it may be a very

happy ministry, if that's what you're after and that's all you're after. It may be, it may not be - you may make a failure of it. But if you're in it to serve the Lord, when you get the most fame and the most money, may be the time when you know you're the least successful, and when you are having the least effect upon solving people's problems and bringing them closer to the Lord. So you may not feel very triumphant then and there'll be plenty of other ~~occasions~~ occasions when you'll get neither fame nor money and yet they may be the very times when you're reaching people the most for the Lord. So in either case to realize that it is God who triumphs and if we're truly living close to Him we are triumphant in Him. "For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ". If we live close to Him we can be that. But now ~~we~~ we are the sweet savor of Christ" he says to two kinds of people "to them that are saved and to them that perish; to the one a savor from death unto death; to the other a savor from life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things." You face the ministry of God - who is sufficient for this? "We are not as many who corrupt the word of God but as of sincerity, as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ." "We are the savor of death unto death and the savor of life unto life - to them that are saved and to them that perish." And yet God causes us to triumph if our eyes are on Him. It is a wonderful start to this section on the ministry - the triumphant nature of the true ministry which is lived close to God. Now Paul at this time as you see would have a rather mixed feeling toward ~~them~~. He thinks of how his first letter accomplished so much. This one of whom he complained about their tolerating in their church, they've thrown him out. He's triumphant and yet he's afraid that perhaps they've done it too sternly and perhaps they're going to injure the man instead of winning him. So he's worried. He'd much rather that they'd throw the man out than that they'd act as they had before as if his sin didn't matter. But he's just afraid that they're doing it in a way that's going to not win him away from his sin but to simply drive him away from that which would help him. And so he is triumphant and yet he's worried - it goes too far. And that's your experience inevitably in life. I think that Satan is like with each of us - it's like we were on a tightrope and he's pulling, pulling, pulling - trying to pull us off the truth, trying to jerk us away to lead us into that which is wicked and harmful and he's trying to pull us over there. But every once in a while when he finds he can't pull one of us on a certain point, he just lets go of the rope and if we've been

and it is possible for us to be in a very difficult situation where we try to serve the Lord for years and there is very little to show for it, but you can be absolutely sure if you're truly serving the Lord that over a period of time there will be - there will be results to show, there will be works evident to show that God is really working in you and through you. And see it is spiritual and glorious. The ministry is spiritual and glorious. He says "the letter kills but the spirit gives life." And this is a section of Corinthians which is often greatly misinterpreted. "The letter kills but the spirit gives life" as if therefore we don't want to be literal, we don't want to borrow the letter. Certainly the letter doesn't kill. It is the exaggerated stress on the letter at the expense of the spirit that kills. It is the attitude that we noticed in Church History where the Circumcilion said Jesus said, "Put up thy sword" so we don't use swords any more so they carry big clubs around and beat the people to death. They are following the letter but they are not getting the meaning which the letter presents. And if you're truly going to get the meaning the letter presents, you have to have the spirit of God lead you and using you. "The spirit" does not mean just some vague general goodness but it means the Holy Spirit applying the thought which is contained in these works.

End of Record 46

But I don't think we should. I think it's very important that the words are inspired. The words are free from error. We don't have ideas apart from words. But there are those who misinterpret the words as if the words were the end in themselves. They are not. You can say, "He walked down the street" or "He walked down the road" and what difference does it make which you say? It may make a tremendous difference and it may make not the slightest difference in the work. Verbal inspiration does not mean these are the only words that could have been used here. But it means these are words which correctly give the thought involved. There may be other words which fit just as well. You may have a thought given in two places in the Bible in entirely different words and yet the same thought. And sometimes you'll have a thought given in one place and you'll have a broad word use in one case and a narrow word in the other. And the narrow word gives you more precise idea. Therefore this is a more precise presentation than the other. It's not a more true presentation but a more precise presentation - but both are equally true. But the words in themselves are of no value unless you get the meaning back of them. But you can't get the meaning without the words. So that "the letter kills" - no, it doesn't mean that the letter kills. It doesn't mean throw away the Bible - the letter doesn't matter. But it means the letter taken alone kills. It means the letter taken without the recognition of the thoughts of it, expressed by the letter and without the Holy Spirit's supplying the letter. So it is spiritual and glories - it shows the difficulty of a title again - it's a general title that's very hard to get into 5 or 6 words

Then the next "D", Scofield calls "Honesty". "The Ministry - Honesty". It is an honest ministry. I'm not sure that word is so good but I don't think of a better - an honest ministry. It is a ministry he says in which there is not handling of the Word of God deceitfully. "We have renounced the hidden things of craftiness, not handling the Word of God deceitfully by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." I was appearing before a judicial commission of a church body not very long ago. And a very learned man, and a man who is very well thought of by a great many people, was before this judicial commission and he was presenting an argument and the point under consideration was whether a paper ~~was~~ was valid or not if the paper had not actually been signed. And if it's not signed, it certainly in any legal thing is not a valid paper. And he said,

"Well the paper doesn't have to be signed because see what the law says here, 'If the paper is signed by more than a third of those present, it constitutes a stay on the action.'" Well he didn't read the whole thing. He just glanced at it quickly. It says, "The paper if signed"- so he said, "Well it says the paper if signed, therefore it can be valid and be a paper that isn't signed." Well I got irritated at that and I jumped up from my place on the commission and I said, "Now this certainly dishonest. Why waste our time on that kind of petty trifling. If it's signed by more than a third it's a stay. That doesn't mean that it's good for anything if it's not signed by anybody." He, I don't think, ordinarily falls into that line of thought but certainly in that instance he was handling, not the Word of God there, there it was the word of man - but it was the constitution of an organization - he was handling it deceitfully. He was picking an argument up that - he didn't answer me back, he just dropped it because it was so perfectly obvious he had grabbed something out of the air for something to make an argument about. But anybody that instead of glancing at it would look at it would see that it was an utterly deceitful argument. Well the trouble is that any of us are apt to fall into that at times. I can't help thinking the Republicans fell into it in this last election when they made an argument that all our wars have been fought under Democrats - Woodrow Wilson was in power when the First World War came, Roosevelt when the Second and Truman when the Korea War - well, what did the presidents have to do with the fact that those wars started at that time. Do you think the people who were giving that argument thought it was a valid argument? Though I'm sure they got the votes by it. It was an expedient argument. I don't think the people who were giving it had any idea it was. I remember some years ago when Bishop Canon of the Methodist Church was known as a great temperance leader. And he was fighting against the liquor interests, fighting very hard against the liquor interests. There was much opposition to him and there appeared a headline in the newspaper one day. Somebody had found that Bishop Canon had been buying and selling stocks in the stock market. Here was this man claiming to be so pure and righteous, fighting the liquor traffic and here he was buying ~~XXXXXX~~ and selling stocks in the stock market. Well, whoever put that heading up there in the newspaper, whoever attacked him on that, do you think they thought for a minute there was anything wrong in buying or selling stocks? Anything wrong in doing that which is a normal part of our economic life? They certainly never dreamed of

such a thing but they thought there would be some ignorant people among the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ supporters who would be moved by that fact that people hadn't known about him before, to think that he wasn't a good man and so they put the heading up. It's very easy to fall into that sort of an argument that will convince somebody. It's very easy to because you often find people come up to you and ask you a question and you give them three words that don't make much sense and they're satisfied - and often much better than a lot of argument would make them. And it's very, very easy to fall into that. But Paul disclaims it here, "We have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness nor handling the Word of God deceitfully." It's very, very easy to handle the Word of God deceitfully - to pick a few words out of context and to use them to present something. The Bible certainly teaches temperance, it teaches the wrong of excessive use of alcohol and it teaches the wisdom - not the requirement, but the wisdom - of abstaining from all beverage ~~XXXXX~~ use of alcohol. It certainly teaches that. But there have been temperance parades which have waved banners, "Touch not, taste not, handle not" and in Colossians it says, "Be not subject to ordinances, 'Touch not, taste not, handle not'". But those words have just been picked right out of context there and have been waved for that purpose. When I was in seminary in Princeton there was an Assistant Professor of Theology who gave us an argument, was discussing the sovereignty of God and he said, "Why we read in Romans ~~IX~~ 'Who has resisted His will?'" Well it is true the Bible teaches that no-one can resist the will of God. God is sovereign, God is supreme, God can accomplish what He wants. But in that reference he says, "But sayest thou ~~XXXX~~ then, but who has resisted His will?" He is quoting an objection in order to answer. And to take an objection and to give it as an argument is something which a man might do through ignorance but he shouldn't do through ignorance. Certainly a theology teacher shouldn't do it through ignorance. I raise objection at the point. I said that that's an objection given there. Well he said, "Yes, but it certainly is a fair summary of the passage." Well, I won't deny that those words may in the end be a summary of what the passage teaches but you quote the Bible says this, you don't give the impression you're giving a summary. You give the impression that these words here in this context means this and actually they didn't. Actually they meant something quite different. And so Paul declares that his ministry is an honest ministry. And you can't just say, "I've got an honest ministry and you don't bother. Passively you're honest."

You have to actively be honest watching, testing your word, testing your arguments, testing what you present that it really is an honest ministry. He says it is not he but Christ that has been preached. "It is an honest ministry, it is truly Christ's that it preached and not himself. And the power is of God." We must be able to say that if our ministry will count for the Lord. But let's examine ourselves that we truly can say it. When you give a message somewhere and somebody says to you, "My that was a wonderful message. We certainly were happy you were here today." Do you immediately think, "Isn't that grand that I was able to get that thought across. They received the Word of God." Or do you think, "My, I certainly did a good job that time. I'm glad they like it." We all fall into that every single one of us. And Paul here gives the warning. He is here giving the defence of himself to the Corinthians. He says that we have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty. They could look at his record and see that it is the case. But even as we see it about Paul we get a wonderful urging for ourselves in order to make our ministry worthwhile that we watch it too. My these verses are wonderful here though, "If our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not. Lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ with the image of God, should ~~XXXX~~ shine unto them." That's by the side in connection with this discussion of the honesty of the presentation. And yet see the depth of thought that has been in it and how important it is in understanding our relation with people, that the God of this world has blinded their eyes and you present truth to them, they just don't see it. Well don't get angry at them and think, "Why are you so wicked that you won't accept this truth I present you." They are wicked but the God of this world has also blinded their eyes. If you can pierce through the blindness, or if you could pray your way so that the glorious gospel of Christ would shine unto them. "For we preach not ourselves but Jesus Christ our Lord and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." Well then "E" - the Ministry Suffering from 4:8 to 5:13 - but Paul puts so much thought into every verse and every section that actually - it's just a title for it but there's a tremendous lot of thought put into it. When I was in Princeton Seminary there was a Professor ~~XXXXXX~~ of New Testament there, Dr. Machen was Assistant Professor of New Testament and his courses were perfectly wonderful, but the Professor of New Testament was Dr. William Hart Armstrong,

who had been Purvis' assistant and his son-in-law and continued to work after Purvis, and Armstrong was a very great scholar. He had written some very excellent articles. Unfortunately I don't think he ever wrote (12.5) An excellent scholar, and perhaps the poorest teacher I've ever known in my life, but an excellent scholar. And one time I had all the course that I could really take but Armstrong announced an Exegeis of II Corinthians. It was one hour a week and I thought, "Well, I can't add another hour to my course but maybe I can audit it. I'll just go and hear what he says." It was one hour a week through the 13 weeks our semester was in those days. I started in and for the first 7 weeks I attended. Then I found it necessary to drop out. But during those 7 weeks Armstron started at the beginning of II Corinthians with the words, "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ" and he was still on those words at the end of 7 weeks. We never got any further into II Corinthians than that. Well the depth of meaning in II Corinthians you could spend years and years studying but I really think in a seminary course it's better to go faster than that, get further into it. But I hate to go as fast as we're going now. This is just a survey and I hope you'll all have more (14.) . But while I say it's "just a survey" that doesn't mean it isn't vital. I think that one thing seminaries have been greatly criticized for in the past is the idea that they take three or four verses and spend a great deal of time on them and do not give you (14.) of the Bible as a whole. Many people say what we need is "English" Bibles, and what they mean isn't that they want study in English, because after all to get the precise thought on precise points it's very vital to get into the original. But what they mean is they want to cover the big (14.25) and get the emphases and that of course we must do too. And so the survey is very vital even though it has to be quite rapid. But it's hard to go rapidly. Suffering - the Ministry Suffering. If your ministry is worthwhile, you're going to suffer. When everything goes easily

End of Record 47

when everything goes easily, the chances are it isn't worth anything. The thing that you get without working for is probably not worth having in the first place. And we all like to complain about how hard we have to work. But if we didn't work we wouldn't get anything worth having. I had a fellow say to me once, "My, I ought to get through a year sooner" than according to our standards. A whole year sooner he wanted. I think he'd come 10,000 miles. He wanted to get through so much quicker. Well, I said to him, "Suppose we lowered our standards so that you'd get through as quickly as all that. You wouldn't get anything that'd be worth coming for. You wouldn't be able to recommend anybody else to come that long distance to come get our course because it just wouldn't be worth it. You've got to keep the standard if it's going to be worth anything. And anything that's worth having has got to be worked for. And one form of work is suffering. We have to endure. Well, in fact that's the thing we don't like about work - it's difficult and it tires us and wears us and we feel not so comfortable as if we're playing ping pong or enjoying life in some other way instead of studying and working. It is difficult but it must be so if it's worthwhile. The ministry is a suffering ministry, Paul describes here. We groan in this tabernacle, we groan for what Christ has for us, we long for it. It's a triumphant ministry and yet it's a suffering ministry. It's a suffering ministry, a toiling, laboring ministry but a ministry in which we see the Lord's approbation and we see the end and so it is triumphant. And so we start with triumphant - and he gives four verses to saying it's triumphant and then he gives 23 verses to describing it as a suffering ministry. They both are true. And if it's the ministry of God, they're both there. Then Section F is Chapter 5:14-21, and Scofield gives the heading for that, "The Ministry Motive and Object". I think perhaps one could work out a better title for that but he gives an idea certainly of the content. What is the motive? "For the love of Christ constrains us." We as ambassadors for Christ. It is the love of Christ that constrains us - it is our motive or the ministry is worth nothing. It must have this as its primary motive. That's similar to what he said before that it's (3.) but it's more in the general and deeper than the detail of its . Its motive and what is its object? Its object to make Christ known. "We are ambassadors for Christ as though God did beseech you by us." We prayed and God said be reconciled to God. He is committed unto us ~~XXXXXX~~ the word of reconciliation. We be-

lieve that God has elected to eternal salvation those whom He has chosen from the foundation of the world. We believe that God will save those whom He has foreordained to salvation. We believe that but we are His ambassadors to bring to salvation those who are to come and He has committed to us the ministry of reconciliation. He's given us this task to do and we can't sit back and say, "Well, His will's going to be done." His will's going to be done through us. And if it isn't done through us it's our fault. And no-one can say of any individual, that individual is lost - is going to be lost. You don't know. You can say if he doesn't believe in Christ he's lost but God has committed unto you the ministry of reconciliation and there are individuals with whom you can work from now till Doomsday and you won't lead them to the knowledge of the Lord. And there are others you will lead in just a few minutes talk. But there are plenty of them whom you'll work, and toil and struggle and pray for for years and then they come and you can't say which will be which. He has committed to us the ministry of reconciliation. Our motive must be love for Christ, our object must be to present this message to win individuals to Him. That is the motive, that is the object of the ministry and it must be a vital object to us. Man plants and waters but God gives the increase, yes. And we must be satisfied with what he sends but we must work for it as if it all depended on us. If we don't we cannot be sure - we certainly don't deserve any credit for whatever comes. We do deserve it if we work as He wants. Then Section G - he simply calls Summary - Chapter 6:1-10. It is summarizing Paul's ministry. It is perhaps repeating a good many of the statements given - not the statements but the general attitude given before. It is triumphant but it is suffering. It is honest, it is spiritual, it is glorious. It's summarized here in Chapter 6:1-10 with this stress on the attitude which has been necessary to show if they are to be effective. And the motive and object^{even}/are repeated. He says, "I have heard thee ~~xxx~~ at a time accepted and at the day of salvation did I succor thee: behold, now is the accepted time: behold now is the day of salvation." And then after Paul has - in his principles of action we notice, it's interesting here that the Scofield outline - the Explanation a chapter and a half, the Ministry four chapters, then Section 3 consists of only about ten ~~chapters~~ verses parallel to the four. Number 3 is 6:11 through 17:1 - the Appeal to Separation and Cleansing. Paul presents what his ministry is and what is the purpose of his ministry, of

the mention of his ministry here? It is to present this appeal to separation and cleanliness. And this appeal here is thus stressed in the Book of Corinthians. It's sort of a climax as you see, a short section parallel with these long sections under Paul's principles of action - the appeal to separation and cleanliness - II Corinthians 6:11 to 7:1, a section which stands out in the book which he stresses to the people there and he promises them that if they will fulfill this command then says the Lord, "I will receive you and will be a Father to you and you shall be my sons and daughters" saith the Lord Almighty, 'if you will come out from among them and be separate from them and touch not the unclean things.'" What a wonderful thought and how many people fail to obey the scriptural command here because they think they would lose some earthly advantage if they obey the command. And you will find that most ~~XXXXXX~~ ^{refuse to obey} that/obey the command, the reason is some earthly advantage that they think they can get if they don't obey the command. But God says if you obey this command to come out from among them and be separate and touch not the unclean thing He says, "I will receive you and be a Father to you and ye shall be my sons and daughters." Certainly that is far beyond any earthly thing that we can get by disobeying God's command at this point. And then the fourth heading under Paul's Principles of Action - the Scofield Bible heads as "The Heart of Paul" - Chapter ~~XXXXXX~~ 7:2-16. It shows the nature of Corinthians of which Purvis says it is the least orderly, the least methodical and the most personal of all his Epistles. The four main heads here Scofield entitles The Explanation, The Ministry, The Appeal to Separation, and The Heart of Paul. You don't get much idea just from those heads just what's in it. He gives a very good idea of what is in it but he takes about ten lines to do it and it doesn't make (9.5) at all. The Heart of Paul - Paul's love for them ~~ixx~~, his for them that the church will be what it should be founded on the blood of Christ and going forward to make Him known. Well that's the first main section of the book - Paul's Principles of Action. The second section-I think all interpreters agree that there are three sections in this book - and the ~~second~~ section is Chapters 8-9 - The Collection for the Poor. You remember in I Corinthians he gave them a few words on it, how they were to make a collection for the poor. But evidently some of them said, "Why should we collect for these poor ~~saints~~ up in Jerusalem. If they hadn't introduced this Communistic system they had there, they

wouldn't be in difficulty by this time. They'd be on their own feet." Paul doesn't say they're wrong. But he says, "They are saints of the Lord. Whether they have made mistakes or not, they are God's people and they deserve help and we should give it to them." He gave just a few words in the first Epistle how they should make the collection, they should save the money for the poor saints in Jerusalem when he comes to them. Now in the second Epistle, he finds it necessary to put two whole chapters on urging them to give the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem. And my, how many verses there are here on cheerful giving. "He that sows sparingly shall reap sparingly and he that sows bountifully shall reap bountifully." Verse after verse in here on the grace of the Lord toward us and how we should remember those who belong to Him with our physical help and he ends, "Thanks be to God for His unspeakable gift." If we have God's gift of eternal life through Christ how little it is to give of our resources and help the Christians who are in need. Those two chapters dealing with this, not because it logically comes here, but because it's the problem that was before them at the time. It was a difficulty which I Corinthians didn't solve. He had to give two chapters to what he'd only given four verses before. And then Number 3 - Paul's Defense of His Apostolic Authority. This you might say is - well (pathetic?) Purvis says it very well, "He again gives a prophetic but confident testimony to his apostolic office and authority." Think of Paul having to do this. When you have a struggle in trying to serve the Lord somewhere and people just make all kinds of difficulties. Think of the Apostle Paul having to write this way to the Corinthians, a people he himself had led to the Lord. Don't feel that you yourself are the only one who's ever had difficulty. We all have. But the Apostle Paul found it necessary to write four chapters to the Corinthians here vindicating his Apostolic authority, describing God's revelations to him, the divine authentication, describing the work he had done for the Lord, and the way that the Lord had revealed himself, and stressing how they should listen to the truth as he gives it to them. It is an Epistle which - not like Romans taking a great truth and spreading it out before us so we see it as a mighty canvas and a wonderful picture to study and to get a logical presentation and understanding of this but dealing right with the problem and situation, reproving those who are erring on this that and the other aspect in connection with it, and constantly getting back to

first, main principles. I recommend to you a very thorough study of I and II Corinthians, picking out of the many isolated verses that present such wonderful truths and beautiful sections. But I do not recommend going at it on quite the scale Dr. Armstrong did - I don't think you'd get far enough to be worth it. (Student question) I think you might well say so. There's a brief conclusion at the end but it's so brief that I think we might as well not give a separate section for it. And then we continue there some time next Monday. I'm not sure yet whether it'll be morning or afternoon but I think it'll be afternoon. We'll have, I believe, just one hour together.

End of Record 48

We were speaking about II Corinthians last time and notice Paul's great defense of his apostolic authority in Chapters 10 to 13. This of course is material which would be of importance in connection with any of Paul's Epistles. And this brings home to us something about the matter of these Epistles, in fact of all the New Testament writings, ~~and~~ that I think we should know. They are not systematic treatises on theology. They are not a taking an outline, a few main thoughts and trying to make those main thoughts clear, deal with them in systematic structure. They are not the presentation of teaching, in other words as you would ordinarily give it in a plan or in a textbook on a subject. We write our textbooks and we deal with subjects and then new information comes in and they become out of date and we have to write completely new ones. We have to make completely new arrangements. But these books were written to be valuable for all time and consequently while sometimes you can take a very good logical arrangement, in other cases you can't. And they are written in such a way that the Apostle is dealing with living situations. He's not writing a textbook. He's not presenting logical outlines but he's dealing with living situations and in those situations he takes the whole situation in mind and gives what will be vital for that situation. And so for us very often that which is secondary to the immediate apparent purpose of the book, is of tremendous im-

portance to us. And of course very often he gives material which is secondary to the immediate purpose but which is primary to some other purpose in connection with the book. He'll have say five purposes when he starts a book and he anticipates and he suggests and he brings in ideas about one of the other purposes when dealing with one of them. And consequently it's just limitless what you can get out of these books as you take different strands and different ideas and different approaches and trace them through. For that reason a straight, logical outline is very difficult to make of most of these books. You get an idea of the situation, how it relates to it, you note the main things he hits upon as he goes along, but as you study further you find many more that he hits upon so that you can actually bring out hundreds of ideas that are vital you get from them and there may be others you'd never think of that will prove to be most vital in some new development in our lives, in our Christian attitudes - we find that we've already got the answer here but we just slid over it and didn't realize it. So that don't anybody get the idea you can make an outline of one of these books, memorize the outline and you've got the book. And outline is just a sort of a handle to take a hold of the book but when you get in under the facts of the outline, you find more and more how much there is there that you just can't comprehend in an outline. And we notice the Scofield Bible's headings in II Corinthians how general they were: Paul's Principles of Action, The Ministry - headings like that. The Exhortation - they are so general but often it's very hard to make them specific. Now we're going to take up D - Galatians. And we've noticed Romans is the presentation of the doctrine - all Scripture is profitable for doctrine. It's all profitable for doctrine but this is particularly profitable for doctrine because it is the organized presentation of this great doctrine. Then we have Corinthians in which he reproves those who, knowing the doctrine of salvation by faith and of living lives glorifying to God and to Christ who saved us, are making errors in their conduct on vital points. He deals with those - it is vital for doctrine, for reproof - and then Galatians is for correction. And so Galatians and Romans are very, very closely related. Some will say Romans represents a doctrinal advance on Galatians. I think what they mean by that is there is more doctrine packed into it than there is in Galatians. It's even possible that Galatians was written before Romans but the main teaching of Romans was doubtless

given before Galatians was written. He had given that teaching but probably he was able to give it more fully ~~ix~~ and more completely later on after situations had developed that had drawn attention to the particular need, a particular point that required clarification. So that Galatians is - after people knew the truth given in Romans but they had turned aside from this truth. And Paul felt that this salvation truth was so very vital that it's my impression it's the only one of his Epistles that he does not begin with words of praise for the church to which he's writing. He always praised them for the fine things they have done and for the many fine qualities they have before going on to point out the particular places where they need improvement. But here he doesn't do that. Here he starts in and his praise is only to God, no praise given to them. And then when he first begins talking about them he says in Verse 6, "I marvel that ye are so ~~and~~ soon removed from him that called you into the grace of God, unto another gospel." He jumps right straight into strong criticism of them at the very beginning of the Epistle, right straight into this very strong criticism. The salutation of the Gospel we might call as the Scofield Bible does, Part I - the Salutation - that is only five verses but it is a beautiful salutation. And you notice how in that salutation he lays his stress upon the vital doctrine of salvation, "From our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God the Father." This is the keystone of the Epistle - you might say it is of the whole Bible - the thought that is given in this fourth verse. Then Part 2 - The Theme and Occasion of the Epistle. That's only four verses here but in those four verses he tells why he's writing and what it is that - in fact you might say the whole thought of the book is summarized in Verse 4 of the Salutation and then in these four verses. "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from Him that called you into the Grace of Christ into another Gospel." Correction of false interpretation about salvation through Christ. "Another gospel which is not another but there be some that trouble you and would pervert the gospel of Christ." And what a verse this eighth verse is. The writer on the greatest chapter on love in the Bible - I Corinthians 13 - "greatest of all is love" - tells us these wonderful things about Christian love and if we don't have Christian love, everything is worthless, absolutely worthless. Imagine the one who could write like that, writing this eighth verse, "Though

we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" and repeats it in the ninth verse. He says it in Verse 8. He says it again in Verse 9. If anyone preaches another gospel, let him be accursed. What bitter language! What strong language! What terrible language! I got a letter from an old friend who was with me in seminary and he said that in the Presbytery he belonged to of the Presbyterian Church USA, he said there were people in that Presbytery who were criticizing other men in the Presbytery and they were saying that these other men didn't believe the Bible was free from error and they didn't believe people were saved through the blood of Christ. And he said, "These people are using bitter language about ~~these others~~ these others and criticizing them!" And he said, "Is that any way to win them? Is that showing true love toward them? Shouldn't we be kind, gentle, and gracious with these people and show true love for them?" Well we should show true love for everybody. But what does Paul show here toward these Judites? He says, "Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." We must love the one who is leading the people astray and try to win them to the faith if we possibly can but how much more must we love the multitudes that he's leading astray. And how we must do everything we can to defend them from him, to protect them from him, and to deliver them from his evil efforts. We must never have an attitude of bitterness or hate toward him as an individual but toward him as representative of a force that is leading people to ~~hell~~ Hell and destroying people's opportunity of salvation, we must use every possible effort and Paul even says, "Let him be accursed" and repeats it in the very next verse. And toward the end of the book he says about these people, "I would they were even cut off" He uses the strongest kind of language. It's hard to understand but it shows Paul's very, very strong feeling about these false teachers who have come in among them who were so twisting the method of salvation. He even would say this in Chapter 5:12, "I would they were even cut off, which trouble you." And it's all summarized here in these first nine verses. Now having given here his theme, he says, "I can't understand why you're so soon removed to another Gospel which isn't a Gospel at all." Then in part 3, he defends his message which he has given. It's interesting here

the approach that he uses. Instead of getting right into logical discussion he defends his right to present the truth - Part III - Paul's Gospel is a revelation, not a tradition from the other Apostles. Paul claims to be the messenger of God who has received the message from God and who is standing on the message that God has given him. And these people are people who have been won to Christ through Paul. His correction then of false understanding of this vital doctrine, is an attempt to bring them back to the line which he had presented them. They think they're still Christians, they're following Christian teaching, but they're departing from Paul. "Well" they say, "after all, who are you, Paul. Jesus Christ appointed twelve Apostles. You're not one of those twelve. His name isn't given ~~XXXX~~ in it. No where does it say in the Gospels that Christ ~~was~~ appointed twelve Apostles including Paul. Paul's never mentioned. Nowhere in the Gospel does it say that Christ said, "If one of the Apostles dies, or apostasizes, you appoint another in his places. Or I will appoint another in his place or anything of the kind. There's absolutely no foundation in the Gospel for looking for this man to have authority. This man who didn't even know Christ. This man who never saw Him in his life. This man who was comparatively little connected with the others. They say, "Now Paul you came and you told us about Christ and that's wonderful and we certainly are rejoicing in what we got from you. But now we're getting nearer the fountainhead. Now we have some people who come right from Jerusalem and these people have brought us teaching. Oh, we don't say they came from Peter, but these people know Peter. They know Peter and they know the Apostles and they tell us that if we're going to be saved, now we must be circumcised and carry on these practices of the Old Testament. And, well, you gave us our start and we're very grateful to you for it but we've gotten beyond you now." So Paul in part three is defending his right to speak. In II Corinthians at great length he defended his right to be a leader of them. Now he is defending his right to be a teacher. Of course the two overlap but he is speaking in Corinthians of the conduct and of his right to be one to explain details of conduct. Here he is talking of their belief and of his right to be one who presents the very fundamentals of the Gospel to them. It fits in with the nature of this book as compared with Corinthians. And so this runs from 1:10 until approximately 2:14 - it's hard to know exactly where you ought to make the division - probably an all right place would be near there anyway.

End of Record 49

He is trying to show the people of Galatea that he is one to whom God has specifically revealed His truth. It's rather interesting that a leader in the movement would try to show his independence of the others in the movement rather than to show that he goes back to the fountainhead. Paul says, "I got my teaching directly from God. I got nothing from the others." In verse 19 he tells of his first visit to Jerusalem there after his conversion, after he spent three years in Arabia. He says after three years, "I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter and abode with him fifteen days but other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother." Now James, the Lord's brother, wasn't one of the Apostles according to our Protoestantism. He's using the word, "Apostles" in a broad sense. But this is the only one he saw was Peter he stated in fifteen days. Fourteen years later he came up again and he tells us how he communicated the Gospel he preaches among the Gentiles, "privately, to those who were of reputation, lest by any means I should run or had run in vain." I don't think Paul would say, "Now/^{maybe}what I've been preaching these last ten years isn't right. I'm going to find out." But he's trying to find out whether they are going to stand with him, whether he was going to have difficulty with them. But he says they made him no difficulty, "Neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek was compelled to be circumcised". They didn't compel him to be circumsized, ~~XXXX~~ He says, "We did not give subjection, no, not for one hour" to these false brethren. So Paul says, "I got my truth from God but when I came to the Apostles they agreed with me, made no difficulty for me." But then does he go on to say, "Now you know that the 12 apostles whom Jesus appointed ~~XXXX~~ agree with me - we all stand together. This is God's truth. You should stand by it. You should know that I am worth following because the Apostles whom Jesus appointed agree with me and stand with me." He said the exact opposite. He says here in Verse 6, "But of these who seem to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it makes no difference to me: God accepts no man's person)" Does he say, "Jesus appointed twelve Apostles. These Apostles are the establishers of Christianity. Whatever they say is right. Whatever they write is inspired. Whatever they stand on, we can stand on." ~~XXX~~ No, he says, "they who seem to be somewhat (whatever they were makes no matter to me. God accepts no man's person. They who seemed to be somewhat added nothing

to me". And he says in Verse 9, "When they perceived the grace that was given to me, they gave to me and to Barnabas the right hand of fellowship". Not only does Paul not say, "You can follow me because I'm one of the 12 Apostles." He doesn't say, "You can follow me because I agree with the 12." But he says, "I don't care what the Apostles say. I got my message from God. The Lord has given to me. But they have made no difference." He goes on and says, "I withstood Peter to the face." He's not saying, "Peter and I, we just stand together like this. Here we are. We 12 Apostles stand together." He says, "This is the message which God has given me by revelation. It's a message which is taught in the Old Testament, He's given me the understanding of it, and study it. This is the message and these folks haven't pointed out anything wrong with it. They have not denied my teaching and when in their actions, they differ from it, I dispute them to the finish." It's very interesting how different from that idea. Here are the 12 Apostles, they are in charge of Christianity. Whatever anyone of them says that is the truth. That's not Paul. Paul's attitude is, "God has given this to me by revelation. I'm standing upon it. The others have not differed from me. But, I don't care what they are. It makes no difference to me because I got it from God." There is an idea which is taught in many quarters today that whatever any of the 12 Apostles say, that is what establishes truth. But that's not what Paul thinks as you see here in Galatians very definitely. He says, "God taught it to me. It agrees with the Old Testament. It's contained in the Old Testament. He helped me to understand it. And these others have not differed. When Peter in his conduct went contrary to the truth, that he has expressed his beliefs in, I withstood him to the face and criticized him." Not given to show how he agrees with Peter but to show how he's not inferior to Peter in any way. So Paul here is speaking then as one to whom God has revealed the truth and Paul is declaring it and giving evidence that God has revealed it to him. He's not gotten it from anybody else. That's a rather dangerous thing for us today. There're so many people today who come around with new ideas and new isms, new theory, and they tell us - one man said to me one day, "Just the way God spoke to the prophets in the Old Testament, that's the way that God speaks to me all the time. He gives me messages." And there are people who claim that today. The fact of the matter is that God has given us the message through those and we

It is not impossible God might chose to give us an added message today but it's so extremely unlikely that we'd want to test it and test it very, very thoroughly. They didn't have the Word then. Yes? (Student question) Who was it - was it Miller back in 1880 who said that the Lord was coming the next week. And the people all got out with white garments on on the hill and waited for Him. He didn't come. There are many people who felt that the Lord spoke to them that way. But actually the Word is our only safe course today. (Student question) Yes, certainly he would accept anything the Lord said to them but they might misunderstand. But he doesn't say that they didn't misunderstand. He says they agreed with him. But he says in their actions

(7.5) There have been through the ages many who have thought that God spoke to them. Now personally I'm not ready to say that God has not spoken to anyone since the time of the Apostles. I think it altogether possible that the Lord may very definitely lead a person in specific matters. I think it very, very possible. But I think that when it comes to general matters of doctrine or of teaching, we have our truth in the Scripture. And when it comes to specific matters I feel that it is uncommon that God leads in this generation. And I feel that Satan leads very definitely. And I feel that we're often deceived by our own ideas. So I think that in most cases it is best to stay pretty close to the Bible and not expect a specific leading. I feel that God wants us to learn what the principles are in the Bible and learn to apply them and then after we have applied them, praise Him to prevent its turning out of it is contrary to His

(8.5) I think that's the way he wants us to feel in this age. Now in a particular case He might speak to a certain person in a particular way. But I don't think anybody else can tell whether He has or not. I feel that when somebody declares he's a mouthpiece for God today, the chances are, I would say nine hundred ninety-nine out of a thousand that he is either an imposter or

(9.) Well, Paul though was different. Paul here definitely had been spoken to by the Lord and he makes that his claim upon which he rests his truth here which he has given. Though he does say the Apostles did not differ from it. They agreed with what I said he says. And he says they recognized that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to me as the Gospel of the circum-

cision was to Peter. He recognized that that was God's will - to make him the great Apostle to the Gentiles and Peter the great Apostle to the Jews. But then when Peter got mixed on his understanding of the truth and his actions, Paul said he "withstood him to the face and publicly rebuked him" - in front of everybody. He doesn't tell us here how Peter took it - doesn't give us any information on that. But then Part IV is his discussion of justification by faith alone. He is reiterating the Gospel that he's given there after stressing his right to declare that it is God's revelation to him - he is God's spokesman. Justification by faith alone - now this runs from 2:15 to ~~about~~ 3:24. And this is a very interesting section. It is very parallel to Romans. It's interesting how Paul in Romans and in Galatians makes a big part of his argument ~~XXXXX~~ - Abraham was saved by faith. It was God's grace alone that saved Abraham. We are saved the same way Abraham was. It's nothing new. It is not a new religion/ that he is giving. It's Abraham's religion. It's not a new method of salvation. It's the way Abraham was saved. It is, in other words, already in the Old Testament that salvation is by faith alone. And so he puts great stress on the relation to Abraham in this section here as he did in Romans. Abraham was circumcised as a seal and a sign of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised. Circumcision in Abraham's case was not a method of salvation. It was an indication that he was saved. It was an evidence of his faith. He wasn't saved because he was circumcised. He was saved because he had faith. And then he was circumcised as a seal and evidence of the faith which he had before he was circumcised. My, what an answer that is to those who teach baptismal regeneration - that when you are baptised you're saved and if you're not baptised, you're not saved. Paul says in Romans that Abraham was circumcised as the seal of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised. He was saved before he was circumcised. The circumcision was just a sign. It's strange how this idea of baptismal regeneration is held by some comparatively orthodox people. But I think that really orthodox people who ^{hold it} explain it in such a way that it isn't really baptismal regeneration. I think the majority ^{are} ~~is~~ Lutherans, some of them at least. They say they believe it and then they explain it away. Well, this section then is a very, very great section on the very essential point of salvation - that justification is by faith alone. And this is just as living today as it was when Paul wrote it. That is our big difference with the Roman

Catholics. Our big difference with the Roman Catholics isn't the claim of the authority of the Pope. It isn't the claim the Pope is infallible. ~~XX~~ There are many points we differ with them but they're not the main points. The main point of difference with the Roman Catholics is that they deny that we are saved by faith alone. They explicitly deny it. They come out in their publications that it is not true that we are saved by faith alone. They say we're saved by faith plus work. But if they read Galatians here Paul says we are saved by faith plus nothing. It is faith alone by which we are saved. "A man is not justified by the works of law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified."

End of Record 50

Well there are various subdivisions here but I won't go into them. We'll get the main heads here - and he ends up with showing what the law was. He says in Chapter 3 that (Verse 17)"the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ." Abraham he says is saved through Christ. "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul." God gave it to Abraham by promise. "Why then do we have the law?" he says. "The law was added because of transgressions till the seed should come to whom the promise hath been made." He says the law concludes all understanding. The law shows us our need of Christ. The law is our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ that we might be justified by faith. And then Part V which you might start at 3F25 and run until approximately 4:15. I say approximately in each case because it gradually makes a transition and an argument could be made in each case to move it a few verses one way or the other. It's a running discussion. It's not now I'll discuss this and I'll now take up this. But he now discusses the matter of our difference after we are saved. And so the rule of the believer's life is grace, not legal. Gracious, not legal - that doesn't mean that we disobey the rule but it means that we neither are saved through keeping the law nor are we kept from keeping the law. He doesn't

save us and then say, "Now if you keep the law, you can keep on being saved. If you keep the law you can live a life that is honoring to God." He wants us to keep His moral law but he says - Verse 25 - "After faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." You notice he doesn't say after Christ is come. He says after faith is come. This is for anyone - Abraham or anyone else who has believed in Christ - after faith has come he's not under the schoolmaster. The schoolmaster brings him to Christ, shows him his need of Christ but after faith comes, he's not under this schoolmaster. That is not to say he takes everything his schoolmaster said and cast it aside and says it's no good. Not at all. But it means that his continuance is not conditioned on his obedience to the law which led him to Christ. We are children he says rather than servants and so he develops this them that we are the children of Christ and therefore that we - he gives this wonderful allegory at the end of Chapter 4 which some people take as an evidence that you can take anything in the Bible and allegorize it. And I'm sure Paul would be the first one to be shocked at such an idea. He says in verse 21, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. He who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman is by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the ~~XXXX~~ one from Mt. Sinai which to bondage which is Hagar. For this Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia and answers to the Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free which is the mother of us all." He says that there is the one method, the method that Abraham tried to use when he didn't have any child and God was going to give him a great progeny. Well he got Hagar. He used a human expedient to have a child ~~XXXXXXXX~~ instead of looking to God's promise. God said in Isaac (4.75) He used this human expedient. It wasn't that The Hagar system was right for a while and then the Isaac system was right for a while. The Isaac system was always the right system. This "answers to Jerusalem which now is and is in bondage with children. But Jerusalem which is above is free which is the mother of us all." He doesn't mention Rebekah here at all. It's not an allegory that walks on all fours but it's a comparison. Then he quotes in

Verse 27 he quotes from Isaiah, "Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which has the husband." He quotes from Isaiah's declaration of the calling of the Gentiles. "We, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of the promise." "The Scripture says cast out the bondwoman and her son. Wherefore, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." He brings an illustration, a very interesting illustration. But we don't want to get the idea from that that you can take anything in the Scripture and use it as an illustration. You get the truth first and then you illustrate. You don't get the illustration first and then learn what the truth is. If you did, you could get anything at all out of the Scripture. But he is stressing then the very vital fact of being under - enjoying Christian liberty, freedom from thinking that you are saved by keeping precise ordinances or that you continue through your keeping of them. He says that Christ is become of no effect to you, whomsoever you are justified by the law. You are fallen from grace if you think you are justified by the law - that you cannot possibly be saved in that way. In the Scofield Bible here on Verse 18 there is a very excellent note in the margin. It says in verse 18 that - this is getting down to our next head but it fits right with what I spoke here about justified by the law, "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." And there's a marginal note - m - that is, not under bondage of effort to please God by law works. I think that's a very wonderful statement. You are not under the law. It means you are not under bondage of effort to please God by law works. It doesn't mean we don't please God by ~~XXXXX~~ obeying his moral law, but it means we are not under bondage of effort to please him that way. We please him by recognizing our sonship, by loving Christ, by endeavoring to serve Him, and if we do our conduct will naturally ~~XXXXX~~ accord with His moral law and we'll naturally be interested in learning His moral law to tell us the sort of conduct He wants us to have. But we're not using it as the measuring stick at every point to see whether we've pleased God or not. Yes? (Student question) Yes, very good. Both of them are there and both of them are here. We are alive. Justification is by faith alone and the rule of the believer's life is faith alone - just to live by faith. He becomes alive by faith and he continues alive by faith - excellent. And then Part Six - Sanctification is

Through the Spirit, not through an attempt to carry ~~XXX~~ out precise restrictions and provisions of the law. Sanctification is produced by the Spirit. Verses 16 to 24. It ends up with that wonderful verse, "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." It is the Holy Spirit, not self-effort which produces Christian character in us. Really Part VI might well be included under V because to walk in the Spirit is certainly the rule of the believer's life. But there's - it's more explicit here and perhaps it's good to have a separate part for it. With this comparison of the works of the flesh and the works of the Spirit. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law. There is plenty of law against certain of the works of the flesh. We don't do the works of the flesh, not because we have a list of restrictions - let's watch this and watch that and don't do this and don't do that but because we're trying to please God and follow the Spirit of God in developing love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. And then Part VII - the Outworking of the New Life in Christ Jesus. Again Parts V, VI, and VII really could be put together into one part. Not only is justification by faith but the continuance of life must be by faith. Part VII is the practical application of it to individuals, the practical application to our lives - you can run it to the end of the book if you want. There are a few verses of conclusion and yet the conclusion still keeps stressing this thought. He's so full of it that he can't stop to say goodbye without repeating it as he does it. He says, "See with how large letters I've written you with mine own hand"(Verse 11) and you think that's the end but then he goes right on in 12 and 13 criticizing the people who are trying to lead them into bondage. And then Verse 14, "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." The answer to glorying in circumcision, glorying in what we can do to carry out God's law. And Verse 16, "As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them and mercy and upon the Israel of God." We are the Israel of God. You don't have Israel over there and the church here but you have the olive tree - the continuing people of God, the Israel of God. The true Israel and then you have Israel according to the flesh, part of which is the Israel of God and part of which is outside it. Well this book of Galatians is one that everyone would do well to read at least once a year, I think to

read it straight through and see if you are not falling into the errors which Galatians criticizes would be good for anybody. In I and II Corinthians you find this and that and the other thing that effect details of your conduct and matters that are vital for you that are ~~XXXX~~^{good} to go through carefully and thoughtfully and apply all the time. But Galatians here hits right at the central point of your understanding of Christianity. And these people who were so true to Paul were being led away and he feels so badly about it. And every one of us can be led away. And we are - we get these little stresses on this and that and the other thing - putting them in the place of living in the spirit and following Christ and seeking the works of the spirit. And I think if we can just take these strong statements here and apply them to ourselves that every year every one of us will receive great blessings - the correction. And then go back to Romans and get the clear/ elucidation of the doctrine as a whole. Now in Ephesians we start a new section - "E". We had our first the doctrine of salvation and we have had much in Romans, in Corinthian Epistles and in Galatians about the sort of life that God wants us to live. But it is all very closely related to the method of salvation. It is the primary truth of the Christian life - salvation by faith, living by faith in the (13.5)

And now in Ephesians he gives a doctrinal epistle in which he is taking up not a new doctrine but a step forward in the emphasis. It is the doctrine of the Christian life which is hid with Christ. Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians are addressed to believers. Romans, Corinthians and Galatians are of course also addressed to believers but they are dealing with matters which were very, very vital in connection with their becoming believers. Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians (14.)

but we could never leave them there to everything. But the stress is on the life with Christ. The life in the Heaven. The body of the believers.

End of Record 51

In Ephesians here we have the doctrinal epistle like Romans, going on from Romans, overlapping to some extent with Romans. But it is the epistle which is dealing with the people of God and it is dealing with His body which is the church. And when it says that His body is the church, what church does he mean? Does he mean the Church of Antioch or the Church of Jerusalem or the Church of Laodicea or the Church of Corinth or Ephesus? It's very plain that he does not mean any individual church in this epistle. In this epistle the word "church" is regularly used to mean the whole body of believers. It is the body of Christ, it is the unified collection of all those who are saved through Him. It is the great church epistle of the Bible and yet there is practically nothing about church government in it. There's far more about church government in Corinthians than there is in Ephesians because in Ephesians the church is all the body of Christ. It is all those who are truly saved, without exception, without matter of difference on small points, without question of where they are. This is dealing with the true church in the sense of the invisible church - the church of true believers. And the epistle I think can well be divided into three parts, of which the third is simply the conclusion. The two main ones then would be the doctrinal section and the practical section. And the ~~practical~~ ^{doctrinal} section would be Chapter 1:1 to 4:16. The doctrinal section of the book, and then the practical section 4:17 to 6:17. Then the conclusion - we put a separate head because it is longer than the conclusion of most books. It is just the desire, their prayers, and so on. It's long enough that it sort of separates from the rest, but still it's pretty short compared to the rest. The main thing is the two parts - the doctrinal and the practical. Now the doctrinal section we could divide into four parts of which the first would be The Introduction - Chapter 1. Four parts - one part to each chapter here up to 4:16 - and the first part, The Introduction has the salutation the first two verses and then thanksgiving for the election of the whole church and God's love - verses 3 to 14. His prayer of thanksgiving to God for the blessings which he has given to the whole church, which is united with Christ and which includes both Jews and Gentiles. That section from 3 to 14 is a wonderful introduction to the teaching of the book. It is God "who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in the heavenly places in Christ." In your English text ~~XXXXXXXX~~ in verse 3 there it

says "with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ." Now of course it's in italics so you understand naturally you emphasize anything with italics, don't you. When was it somebody was reading the story of the old prophet in I Kings 13. It says he said to his sons, "Saddle me the ass." And they saddled him - him is in italics. Actually of course the italics in the King James version mean different from what they mean in the other book. They mean the exact opposite. They mean that it is not in the original and this word "places" is not in the original. "Who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in the heavenlies in Christ." Now in English we don't use adjectives that way so you have to have a noun - in heavenly what? I'm not sure if "places" is very good. There is a statement in the Scofield Bible which says that "heavenlies" may be defined as the sphere of the believer's spiritual experience as identified with Christ - and then goes on and gives various relationships. The believer is a heavenly man and a stranger and pilgrim in the earth. This is the man who, though living on the earth, is living in the heavenlies. It is not a place but it is a relationship in the heavenlies with Christ. And Ephesians is the book of life in the heavenly. And here in these 12 verses here, he is stressing the relationship of the whole church to Christ, the head of the church. A very, very wonderful sentence. And then there is a prayer for the church which is the next few verses - 15 to 23 - a prayer for the church that they may realize their unity with a risen and ascending Christ. This first chapter of Ephesians is certainly our charter of life in the heavenlies. And it is a very individual matter and yet a matter which deals not with an individual as one alone but as a member of this heavenly fellowship of all those who make up His body, the body of Christ. Then the second chapter deals with the call of the Gentiles. And the first ten verses of it go back to the method of salvation, but the stress here is on what we were saved for. It goes back to what we've had in the other books, the method of salvation. We have in a life in the heavenlies constantly to look back. They in dealing with salvation are constantly looking forward. You can't draw a sharp line between the two. But this is how we are saved - Chapter 2:1-10. And verses 11-22 are the unity of the believers in Christ. The unity of all true believers. That which was uncircumcision, that which is called circumcision, they now are one. We were without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope and without

God in the world, but now we are one with those who had the hope, had the covenants. Ye are no more strangers in corners but fellow citizens with the saints and with the household of God." They're built on the foundation of the apostles and the prophets. This is the wonderful unity in Jesus Christ the chief cornerstone in whom ye are all built together for habitation of God. I thought we would finish Ephesians but I see we can't. We'll go on with it this afternoon at 2:30.

You notice that we're starting a second cycle of the books of Paul's epistles. We began to look at the book of Ephesians and Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians go together just like the first three did - or the first four. They dealt with salvation through Christ, justification by faith alone. These three deal with life in Christ, the believer's life in the heavenly, the life of union with Christ. And we notice that in the main the book of Ephesians is divisible into two parts - the doctrinal section and the practical section, the doctrine presented first and then the relation to the specific life dealt with next - just as we had it in Romans. Although in Romans the doctrinal was three-fourths of the book - nevertheless there was a very excellent and vital practical portion at the end. Here the division isn't quite as one-sided, quite as unbalanced as that, though in Romans it is a very long and excellent section at the end. But then we look at the doctrinal section - we saw the first part, Chapter 1, we might ~~XXXX~~ speak of as The Introduction. I hate that word because it's so general but it certainly covers the presentation of the picture of the unity of the believers with Christ as their head. The whole church as a union of believers with Christ as its head and showing his life through them. It's divided into a thanksgiving section which went through Verse 14 and then a prayer from 15 to the end - a prayer for fuller knowledge. Then the second chapter might be called The Call of the Gentiles. The first chapter was the whole united church including all sections. In the second chapter he deals specifically with those to whom he is writing, the bulk of whom are gentiles. And he shows how - in the first 10 verses - how they had come purely through the grace of Christ, purely through justification by faith. And then in verses 11 to 22 he shows the union of the Gentiles, who were from the wild olive tree, with the believing Jews

members of the olive tree that had continued so long, united together into the one building, the holy temple in the Lord - the united church of all believers regardless of background, regardless of any other quality, all those who are born together in Christ. Then Chapter 3 - I think we can call Chapter 3 The Church - A Mystery Hidden From Past Ages. What is the mystery that is hidden from past ages? Well, certainly no-one knew all about the life of Christ until he lived it. The prophets saw this and that about it, they learned certain features of it, they saw its import, they saw its meaning, they saw how through it they were saved, But they couldnot know all about it - they couldn't apprehend or comprehend it ~~XXX~~ the way one could after it was completed. And it was necessary prior to His actual coming that the message be given out through a specific organization with a special type of ceremonies and services in order to get across to people that which they only saw through a glass darkly. But now that He has come and we can know more detail about Him, that He actually has been crucified and we don't look forward to something which we have a few glimpses of, but we look back on something of which we know a great deal, we have a different situation. And it is possible then to have a universal call to all people. All peoples could come before but they had to come through a very prescribed way. Now it is possible to put the stress simply on the faith directly in Him without the necessity of the intermediatex steps which were there before. And so we have this Chapter 3 - The Church-A Mystery Hidden From Past Ages

End of Record 52

and this chapter divides into two main parts. The first of those is verses 1 to 13 or 1 to 12 - it's a little hard to know whether to put 13 with what precedes or what follows. I think I'll put it with what follows - say 1 to 12. Here we have the mystery of the universal call new in revelations, specially trusted to St. Paul. The universal call that is the mystery - entrusted specially to Paul and first revealed now. ~~XXXX~~ ^{And} he says the mystery is that the Gentiles shall be fellow heirs from the same body. Always it was known Gentiles could be saved but it was thought they would have to become Jews first. Now there is the mystery that out of the two He formed the one body, the church of Christ. And then verses 13 to 21 is the prayer for their fuller knowledge and understanding of the indwelling of Christ. The key word of it is verse 18 - "ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length and depth and height and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge" - how can you know it if it passes knowledge. He claims that they may know it, in other words, that they may increase in knowledge, that the Christian life may be one of constant increase in the knowledge of Christ, constant advance in this life in the heavenlies, constantly closer association with Him so that we are living in Him and He is living in us. Then chapter 4:1-16 summarizes the doctrine of the unity of the believers in Christ. Verses 1 to 6 stresses the unity of the believers in Christ. Verses 7 to 11 - the diversity of gifts in the glorified Christ. These are gifts spoken of for the universal church. He is not speaking here of any individual church but of the whole body of Christ. He gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ. (Student question) The diversity of gifts in the glorified Christ - verses 7 to 11. And then verses 12 to 16 - the purpose of the ministry - the purpose of the gifts to the church is for the edifying of the body of Christ in order that all of the individuals who belong to Christ's church shall grow in the unity of the faith and in knowledge of the Son of Man, the Perfect Man, and the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. The purpose is for the development of the individual and for the development of the unified body of believers. That is summarized in verses 12 to 16 and that ends the doctrinal section - Chapter 1 through 4:16. Then we have the practical section of Ephesians. And Ephesians, like Romans,

being the presentation of the doctrine, the balanced orderly presentation of the doctrine, it has a larger practical section than Romans because it is dealing more with present situations. And the practical section of the book can be divided into four parts. The practical section is Chapter 4:17 to 6:17. And it can be divided into four parts. First - The New Light - that is, learning Christ and growing into His image - Chapter 4:17-24. The second part is The Conquest of Sin- even with true, born-again Christians - still so vital because there is no end of the power of sin in this life. And so even in the life in the heavenlies we have to think of "Wherefore, putting away lies, speak every man truth with his neighbor." You wouldn't think it was necessary when people had reached the point where they were living in the heavenlies - but Paul had had a good deal of experience with people and he knew it was necessary. So The Conquest of Sin is Chapter 4:25 to 5:31. And then Number 3 in the practical section - The Social Relations of the Christians - and that is in three sections.: Number 1 - the relation of husbands and wives consecrated as a type of union of Christ with Israel - the relation of husbands and of wives consecrated as a type of the union of Christ with His church - 5:21-33. And second - the relation of parents and children - hallowed as in the Lord - Chapter 6:1-4. Rather strange in our English Bible, I guess in all modern Bibles, where they have a chapter division there right between the parents and the children. And then part number 3 - The Relations of Masters and Servants - made a brotherhood of service to one master - Chapter 6:5-9. And then part 4 - The Warfare of Spirit-filled Believers - Chapter 6:10-17. Even the life in the heavenlies is a life of warfare for which it is necessary to put on the whole armor of God. And this beautiful picture of the Christian armor. Then the remaining verses of the book are the personal conclusion - Verses 10 to 24. You can call that a third main section if you want. It's just a personal conclusion. We won't need to look at it in detail now. Now this book of Ephesians is the presentation of the doctrine - the light in Christ, the light in the heavenlies. And in the presentation of this doctrine great stress is laid on the church, on the body of believers, the body of Christ. In the other two epistles which go with this, there is not nearly as much stress laid on the church. I think the reason for that is because the doctrine of the relation of the believers in the one body in the church is very important in understanding the doctrine, but perhaps did

not enter so much into the errors against which Paul wrote Philippians and Colossians. It is there it is touched upon, particularly in Colossians but not emphasized nearly as much as it is emphasized in Ephesians. We go on to F - Philippians. Quite appropriate - see we had E for Ephesians and F for Philippians. And in Philippians we have the book of reproof in connection with this doctrine. Now the reproof in connection with this doctrine is not nearly as strong as the reproof in connection with the doctrine of salvation. In that the reproof got into matters of sin, matters of division of such a sort as would bring shame upon the body of Christians and as would interfere with its evangelistic work to a very great extent. And so the reproof was very strong in places in I and II Corinthians and it was necessary that Paul should defend his apostleship there very strongly. Now Philippians is written to those who have been justified by faith and know they've been justified by faith. There is no question in their minds of the doctrine in Romans. And the main points of the doctrine of Ephesians are familiar to them, even as the doctrine of Romans was familiar to ~~XXXXX~~ the people to whom (12.) But the reproof which Philippians has, the reproof, the emphasis upon the errors of life into which they might fall; deals very particularly with one sort of error. The error of spiritual pride. The error of feeling that one has arrived at some point, feeling that one is better than others. That is perhaps the most subtle danger for the Christian, the one which after all is the sin that brought Luther to his downfall, the sin of pride. A good argument can be made that it is the worst sin of all. And yet after the grosser sins are taken out of the way and one makes progress in the Christian life, this is the most subtle of all, the one most difficult to avoid. Who is it said that a person can become so humble that he soon becomes proud of his humility. And it is an error which possibly must be guarded against, this error of spiritual pride, this error of exalting oneself. Now I don't think that Paul would want anyone to go to an extreme on this point to the point where he would fail to take that which he has and use it for the Lord's glory. There are some people who the devil manages to push into going to that extreme. They are so anxious to be humble that they reach the point where they're not trying to accomplish anything for the Lord. And that certainly would be utterly contrary to Paul's example. Paul is anxious to make every effort count for the glory of Christ. And I feel that when

a person has a certain talent, has a certain ability, has a certain standing in some way, that that should be used for the Lord's glory wherever it can be properly so used. And it often makes a subtle psychological question to know where one is using it for the advancement of the Lord's and where something of personal glory can enter in. It is necessary to find the right balance between the two or one is not looking for personal glory but is anxious to utilize everything for the glory of Christ that can advance the Gospel. Now in Philippians this is his great stress. It is urging people to seek the humility that is typical of Christ, to seek to get that attitude in them which was in Christ, who thought it not "a thing to be grasped at, to be equal with God, that made Himself of no reputation, and took on Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men."

End of Record 53

but I think that the book can be fairly decently outlined simply along the line of the chapter divisions which are probably somewhat better made here than a good many of our books. The first chapter is - Christ, the Believer's Life, Rejoicing in Spite of Suffering. Notice how similar again to the thought of Philippians. As in Corinthians, as in almost any case of reproof, it is good to start with a positive presentation. And that is what he starts with here. And he gives them the example of himself. He, himself finds that he is badly treated, put in prison. He's writing from Rome where he is in prison and he finds people who are trying to add affliction to his bonds by preaching Christ out of envy and strife. And Paul in this first chapter gives them an example of the attitude which the Christian should take. He says, "that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather to the furtherance of the gospel. Some indeed preach Christ of envy and strife, of contention, not sincerely thinking to add affliction to my bonds. What then? Notwithstanding every way whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." He is

showing here the attitude which Christians should take. But in showing it he is already giving the reproof of the Philippians. I don't think we would have ground, if we had only this chapter to say that, but you go on through the rest of the chapters and it fits in with the stress that he is laying thereafter. He is very quietly here presenting it, an example right in the first chapter, an example of the attitude they should take. He says, "For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." Then Chapter 2 - Christ the Believers' Pattern, Rejoicing in Lowly Service. And here the rebuke comes out strongly, given not the form of a direct rebuke but an exhortation to avoid "strife and vain-glory but in lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than himself." Pointing out the example of Christ and incidentally in connection with that describing the exaltation of Christ. Perhaps the greatest passage in the Scripture on the exaltation of Christ but introduced here in the midst of this rebuke for exalting themselves. Pointing out that even Christ exalted not Himself but humbled Himself to the death of the cross and is to be highly exalted. So he pleads with them to "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling". What a wonderful passage on work too. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" - God has put it in you, now work it out. He has implanted it in your heart, work it out, let it be evident, let it show itself. He says James says, "Faith without works is death" but the faith that is worked out. It is not that one works the salvation but that one produces the works which the salvation has made possible. "For it is God who works in you both to will and to work, for His good pleasure." And now he gives his own example. He gave Christ's example and now he gives his own, "Yea if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all. I have no man like Timothy who will care truly for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Christ's." What a sad thing to say. After preaching for years, building churches in all these places, having such a tremendous influence for the work of God, then for him to say, "I have no man likeminded who will naturally care for your state for all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's." We oughtn't to feel too disturbed when we find people disappointing. Even the Apostle Paul felt so at this point. He gives this reproof here to them and admits that it refers even to those who are with him in Rome. "All seek their own, not the things which are Christ's."

And then Chapter 3 - now there are those who try to make out that Chapters 1 and 2 are one letter and 3 and 4 another. I don't know whether Dr. Hedegard has mentioned that in the Origins class or not - that attempt to prove that there are two distinct letters which have been combined here. But **X** - it was quite a moot subject a few years ago. If he hasn't dealt much with it, it must be that that theory has largely been given up. That's a matter of criticism rather than survey. The book ~~x~~ makes a complete unit, the parts of it all fit together, certainly from a viewpoint of internal evidence, there's no reason why it's necessary to divide it. And argument can be made for it because he talks about who he's sending to them at the end of Chapter 2 and in other books he talks about that at the very end of the book. And he talks about it again a little bit at the end of Chapter 4. And so it can be suggested that here is a close to the book and that you have another letter. But actually there's no necessity of holding that - it makes a good unit as a whole. And so Chapter 3 - Christ, the Object of the Believer's Faith, Desire, and Expectation. And here he deals again with the matter of Galatians. He warns against the Judeisers, he warns against trusting in legal righteousness, but Christ alone is the object. Back in those letters we had the discussion from the viewpoint of salvation. If you're looking to personal works, to human advantages, to circumcision, to anything like that for salvation, you'll never find it. Here he's looking at it but from a different viewpoint altogether. If you look at these things you will lose the great things. He says, "Yes, doubtless, but I count all things but lost for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord, through whom I have suffered the loss of all things and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ." Again the theme of the book - rebuke of personal vainglory and esteeming oneself better than others - the great theme of the book, that we should be so completely devoted to Christ that our own position sinks into utter insignificance. "Our conversation is in Heaven from whence we look for the Savior, the Lord Jesus. I press on. I count not myself to apprehend it" says Paul, who, if anybody ever apprehended, he did. I count not myself to

(8.5) but I press toward the mark - the prize of the high calling.

The example for us. And then Chapter 4- Christ, the Believer's Strength, Rejoicing Over Anxiety. I can do all things through Christ which strengthen me. "Be anxious for nothing but in everything with prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be

made known unto God." Christ, the believer's strength. Rejoicing over anxiety. So we have the great similarity between Ephesians and Philipians and we have the great contrast between them. But we have the same central theme. Now we go on to G - Colossians. Colossians is the book of correction just like Galatians is and just as Galatians has more in common with Romans than any other book in the Bible has with either of these two, similarly Colossians has more in common with Ephesians than any ~~other~~ book of the Bible, ~~has~~ with either of these two. In fact it has so much in common with it that the most critics say that the same man couldn't have written both books because they're so similar. Usually their argument is the same man couldn't have written ~~THE~~ two books, they're too different. But in this case it's the exact opposite. The two books are very similar, both of them in the end it says that Titus is bringing the letter. They seem to have been written at the same time and they are dealing with a very similar subject. But they are dealing with it from quite a different emphasis and a different approach. There are those who question whether Ephesians is written to the Ephesians, actually. Many of the early manuscripts don't have the words "in Ephesus" at all in the first chapter. And in Colossians, "Let this letter be read to the Church of the Laedoceans and you read the letter I've written them." And we have no letter to the Laedoceans so some think that Ephesians is really ^Laedocean. One theory that's been advanced is that the ~~E~~phesian letter was sent to both Ephesus and Laedocea and that actually it is a letter meant for all the churches but sent to Ephesus and also Laedocea and that those words, "in Ephesus" came to be inserted in the first sentence because that was where the letter was sent. But that he had in mind not one specific church but that he had the churches in general in mind in writing. One thing that I think is very strongly in favor of that theory is the fact that he has no personal greetings in Ephesians, and after all he'd been there three years. In Romans he has a whole chapter of personal greetings and the only people he knew in Rome would have been people he'd met somewhere else who had gone there. And so if he had so many in Rome, it's strange he wouldn't give any to Ephesus. But if the letter he wrote to Ephesus was intended to be a letter to two churches or more, it can easily explain that. And it might be that he sent along personal greetings by Tychicus to a lot of people without including them in the letter because the letter wasn't meant just for the Ephesians. At any rate

Colossians is meant for a specific church. It is the people in Colosse and these people in Colosse are in a great danger. And he writes them in relation to that danger just as he wrote the people of Galatia in relation to their danger. It is correction, correction of false thoughts. The people of Galatia were in danger of losing the understanding of justification by faith and the people of Colosse are in danger of losing the blessing of life in Christ. Colossians does not cover as big an area as Ephesians does, just as Galatians does not cover as big an area as Romans does. It is a book of correction of those who were erring on this point. Now in Ephesians the great emphasis is on the body of Christ. It is on the unified church, all the believers in Christ. That is in the background of Colossians also but it is not stressed in Colossians as it is in Ephesians. The was not the point where there was the error of thinking. It is not the point where there was the special need of correction. But it is on the relation to Christ specifically where the need comes in. And so in Colossians you have more than in Ephesians, you have stressed the greatness of Christ, the union with Christ, the importance of Christ in every way. It is stressed in Colossians, it is touched on much in Ephesians, but it has other matters which are also touched upon in Ephesians which it was not necessary to give in Colossians, particularly if the Colossian people were also to hear the letter to the Ephesians. But in Colossians then the stress is on the truth about the origin of Christ with whom we are to have our life in the heavenlies - our life in union with Him.

End of Record 54

is to evaluate oneself accurately but purely from the viewpoint of the service to Christ rather than from one's own glory. It is to be willing to take the lowest place and to be accountable as far as one's own but to seek to utilize whatever may be utilized for the advancement of the work of the Lord. If I'm writing a letter and if it's a personal letter or anything of the type, I never put a title at the end. Some people always do, I never do. But if I'm writing a letter about some official matters connected with ^{the seminary} where it's going to be important, in that case I use

add to the effectiveness. (Student question)

a special advantage rather than to injure oneself. It's not the Well, now in Colossians then we have this great similarity to Ephesians just as Galatians has the similarity to Romans and for the same reason - because it is the book of correction dealing with the same matter but from the viewpoint not of presenting the doctrine but of correcting an error in connection with the doctrine. In the Elicutt Commentary there is a statement, a division of the doctrinal section into three parts of which it says Number 2 - The Doctrine of Christ Stated Positively. Number 3 - The Doctrine of Christ Stated Polemically. I think that's a very interesting way of putting it. It shows that it is the book of correction. First he reviews the doctrine and then he corrects this interpretation regarding the doctrine. The outline which Elicutt gives here is very similar to the outline for Ephesians. First there is a doctrinal section and then there is the practical section. The epistle is shorter than Ephesians and these two sections are shorter but still they are a fairly good length and they divide this book nearly in half. The doctrinal section then of the book is from 1:1 to 3:4. The doctrinal part is divided into three parts: 1 - the salutation - 1:1-12 and it's divided into two parts - thanksgiving and then prayer for their fuller knowledge. Notice how similar that is to Ephesians where we had thanksgiving and fuller knowledge - very similar - and there are many similarities of words though there is a little difference of emphasis. Then 2 - the doctrine of Christ stated positively is 1:13-29. It is a review of

the doctrine of Christ. A review of the doctrine which was presented in Ephesians. "He is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence." It's interesting to go through this section here and see how often the third personal pronoun occurs - about what He is. Yes? (Student question) Yes - that's in the Doctrine of Christ stated positively - His relation to it. He says that, "I, Paul, am made a minister of this Gospel and now rejoice in my suffering for you and ~~filling~~ ^{filling} that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake which is the Church." Well the afflictions of Christ on the cross they say is sufficient for all, efficient for the elect. His death is sufficient to save all if all would believe on Him. But it is efficient for the elect. And of course the body is the elect. But when it comes to saving people there is nothing which anybody else could do which would add anything to what Christ did. His affliction, His suffering ~~is~~ infallibly produces the salvation of those for whom He died. It is the sufficient and full payment and there's nothing behind in it, there's nothing which we could do to add to it. But in the effective securing of the results of bringing them into the knowledge of Christ and helping them to grow in grace, there is something which we can do. That is the afflictions of Christ produce in the end, all the elect, saved from sin, and brought into a state of perfect union with Him, brought to the perfect man. That is eventually to be produced and certain to be produced as a result of what He did. But of the afflictions of Christ, of its effect, something is now behind in the back, not yet obtained and will be behind until it is obtained. It is going to be attained. We can add nothing to the justification but it is God's will that in a somewhat different school, some of us experience affliction as a means, or endure suffering, or endure hard work, as a means of securing the end - the end which is infallibly produced through the afflictions of Christ. And so Paul says that he is now "filling up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for His body's sake which is the Church." That is the full effect which the afflictions of Christ is going to produce and will inevitably produce is being brought toward that point now by effort which He is putting - which has no saving whatever but it is the securing of that which is purchased. Yes? (Student question) Yes, that would be the same thing. Of course there you get back ^{to} the fundamental mystery of God's sovereignty and man's responsi-

bility. The fact is that God by His sovereign will accomplishes all that He de- (8.25).
 But it also is a fact that He places responsibility upon us, no man is lost but he deserves
 to be lost by his own willful rejection of truth. In most cases when a man is saved there
 is another man who has exerted himself and has worked to secure that purpose. Well even
 take the work of prayer. It is God who does but he does it in response to our prayers. And
 we are working as we pray. And yet God does this entirely but we have a
 . It's a mystery we can't fully understand but we can ~~XXXX~~ see both sides
 of it and we can see that both aspects of it are true. And if we deny either aspect, we
 have a distorted picture of ~~XX~~ the truth. And of course it's very easy, since the human
 aspect is the one that we are immediately dealing with, it's easy to overlook the divine
 aspect and take the view that what we do is all that matters. And of course that is defi-
 nitely wrong. And then there is the opposite extreme to which some go of saying that God'll
 do what He wants regardless. Well God will do what He wants but He will do it through us -
 if not through us, through someone else. Well that was a very interesting verse there and
 I appreciate your raising the question. This is the Doctrine then of Christ stated posi-
 tively here - a wonderful presentation of it in the rest of this first chapter. And then we
 have the correction which he calls here The Doctrine of Christ Stated Polemically. The
 first seven verses are Paul's anxiety for the Colossians. He has great conflict for them
 and for them at Laodicea. He asked them to have their letter read at Laodicea too. He says
 this lest any man should beguile them with enticing words. He is concerned about them. He
 wants to correct the danger of false understanding. And false understanding of course in-
 evitably leads to Paul's (10.75). And so then there is a warning
 against speculative error - verses 8-15 - a warning against speculative error. The Colos-
 sians here in this matter of life in the heavenlies were meeting with the first bits of
 gnosticism - the attempt to explain that which no-one can understand, and in explaining it
 to import into it that which is false. We'll be dealing with that in Church History during
 the next two or three weeks - quite a very considerable amount - not with this particular
 aspect of it but with that same problem. The delving into that which you can't understand,
 where you don't have the data to understand and then trying to explain it on your own theoriz-
 ing. "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tra-

dition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ." In every age we have people who take the Christian doctrine and try to make a philosophy out of it. And they fit it into the philosophy of their day and they say this is Christianity and what they present may be Christianity but it's presented in the language of the philosophy of their day. And then when that philosophy becomes out of date, people think Christianity's out of date. And we have to state it all over again in the form of the philosophy of the next period. It would be better if we kept it separate from the Philosophy and didn't have to keep re-stating it - because Christianity is fact and philosophy is an attempt to explain fact beyond what there's evidence. So that this warning against speculative error goes from 8 to 15 and deals with the various misinterpretations of Christ's true Godhead, of regeneration, and of His sole atonement and triumph over the powers of evil. Then there is a third - under this Doctrine of Christ Stated Polemically - there is a warning against practical superstition, warning against the superstition of trust in obsolete Jewish ordinances - the first part of it. And then a warning against the practice of superstitions worship of angels which interfere with the sole headship of Christ - "not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment administered and this together, increaseth with the increase of God." Yes? (Student question) Yes the Jewish ordinances and angels were the two which went under this practical superstitions - 2:16 to 2:19. 16 and 17 are the Jewish ordinances, 18 and 19 are the worship of angels encroaching on the sole headship of Christ. Well, we'll have to stop there and continue there next Thursday.

End of Record 55

Colossians, we saw that it had a doctrinal section and a practical section just as Ephesians had had. These two letters are very similar in their structure and their content is very similar but there is a somewhat different emphasis in the two. And we were speaking about the Doctrine of Christ Stated Polemically and we had come to "C" - the Warning Against Practical Superstition under which there was "a" - of trust in obsolete Jewish ordinances and mystic asceticism and "b"-of superstitious worship of angels trenching on the sole headship of Christ. These two together were Chapter 2, Verses 16 to 19. And these verses are strikingly similar to verse which we had in Ephesians. You remember how in Ephesians we read of the - in Ephesians 4:15-16 we read, "but speaking the truth in love, may grow up unto Him, in all things which is the head, even Christ; from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplies it, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, makes increase of the body with the edifying of itself in love." And here at this point which we have now reached in Colossians, we have a verse which is very, very similar - verse 18 and 19 - "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels which ye have now seen vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered and knit together; increases with the increase of God." But you notice the difference between the two- how in Ephesians it was the - God has given these gifts for producing this, from whom the whole body works together with the effectual working through the joints and so on - in this other case it's "let no man beguile you into this which is wrong, not holding the Head, " from whom all this comes. A very great difference in attitude between Ephesians - the presentation of the doctrine and Colossians - the correction of false thinking about the doctrine. Now whether Colossians was written first or Ephesians first or both about the same time, doesn't make much difference to your interpretation but it makes a great deal of difference to the interpretation to see the different approach in the two. I would think that with most Christians it would be better to take Ephesians first and then to take Colossians. Col-
ⁱⁿossians gives the doctrine/perhaps not as fully a worked out fashion, a balanced complete idea of it.

(3.5) to correct the places where he was

going astray in his ideas. Ephesians has its emphasis on the church, the body of Christ. Colossians has its emphasis on the relation of the believer to Christ which is the vital thing about the body of Christ is the relation of each part of it to the Lord Himself, to the Head of it. And so there is this important warning here in verses 16 to 19. And then - I called that "C" didn't I - Warning Against Practical Superstitions - these two parts and then "D" is an exhortation. And the exhortation has two parts to it. The exhortation to be dead with Christ to the rudiments of the world, to be risen with Christ to the communion with God and Heaven. And it seems a little unfortunate that the Archbishop put the chapter division right between the two because certainly they belong together. "Wherefore if you are dead with Christ in the rudiments of the world, why are you subject to ordinances - touch not, taste not, handle not. But if you be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sits on the right hand of God." The two certainly go together - "Dead with Christ" - dead to the things that we need to avoid. Not simply laying down a set of rules and wanting to force ourselves to follow them, but dead to these things. They are part of that which we have died when we died with Christ but our affection is set with Him in Heaven on things above. And so at verse 4 of chapter 3 ends this section on the doctrine of Christ stated polemically - in fact ends the whole doctrinal section. And then number 2 - just as in Ephesians we had a practical section after the doctrinal section, similarly here we have the practical section, which begins here with 3:5 and runs to the end of the book. The practical section grows right out of the doctrinal section, out of the believer's union with Christ, from the understanding that he should set his affection on things above and consequently not subject to ordinances, touch not, taste not, handle not, but very definitely staying away from those matters that are contrary to God's will. And so this practical section we might divide into three parts - Number 1 - A General Exhortation - and here the two parts (powers?) like the the dead to Christ, the risen with Christ - we just had. "A" - To Mortification of the Flesh - and all the sins of the old, unregenerate nature - that's Chapter 3:5-9 and it parallels the last four verses of Chapter 2. "B" parallels the first few verses of 3 - to putting on the new man in all the graces of the image of Christ - Chapter 3 - verses 10 to 17. That was Number 1 - the General Exhortation

then Number II - the Special Duties of Human Relationship - where we have the same three exactly as we had in Ephesians. In Ephesians we had the relations of wives and husbands and then a chapter ended. There are three parts under this Special Duties of Human Relationships - wives and husbands, children and parents, slaves and masters. But in Ephesians wives and husbands ended a chapter and you started a new chapter for the children and the parents and the slaves and the masters. Well in Colossians you might think they put them all together in one chapter which is better. But it's worse because the masters alone are left over to Chapter 4. The husbands and wives are in Chapter 3 - Verses 18 and 19, children and parents are in Chapter 3 - Verses 20 and 21, but then the slaves and masters are 3:22 through 4:1. And I'm sure the Archbishop's horse didn't merely stumble, he must have actually fallen at this point to make a division like that here, to have the last verse of a section of this length simply left as the first verse of a new chapter. It's quite illogical. It's about as illogical a division as there is anywhere in the Scripture I would think. But through 4:1 then we have these three relationships. And then we have the rest of Chapter 4 - is the conclusion which involves the exhortation to prayer and watchfulness, the mention of Tychicus and Onesimus and the various salutations. We won't need to take time over the details of the conclusion. But the conclusion is Chapter 4 except for the first verse. Now this similarity between Ephesians and Colossians is very striking and of course it is helpful to us to have the two because each throws light on the other. There've been those who've said Paul couldn't possibly have written them both because they're so similar. But when you see the different purpose, it's easy to see why he should have written both and the truth in them is so important, it certainly is worth stressing and recapitulating. Now this survey has covered the second group of Paul's epistles - the group which deals with the life in Christ, the life in the heavenlies. The first group dealt with the entrance to the Christian life and principles for carrying it on. The second deals with the carrying on of the Christian life with occasional glances back at its beginning - but it is the life in the heavenlies, the life with Christ. Now we go on to a third round of the epistles. We called Colossians "G" I believe. We will call I Thessalonians "H". But perhaps

we should have had a main head and subheads to put these first two groups of Epistles in two groups instead of just one Epistle after the other. So long as you understand that, the precise numbering doesn't make much difference. But now we enter the third group. And the third subject which he takes up is the matter of the second coming of Christ. Paul did not set out to take up these subjects in this order. He wrote Epistles to deal with the needs of the various churches. And the one which is the beginning of the third cycle here is actually the first Epistle that Paul wrote. But in our logical structure it is well placed in the books as they have come down to us traditionally. Whoever arranged them in this order - we have no idea in the world - there is absolutely no way to know. Humanly speaking it would just be a random thing. They happened to get put in one book this way and they kept being copied. Unless somebody deliberately arranged them and it's not impossible that somebody did, but we have absolutely no evidence of it. But as we see how they're arranged, I don't think we can escape the conclusion that the Holy Spirit certainly led whether through a random order or through an individual's thinking it out. Yes? (Student question) Yes. Salvation. The first group is the doctrine of Salvation - entrance to the Christian life. This is the foundation. If you don't have the first group you have nothing. But after you have Romans giving the doctrine of Salvation, how to enter the Christian life, with pointing out the principles by which you enter - they're also very important all through it - and then Corinthians with its rebuke regarding this and Galatians with its correction of false doctrine. Then you start the second subject - The Carrying On of the Christian Life - the life in the heavenlies with Christ. There you have again the doctrine, the reproof, and the correction - through Colossians. And now you start the third group and here you do not have the same three subheads. Possibly because the doctrine of the - well, I guess you might say we have two Epistles and that's the reason you don't have three subheads. Perhaps we should say that. Perhaps I Thessalonians is the doctrine and ~~KE~~ II Thessalonians is both the reproof and the correction - perhaps that's it. Because there is reproof and correction in II Thessalonians. And in getting the reproof and the correction you have a certain amount of addition to the doctrine of I Thessalonians. But the two Epistles are, like I and II Corinthians, very closely related to each

other. The same problems are taken up in them. And it's interesting as we saw in I Corinthians to see how Paul had certain problems which he wrote about and on some of them he was extremely successful and on others the people didn't pay much attention to his ideas. So when he wrote again he had to deal with these matters and appreciate where they had accepted what he said but then go into the places where they hadn't. Well we have the same relationship between I and II Thessalonians. I Thessalonians then we take up and in connection with these two, we can make an outline which is very similar, just as the outline of Ephesians and Colossians is very similar - so is the outline of these two very similar. We will give you that of I Thessalonians but we have a very similar structure for II. I Thessalonians then we'll make a Roman numeral I for an outline of it - "Personal Greetings to the Thessalonians" and this personal greeting we might extend through the whole first three chapters. Paul, in the course of his personal greeting to them, lays the foundation for the specific message and reminds them of a great deal already given, and stresses his relation to them in such a way as to secure a good hearing for that which follows. And so three-fifths of the book is devoted to personal greetings. By the time he finishes the greetings he has thoroughly laid the foundation for the rest.

End of Record 56

So this personal greeting to the Thessalonians is divided into two parts. The first is - "A" we'll call it - Reminiscences of Paul's Stay at Thessalonica - and this is tremendously interesting from a viewpoint of Church History - to see what we learn about this early visit of Paul to Thessalonica and what we learn about what he did there, what he taught. From Chapter 1:1 to 2:16. Under that Number 1 - Appreciation of the Thessalonians - Chapter 1. And in this Appreciation of the Thessalonians, he shows what he has found them to be doing and what a picture it is of a wonderful church. This place where Paul spent a comparatively short time, yet he was able to establish a church of which he could say the wonderful things he says about them: "You were examples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia, for from you sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad; so that we need not to speak anything." Wonderful the examples set by this church and their enthusiasm about spreading the Word. And so he speaks ~~XXXXX~~ of the things about this church and it's very interesting what he describes them as having done - Verse 9 - "And they themselves show us what manner of entering in we had unto you; and how you turned ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ to God from idols, to serve the living and true God and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." Here we have three tenses in the life of the Thessalonians - this early church which Paul established - three tenses here. The past tense ~~XXX~~ - the turning from idols, the present tense - to serve the living and the true God, the future tense - to wait for His Son from heaven. So we have these three as the three prominent aspects in the light of this church - what they've turned from, they're now serving God - they're not just saved and that's that. They're saved to serve and they are ~~servigg~~. But they are not only saved to serve, they are waiting for His Son from heaven. There's an expectation in that early church - an expectation of the return of Christ and of course that sets the scene for the Epistle because the return of Christ is one of the big, main themes of this Epistle. Then Number 2 - "Reminder of the Conduct of Paul and Silas" - Chapter 2:1-12. In which he reminds them of himself and Silas and of how they were among them and how they dealt with them and this remembrance is to bring it back to their minds so they'll be ready to listen better now to what they have to give them. It is as in Corinthians only much milder

reasons for paying attention to what he's going to give them. And then Number 3 - "The Response of the Thessalonians". This is Chapter 2:13-16. He describes how he and Silas dealt with them and then he appreciates the fact that they received the message so readily and so different from these others - from the Jews who both killed the Lord Jesus"and ~~xxxxxx~~ are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved." This of course would strike a strong note with the Thessalonians because the Jews had come there and roused a riot; gotten Paul and Silas driven out of town. And then B under Personal Greetings to the Thessalonians is "Paul's Continuing Interest in the Thessalonians" - 2:17 to the end of chapter 3 . He tells them how anxious he'd been to come back, how he'd planned various times to get back and see them but Satan hindered. And then he tells how he sent Timothy to them. And Timothy came and brought him news about how he's constantly praying for them, praying God's blessing on them - his continuing interest in the Thessalonians. All this would certainly dispose them to listen carefully to the message that he has to give them now. And that is a very important thing in any Christian work. It isn't enough just to have a great deal of truth and go out and give it. You must give it in a way people will listen. And even Paul resorts to all this in order to get people to listen to the message. Tox get it into their minds. It's not enough simply to give it but to get it into their minds. I believe I've told you the story I heard at Princeton Seminary when I was there some years ago, about how - they used to tell with great pride there how a student had come once and said, "Well if you do this such and such, you won't have any students." The professor said, "Young man, Princeton Semirary will go on just the same whether they're are any students or not." And when I was there they had carried that point to an extreme. They had great scholars there who would stand up and talk in a class with twelve ~~tos~~ in it - not more than one or two rows at most could understand what was being said. It was so low and so little effort to get it across to anybody. Here was the truth, take it or leave it - and unfortunately the bulk of the students more and more left it as the years went by. But that is not what God has sent us to do. It is fine to have all the truth you can but it's better to ~~xxx~~ take a little truth and get it across than it is to take a lot of truth and have nobody get it. And we all need that for our work. We want to give people all they take, all they're ready for but we want to be sure they get it. And

we want to be sure we get some across. And that is one of the great dangers of theological graduates. They go out and they think they're going to give all the difficult points of the Scripture immediately. When ~~what~~ the people need is to get grounded in the simple things, get established in the great truths. Then the time will come when these other matters will be tremendously important. But they shouldn't all be given at once and enough time and effort should be taken to get the others across. I was talking yesterday with a Rabbi of a big synagogue down here - a fairly young fellow - and he told me how in his graduating class of the Hebrew Union College there was one of the best students in the class who went out and took a synagogue and he said he didn't last a year. Just couldn't handle it, couldn't get along there, couldn't get along with people, couldn't preach so anybody'd listen to him. So they called him back to the seminary and made him an assistant professor in the seminary. Well we don't do that way here. If a person can't get ~~his stuff~~ ^{his stuff} across we don't look to him to teach other people how to get it across. If you can't preach you're not apt to be any good as a teacher either. I'd be interested maybe a year from now or two - if I see him again I'll ask him to tell me how that fellow's getting on. That was - certainly I think it's a mistake. Of course in that particular case there may be special reasons why - maybe the man has the abilities and they weren't brought out or something. But Paul here takes three whole chapters getting across to them ~~XXXX~~, establishing friendly relations, establishing a rapport with them, reminding them so they'll feel as if he's back with them again and he'll be vivid, personal to them and the thoughts will be prominent that were prominent with them when he was there. And then he's ready to go on to the problems that he~~XX~~ has to present. And here are the specific messages. And now the first of these is rebuke. Well I don't know as it is rebuke but it certainly is something that is pretty close to it. Chapter 4 - "The Specific Messages of the Epistle" - Thessalonians 4 to 5 - and the first of those is a warning against uncleanness and lack of love or of industry - the three things in this warning - Chapter 4:1-12 - warning against uncleanness and lack of love or of industry. Now they in a way don't go together but it gets the three in. Maybe I should just have said "warning" because I've got 1, 2, 3 underneath it mentioning the three things. Number 1 is uncleanness and to this he devotes 8 of the 12

verses. And I must say many a person reading this would be tempted to say, "Well now here as Paul gone to this great Christian group in Thessalonica, built up this fine church, writes all the wonderful things he says about them in Chapters 1 and 2 and then he devotes 8 verses to urging them to avoid fornication. Why on earth should it be necessary that Paul should do a thing like that?" Well somebody says these people were just out of heathendom and of course that's altogether different from anything nowadays. Well two or three years ago Mr. Conant, pastor of a fine church over here in Camden gave us our day of prayer talk and he gave us instances from his own personal experience of individuals he had known, good sound fundamentalist fellows who were preachers in churches and effective preachers, men who were doing a good piece of work, who fell into either this or related sins and as a result had their ministry ruined and their life wrecked. In some cases it was only slightly in this direction and some cases very far in this direction but he gave us a dozen cases at least with a great deal of detail about the individual, sufficient to show that he knew them all well. And he's not a very old man either. And it just shows how necessary it was that Paul give the warning not merely to the Thessalonians but that he include it for Christians today - for Christian workers today. That we be warned on the importance of avoiding uncleanness, avoiding that which will injure and wreck and destroy our testimony. And so this important warning given here to the Thessalonians - Number 1 - Verses 1 to 8. And then Number 2 - "Brotherly Love" - he only gives two verses here on Brotherly Love - 9 to 10. He says, "Touching brotherly love, ye need not that I write unto you for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another and indeed do it toward all the brethren which are in all Macedonia. But we beseech you, brethren that ye increase more and more." It would sound as if he did not - he only gave two verses, not because he didn't think this was important but because he felt this was a thing that the Thessalonians had made great progress in - and perhaps the two verses were enough to remind them - it's not a thing to be forgotten, we must keep stressing it. But at this particular church at this time, it wasn't a problem so he simply touches on it. John in his Epistles devotes much more time to it. Not because I think John was more interested in it than Paul but because there was a particular need at a particular time when he was writing. But two verses on that

and then two verses "industry". "We beseech you brethren that ye increase more and more and that ye study to be Quiet and to do your own business and to work with your own hands, even as we commanded you that ye may work honestly toward them that are without and that ye may have lack of nothing." He urges these people to be industrious, to work, to earn what is necessary to walk honestly toward those that are without. I have been amazed occasionally at seeing a person appointed as a missionary and ready to start off for the foreign field and immediately get into a frame of mind where they feel that everybody in the world should start giving gifts to them, doing everything they can for them, and practically begging people for all kinds of things. I remember one case I was positively amazed by. I never dreamed that the people were that way. And in that case I wasn't surprised when they were called back from the field after about three years - it just wasn't working out. But the people would get into such an attitude. Paul thought it necessary here to warn against it. We had two fellows our first year in the seminary here who were exact opposites on that. We had one fellow who everywhere he'd go he was begging for money and people were giving him gifts and everything imaginable and we were just ashamed of the way he was always begging for things. And now he's out of the ministry altogether. I'm not surprised at all with the attitude that he showed there. But that very same year we had another fellow

End of Record 57

you couldn't help admiring the attitude he'd taken. But I wish he hadn't because he only got a year and he could have had three - people would have been so glad. And he didn't need a great deal but he just wouldn't admit to anyone his needs. He and his wife slept on the springs for weeks without saying a word about the fact that they didn't have a mattress. And finally it came out just by accident. It got to where they were getting in bad shape for lack of food because the money he had counted on hadn't come through and he was up against it. We had the two extremes right in one class - the very first year of the seminary - it was most striking to see the difference. But Paul had the problem here with these Thessalonians and here he gives two verses to this but in the next Epistle the emphasis is turned around and you find this was his problem in the next Epistle - he devotes a lot of space to it. But here two verses he evidently thought would be sufficient. Then these important warnings - part of this specific message. And it's interesting that these practical things in our later Epistles come at the end. But here Paul starts right in with them after his personal greetings. He wanted to give all this personal greeting to be sure they'd be ready to listen to these things and they'd be ready to get them and he stresses these vital things and then he goes on to "B" - Matters Connected With the Return of Christ, Under Roman Numeral II - the Specific Messages of the Epistle - 4:13 to 5:11. And here we have two different sections in this part of the Epistle and the Archbishop has made the division right between the two main sections. I'm glad he didn't make it in the middle of one of the sections. He made it definitely between the two sections but since they two form a larger section it's too bad that he didn't put them in the same chapter. It would be much better if Chapter 5 had started with Verse 13 of Chapter 4, rather than where it does. But here are these two matters - Number 1 - Its Relation to Those Who Have Died. Evidently Timothy came and told him, "There's a problem here in Thessalonica. The people are quite disturbed. They are looking for the return of Christ and now they've had a few deaths in the group. And they feel so sorry for these people to think they've died and cannot be present to greet the Lord when He comes." And here these people are losing out on all these blessings. If they die before the Lord comes, they won't be here to greet Him." It doesn't seem to us so much of a problem now because so many generations have died. But evidently Paul at that time felt the Lord might come very, very soon and the

Thessalonians expected He might be very, very soon and so they were quite disturbed. And so Verses 13 to 18 in answer to the problem that Timothy told him about the Thessalonians, gives us our great section on the Rapture, our great doctrinal section on the Rapture of the Church. I was interested to see Matthew Henry's commentary written some centuries ago. In commenting on this he uses the word, "This Rapture of the Church" he uses in commenting on this passage. Of course it's just a Latin word which means snatching away. But it has more recently become almost a technical term with us to define this particular act here, event here described. And it is certainly a great event in the expectation of the Christian. Paul describes it here very vividly, "We which are alive and remain will not prevent those that are asleep." And of course this is Old English "prevent" - we won't come before them, we will not precede those that are asleep. "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." The first thing that happens is that the dead in Christ are resurrected, not first and then somebody else rises second. This is the first thing that happens in this sequence of events. They rise first. And then the second thing is that ~~they~~ they and we together are caught up - "we which are alive and remain are caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air and so shall we ever be with the Lord." There's no mention in this passage of coming back to earth. There's no mention here of what happens after that, whether they come back to earth the next day or the next month or the next year or the next century or whether they ever do is not mentioned in this passage. But in this passage it is brought out that they are lifted up from this earth - the living and the dead together - to meet the Lord in the air. And then he says, "Wherefore comfort one another with these words." I hesitate a little about the title here, "Matters Connected With the Return of Christ" because while that is the great teaching which we draw from this, the immediate application of it is the problem of death, and we have that brought out in Verse 13, "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." He doesn't say we're not to sorrow. But we're not to sorrow the way that those do that have no hope. We of course are to sorrow at being separated from our loved ones. It is a loss to us, a terrific loss. We suffer

from it. We sorrow, we regret it greatly. But our sorrow is for ourselves, not for them. Because for them it is a joy to be with the Lord. A man said to me this morning, "My, I was so sorry for Mr. So-and-so." And I looked at him in amazement because I had heard - this is a man who is nearly 70 years of age, has had a long life of great usefulness in the service of the Lord, accomplished a great deal as an evangelist. It's the sort of activity which there's a nerve-strain to it and a wear to it and he was at the point where he could not hold the tension of it any more. And he died a couple of days ago and ~~XXXXXX~~ the man said, "Isn't it a shame about him" he said. I couldn't think what was the shame. And then I realized it was that he'd gone to be with the Lord. Well I said, "I certainly sorrow for his wife and for his family to ~~XXX~~ be separated from him. We have great sympathy with them. But as far as he's concerned, I see nothing to be sorry for him for or to have any sorrow for him. For he is receiving the crown from the Lord for his great work and he's gone to the presence of Christ. We certainly, I think, should rejoice for him." ~~X~~We do not sorrow as others, "as those who have no hope" but we do sorrow. But we know that we will be re-united with them at the return of Christ when we"with them shall be caught up together ~~XXXXX~~ in the air." And then the second matter connected with the return of Christ is its time - Chapter 5:1-11. And it does seem a shame that these two are separated by a chapter division. Its time. These 11 verses tell us~~XXX~~ - he says of times and seasons you have no need that I write to you. Why does he feel that they have no need that he write to them. How can anybody know the times and seasons if nobody writes to them. Well in their case he's been with them. And it's very interesting to take this Thessalonian Epistle and go through it and see the doctrines that Paul refers to as something already known by these people with whom he has spent such a brief time. You've got the foundation of the Christian doctrine in so many different lines, definitely referred to here as well established in their hearts and minds. And here even this rather intricate point - the times and seasons, no need I write to you. Why not? Well because he's already told them. They should know it. He's just reminding them of it. "For you yourselves know perfectly ~~X~~ that the day of the Lord so comes as a thief in the night. For when they shall say Peace and Safety, then sudden destruction comes on them as travail on a woman with child and they shall not escape." It is a sudden unexpected calamity for the lost - the coming of the

Day of the Lord. "But you, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as a thief, for ye are all sons of light" - therefore you're going to know exactly when it happens. You'll be able to do like the Bible teacher, I believe I told you about who said in 1921, "Dr. Toy will finish his message but mine, that comes the next hour, I won't be able to give because it's right then the Lord will come." You're in the light, you can know - well surely that's not what he means because in Matthew and in Luke it is made so clear that the Lord keeps the times in his own power and nobody knows when they are. Not even the sun knoweth. And so he says, "You brethren are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief, for ye are the children of light". That doesn't mean you know when it is going to be but it means that for you it is not a time of misery but a time of happiness. And it is a time for which you should always be ready. It comes all of a sudden. You don't say, "Isn't this terrible. We didn't expect it. If I had known the Lord was going to come today, instead of spending my day in just having a good time, I'd have spent this day working for him so that he'd find me on the job." Well, it will catch some Christians that way. It will catch them - some real Christians will be lifted up to meet the Lord in the air out of circumstances in which they'll say, "Well, I need a little relaxation. Certainly the Lord had no objection to my having a little relaxation but I had extended the relaxation about three times as long as there was any point in. I was not energetically serving the Lord to the full when He came." And the day of the Lord overtook him as a thief, it caught him at a point where he'd rather not be found. It would be so different if he'd known the Lord was coming down today. But he says you shouldn't be caught that way. You're not in darkness. You're the children of light. Let us not sleep as do others but let us watch and be sober - and by watch he doesn't mean be looking ~~xxxxx~~ all the time to see if the Lord's coming but he means be on the job - serving the Lord effectively so that when the Lord comes, He may find you having a proper and reasonable relaxation but the relaxation if it is reasonable is part of the work already and part of the preparation for the work yet to be done and you have no reason in the world to be embarrassed about it. But if the relaxation is neglect of the Lord's work and not working at it as energetically and industriously as you should and is laying it aside and forgetting it for a time, then

certainly it is catching you as a thief in the night. Yes? (Student question) Now that opens up a whole series of problems which I would like to just say a word about. The terminology like this - "the day of the Lord", "the day of Christ", "the kingdom of heaven", "the kingdom of God", "the coming of Christ" - these terms often are used in the Scripture in a general sense. Now there may be in - any term may come to become a technical term. The Lord may use it in a specific sense so it means just precisely this. And this one particular type of day is this part and this one is just this part or this is this part and this is this part - any one may be used in a technical sense but it often requires a great deal of proof of examination to prove that such is the case. And my recommendation is that we assume that such terms are used in a general sense until we ^{have} gathered absolute proof that they are used in a specific technical sense. I find this error on the part of people of all sorts of views, most opposite and diverse views. I find it's an easy error to fall into - that of too readily assuming that words are technical terms for just precisely one specific thing. And I think that you will very often find in the Scripture - even take the word "faith". What is faith? Paul says, "We are saved by faith without works." And James says, "Faith without works is dead." Abraham was justified by faith with works. And the fact of the matter is they're using the term "faith" in two different senses. If they're not they're sharply contradicting each other. But it's evident in the Scripture they're not contradicting each other, they're using "faith" in two different senses. Now we use faith in Paul's sense - Paul wrote much more of the Bible than James did. And Paul's terminology has become our terminology and so when we read James we say James is using the word in a slightly different sense. But you have to examine the cases very specifically to be sure as to just how technical to make the (14.25)

And so for our present point in this survey, I'd rather not go into the problem of whether some of these are precise technical terms, but see what we can get from taking them in a general sense. And that can be gone into more fully as one desires to later.

End of Record 58

but this is very important I think. I Thessalonians here is dealing with this matter of the time and he stresses that this is a thing which comes as a thief in the night. It comes to the unbeliever as a thief - something he doesn't want, something that injures him, something that is terrible. It comes to those who are Christians not as something that is undesired but does come as something that is sudden. That's clearly taught elsewhere that it comes as something that is sudden, we don't know when it's coming. It's not unexpected because it may come ~~any~~ any time and we are always to be ready for it. He doesn't say, "We are children of the (1.) therefore let us figure up the times exactly and precisely and study all the passages accurately and know the exact day when the Lord is coming and then we'll be right ready for Him when He comes." If he said that he would sharply contradict many another passage in the Scripture. But that's not what he says. He says, "They that sleep, sleep in the night; and they that are drunken are drunken in the night. But let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for a helmet the hope of salvation. For God has not appointed us to wrath but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ who died for us that whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him. Wherefore comfort yourselves together and edifying one another, even as also ye do." Be ready for the Lord's coming at any time but don't say, "I know it's got to be today, tomorrow, or next month." But neither should you ever say, "I know it can't be today." In Paul's time, as far as I know, the only people who could say, "It can't be today" were the people who were right with Peter because if they had read John's Gospel or they had heard precisely what's in it - and maybe they hadn't but some of the people had. Of course John's Gospel wasn't written till long after Peter's death. How many people knew about the last chapter of John, I don't know. But those who knew the last chapter of John knew that Christ couldn't come back until Peter was dead. They knew that. But I'm not sure anybody but Peter knew it. For all they knew Christ might come back the next minute. Now the people who weren't with Peter, they could have 'phoned up to Rome to inquire whether Peter was still living or not to know whether the Lord could come today but unfortunately the long-distance service wasn't established yet at that time. So they couldn't tell. And so those would be the only people then who could say, "Christ

can't come today" - would be people who knew the last chapter of John's Gospel or its content and who were right with Peter. Because if you'd been with Peter yesterday you couldn't tell but what he'd been killed today. And if he was killed this morning, the Lord might come back this afternoon for all you know. So he is not saying anywhere here in this chapter, "Figure things out and know exactly when the Lord is coming and don't worry about it till that time comes." But he is saying, "Don't worry about it at all but be ready for it at every time." Ready for it right away as he said in Luke 12 - this is the kind of people you should be - people who are waiting for their Lord so that any time when he comes, they're ready for Him. And Paul is stressing this again to the Thessalonians. "Wherefore comfort yourselves together and edify one another as ye also do." That is a conclusion fitting in with Verse 18 of Chapter 4, "Comfort one another with these words." Don't feel bad about those who are dead, that they'll miss the coming of Christ. They will partake of it too. And you be ready for it too but you don't know when it is coming. And then "C" is the concluding exhortation - Chapter 5:12-28. The concluding exhortation in which he touches on a lot of very important things, touches very briefly on them. Very important things - we won't take time to look over them. They are quite obvious most of them. Then II Epistle we'll call "J" - we won't call it I because that would look like a Roman Numeral I and be confusing. "J" - II Thessalonians. And II Thessalonians is very similar to I Thessalonians. It starts in with Number 1 - Personal Greeting to the Thessalonians but in this case it's not three chapters, it's only one chapter. And this one chapter involves ~~a~~, the same as the other did, first section is "A" - Appreciation of the Thessalonians - the first four verses - a very fine church. "B" - Comfort in Persecution in View of Christ's Return - verses 5 to 10. Evidently they were really suffering persecution. If you were to parse English words-in Greek or in Hebrew you have an ending to tell you what the form is. But in English what is the word "rest"? Is it an adjective or an adverb or what? It is a noun, is it? It's a noun or a verb, you can't tell which when I say "rest". Now supposing that you look at verse 7 of Chapter 1, II Thessalonians. At verse 7 you find the word "rest". What is it an adjective, an adverb, or something else? Everybody look at it please and I'll take a vote. "And to you who are

troubled, rest with us and the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven." How many will say that it is an adjective? How many say it's an adverb? How many would say that it is a verb? Quite a few. How many would say it's a noun? We have one who says it is a noun. But I don't think that's fair because I suspect he's looked at the Greek. And this was a test on the English. We shouldn't have to look at the Greek to find that because read the context. "And to you who are troubled, rest with us." If you'd read the verse alone that sounds the most sensible way doesn't it - it's a verb, "rest with us". But if you read it in the context - Verse 6 - "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you, and to you who are troubled, rest, with us." You see the context? In the light of the context herex- now if you look at the Greek the form would immediately tell you. But in this case the King James writers have given us in context clear evidence as to what it is. It is parallel with tribulation. Those who trouble you God will give tribulation but to you He will give rest with us when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with His mighty angels. And then he continues with these two notes of tribulation for those who trouble you and of rest for you who are troubled. He continues with that, "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christwhen he shall come to be glorified in his saints (that's the "rest with us") and to be admired in all them that believe, because our testimony among you was believed, in that day." And I guess we'll have to continue there next Monday morning.

Last time we began to look at II Thessalonians and we noticed that II Thessalonians is closely related to I Thessalonians as II Corinthians is closely related to I Corinthians. And certain of the things which Paul had presented in I Thessalonians had been cleared up and satisfactorily dealt with and he is very grateful for that and then on the other hand, certain of the things that he had mentioned had not been straightened out. Consequently it was necessary for him to go into them more at length. There was a new problem which had come up about the matter of eschatology which he had to deal with and the tendency to disorder and idleness which he had slightly censured in the first letter had become stronger instead of receding. It's quite clear that there were considerable number in the little church who'd become mere busybodies - left off work expecting maintenance at the public

expense of the community while they indulge themselves probably in what seems more religious proceedings. We can trace the doctrinal ground on which they took this attitude. They believed the day of the Lord was upon them and that being the case, why should they be doing secular ~~XXXX~~ work and wasting their time in making a living? Why shouldn't they be going about and serving the Lord actively? Many of them may have been thinking they were serving the Lord actively. Actually they were looking for others to support them in a life that was not particularly honoring to Him. And then it would seem that this may even have been confirmed by some audacious forgeries and fictions - at least many interpreters think that'd probably be the case, basing their theory on the statement in II Thessalonians 2:2 where you find Paul saying that "We beseech you..... that you be not soon shaken in mind or troubled neither by spirit nor by word nor by letter as from us that the day of Christ is at hand." "Nor by letter as from us" - why would Paul say a thing like that? "Let no man beseech" - you notice how he stresses it here. When he writes to the Galatians - the Galatians are being led astray. Well here he says the same thing, "We beseech you that you be not soon shaken in mind or troubled neither by spirit nor by word nor by letter as from us. Let no man deceive you." Evidently there are those who have ideas and they feel so strongly on these ideas that they're having visions. Spirits are talking to them explaining the visions to them, telling them this. They are hearing what Paul has said and this is what Paul said what we're giving you now, "The day of Christ, the day of the Lord is right here now so we shouldn't be wasting our time in making shoes for people, for heathen people to wear. We should be out serving the Lord, not doing this kind of thing to make money. We should be - the Lord has everything, He can support us, we don't have to work. We should be out serving Him all the time. And look at this letter from Paul - 'nor by letter as from us'". So there evidently were people who were so strongly convinced that they were ready to resort to dishonest procedures in order to advance their theories. It is amazing how often you will find people who in their doctrines seem to be very real Christians, who will resort to twisting the truth to say the least. It is amazing, twisting the truth. Sometimes you wonder whether they are consciously doing it or not. They'll take three paragraphs which all are for one thing. And they'll take two sentences out of the middle, take them out of context, and present the opposite.

And you'll run on to that sort of thing - the more you live among people, the more you become convinced that this is Satan's world. And Satan is controlling this world until our Lord comes back. And he will twist the truth and he will even lead God's own people to twist the truth, perhaps unconsciously. But when somebody sells you something, I don't care how fine a person he is, get the evidence and see the facts before you accept it. Very often it is not intentional misrepresentation at all. But a person has an idea so fixed in his mind. I may have mentioned this before but such an illustration as this I do want to mention it again. A man came from another seminary. He'd had a year in a fine Christian college that had some theological work. He'd taken a year of graduate work there. And then after that he had gone to this theological seminary and after a year there he wrote here and had some correspondence with the man who was then our registrar - this was about four years ago - and then the first I heard of it was the next fall when he was here. And he came to me and he said, "What courses shall I take so as to get my B.D. degree this year?" And I said to him, "Why we require two years in residence to give a B.D. degree." "Well" he said, "I have a letter which says I can get it in one year." I said, "We never say that to anybody." He said, "Well, I've had one year at that school and one year of this seminary and the work at that school was post-graduate work, theological work, and I'd like to finish up this year and I wrote and asked if I could finish up this year." Well I got out his folder and I found the letter.

End of Record 59

registrar said - it was approximately these words. No, the man said first, "I read in your catalog it is necessary to have two years in residence to get a B.D. degree. However, I have had these two years. At this seminary it would take me four years to finish. I would like to finish in one more year and get the B.D. degree." Our registrar had written back and said, "It is true that the catalog says that two years in residence are required to get our degree, however, in your case, in view of the additional work that you have, it would be possible for you to get the B.D. degree and the S.T. degree together at the end of two years with us." Now you see he said, "It is true that the catalog says this, however,

in your case, in view of your advanced work". So this man came up here absolutely convinced he had been promised he could get his degree in one more year, absolutely convinced of it and yet what the letter said was, "you can get your degree of B.D. and the S.T.M. after two years, in view of the work you had elsewhere." That's exactly what it said in black and white. Now fortunately we had the letter. Because he might have said, "This is what was promised me. I was written. I was promised this. I was told I should have it and now I've come way up here to get it and now you won't give it to me." Well I told him, "Our catalog says it and that's what the letter says. Don't you see that's what the letter says?" He said, "Yes, I do. I was so anxious to finish in one year that I misread the letter and thought it said the exact opposite of what it did say." Well now there is a man who got pretty good marks in seminary. He was a bright fellow. And I'm sure he was perfectly sincere. But he utterly misinterpreted a statement in a letter and was very settled in an idea exactly contrary to it. And I won't say that Satan in that case confused his mind or misled him. I won't say that. I think it was his own desire to get something. If he'd come to us in the first place he could have finished in three years. But having gone to these other places for a year each, he could have the two degrees in four years but we couldn't finish ~~xxx~~^{it} in one year. We just don't do that. Hardly any schools do. But that was a situation where he had an idea in his mind and the letter was misinterpreted. Well people misinterpret, people are confused and then when they get confused they proceed to interpret things and state things and so on and get the situation which this early in the Christian Church you find Paul had right there in Thessalonica at the time of probably his very second Epistle that he ever wrote, he was facing this situation where what he said would be misunderstood, misrepresented - people were misquoting what they said they had heard him say in talks and they were even presenting letters which they said were from him. Now I don't know whether - it's possible somebody forged a letter. It's possible on the other hand that Paul had written a private letter to some individual and that that individual had misinterpreted, misunderstood it. And they had said what Paul had written and other people got it a little bit twisted and they quoted it and you had this. But at any rate Paul is in a situation here where he says that you "should not be soon shaken

in mind or troubled either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, that the day of the Lord is here now." Now our King James Version translates it "at hand" and that of course has caused much confusion in the interpretation of the epistle because we are so clearly told in the Gospels that we are to be ready for the coming of Christ because in an hour we think not, it is going to come. He wishes to find us actively engaged in His service so He has intentionally kept from telling when it is. Every person is supposed to so live that if Christ comes back now, we're ready. Well then for Paul to say, "Now don't think the coming of the Lord is at hand" would seem to be a direct contradiction of what is said in the Gospels by our Lord Himself and of what Paul said in I Thessalonians that "if the times are ceased ye need not that I write you for you yourselves know that it comes as a thief in the night". It shouldn't take you like a thief in the night so that you're thrown into consternation. We never dreamed it would come. You should always be ready. But of the time of it knows no man (4.75) Well now don't get confused into thinking I said it's at hand. Of course if by that he meant, "Don't get confused by thinking that I said it's coming right now, that we can depend it'll be next week or next month." Because we are told there is no sign which can tell us that the coming of the Lord is within the next year or two or three. We do not know. It may be today, it may be tomorrow, it may not be for a hundred years. We do not know. That's clearly taught us in the Word. But here this word which was translated "at hand" in the King James Version and which is susceptible perhaps by itself of misinterpretation, has been found within the last thirty or forty years to be a very, very common word in compiling letters in Greek in Egypt from the time of Paul. And the word - this is not of course in the Greek study - this is a survey so I'm merely touching on the point - but here it is very important to the interpretation of this verse - that this word is used constantly and frequently to mean "the present". It means "today". This is the present letter. This is ~~XXX~~ a matter that you should do now. This is the thing that we are at present concerned with - that is this very word. While if you simply took the word etymologically you might think it means at hand. That is its regular use ~~XXXXX~~ in the time of Paul to mean not at hand in the sense of - certainly never in the sense of a year or five years or so - but it is at hand in the sense of right here now. And so it is that it is now present, that this is the day of Christ. You don't need to work, you don't need to

do ordinary things in life. Christ's coming is right here. Just get busy and take part in it. Now there have been many people who have figured Christ is going to come at this particular time. I think it was 1881 wasn't it - there were a great many Americans went out on a hill in white costumes, expecting the Lord to arrive. He didn't get there. In - was it 1900 - there was a big group decided He was coming the next year and went over to Palestine in order to establish a colony to be right in Jerusalem immediately. And they founded the so-called American Colony, which is a very important place for people to visit in Palestine now, that was formed by people who knew that Christ was coming next year and who wanted to be in Jerusalem when he came. And they've been there 50 or 60 years. Their grandchildren are there. But He has not yet come. He may come tomorrow. He may come the next day. But we can't say He is coming right now. But that's not what Paul means here. What Paul means here is it isn't present already. It is something which we don't know when it's coming, we should be ready for it, but we should carry on our normal life activities and so live that if He doesn't come for 50 years, our lives are an honor to Him and not a reproach on His

(7.5). And consequently he proceeds to discuss this theme here. And in discussing this theme here he says, **Let no man deceive you by any means.** Don't let anybody tell you that that day is right here. Now what is that day - the day of the Lord, the day of Christ. Let's not try to get into technicalities as to precisely what it means. If the day of Christ or the day of the Lord is a technical term which means one precise point or precise area in the Lord's dealings, that it should be possible to prove with no exception. But there are very few such technical terms in Scripture. As a rule the terms have to be interpreted in the light of context and are used in different ways in different places but can be

in the light of

(8.5) to know exactly what is meant.

Now in this case it may be somebody can prove there's a precise, technical, exact meaning to it, but I don't think it will effect the general interpretation much whether it is or whether it is not. The general interpretation is clear that he is talking about either the millennial reign of Christ or those circumstances which immediately precede it. He is talking about the great events of the return of Christ. And he is saying let no-one deceive you by thinking that this is right here now. We don't know when it's coming.

Let no-one deceive you by any means and then in our English there is inserted in italics - for that they shall not come - but that is italics, that is not in the original. The original says "for except as that the day of Christ is now present or except there come such and such first". Well "that day shall not come except" is a very good insertion to show what he is talking about but of course it's not part of the original. The day of Christ, the day of the Lord, the millennial reign of Christ, the events preceding the setting up of His kingdom - whatever precisely is referred to, one might make lengthy studies and may become completely convinced on some detail of it and may be able to convince others. But for our present point we are noting that the general thing is perfectly clear. That is these great eschatological events of the end of this age and the beginning of the next - these will not come except certain things happen first. Now if it means the setting up of the Millennial kingdom, or if it means the actual coming of Christ to this earth, or whether it means the beginning of all these related events, it won't happen except first there come - our English Bible says - "a falling away, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition who opposes and exalts himself above all that is worshipped so that he is God, sits in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Well, what has this to do then with what was said by Christ in Matthew, Mark, and Luke and what Paul said in his first epistle. He said there that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night - you don't know when ~~XX~~ it's coming, don't let it catch you as a thief in the night because you will be serving the Lord faithfully so that you will be glad of it rather than sorrowful even though you don't know when it's going to be. In such an hour as ye think not it comes. Well he says it can't ~~come~~ come until we have certain definite signs. First there's going to be a falling away. Second there's going to be the anti-Christ who comes and sits in the temple of God and says, "I'm God. So right today we say we know the Lord can't come because we don't have any apostasy, any falling away and because the anti-Christ hasn't yet set himself up in the temple saying that he is God and so until these things happen let's forget about the return of Christ and let's go on with our ordinary work. Well Paul is saying don't let the thought of the return of Christ lead you to not live a normal life because he may not come for a long time. But he is also saying ~~XXIX~~ as he said in these

other places, "Be ready for His coming for in such an hour as ye think not, He will come." Well now ~~XXX~~this definitely contradicts I Thessalonians and contradicts what precedes if he is giving us signs ~~XXXXXX~~ ^{which} will tell us Christians ~~XXXX~~ when he is going to come so we don't need to think about it or watch or be ready or be applying any of these exhortations to ourselves till we see these signs. So that did not seem a reasonable interpretation and yet that is what these words seem to say in the King James Version. It flatly contradicts other passages. But ~~he~~ says it won't come except first there come a falling away. Well now suppose I say to you, "Don't you think about being ready for the Lord's coming, watching, avoiding sin lest he find you. There are other reasons to avoid sin but don't let this be a reason. Don't let this be a reason for you to be on your job serving Him because after all it can't come till there's a falling away." What will your answer to me be? Your answer will be, "How're we going to recognize that falling away? How're we going to know it when it comes?" Well supposing that three-fourths of the Christian world were to deny the deity of Christ. Would not that be a falling away? Well that's what you had in the fourth century. In the fourth century you had three-fourths of the Christian world following errors. You~~XXXXXXXX~~'ve certainly had a tremendous~~X~~ of falling away, I believe, ever since. In the Middle Ages you had the Roman Church setting up a doctrine of works and while giving lip service to the teaching of the Scripture, it was so pushed into the background and forgotten, that it was a religion of works far worse than what Paul opposed in Galatians, and there were little groups of true Christians here and there but the great mass knew nothing about it. Certainly there was a falling away then. And even if you go earlier than the time of Constantine and look at Gnosticism in the second century with great multitudes being led away into unbelief and denial of the truth. Well, even for that matter, what does Paul say over here in II Timothy. Paul says in II Timothy 1:15, "This thou knowest that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me." All the people in Asia Minor, where Paul had stayed for three years in Ephesus preaching and gone to so many other places, preaching and presenting the Word of God

End of Record 60

Wasn't that a terrible falling away? Are we then to interpret it that Paul writes to the people in Thessalonica and he says, "Don't be deceived thinking the day of the Lord is now here because that date can't come until the falling away from" but then ten years later everybody sees that all of Asia has turned away from Paul. The falling away is right here so it has no to us at all. It is just then In other words if this "a falling away" means an apostasy, a giving up of the on the part of a sizeable number of people, there have been such since from the first few years after Christ right up to the present one after another - some great, some small. There've been periods of great loyalty and periods of tremendous apostasy. It is not a sign that we can tell the world in this great epistle meant for all future ages until the return of Christ, "Don't worry about the Lord's coming yet because it won't happen until there's an apostasy." Well there've been so many of them. It doesn't seem a reasonable interpretation. And we ask ourselves, "Does this Greek word which is 'apostasia', does it mean apostasy?" And of course our English word apostasy is derived from it but that proves nothing about it. We have our English word "knight" ^{derived} from the German word "Knecht". They're the same word exactly in the original Indo-European languages and the original Teutonic. The Anglo-Saxons brought it over to England with them but the Knecht in Germany is the slave, the lowest menial. While in English the Knight is the servant of the king who rides around on a horse and everybody looks up to so Winston Churchill after all his years of service was made a Knight. Our English Knight is quite different from German Knecht but it was exactly the same originally. So that what a word means in one language does not prove much about what a cognate means in another language. What does this Greek word "apostasia" mean. It is a word which is used very commonly in Greek historical texts to refer to a rebellion against a king. It is comparatively little used in religious connections. It is often used in political useages to mean a rebellion against a king. There seem to be cases where it is used of the moving of a group of people who were loyal to a ruler in Greece, over to another part of Greece - transferring their loyalty to another sector or another ruler. The word etomologically simply means "the going from" and if I recall correctly, I haven't looked up these precise facts right now but I studied them rather thoroughly about six years ago, the noun only occurs one or two other cases in the New

Testament and there does not mean an apostasy at all. The verb from which it is derived never means that but it is a very common verb in the New Testament to mean simply to go away. The verb is used for, for instance the angels take Peter out of prison and they walk with him out of the prison, They leave the sleeping soldiers there, leave the chains there. They walk out of the prison, on to the street, and then the angel apostasizes. Our English simply says he departs. And it is used my recollection would be perhaps 20 or 30 times in the New Testament in this sense of simply going away and leaving some person or some place or some thing. And it's very easy to see how from simply going away there could come this idea which is here rendered "falling away". It's never translated falling but a going away in the sense of giving up a thing or giving up the Lord. Now in the Ladell and Scott Greek Lexicon in the latest edition it's my impression that the word is given three meanings and the second meaning is simply departure. But for that they give one instance of its use and I have not been able to find many others uses in it. The ~~XXXX~~ verb meaning "to depart" is perfectly plain and common. It's frequently used in the New Testament. And this noun is derived from the verb

(5.) But does the noun simply mean a departure in a general sense, which could be used of the angel ~~XXXX~~ leaving Peter, or does it mean departure in a specific sense which would mean giving up loyalty or giving up the faith? Well the word ~~XX~~ quite commonly means giving up loyalty in Greek and it's also used for ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ a measure in some places and there are certain other derived uses but the noun used strictly in the sense of departure I've only been able, in the little time I've had to put on it, to find one use of it, one instance - but that's a very clear one. That's in the sixth century A.D. in a commentary on Aristotle's discussion of Physics. And Aristotle says that a piece of board or something, a piece of cardboard I believe it was, paper, that this which is wet will become stiff because of the apostasia of the water. And very evidently it means the evaporation, the departure of the water. Now that is a clear case where it means a departure of something from one place to another. The precise noun I have not come across another clear case but that is an absolute clear case. But it does not specifically mean religious departure. But it is often used of a rebellion, a political rebellion. And I've heard one or two ministers say they think it should be here "rebellion" rather than falling away. Well if it

says "a rebellion occurs" - ~~XXXXXX~~ there've been hundreds of rebellions in the history of the Christian church. It certainly wouldn't prove much unless there was something to single out this particular rebellion. It is the rebellion, the falling away. The English says "till there come a falling away" but the Greek has the article "until there come the apostasy" - if you take it in the general sense of the word "the departure" which certainly is not impossible and which fits in with the common use of the noun, then it would fit in with Paul's teaching elsewhere. And then it would fit in with the teaching of Christ. And so I do not think we can dogmatically say it must be taken as "departure". Some people say as a rule of interpretation take the hardest possible interpretation if a certain text contradicts other texts, then that's the correct original text. I think we can go a little too far in that (7.75) But I incline to think that if the two can be so interpreted that they fit together reasonably, that is often a better rule of approach. And so I personally think that this means, "Except first there comes the departure and then the man of sin will be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposes and exalts himself above all that is called God." In other words that after this departure, the departure - and what would be the departure? Well back in I Thessalonians he devoted half a chapter to telling us how all the Christians are going to be snatched up into the air and taken away from this earth. Well that would be a very reasonable thing to refer to as the departure. And everybody would know when it happened. And he would say to these people, "Don't you think that you should give up trying to earn your living and trying to live a normal life among the people and should say, 'The Lord's going to be here tomorrow or next day or the Lord is right here already. Let's just forget these things and devote ourselves and expect the Lord to support us entirely by other means.'" Because the day of the Lord won't be here until first there's the departure he predicts, the snatching up of the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ resurrected saints into the air (the departure at first) and then after the departure occurs, then there will be the revelation of the man of sin, the son of perdition who opposes and exalts himself above all that's called God. He'll go in the temple of God and sit there showing himself to be God. Paul says don't you remember when I was still with you I told you these things. "And now ye know that

were hold that he might be revealed in his time." What does withhold that he should be revealed in his time? Now you know what it is. Well, what is it? "For the mystery of iniquity does already work only he who now hinders." Old English "let" means modern English "hinder" - exact opposite. How words do change - 300 years it means exact opposite. Just like science 300 years ago meant what philosophy means today. Philosophy 300 years ago means what science means today. Similarly "let" 300 years ago meant what "hinder" means today - the exact opposite. "But now you know what withholds for the mystery of iniquity works already & only he who now hinders will hinder till he be taken out of the way." Now who is the one who now hinders - the revelation of the man of sin - and who will hinder till he be taken out of the way. The Berkly edition of the New Testament, a very good translation - not especially good English but on the whole a pretty good translation - has a footnote which says, "The one who hinders is the Roman Empire which is protecting Paul and protecting the Christians and it is the force of the Roman Empire that is hindering." And then another note says the anti-Christ is the Roman Emperor who sits in the temple of God and says he's God and the emperor says you must worship him. Now if the emperor is the anti-Christ, who is predicted, how can the Roman Empire be what hinders. What prevents him from being manifest. It seems to me that it shows very, very sloppy thinking. What hinders it from being manifest? I don't think it's the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire disappeared many, many centuries ago. You know what it is that hinders he says and he will hinder till he be taken out of the way. "Then shall the wicked one be revealed whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of his coming." Then when this one is taken out of the way the wicked one will be revealed - an exact parallel to what we have in verses 3 to 4 - that day won't come except first there come the departure and the man of sin is revealed. That that hinders will be taken away and then shall that wicked be revealed. The taking away of that which hinders would seem to be exactly parallel to the departure, in both cases followed by the one being revealed who is the man of sin whom the Lord will destroy with the brightness of his coming. And so it would certainly suggest that after the church is taken out of the way then this wicked one will be revealed. What is it then that hinders the full manifestation of evil? Is it the Christian Church as an organization? I wouldn't think so. Is it the Holy Spirit as a divine spirit? I wouldn't think so because the Holy

Spirit is everywhere, has always been here and always will be. But I would think it is the Holy Spirit acting through the church. The Holy Spirit acting through true believers. And when these true believers, in whom the Holy Spirit is acting, are taken out of the world then this force of which Christ said, "You are the salt of the earth. You are what keeps it from becoming corrupt and utterly spoiled. Your presence here is the salt of the earth." And if you took true believers out, the descent morally and all ways would be just indescribable, it can easily be seen. Now he says this will be taken out of the world and when that is taken out then he will appear whose coming is after the work of Satan with all powers and signs and lying wonders". Fifteen years ago I saw a little booklet put out by a Presbyterian missionary in Mesopotamia who said he had seen the anti-Christ and he said he had seen him there and he could just look at somebody and that person would drop dead. He could point his finger at a tree and it would just light a fire. Now he said of course these are simple things he can do but he'll be able to do real miracles when he reveals himself to the world. Well I began to wonder - I saw that published by a Presbyterian missionary. I haven't heard since what became of him whether he's still at loose or not. But such things could happen but I believe if they did happen we would have clear enough evidence that it wouldn't be the word of one man. I don't think that that sort of thing is going to happen before our Lord takes the church away. After that perhaps it will be because

(13.75) And I have no doubt there are lying wonders today done by forces of Satan - but anything like striking a man dead and so on I'm very sceptical of. We'll have to stop. I was hoping to get through a couple of more books today but we'll meet again Thursday.

End of Record 61

But we were looking at an extremely important matter X - the specific message of the second Thessalonian Epistle. And that specific message was divided into two parts, one of which was dealt with in the second chapter and one in the third chapter and the two are very closely connected. We notice that in this II Thessalonian epistle he is dealing with the problem of the attitude of the people toward the return of Christ. And their idea that it is right here now and consequently that the ordinary pursuits of life no longer need to be taken care of. And he is urging them not to take that attitude. And we found that in this second chapter there was a real puzzle as to its relation to the clear teaching of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and I Thessalonians - all of which say "In such an hour as ye think not, the Son of Man cometh" - and this, as it stands in our English Bible seems to say in Verse 3, "Don't you be bothered about thinking the Lord might come at any time and being ready for him because after all he can't come until first there is the falling away and second there is the manifestation of the man of sin." But that interpretation would flatly contradict those other books. And the only way that you can take that interpretation is to explain away the teaching of the other books in some way. The other books are absolutely clear Xthat in such an hour as you think not, He's coming, that even Peter in his lifetime was to be ready, that right then they were to be ready and watching so that if he comes he finds them actively engaged in the work. And if we notice that if this one word "apostasia" which is translated "a falling away" were rendered in a different way, then there would be no contradiction whatever between this passage and these other passages. Now this suggestion of rendering it in this other way is one which has been made fairly recently. It was Dr. Schuyler English who wrote me a letter about ten years ago and he said that he had come across in Ladell and Scott's Lexicon, departure as a translation given there for "anostasia" and if it were to be taken as "apostasia" that would do away with the evident contradiction between this and the many other sections of the Bible. And he asked me what I thought of it. He wrote the letter to quite a number of various scholars and half of them replied that it was excellent and the other half said it was no good at all. I was one of those who thought it was excellent. I made quite an investigation. I looked into Greek sources at some length on the matter and I came to the conclusion that this translation "falling away" is a pure guess. The English word "apostasy" of course means exactly that.

Dr. Hedegard referred to the "falling away" this morning and that is a clear teaching of the Bible that in the latter days there will be great falling away. That is a clear teaching regardless of whether in this particular passage it is meant or not. But this has been usually taken, the falling away, to mean a great apostasy at the end of the age and there certainly will be such - it's clearly taught in many other passages. But is that what this here means? This word apostasia is not used commonly in the New Testament in the sense of our English word apostasy. It is not so used. I don't have the figures right here on its use but my recollection is the word is quite infrequently I'm not at all sure that it is used at all in that sense elsewhere. I haven't checked again on that particular thing - I did very thoroughly at one time. At least this I am certain of. It is extremely infrequent, if ever in this sense in the New Testament and it is never, I believe rendered "falling away". The word simply means to depart. It is used many times with the translation "depart". It is the common meaning of the word. It would mean a natural thing for the noun to mean a departure since the verb means depart. But the noun can become specialized to mean one particular type of departure and that ordinarily has occurred. It is a common word for rebellion, for a political rebellion. It is commonly used in that sense in Greek sources though it is also used in two or three other senses and there is one clear case in the Hellenistic writing of its meaning the general thing of departure where it speaks of the departure of the water out of ~~XXX~~ something that dried. But in this case it is interesting to notice ~~XXX~~ how clear the thought is made if the word is rendered in that general sense and thus applies to the specific departure of the true Christians from the earth. Because verse 3 then and verse 7-8 make an exact parallel. Verse three says do not be disturbed as if Christ were right here now and you just haven't seen Him but He's on the earth already and the day of Christ has started. The thing for you to do is to get in line with it and forget about ordinary work. Don't let anybody deceive you with such an idea. His reign on this earth won't start until first there's the apostasia and then the man of sin is revealed - the man of sin who causes people to worship him as God. That's what he says in verses 3 to 4. Then in verses 7 to 8 he says, "He who now hinders, will hinder till he be taken out of the way and then will that wicked one be revealed." You note the exact parallel - the first three - there is the departure and then the man of sin is revealed. Verse 7 - "he

who now hinders will be taken out of the way and then the wicked one will be revealed."

There is an exact parallel between the two passages. That which he speaks of in verse 3, he reiterates in verse 7 - if you take apostasia as meaning the departure. If you take it otherwise then you have three different things referred to. You might say A and B in verse 3, C & D in verse 7. The parallel does not prove that this is what it refers to but it certainly makes it seem clearly the most natural interpretation of it and it fits in with the teaching of the rest of the Scripture. "He who now hinders will hinder" - who is that that now hinders? Well many say it is the Roman Empire but they don't work out a very sensible interpretation on that view particularly when most who take it as meaning that take it as meaning that the wicked one who sits in the temple of God and says he must be worshipped as God is the Roman Emperor. And if the Roman Empire keeps the Roman Emperor from being revealed of course it makes no sense at all. The thing that prevents the man of wickedness from being revealed and doing his wicked work is certainly the restraining influence of the Holy Spirit acting through the believers. And when those believers through whom the Holy Spirit works, are taken up out of the world then the forces of iniquity will be released from that that holds them back and then the wicked one, the wicked leader can exert himself fully. We are told here in verse 8, "That wicked one whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming." That's a funny way to say it isn't it, "that wicked one whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming". Why doesn't he say, "And then will this wicked one be revealed and then later on when the Lord comes he will destroy this wicked one". But why does he say that wicked one? And that wicked one whom the Lord will consume. What is the reason for that? How many could tell? It is a peculiar phrase. "That wicked one will be revealed whom the Lord shall consume." Why would he have used language like that? (Student question) Well even so - "the lawless one whom the Lord shall slay" Why do they call him that? Does your Greek have anything for the "that"? Well evidently then the King James, from the form of the construction "the one whom" put in the "that" to bring out the idea more clearly. The one whom the Lord - now that wouldn't have to be because it might be - and then we'll start the year which will end when commencement comes and the students graduate. But that wouldn't be the usual useage. If you say,

"Then will start the year which will end when commencement comes" it would imply that this is the only year when there's commencement. ~~XXXX~~ It would be more apt in such a case, "Then will start the year which will end in the spring of 1957". It is a descriptive pointing out that particular one and that's why the King James started in with a that giving the strong force to the Greek article. "That wicked one whom the Lord will reveal". The reason why this is used here ~~ix~~ instead of Paul saying, "Then will the wicked one be revealed and later on the Lord will destroy him" but he says, "the wicked one whom the Lord will destroy" is that he is referring back to something already well known to the people. The people know that when the Lord comes He will destroy the wicked one with the breath of His mouth. They know that He's going to do that. Who is the wicked one whom He will destroy? They don't know a great deal about it but they know that when he's destroyed, when He comes He will destroy a wicked one with the breath of His mouth. So Paul says, "then will be revealed the wicked one whom the Lord will destroy with the breath of His mouth". And he gets that from the teaching of the Book of Isaiah. Because in the Book of Isaiah you find it stated in Isaiah 11 where it is describing the Lord in verse 4, "That with righteousness shall He judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth; and He shall smite the earth with the rod of His mouth and with the breath of His lips shall He slay the wicked one." Now who is this wicked one who He's going to slay with the breath of His lips? Paul explains. Paul says, "Then will the wicked one be revealed whom the Lord will destroy with the breath of His mouth." He is taking Isaiah which tells us that the Lord will destroy the wicked one with the breath of His mouth and He is telling us when that wicked one will be revealed who has already been described in Isaiah. Thus he's tying it up with Isaiah. And so that's why he uses this language - "that wicked one" or "the wicked one whom the Lord will ^{consume} ~~XXXXXX~~ with the spirit of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming." And so Paul says in verse 3-4 and again in verses 7-8 - there are two steps which must yet take place before the Lord is actually here - the taking away of that which now hinders, the departure which is described in full in I Thessalonians in several verses but here it's just alluded to, having been fully described in the previous epistle - "the taking away of him that now hinders" and then the revealing of the wicked one who after the true believers have been taken out of the earth will be able to do his wicked work but it will come to an end when the Lord will come

back to the earth and will destroy him with the breath of his mouth. So that Paul says to the Thessalonians - Paul says in I Thessalonians, "The day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night" - but don't let it catch you as a thief in the night. You're not people of darkness who are going to be thrown into utter confusion and misery because of the Lord's return. No. For you it is something you should always be ready for so that it doesn't come to you like a thief at all but like a great joy and a joy that you don't know when it's going to come. But whenever it comes you will be ready and He will find you actively serving Him, wide awake in His service. That is his exhortation in I Thessalonians, then in II he gives the other side of the picture, "You don't know when it's coming. Don't take for granted it's right here now and the old ordinary pursuits of life can be forgotten. It may be very soon. You don't know when it's coming. But it may be quite a ways off." But the actual setting up of Christ's kingdom will not take place until after these two things have happened - the departure of the saints and the appearance of the wicked one who does his wicked work on the earth but who is slain by the Lord, by the return of the Lord actually, to this earth. And that is Chapter 2 - the first part of the specific meaning of the Epistle. And Chapter 3 is the second part of the specific message of the epistle. He tells of the terrible fate of those who reject the truth here and gives thanks that the fate of the true believers is very different from this

End of Record 62

chapter 2. Then in Chapter 3 he ~~XIX~~ applies it to the immediate situation. He asks them to mark those who are not living in orderly fashion, those who from the reason of their certainty that Christ is already here or for some other reason are neglecting to live a normal life and to serve the Lord steadily and effectively. About work, in other words, the necessity of work - the subject of the third chapter. The necessity that the Christian shall be an orderly member of society. Verse 6 says, "We command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walks disorderly and not after the tradition which they received of us." He had one or two sentences on this in I Thessalonians. This problem was worse instead of better so he devotes nearly a whole chapter to it. He says, "When we were with you, this we commanded you. If any will not work, neither should he eat. We hear there are among you some that walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. We exhort them that with quietness they work and eat their own breadAnd if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man and have no company with him that he may be ashamed. Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." The treatment which the Lord wishes us to have for those who are not apostates. They are not enemies of the church but they are people who are walking disorderly. They are people who are misinterpreting some doctrine and consequently not living in proper fashion or they are people who just through laziness or natural giving in to the wickedness of the human heart, are a dishonor to the cause of Christ, we are to admonish them as a brother but we are to see to it that we are not effected by them and are to do everything we can to make them ashamed that they will remedy their behavior in this regard. (Student question) Oh yes, in the 6th verse, "From every brother that walks disorderly and not after the tradition which he received of us." Very interesting. What is the Greek word here translated "tradition"? Now this word tradition is a very strange word. In English tradition is just anything handed down. In college we have the tradition - the way that we've done things for years back. A tradition can be established in a very short time or it can last a long time. And it is very nice in life to have many things handled by tradition that establishes a definite policy that you don't have to be changing around all the time. But all traditions should be constantly checked in order to see whether they apply to new situ-

ations. Now in this case he doesn't mean that kind of a tradition. He means what I told you and you are passing on. Now the Roman Catholic Church, of course, claims it has traditions from the Apostles - things not written down but passed on by word-of-mouth. And any time there's some particular thing they want to insist on they'll say they have a tradition but they never give us a complete list of the traditions. There's no evidence on it. And that sort of tradition is dangerous. As Christ said, "You make the Word of God of no effect through your tradition." The Word of God is what matters but tradition is simply the addition to the Word. As long as you have very little of the Word, tradition is of real importance, but when you have all of the Word the more you can get away from tradition and the closer you stay to the Word, the better. We all get tied up with tradition. We hear things, we get to thinking about things, we pass them on to others. It's remarkable how much of our ideas we take from what other people said, or we've heard in a sermon, or we've just gotten it sort of in the air around us instead of what we find definitely taught in the Word. And we should see to it that our tradition doesn't make the Word of God non-essential. It is the Word and only the Word that (4.75). But if you had tradition from a man like Paul - if Paul had been here and given you something to pass on why that would be worth . But you want to be mighty sure it comes from

I'm not sure that's a very good word to use at this point in the English. But it certainly is a concise way of putting it. (Student question) Well, but of course, he's not dealing with doctrines here. The verse is dealing with the idea that he gave them of how they should live. This particular verse is not dealing with doctrine. It's dealing with life. It's a practical course of life he intended them to pursue. But in this particular connection I don't think doctrine (5.5). There's a book I had thought to bring to class today. It would have been very useful right at this point. I had thought of bringing the Englishman's Greek Concordance - that was a very useful work - the Englishman's Greek Concordance and the Englishman's Hebrew Concordance are extremely useful works, published by Baxter in England. I think they're almost as useful as the dictionary - in some ways even more useful because while they do not enter into discussion of the etymology or the general principles of the interpretation of the word, and that we get in the dictionary and that is very helpful, they give you all the passages in the Hebrew or

Greek where the word occurs with the English context of the use of the word. And consequently you would immediately see if a word's used maybe twenty times, you'd have perhaps 7 or 8 words from each case, enough to remind you of the passage and at a glance you get a recollection of the total context. And it gives you a quick idea of useage as rendered in the King James Version. It's one of the most helpful things for interpretation that I know of. Personally if I had to choose between the Englishman's Hebrew Concordance and any commentary that has ever been written on the Old Testament, I would take the Englishman's Hebrew Concordance. It is more useful, I think, than any one commentary - perhaps any three commentaries. The Englishman's Greek Concordance is perhaps not quite as useful as the Englishman's Hebrew because we have more helps that give us the same material - but perhaps not quite as quickly. It gives you access to it more quickly than most anything I know of.

(Student question) They're not very expensive. The Englishman's Greek is quite inexpensive. The Hebrew is a bigger book - the Old Testament's bigger - but it's not extremely expensive. It's well worth the investment. I would say for anyone who's going to work at interpretation of Scripture, if you could only have ten books, I should say those two ought to be

(7.75) . Well, II Thessalonians then deals

with the same problems pretty much as I, but things have moved along a little further among the Thessalonians and he is dealing with things from a little further advance in people's thoughts and in some points he praises them for the direction they're going and in others they've gone a little too far. He wants ~~XXXX~~ to hold them back from it. But you put the two together and they give you a good idea of the Apostolic teaching. Now it is very interesting to note in these epistles - I and II Thessalonians - the very epistle that Paul wrote, how large the return of Christ loomed in his mind at that time. He had been with these Thessalonians for only a short time, getting the church started, getting things going, and yet we find that in that time he had stressed most of the vital doctrines and he put great stress on the return of Christ. Look at I Thessalonians - why did they turn to God - Verses 9 to 10 - "to serve the living and true God and to wait for His Son from heaven." Look at Chapter 2:19 - "For what is our crown, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming?" Look at chapter 3:13 - "To the end He may establish your hearts unblameable ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ in holiness before God

even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all His saints." Chapter 4 the whole last six verses are a description of the rapture at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. And Chapter 5 begins with the reference to the return of Christ and stresses it toward the end of verse 23 - "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless with the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." What a stress on the coming of Christ in I and II Thessalonians. And one man said to me once - he was a professor in a great Presbyterian Theological seminary in Chicago and when I first met him (I was just in college then) he was sort of hoping I might come to his seminary the next year, but after he talked with me a few minutes he was afraid I might come. And he told me, "Paul made a great mistake when he wrote I Thessalonians. And he made a worse one when he wrote II Thessalonians but he did his best to remedy it by writing I and II Timothy." Well now there are those who would agree with that learned professor that Paul in his early days, when he wrote I and II Thessalonians, was sort of an extremist on this idea of the return of Christ - that Christ might come soon and we should be ready for Him. But after Paul had gone on for many years in his ministry he'd gotten over this business and he was accustomed to the idea that it's how we live on this earth that matters and it's the building the kingdom of God here that matters and this matter of the return of Christ is not nearly so important as he used to think. But I and II Thessalonians are his first epistles. I and II Timothy are among his last epistles - II Timothy perhaps his very last epistle and it is true that by the time he writes I and II Timothy, he's got so many churches started that he has all kinds of problems which he has to deal with in connection with these churches and his thought is pretty much taken up with the immediate problems about these churches. Nevertheless we will find that in these epistles, while there is nothing like the same great emphasis on the return of Christ, that ~~XXXX~~^{it} is in the first very definitely and clearly taught. You look at II Timothy - the last epistle Paul ever wrote - very near the end of his life - the 4th chapter, the last chapter of the last epistle he ever wrote, verse 8, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day." Well, "at that day" that's going to be given. Now Paul used to talk about the day of the Lord coming suddenly, you don't know when it is, be ready for it and all that. But now he's just referring to the great judgment at the end of the age. He's forgotten all this stress on the pre-millennial return of Christ. Yes, but

look at the rest of the verse -"and not to me only, but unto all them also that loved His appearing." What does "His appearing" mean? They love what He looks like? They love the kind of face, the kind of hair, the kind eyes, the kind of looks He's got? Certainly not. It isn't that at all - and it isn't "appearance" anyway. It's His "appearing". It is the return of Christ - His appearing without sin unto the setting up of His Kingdom of joy upon this earth. Those who love that, those who don't simply think of the return of Christ as something way off at the end of the world some time, but those who are watching, who are ready, who are faithful, who are loving His appearing and so living that when He comes they will be happy to see Him. "To all them that love His appearing He has a crown of righteousness." Now these books - in a way I wish I had not outlined as I did with a separate capital for each epistle of Paul because the epistles of Paul fall into definitely defined categories. First we had the epistles about salvation - Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians. Then we had the epistles about the walk with Christ in the heavenlies - Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. Then we have the epistles about the second coming - I and II Thessalonians. And now we have a fourth group of epistles which is called "The Pastoral Epistles". And while certain of Paul's epistles are recognized by all scholars, except the very most extremely radical - there are very few quite so radical as to deny that any of them are by Paul, there are a few that practically everybody will recognize - those who take a liberal position and deny any of his epistles are quite apt to deny these last two - "The Pastoral Epistles". And we call them the Pastoral Epistles because they are the epistles that deal with the shepherding of the flock. And there are three main ones in this list - I and II Timothy and Titus

End of Record 63

I don't know whether Philemon is ever considered a pastoral epistle or not. An argument could be made for putting it among the pastoral epistles or an argument for simply considering it a personal letter. But certainly it is more related to pastoral than to any other even though it was probably written and sent along with the Colossian - Ephesians and Colossians. But we're not to that yet. "J" was II Thessalonians. "K" will be I Timothy. And these letters aren't like the previous letters addressed to churches but to an individual. And here is a paradox. The letters written to churches deal with the salvation and growth in grace of individuals. The letters written to individuals deal with the care of the church. There is a paradox. But it is interesting that in Paul's epistles the letters which have a man's name instead of a church are pastoral. And the reason for that is because he is not writing to the churches now. He's not doing the pastoral work now which he did previously but he's writing to individuals asking them to do pastoral work.

So the pastoral epistles are the letters which Paul writes about the care of the churches. And they are specifically letters for those who are in charge of the churches. They are letters to the ministers rather than letters to the laymen. There is much in them of real value to the laity but there is a great deal in them which is very specifically addressed to the ministers. And he is addressing it to his ministers. The word "minister" in its original sense means "an assistant". And this is his assistant, the one who is helping him in his work, the one to whom he writes to bring his cloak to him, to bring the parchments and to do these things, the one who is acting as an assistant to him, and now he's sending him as an emissary. And so he writes to Timothy who is representing Paul in carrying on the care of the church. And he writes him about all sorts of practical matters connected with the care of the church. ~~XXX~~ It is fairly easy to make a division into a good many headings because he deals with a good many subjects. But to make a few main headings is not so easy. The first chapter of Timothy is pretty much an introductory chapter - I Timothy. It is a chapter in which he is warning him against false teaching. And it is interesting how in these letters toward the end of his life how great the stress is on this matter of false teaching. These people had no teachers before Paul started with them. Paul started the churches. You get the movement started, then you have all sorts of people

springing up with all sorts of ideas. That is one experience you will have in life. You get something really going and immediately you'll find there are plenty of changes. You perhaps never could start it but they will change it. The great overwhelming majority of the religious broadcasts in this country have been founded by fundamentalists. Actually the overwhelming part of the wealth of the churches in this country is in the hands of modernistic leaders. They have the large denominations, they have the control of the numbers, they have the control of the greater part of the money that belongs to the denominations. But it is comparatively rare that a religious broadcast is started by a liberal. It is fundamentalists, anxious to get the gospel out, who have started the radio broadcasts and radio was under way quite a while before the liberals paid hardly any attention to it. But the fundamentalists began to see the possibilities of this means of getting the Word of God out and began to get out religious broadcasts and then the liberals jumped in and decided that they ought to have control of the religious broadcasts. And in city after city the organization of the ministers has demanded that they have control of it. And in many cases they have taken it over and have apportioned it among themselves and perhaps had an orderly system with one after another would take part and the fundamentalists who started it might get to use it once in 10 times or something like that. But they haven't started it. And Paul started the churches but then the false teachers came. And so he warns Timothy in this first chapter about false teaching. And he says there are always false teachers but he points out how there's the true teaching and the necessary stress on the true teaching as against the doctrine and the life of the false teacher. Dr. Killen spoke very excellently the other day about the importance of the relation of so many things that by their truth ye shall know them. So many things we know they're evil because of the evil of their

(5.5) rather than their doctrine. I think perhaps just a slight word of caution is in view there that while perhaps in the majority of cases you find out what is evil because the truth is evil, yet if the doctrine is evil you don't have to bother to look at the truth. You've already got quite consistent evidence. As Christ said you cannot get good food out of a bad tree. ~~XXX~~ If the doctrine is not sound, there's no need of looking further to see what the fruit is. But if the doctrine sounds good, then look further and see if the fruit (truth?) bears out the doctrine. But he is warning here on two grounds - on the

of ground ~~XXXX~~ the erroneous doctrine and also very particularly here, on the ground of the erroneous truth or the harmful truth. And so this first chapter is stressing the importance of holding true to the teaching of the sound doctrine which he has given against the unsound teachers who have risen up. And then in Chapter 2 he goes into a practical matter - the matter of the relation of the sexes in the church. And here he is concerned with the fact that Christianity with its clear teaching which Paul clearly stresses that there is neither bond nor free, there's neither male nor female. He explicitly says it in Galatians I believe - there is neither male nor female, there is neither bond nor free - that all such distinctions have no place in Christianity - an individual is either saved or lost. And this individual stands as an individual before God. And when people got to this wonderful teaching, they some of them proceeded to carry it out in such a way that it went so sharply contrary to the established customs of the day that it caused great difficulty and it is one thing we notice about the New Testament. The New Testament writers were not social reformers, nor was the Lord Jesus Christ a social reformer. They came to give great spiritual truths, to give great principles, and these principles carried out will inevitably result in great social reforms. But the principles are the vital things and the principles will themselves inevitably bring the social reforms when we recognize the truth of the principles. The social reforms without the truth are of no value. The principles are of great value and will bring, if properly carried out, the social reforms inevitably. And so here he deals with the fact that these people have been tempted to ignore the social situation of the day altogether and to bring great criticism upon the church. And so he urges that people everywhere lift up holy hands without wrath and doubting, "that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefastness and sobriety: not with braided hair, or gold or pearls, or costly raiment; but with good works." And he stresses the importance of carrying on an order of the relationship of people which will not be scandalizing to those round about. I think it's important we recognize this fact about Paul's dealing with this matter for he explicitly says elsewhere there is neither male nor female, there's neither bond nor free in the kingdom. And God gives special gifts to individuals and God may use individuals in very particular ways but there is a normal order which will ordinarily be carried out. So Chapter 2 is dealing with this matter of the order in the churches. And then in Chapter 3 he deals with

church officers. These church officers here, he teaches us that there is to be a definite order in the church. An individual stands or falls before the Lord. He is saved or he is lost. But it carries on logically the thought of chapter 2 - there is to be an order within the visible church, an orderly established procedure, and for that there are to be officers. And these officers are to be people who are selected, people who can worthily carry out these offices. And there are two offices described here - the office of the bishop and the office of the deacon. So we have Paul here stressing two offices and describing the qualifications for them and the qualifications are very similar. And he says "the bishop must be the husband of one wife" and "the deacon must be the husband of one wife" and yet the Roman Catholic Church insists that they bishops and deacons should be the husband of no wife at all - flatly contradicting the Scripture here which says the bishop and the deacon should be a husband of one wife. So that you have here a statement - of course there are two ways of taking it. "Husband of one wife" could mean the husband of at least one wife or it could mean the husband of not more than one wife or a third way would mean the husband of exactly one wife. They're the three ways of taking it. Now in dealing with polygamy, which was common in his day, he might have meant it is not to be one who is the husband of more than one wife. But it certainly doesn't say that. He doesn't say "not more than one wife". He says "The husband of one wife" and it's pretty hard to reasonably interpret this passage without considering that Paul means that normally at least, the church officers are to be men who are familiar with that important phase of life which is involved in marriage. That normally the church officers are to be men who are married and who are not polygamists. Of course there are some who have interpreted it "the husband of one wife" meaning a man who has never in the total had more than one wife and that if a man's wife dies and he marries a second wife, he is incapacitated for a position in the church. And there are many who interpret it that way but it seems to me that is rather twisting Paul's words. If he meant that he would explain it differently than he does here. But that has been taken by a good many. It seems to me that what he is saying is that the normal order is that the bishop or the deacon be a man who is married and who is ruling his home well. So he describes here the qualifications of these officers in the church. He shows that he expects to have an orderly arrangement of the local church with officers who are ruling in it. And then the fourth chapter he warns

again about the false teachers and urges Timothy to avoid certain things which would interfere with his effectiveness. And these are very important for urging all Christian leaders to follow the example that he's given to Timothy. It is warning against matters that would interfere with his effectiveness. "Neglect not the gift that was in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.....Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine. Meditate on these things." Then Chapter 5 continues with the exhortations about the life and work, particularly the work perhaps more stressed on the life ~~life~~ than Chapter 4 of Timothy and consequently of other servants of the Lord. "Drink no longer water but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and for thine often infirmities - verse 23.

End of Record 64

There are those who say that the Christian should not use medicine but should only pray. In this verse Paul is definitely commanding ^{Timothy}/to use the knowledge available in his day - which wasn't very much, but there was some and what there was to make use of it. He wants us to live in a world of natural phenomena and to utilize these natural phenomena to the best of our knowledge. If the Lord needs you or me down in South America, He can suddenly cause us to disappear from here and be down there just like that if He desired to do it. But ordinarily He does not work in that way. We have steamships and airplanes and railroads and the like and He wants us to utilize them means that we have. He does not ordinarily work

but He does with His providence cause that His desires shall be worked out. So even a verse like this one has much of real teaching and meaning for us. Yes? (Student question) Yes, I think quite definitely He means don't just continue to like water

I would gather from it that Timothy was a sort of a natural health faddist and Timothy said a very true thing - that water is one of the best medicines there is and drink lots of water and it's good for you. And it certainly would be true but Paul says do not carry this good thing to the point where you neglect other things that are useful. When you have a particular ailment or illness take a little boiled milk or something that will meet the need of your time. (Student question) I don't know. I think there's this: that the word "wine" in the Greek covers both what we call wine today and what we call grape juice. I don't think there's any doubt they are both included in the word "Wine" in the New Testament and I imagine that refers to most any sort of whatever would be prescribed for the particular infirmities. He certainly is not suggesting that alcohol is just a general remedy for all ills. I don't think anybody would suggest that. But he means don't just confine yourself to water when you have an infirmity which needs the particular thing which is Then the sixth chapter is continuing with this discussion of personal problems and personal needs of the servant of the Lord. Chapter 6:10 - "the love of money is the root of all evil" He doesn't mean all evil in the sense of every evil there is but certain kinds of evil. There is no kind of evil but what you will find it is greatly aggravated in some way because of someone's desire for money which he gets from the extension of the motion of this evil. (Student question) Yes, coins are of value only as they represent the ability of a person to pay. But he means the desire for acquisition. He

is not saying that it is wrong to acquire money. He's not saying saving is wrong. But he is saying that the desire to acquire much, can become (4.)

This is so much of different specific personal things, all of them valuable, but it would take a very detailed outline to get them all. It's well worth your study - for thorough study - but for the purpose of our survey the general idea of the approach of Paul here is very vital and that's all we can cover. II Timothy - the last Epistle that he wrote continues this same approach to Timothy, stressing further these matters, starting as the first chapter did with stress on his personal relationship to Timothy. I Timothy started with ~~XXXXX~~ false teachers. II Timothy deals with them further on. But II Timothy starts with an exhortation to Timothy to continue the way that he has been going. It is a reminder to Timothy of all their good relations in the past and an urging to continue it and what a sad verse that is in verse 15, "This thou knowest, that all that are in Asia turned away from me." It's not a new experience to have those whom you've taught, turn away from you. Paul stayed three years in Ephesus and now all these people have turned away from Paul. What an example it is to us to keep our eyes on the Lord and trust Him and know that verse 12 just above it is true - that He is able to keep that which we should commit to Him against that day. Well, we continue there next Monday. We spoke about II Timothy 1 - about the exhortation ~~ixx~~ and I believe I mentioned the stress on the second coming which we find in II Timothy and we'll notice it also in Titus. It is not nearly as much spoken about as it is in I and II Thessalonians but it is very definitely stressed. Paul was still holding to it and feeling it was of tremendous importance but by this time he had come in contact with so many problems within the churches, so many different situations along the way that the greater part of his attention is directed to them. We notice then that II Timothy 1, was the exhortation to Timothy to stand fast, when so many were leaving Paul, to stand fast by the truth and go forward. And then Chapter 2 we have further exhortation to Timothy. These are the pastoral epistles but these two chapters are very, very definitely dealing with the individual pastor. Whether you would call Timothy a pastor in the modern sense or a bishop in the modern sense - I think he'd be more like a bishop in the modern sense. He was Paul's representative in going among the churches and presently was exercising very great authority over them. But this second

chapter here is dealing very definitely with Timothy's relationship to other people. The first chapter was his own personal attitude, his standing fast in himself. But this one is his attitude toward others. It stresses various aspects of Timothy's life particularly in relation to the people with whom he was dealing. He must constantly be preparing to deal better with them - verse 15 stresses. He doesn't know everything already. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." He must constantly be figuring how he can do things better, how he can serve the Lord more effectively. But it is a very practical chapter to a man who is actually in the work. And it's not enough that he go through motions but it's vital that he do the work well. "And the servant of the Lord must not strive but be gentle towards all men, apt to teach, patient" - some people take this that he mustn't strive and figure that it means he must just like down and let everybody walk over ~~him~~ the cause of Christ. But if they'd read the rest of the verse, it would contradict that - "in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves". He is to be stalwart and steady and firm for the Lord. Verse 3 says "Endure hardship as a good soldier of Christ". But he is not to be striving for his own advantage. He's not to be trying to advance himself and he's not to be allowing the flesh to take control of his methods of serving the Lord but to do it in a way to win rather than to drive away. ~~IX~~ Chapter 3 goes back to the theme that was stressed in I Timothy - the coming of the false teachers - "in the last days perilous times shall come". This division we had better include only verses 1 to 13 - "The False Teachers and the Warning Against Them" - "having a form of godliness, but denied the power thereof, lovers of their own selves, withstanding the God-sent leaders, as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses." He says in fact all that live Godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution. The opposition to the Gospel today is no new thing. Even in Paul's day he saw it coming. I don't think we should take this as a prediction of the last days. I think we should take it as a prediction of that which will be in - which the Gospel will have to face right along including the last days. It is in Paul's day and in succeeding days but perhaps in intensified form toward the end of the age. As times go on it gets worse to some extent. But Timothy is facing - Timothy must know that all who live Godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution and verse 3:14 to 4:9 are Timothy's attitude in the face of the rise of false teaching. II Timothy's a much

more personal epistle than I Timothy. I Timothy dealt much more with the work, II Timothy more with the man who does the work. But this is exhorting Timothy - the attitude Timothy is to have in the face of the false teachers who are here predicted. He is to stand on the Lord's Word and here we have this great outstanding passage on the value of Scripture - Chapter 3:16-17 constantly quoted as a proof that the Scripture is inspired but that's not what Paul is dealing with here. Paul is dealing with the fact that since the Scripture is all inspired it's all profitable. And of course if it's all profitable because it's all inspired, it is all inspired, and so it's an entirely valid use of it, to use it as a proof for inspiration. But it is very wrong to just take the inspiration and not notice the thing that Paul is actually driving at here - the fact that all the Scripture, being inspired is of value to us and that we're not just to take a few sections but that we are to stand upon and study all. There's been great controversy over the difference between the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Authorized version, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God" and the Revised Version, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is also profitable". And then the Revised Standard Version has returned to the Authorized at this point which many think is a sign of greater conservatism in the Revised Standard Version. It actually isn't for two reasons. The first of these reasons is that actually the Revised Version that is the American Standard Version of 1901 actually was just as strong if it's correctly understood, as the Authorized Version. "All Scripture inspired of God is profitable". What Scripture is inspired of God?

End of Record 65

as a proof that some of the Scripture is inspired and some isn't. That the Bible can change the Word of God instead of being the Word of God. But that is an utter misinterpretation. Because the verse right before says, "Continue thou in the things thou hast learned. From a child thee hast known the Holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation." All the Scriptures being inspired of God are profitable. All the Holy Scripture that you have known from a child. It's a very simple matter then to know what the Holy Scripture is. Timothy knew from a child and it is the Old Testament. It is precisely the thirty-nine books of our Old Testament. And so he is saying that since these books of the Old Testament are inspired of God, they are all of them profitable for doctrine, for instruction, for improvement, for correction - "that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished". All the books of the Old Testament are profitable. Now we use it as a proof-text for the New Testament but that is by application. Paul was not talking about the New Testament here. He's talking about the Old Testament. The context makes that very clear. He's saying the whole Old Testament is profitable for doctrine. We've been seeing (saying?) - in the very outline here he gives a prize(?) to the New Testament. And the New Testament is a continuation of the Old. What is true of the Old is true of the New. But Paul is here talking about the Old. The Revised Version then, if you take it in context, is just as much a proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures as the Authorized - taking the verse absolutely by itself, the Authorized seems a little more so. Well then why not say that the RSV is an improvement, that the RSV is getting more conservative than the American Standard. Well actually it doesn't make any great difference between the Authorized and the American Standard so I don't think you can say that but in addition to that the RSV here says, "All Scripture is inspired of God" and then it takes the word "inspiration" and (2.5) the word. And there are three or four cases in the New Testament where it inserts the word "inspiration" where it's not in the original at all, in such a way as to reduce "inspiration" to simply divine leading - make it entirely different than what this means. This means God

(2.5) Like in the case in Luke where the woman came into the temple and saw Jesus there and it says she came into the temple in the spirit - by the spirit entered. That's what the New Testament says. But the Revised Standard Version says "inspired of the spirit she came into the temple". Well, of course, the word "inspired" in proper uses refers

only to the act of the Holy Spirit in keeping the books, the written material free from error. She wasn't in any such situation as that. She was led of the Spirit but she was not inspired of the Spirit. And that's one of three or four instances where they have taken this word and they have insidiously lowered its value so that then when they say, "All Scripture is inspired of God that it doesn't mean any more than that this woman came into the temple. But it's one of our great passages on inspiration unquestionably and more than that it's one of our great passages on the value of the Scripture because it doesn't do you any good to put the Scripture up on the wall and say, "Look here, this is inspired of God. This is wonderful. Every word of it is true " and then ignore it. If it's all inspired of God, it's important to study it all and to use it. Yesterday I stood in a synagogue and ^{up in front} saw/~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ these great big beautiful volumes of the five books of Moses - beautiful - put up there right in the central position in front of everybody in the synagogue. That's the thing they see - the five books of Moses - the law. But actually it's a reformed synagogue where the teaching reduces it to pretty much to - well just like in an ordinary modernistic church - Protestant church. It's old tradition and as to - one of the young folks there was quite amazed when I said I believed there was

(4.5). The Scripture is put up there and elevated but it's not used. The Talmud and the Jewish tradition and modern philosophy get between the people and the Scriptures. How easy it is for us, the fundamentalists, to say, "I believe every word of it" and then not to pay much attention to it. Paul's big point here is - it is true and that's vital - every word of it's true. The vital thing is you study it and you follow it, you live by it. And I think it's unfortunate that chapter 3 - there's a chapter division between ~~xxx~~ 3 and 4. Because 4, "I charge thee therefore" - why? Because all the Scripture is true. I think it's fit to combine the two together. I often read this passage but I always start before the end because they belong so definitely together. He charges Timothy, in view of the false teachers described in Chapter 3, referred to again in Chapter 4 - he charges him in view of this to energetically preach the word and the instant in season and out of season wonderful sermon at a set time. Hold a prayer meeting at a set time

(something wrong with the record from 6. to 7/)

these particular writings he's just referred to - the Holy Scriptures. And then the rest of the epistle - Chapter 4:10 to 22 is the personal conclusion in which again we find Paul - no man stood with him "but all men forsook ~~XXXX~~ me.....but the Lord strengthened me."

"The cloak I left at Troas, bring with thee." And that's just as much inspired, the statement, "The cloak I left at Troas, bring with thee" as the statement that "now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three" - just as much inspired because inspired means kept free from error. Yes? (Student question) (7.5) each one of us will

live about 10 lives constantly learning more and improving. We'll be a lot nearer being "completely furnished" than we are now. If a man were to know the Old Testament perfectly and understand it fully in every way, maybe he would be "completely furnished". Paul is saying that all of the Scripture is necessary to the complete furnishing. Therefore to omit any of it means But he's not saying that you can the complete furnishing in this life - no-one will have it. This is not a means whereby you acquire this. But all of this is necessary in working in the direction of acquiring it. And of course we need the New Testament too, naturally. But we cannot be thoroughly furnished without the entire Old Testament and we can't be without the entire New Testament either. He is certainly not speaking of the whole New Testament. Now some of it was not yet written but there's nothing in the context to relate to the New Testament - you have known from a youth the Scriptures to make you wise to salvation. These Scriptures are all inspired of God and they're therefore profitable ~~XXXX~~ for all these points and if you're going to be thoroughly furnished you need all of those. Well of course it is a natural reasonable inference that you also need any other books that God inspired which bring the thing more up to the present state of knowledge and give you further understanding than you can get just from the Old Testament. So it is entirely proper for us to use it and apply it to the New Testament. But that is not what it is directly speaking of. Well now the next book is "M" - Titus. And these three are the pastoral epistles - I and II ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ Timothy and Titus. And Titus is very similar to I and II Timothy, particularly to I Timothy. Titus is much less personal than II Timothy. You read II Timothy and you feel as if you know Timothy. You know his strong points and you know his weak points. You know his background, you know his parentage, you know what privileges he's had. You really know Timothy as a person. ~~XXXX~~ You wouldn't

know Timothy that way from I Timothy though - it takes II Timothy to do it. Titus is like I Timothy. He is dealing most particularly with the matters in the church and with the dealings with the Christians and with the carrying on of the work. I Timothy and Titus are in the truest sense, pastoral epistles. II Timothy is dealing more with the pastor himself than with the pastorate though that does enter in very definitely. Sufficiently it can be called a pastoral epistle all right but not nearly so fully pastoral epistle as I Timothy is which deals more with the relation to the Christian people. Titus here is dealing specifically with the relation to the people and stresses a good many of the points of the relationship to them which you find in I Timothy. The first chapter of Titus is dealing with his establishing order in the church, how Titus is to establish order in the churches. He doesn't tell him about the deacons as he did Timothy - it is briefer - but he tells about the bishops. And what he says about the bishops is the same as what he's told Timothy only briefer. It would seem that Titus is in Crete and he's having a tough job there in Crete. He's finding some real difficulties. I heard Dr. Zweemer once speaking - the man who had so many years of experience as missionary to the Moslems - and he said that all Scripture was inspired of God and all is profitable. And he said, "You may think some of the verses here you may not see much point to. You may not know how they're going to be profitable - like 'the cloak I left at Troas' and 'take a little wine for thy stomach's sake' - but God has put everything in the Scripture for a purpose and it all will be proven profitable." He said he had a most strange experience once where a verse proved profitable that he never would have expected to. ~~XXXXX~~ It was in the old days before the break-up of the Ottoman Empire and he was at a place where there were a lot of Turkish officers. There was a little coffee house there and there was a Cretan who ran the coffee house. Dr. Zweemer was going among these Turkish officers offering them New Testaments for sale and he sold quite a few to these people and ^{had} gotten them to promise to read them and was hoping God would bless the seed sown that way. He said he preferred to sell them ordinarily rather than to give them because they were more apt to read them. Then some of them came to him and began to ask for their money back, wanted to give the books back. And then he noticed that this Cretan, who was a Greek-Orthodox man from Greece, was saying to these Turkish officers, "I'm a Christian and I know something about this and that's a bad book that fellow sold you. I wouldn't advise you to read that."

And so these men were coming and wanting their money back and pretty soon all the books would be given back to him and his opportunity of reaching the Moslems with the Gospel would be gone. So he said that he opened up the book to Titus and he said to ~~XXX XXXXX~~^a Turkish officer~~s~~, "I know why that Cretan there doesn't like this book - because it tells about him in it. Look here at Titus 1:12, "One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, 'Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, low-bellied. This witness is true.'" The Turkish officer said, "Yes, that's right. That fits exactly. That book must have a lot of good things in it that has that in it. I'll keep the book." He told the others and pretty soon those who had given him the books back came and bought them from him again and others began buying them. Then ^{Dr. Zweemer}~~XX~~ went over to the Cretan and he said, "That was kind of ~~hard~~ on you. I'm sorry. I'll give you one of the books if you'll promise to read it." So he gave him one and sold it to the others. This verse came in handy at that particular point. But Paul points out here the difficulty that Titus was having with the Cretans but he says that the grace of the Lord is sufficient for them also. But he needs particular advice as to how he's going to ordain elders in every city and carry out the work there.

End of Record 66

then in Chapter 2 he deals with situations inside the church more. Here for instance he deals particularly with the different classes - like the aged women and the young men and the servants - he takes up particular classes of the people. In other pastoral epistles and in other epistles in general like Corinthians he's ~~gone~~ more at length into some of these, and Ephesians and Colossians. Here it's quite brief but he's stressing the same point for Titus and is dealing with these people. And then ends the chapter with the stress on the great blessed hope, "Looking for that ^{blessed} hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our savior Jesus Christ." Now here is one of the few places where I like the Revised Standard Version better than the King James, "Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing" - the Revised Standard Version says - "of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ." Now that brings out the deity of Christ more clearly than any other passage in the New Testament. "of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ." Elicutt in his commentary has a discussion in which he says, "Both are grammatically possible but this word "the appearing"

(Greek) is used of the return of Christ and is never used in the Scripture of God the Father and so Elicutt feels that very definitely here what is meant is "the great God and our Savior" - that they are both describing Christ.- "the great God Jesus Christ and our Savior Jesus Christ" or our great God and Savior Jesus Christ. Elicutt, ~~was~~ written long before the Revised Standard Version, feels that that ~~XXX~~ is the better translation of the two though both are grammatically possible. If you read it as in the King James it would suggest that two persons are appearing. We have no evidence that God the Father is to appear in a special way other than the manifestation of Christ at the second coming. It is a manifestation of God in the first (2.5) and it does of course bring out the deity of Christ so very clearly if we take the great thought here as a description of Christ. ~~XXX~~ He is in this difficult situation among these Cretan Christians. He is stressing the relation to the second coming. "The appearing of Christ who gave Himself for us that He might redeem us from all iniquity and purify us unto Himself a peculiar people." When I was in seminary I remember one of the professors saying, "This doesn't mean we're to be a queer people - a peculiar people." The word, "peculiar" has derived that new useage in modern English - that's very peculiar, that's very queer. But when it was used in the Auth-

orized Version it doubtless meant one particularly belonging to Him, one set apart, a peculiar people - not a queer people. A peculiar people, one set apart,"to be redeemed from iniquity and purified to God, zealous of good works." Two generations ago it was very common for people to preach all the time on good works - constantly - good works, good works. Until people got the idea you were saved by good works. And then there was a splendid reaction against it in the last generation ~~XXXXXX~~ in which people stress the great Scriptural fact that salvation is by faith, by faith alone. You're only saved through faith, you're saved only by faith. No work we could do could possibly save us - which is so clearly taught in the Scripture. But this has gone a bit too far in many circles. Not that you can stress salvation by faith too much but you can neglect something else while you're doing it. And this phrase "zealous of good works" has been neglected in the preaching to a great extent in our fundamentalist churches. And now there is coming a very definite reaction against that. Among the leaders of the people who stress salvation by faith there is coming a very great reaction against the lack of sufficient stress on good works. Actually of course in the Scripture it is constantly stressed in the New Testament that we are saved "unto good works". We're not saved by them but we're saved for them, we're expected to do that. Let's hope that this new reaction won't go too far again and we'll get back to where we were two generations ago. But it can go a bit further than it's gone yet without going too far - very definitely. "Zealous unto good works" - the true Christian~~x~~ - "by their/truths/ye shall know them". He is expected to show fruits. He's not saved for having fruits but he's expected to show fruits. And then Chapter 3 I guess we ought to consider as simply a continuation of Chapter 2. He is continuing with these same matters which he dealt with more at length in other passages. "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work." Here you have your good works again but here "to be ready to every good work" - he's probably speaking here not so much of good works in the sense of Christian work as of being ready to take our part in civil affairs, in that which is good in civil affairs. An evangelist said to me once if a man's going to Hell anyway, what's the difference whether he goes drunk or sober? Well of course what he said is absolutely true and yet that doesn't mean that we're not interested in social im-

provement and human betterment. We are interested in making this world as good a place as we can while we're here, realizing that it is Satan's world and that whatever we do he will eventually wreck. But we are interested in good civil works as a minor part of our activity. Most of the good improvements in civil life that have occurred have been by-products of the preaching of the Christian Gospel. The ordinary pagan has ~~XX~~ little interest in it - one who's had no contact with Christian work. It's a by-product of the Bible. If we take the by-product ~~SIXXXXXXX~~ and make it the main thing, it becomes an evil. But that doesn't mean that we should not have it as a subordinate factor. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done but according to His mercy" - what a wonderful statement of salvation by faith. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done but according to His mercy He saved us" and yet he's just told us to be "zealous unto good works" and "to be ready to every good work". They are not a means of salvation but they are an inevitable proof of salvation. Again in verse 8 - "they which have believed in God must be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men but avoid foolish questions and genealogies and contention and strivings about the law for they are unprofitable and vain." Twenty years ago I heard of a church up in New Jersey, a fine fundamentalist church that almost split because half of them believed that the Crucifixion was Friday and half of them believed it was Wednesday. And it almost came to a split in the church over that. Paul says to Titus, ~~X~~ "Foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions and strivings about the law, avoid because they are unprofitable and vain." I think there's one denomination that baptizes by putting people forward into the water and another does it by putting them backward into the water. And there's a division over that as to which way. It's a thousand times more important that we know what baptism means than that we use any particular mode or way of doing it. But in opposition to verse 9 "avoid foolish questions" - verse 10 "a man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject". The two come into sharp juxtaposition. He says to Titus don't get into fights and squabbles and divisions over little, small points, foolish contentions and genealogy that should not interfere with Christian fellowship. But if a man is denying the deity of Christ, if he deny the atonement, if he's denying the truth of the Scriptures, he's taking an attitude that is positively heretical like this, then you must make a clear line. People go to one extreme or the other. Either we're all brothers

together no matter what we believe or we must divide over the littlest, tiniest points. And it's a wonderful thing about this little epistle of Titus - Paul to Titus - how well-balanced the truth is in it and how careful he is to stress both sides of various truths which we might otherwise tend perhaps to go to one extreme or the other on. Now "M" was Titus and then "N" will be Philemon. Philemon I think we should consider as one of the pastoral epistles though it's a pastoral epistle in a different sense than the others. It is Paul doing pastoral work. It's giving us an example of it. It is not explaining to a pastor what kind of work to do but it is doing it himself. It's a very small epistle but it's a very rich epistle - in just this one chapter we have an example of Paul's method of doing things. You notice the wonderful tact that he shows here. Paul, the one who would that they were at even cut off the trouble you, the one who uses such strong language against those who deny the truth of God, uses this wonderful tact here in dealing with a true Christian over a matter on which he thinks the man may disagree with him. We don't need to go into the story of Philemon - I'm sure you must all know it. It is a wonderful instance of Paul dealing with a social problem which he is dealing with not by saying slavery is wrong and you should free this man. It certainly is. The Gospel did away with slavery in the end but he doesn't attack it from that view. He says here's this man who is now a Christian brother and he's wronged Philemon, he's stolen from him, he's run away from him. Now he's coming back to be received not as a servant but as a brother beloved, one who is a true Christian with him but who is in-the situation in the world there is working for him. And Paul reminds Philemon very tactfully how Philemon has been led to Christ through Paul - he owes Paul his very life. And Paul tactfully uses this as an argument for Philemon to do that which he points out is right in this case. (Student question - Does he mean in verse 16 not as a servant alone or does he mean not as a servant at all?) I think not as a servant alone. Yes, Paul never tells servants to run away. He tells them to submit to the situation in which they find themselves but he tells the masters if they're Christians to treat them as they should be treated. And in the end of course the principle of the Gospel destroys the very foundation of any such relationship. But they go at it through the principles here rather than through a direct attempt to change the social order. Christians change the social order at times. Christians realized that slavery was absolutely inconsistent with ~~the~~ ^{the Gospel}. But it wasn't the direct

Now the - I think that I will Hebrews a separate heading by itself. Otherwise we would be judging something that nobody can judge. We call this the Pauline Epistles. What number was the Pauline Epistles again? Roman numeral ~~XXXX~~ IV? Well then let's call V - Hebrews. Now that's giving 13 books one number and one book another. That is no to say they are equal in importance but we gave Acts one too. Hebrews is of course an epistle but is it one of the general epistles? Is it one of the Pauline epistles? I notice the Scofield Bible has a heading - The Jewish-Christian Epistles and they put Hebrews, James, I and II Peter, and Jude under that head. Who wrote Hebrews? Nobody knows. In the early church it was recognized that nobody knew who had written Hebrews. There were those who thought Paul had written it but it has very marked differences between - with Paul's epistles. Oregan, I believe, advanced a very clever theory.

End of Record 67

himself. Somebody took Paul's teaching and put it in his own words. Well, maybe that's true. Maybe it isn't. We don't know. There's absolutely no way of knowing who wrote Hebrews. There were those in the first two or three centuries who thought Paul wrote it. There were those who thought Barnabus wrote it. There were those who made other suggestions as to who might have written it. And we've had great leaders in the modern church who have been convinced Paul wrote it and we've had great leaders who've been convinced Paul didn't write it. If it was vital the Lord would have given us evidence. As it is we just don't know who wrote it but we know God wrote it. We know it is one of the inspired books which God has given us for our leaning as Christians. And so I'm going to give it a separate heading, number V, which does not imply that it is by Paul or that it isn't by Paul. It is a book which perhaps it's good to give a separate heading anyway because it is so different from other books. Now the difference certainly is not any contradiction to the Pauline epistles. Hebrews presents the same teaching as the Pauline epistles but then it's the same teaching as Peter presents in his. It is not uniquely Pauline at all but it is right in harmony with the other teachings. There is no introduction to it, there's no statement

who ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ he's writing to, or a statement of who has written it. It would seem to be addressed to the special problems of Hebrew Christians, to confirm them in the faith and to urge them to remain true in the faith which they had adopted. And so Hebrews is a book which deals with a certain area of thought which you find touched upon in other books of the New Testament and the principles of Hebrews are all in other books but it's nowhere developed as fully as it is here in this book. ~~XX~~ It is hard to make a clear simple division of the book because the book is so practical as well as theoretical. It presents a theory and then it applies it sharply and positively. And then it takes another point of theory and then it applies it and so you have alternation of doctrine and then application. You have these constant alternations. Sometimes people take the practical passages and call them parenthetical. Well it's parenthetical from the viewpoint of the development of the doctrine but it's not the least bit parenthetical from the viewpoint of the purpose of the book. It is to confirm Hebrew Christians and to strengthen them - that is the purpose of the book. And I think it is good to consider the first portion of the book as running right through Chapter 4:16 - the whole first ~~three~~ four chapters. That could be divided into the first two and the second two but the second two are so closely related to the first two that I think it's better to outline it that way. So section I then we would call - Chapter 1 through 4 - and the argument of it is - Superiority of Christianity to Judaism - or to any other dispensation, to any other presentation of the Lord's will. It is a greater revelation because the revealer is great. Not that it's any more true than the teaching of the Old Testament but it is greater because the revealer is great. And so he takes up various other organs of revelation that God has used. "God spoke in the past through the prophets" - that's wonderful but now he has spoken by one who is far greater than the prophets because He's His son, He's the brightness of His glory, the express image of His person, He upholds all things by the word of His power. None of the prophets could be compared with this at all. And so the superiority of the revealer of Christianity to all previous revealers, is what is stressed in Chapter 1 through chapter 3:6. Perhaps it's good under ~~XXX~~ 1 here - the first section of the book - The Superiority of Christianity - to call A - Superiority of the Revealer of Christianity - that is, Christ. A is the doctrinal portion, B the practical portion of this first section - Chapters 1 to 4. So The Superiority of the Revealer is A and under that 1 - He is greater

Than the Prophets - Chapter 1:1-3. It does not explicitly say here that he is greater than the prophets. But he certainly means that, it is certainly the clear meaning of the three verses. When you take that the second section is to show that He's greater than the angels, the first here is dealing with the prophets and is stressing His greatness so I think there is no question that that is the purpose of the author to show that He is greater than the prophets. The heading in the Scofield Bible here is - The Son, Better Than the Prophets. I think "greater" is a better word than "better". He is of course better - He's supremely holy and they are human beings who have sin upon them but the thought here is how much greater - greater than the prophets. And then second is that He is greater than the angels. And that is a theme which wouldn't bother probably most people today very much but which through many periods has been very important and it would be among the Roman Catholics greater than all the angels and the saints. These saints many of them were grand Christians, did a great work but they're not to be mentioned in a class with Christ. They're in a different category entirely and the angels are His instruments which do His bidding but they're not to be mentioned in a class with Him. And so "Greater Than The Angels" would be chapter 1 verse 4 to chapter 2 verse 18. We probably ought to subdivide that how He is greater - first a more excellent name in Scripture - small a. And here he gives the Scriptural evidence of Christ's superiority to the angels. And now you have a series of quotations here which are very helpful in understanding the Old Testament and seeing where the author of Hebrews says that it is Christ whose death has been spoken of in the Old Testament. It's very helpful for interpreting the Old Testament and it is of course very helpful in seeing His superiority to the angels. And it's very helpful for understanding the nature of the RSV because if you will take the RSV on the Book of Hebrews and look up all the Old Testament quotations - and this chapter's full of them - and then compare them with the RSV's translation of them in the Old Testament, it's most revealing to see how differently they translate them. Here it's impossible to translate the Greek without showing that it considers the Old Testament to recognize Jesus as God. But the Old Testament passages which are here quoted are most of them translated in the RSV in such a way as to consider Him as definitely (9.25)

In several of these cases the differences are most striking and absolutely unwarranted. The primary assumption of the RSV is that the New Testament writers believed Christ was God but

the Old Testament writers never dreamed of anything like that. And that of course makes it impossible to call it a Holy Bible - a Bible which presents such a contradiction between the New Testament view and the Old Testament writers whom the New Testament writers claim are teaching something the RSV assumes are teaching something very, very different

(10.) So we have the Scriptural - "a" here - A Greater Name In Scripture Christ Had Than the Angels. And then "b" is Exhortation. If Jesus is so much superior to the angels as this we should give them more earnest heed, not to let what He has revealed to us, slip. Exhortation - Chapter 2;1-4. I said 1:4-18 didn't I? I meant 14 of course. There are only 14 verses in the chapter. Then "c" - Christ's Exaltation. Greater than the angels because all things are under His feet. Can't possibly be said of any angels - 2:5-8. Then "d" - Greater In His Work. And here we have the whole work of salvation presented subordinate to the theme, Christ Is Greater Than the Angels. Why? Because He could save and they couldn't. Greater in His work than the angels - 2:9-18. And then this was 2- Greater Than The Angels. 3- Greater Than Moses - the great revealer of the Old Testament. Christ is greater than Moses - 3:1-6. Moses was a very great man, a very great revealer but Jesus is even greater. Well I guess we stop there till 2:30 this afternoon. We began to look at the book of Hebrews this morning and I hesitated just a little bit about giving it a heading all to itself since we had a heading that covered all of the Pauline epistles. It seemed like giving a great deal of prominence to one particular book. And yet as you think about it I don't think it's so bad to do this because Hebrews is in some ways a very unique book. It has very unusual qualities about it and unusual features.

End of Record 68

People sometimes find it hard to get into because it is different from most of the other books but I think it is well worth the effort of getting into it. There are a few of its chapters which are preached on a great deal. But all of its sections are worthy of very careful study and even in the sections which may at first sight appear to be less interesting, you will find remarkable verses which stand out and which there is a great temptation to pick out of the group and to give very special attention to. Now the Book of Hebrews, like most epistles, most articles that move along steadily, has a gradual progress from one section into another. It is not divided into sections which - there's a stop and a title and a new heading. That is not usual in the epistles and while in some of the Old Testament books and some of the epistles we do have that sort of a change, yet ordinarily it is not the case. But there are some fairly sharp changes in Hebrews often made with a gentle sort of a transition where the one section looks forward to the other and the other ones look back to the first ones so that it may be hard to know exactly where the transition is. But there is a very definite transition. The book is I think very nicely divided into three main sections. And I think in the case of this particular book that it would help a little in our understanding if we glanced at the three of them as units first before we went further into detail of the first. I began this morning to speak to you about the first - The Superiority of Christianity to Judaism or The Superiority of this revelation to any other anywhere. That is the first heading. That runs almost to the end of chapter 4. Then the second main section we might call - Jesus Our High Priest. This would contain the last two or three verses of chapter 4, all of chapter 5, and on just about to the end of chapter 10 - that is, roughly chapters 5 to 10. I think that if you want a precise division we could say 4:14 to 10:37 - but approximately chapters 5 through 10 - six chapters. Well now you notice the relationship between the second and the first. First is the Superiority of The Revealer, second is Jesus Our Great High Priest. Well the first part is talking about Jesus and so's the second. The first is showing that Jesus is greater than ~~XXXX~~ the angels, greater than the prophets, greater than Moses. The second is showing He's greater than Aaron. So that you might say that the same head runs right through. And yet there is a marked difference in this way - that in the first four chapters we are principally showing, great as these are, Jesus is greater. But in this section we are showing Jesus

is greater than Aaron in that He meets our great need and consequently this is the meat of the whole thing - the second part. You still have that thought, the superiority - Better Than Aaron you might say if you want for these six chapters - and better than Aaron is a substantial part of it. But that is not the primary purpose of the subject - to prove that Jesus is better than Aaron but it is to show the relationship of Jesus' work to our lives. To show how all that Aaron looked forward to Jesus had fulfilled. One thing about this word "better". Sometimes the word "better" is given as the key word of Hebrews and it isn't a bad choice for a key word. Hebrews is written to show ~~XXXX~~ the Hebrew Christians that they have something better in Christ than in Judaism. But I think that it can be misunderstood. It is not better in the sense of "that is bad" and "this is good". It is better in the sense that this is a step of progress. It is like saying college is better than high school. Well then why go to high school? Why not go right to college? You're not ready for college. You need the high school first. The high school is the preparation. But the college is better than the high school. And in comparing with Judaism here, he is not running down any of these things. He is not comparing it here like Paul is in Galatians with a false belief. He's not comparing it with a religion of works. There may be the possibility of going on from that with which he is comparing it to make a religion of works. But that's not what he's doing here. He's not taking the erroneous Judaism and let the grace out of it and made it a religion of works. He is taking the true Old Testament here and he is showing that Christianity is a step forward from it - it is the fulfillment of it. It is that to which it looked. So I think this word better is good to take as a key word if we have this clearly in mind that by "better" we don't mean "that is bad and this is good" but we mean "this is a step forward" - this is progress, this is that to which that pointed and without which that is of no value. But that is of great value as pointing to this.

Two main heads thus far - The Superiority of Christianity and Jesus Our Great High Priest which is of course on the note of the Superiority. And then number 3 - Faith and Its Results. And this relates closely to the other two because it is faith in Jesus as the high priest through which we get the values that he secures for us as the high priest. So number 3 - Faith and Its Results goes from chapter 10:38 to the end of the book. A few words of closing at the end we won't make a separate division for. Well now these as the

three heads then - I think it enables us to get an idea of the progress of the book and to see how its value is not simply an apologetic thing by any means. It is not just a book to urge Hebrew Christians to stay true to Christianity and if we're not Hebrew Christians what does it have to do with us? Nothing of the kind. That is the great value of the book but it is a book to show everyone that the Old Testament finds its fulfillment in the New Testament and that wonderful as are the teachings of the Old Testament, they are looking forward to this which is their capstone, their real purpose, their ultimate goal. And that in Christ we have the blessings offered us through the Old Testament and that therefore we learn the correct use of the Old Testament from this book and we learn to get the blessings of the Old Testament much better than would otherwise be the case because we have this as a book showing us the relationship between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Since all Christians are vitally interested in the Old Testament, this is a book which has tremendous meaning for all Christians even though some sections of it are specifically directed toward the Hebrew Christians. Well the first part of the book is very definitely apologetic in its approach and of course there is considerable of that apologetics in the second part also. But in the first part - The Superiority of Christianity - we notice that there, we find the alternation which you find all through the book between doctrine and exhortation. And first you have the doctrine which I called "A" - Superiority of the Revealer. Christianity is superior to all other forms and teachings and doctrines because its revealer is greater than other revealer. Superiority of the Revealer - Number 1, He Is Greater Than the Prophets. God spoke through the prophets. Now He has spoken through a greater one. Chapter 1:1 to 3. Number 2 - Greater Than The Angels. Chapter 1:4 to 14. Did I mention to you any subheads? I mentioned to you one or two subheads - mentioned all four. Yes. He Is Greater Than The Angels. Number 3 - Reasons And A Brief Passage Of Exhortation making four under that - then Number 3 - I mentioned Greater Than Moses - Chapter 3:1-6. And then after showing he's greater than Moses - 3:1-6 - then we have "B" - a long passage of exhortation. And this exhortation is rather hard to summarize without a rather long sentence but I think that the long sentence is helpful there. "B" - Exhortation, Not To Imitate the Unfaithfulness Through Which Israel Failed to Enter the True Rest of God - 3:7 to 4:13. Now this is a section which is exhortation and yet a section which has in the exhortation real teaching, real advancement for us, real help in knowing how

to get the most from our Christian lives. It starts with a section that - Number 1 - As A Result of Unbelief the Generation That Came Out of Egypt Did Not Enter the Canaan Rest. It's long but I think it's pretty hard to express it more briefly - 3:7-19. A fairly long section but a section in which he tells how these people came out of Egypt, did not follow through with Moses. They failed to enter into Canaan. People said, "Well, after all we're getting tired of this new revelation, this new Christianity business. We have these wonderful things in Moses' teaching. Let's go back to Moses." Well he says the people who followed Moses failed to follow through and get the blessing from it. See what happened to them. Watch out that you don't have a similar fate now. But he goes beyond that. Number 2 under B - There Is An Even Better Rest Available To Us. They failed to enter Canaan because of unbelief. We have a change of entering into the divine rest - something even better than Canaan, which is available to us and he is exhorting us to follow on and receive this blessing. In verse 8 it's rather deceptive. It says, "If Jesus had given them rest then would He not afterwards have spoken of another day." What does that mean? It means Joshua. You have there of course the fact that the name Jesus and the name Joshua are the same name. Joshua is the Hebrew form, Jesus is the Greek form. Just like Elijah is the Hebrew form and Elias is the Greek form. And in the New Testament when the King James translators or revisers issued the work, there was evidently a disagreement among them over this rather important question, "Shall we call it - shall we use the Greek form making a precise transliteration of the Greek which we have or shall we go back to the Hebrew form of which the Greek was a translation. And in a part of the New Testament they do on and in a part, the other. Evidently they had rather watertight proof that were translating different sections and in one section they always say Elias and in another section they say Elijah. And of course the Greek is Elias in both cases representing the Hebrew in both cases.

End of Record 69

If you're going to translate Elias the Greek for Elijah, you'll naturally translate Jesus the Greek for Joshua. And so in this case they perfectly consistently have said Jesus, but it's very confusing to the person who is accustomed to read about Joshua with the Hebrew form and about Jesus with the Greek form. I personally think it would be much better to use the Hebrew form all the way through. I'm hoping that the next edition of the Scofield Bible that comes out will have that done. If it doesn't you'll find that you will reach the conclusion that my influence is not as great as I hope it will be in connection with that edition. But it seems to me that it ~~introduces~~ unnecessary confusion to say Elias in some parts and Elijah in other parts and so I'm strongly urging that it be Elijah in all - I mean I will when we get to it. Yes? (Student question) This matter of this book of Hebrews which is such a wonderful book and such a very vital book. We were speaking about this Jesus here which we would much better I think translate Joshua. And Joshua if he had given them rest then why would David have said, "Today if you will hear His voice, harden not your hearts"? Why would David have looked forward to the coming rest if they already had the rest? A pretty good argument to prove that there is a greater ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ rest coming than the rest that Joshua gave coming into Canaan. And the passage ends with this about, "Let us labor to enter into that rest lest any man fall after this same example of unbelief. For the Word of God is quick and powerful, sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Showing that some of us maybe are going through certain forms and pretending to be Christians, some of us sincerely are in the heart, but the Lord can see our sincerity or lack of it. Let us examine ourselves to be sure we truly are believers and we truly are pushing forward for the goal that we will be pushing forward to if we are His. And then I think it's best to start the next section with verse 14 instead of with chapter 5. Verses 14 to 16 are a transitional section. And this transitional section could be taken conceivably as the end of the previous - and that's doubtless what the archbishop did when he started the new chapter where he did. But it seems to me that instead of simply being a summary of what's past, it's an introduction to what follows. And so I think it much better to start section 2 - Jesus Our Great High Priest with chapter 4:14. And this section is a section which has

again some alternation of exhortation and of doctrine. First it has doctrine which we might call simply a repetition of the title - A, Jesus Is Our High Priest - 4:14 to 5:10. Under that Number 1 - Our Need of a High Priest - 4:14 to 16. It seems to me that it fits there more reasonably than to fit it with what precedes that "there's a better rest for the believer". That we have need of a high priest - 4:14 to 16. "Seeing then we have a great high priest, passed into the heavens, let us hold fast our profession for we have not a high priest that can't be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, but is in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need." Our need of a high priest - 4:14-16.

Then Number 2 - The Office of High Priest. We need a high priest. What does the high priest do? Chapter 5:1-4. Every high priest must have certain qualities. One of these qualities is to be appointed master. He must be one who can have some (4.75) who can do the things we need but he can't take this honor to himself, he must be appointed - 5:1-4 - The Office of High Priest. And then Number 3 - Christ, a high priest, after the order of Melchizedek - 5:5-10. How is he appointed? Well he was appointed by God as Melchizedek was. And as Aaron was too. God appointed Aaron. Aaron's children inherited it. God appointed Melchizedek. He appointed Jesus. He's the high priest after the order of Melchizedek. So that is your presentation of the fact Jesus is our high priest. (Student question) A very good question. We don't know a great deal about Melchizedek. But this we do know that Melchizedek was a priest of God and he was not a member of the Levites. So that is the real point about Melchizedek. It is that God appointed a man as priest without his having this hereditary reason for appointing him. That is the reason. And as to whether Melchizedek was a great outstanding character, who did many fine things for the Lord that we don't know about, or whether he was one who on just one occasion was used of the Lord, we just don't know. (Student question) Job would be like Melchizedek. He would be one who was a priest but was not of the Aaronic family. He would be that, yes. God appointed a man as a priest and if God could appoint Aaron why God could appoint another. But if God could appoint Melchizedek it's a better argument because after God appointed Aaron they all descended from Aaron. But here God appointed one from whom we have no descendants named so that God could appoint another simply as an isolated one by himself. And what he's saying really is that God has the power to

appoint whom He chooses. And though he chooses to have a continuous line of Aaron that doesn't mean that He did not appoint others before and that He may not similarly appoint Jesus. Yes? (Student question) No, that's said right here - or is it a little later on? We'll come to that. Let's leave that just for a minute just till we come to it. ~~XXXXXXXX~~

But right here all he said is that in the Old Testament it's said in the 110th Psalm, "Thou art a priest forever ~~XXX~~ after the order of Melchizedek." This is evidence that the Psalms teach that there is such a thing as a priest/^{hood} that is not from the Aaronic family and a priest-hood like that of Melchizedek who was outside the family of Aaron, outside of the tribe of Levi and yet specifically appointed of God. Of course it's interesting that in the 110th Psalm it is the king who is thus appointed. And of course Jesus is the king. And so it's particularly fitting for Him. But that's not stated here that we can infer. But then we have Him a priest after the order of Melchizedek and here a description of His service, "In the days of His flesh, He offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tearsthough He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered." Christ as our example, even He had to suffer. Now this is laying a foundation for some of the teaching that comes later on in the book showing that even Christ had to be made perfect by obedience and by suffering. Then we have the exhortation. And we have a long passage of exhortation here which runs from 5:11 to the end of 6:20 - Exhortation to Stand Fast. You have this alternation. You have doctrine, you have exhortation. And at this point the doctrine has gone to the point of showing that we have a high priest, we need a high priest, and we have one who is the high priest after the order of Melchizedek. Having introduced the discussion to that point, then he pauses for exhortation. And these exhortations are very fine for us as Christians as well as for the Hebrew-Christians. They have so much in them that is very useful to us. And this exhortation I think I'll give you some subheads for. Exhortation to Stand Fast - it's pretty hard to give a title that's very good because he combines a good many things in it - but that is of course the main theme of the book - Stand Fast in the Truth You Have. And it's very definitely in this exhortation here - 5:11 to 6:20. Under that we'll say Number 1 - We Should Increase In Understanding - 5:12 to 6:3. Here's one place where I think the archbishop did make a rather poor division. Chapter 6 starts

"Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on to perfection, not laying again the foundation " - well, what a good place to start a new section - "Therefore". You have one chapter with something, therefore there's something else. But that's not what you have. You have four verses with something and then you have three verses going on from there and the four and the three are connected with "therefore". So the seven make one unit which is divided into two parts by "therefore" and the archbishop made his division at a definite dividing point but it's not a division of two chapters, it's a division of two parts of a seven verse section. He is saying before this you ought to be ready to be teachers but you need to learn again the primary of principles. You're not ready for strong meat. You're only ready for milk and so on. He is speaking of the fact that they're not ready to move forward. Then in the next three verses he is saying you should move forward - "leaving the primary principles" - you should have them by this time. You should be ready to go on ~~XXXX~~ to more advanced doctrines and this we will do if God permits. These three verses are a definite unit, separate much more from what follows than they are from the last verses of chapter 5. 5:12 to 6:3 - We Should Increase In Understanding. Number 2 - Paul's Believers Will Perish - 6:4 to 8 - a very marked division between verses 3 and 4 though not nearly as marked as between 5:10 and 11. It is a lesser subdivision under this main exhortation. From the exhortation to go forward in the knowledge of Christ then he gets on to pointing out that those who do not go forward will probably go backward. You can't stand still in the Christian life or in Christian understanding. You're going forward or you're going backward. And if you're going backward, you probably never really did come forward. It probably was simply an appearance, a sham, your appearance of faith though you, yourself might even have been deceived as doubtless people have been. Yes? (Student question) He doesn't say that they have digested the good word, he only says they've tasted it. He doesn't say they merely tasted the heavenly gift. And as far as being enlightened is concerned, why certainly all those who are at a place where they can hear the Word of God, they have received some enlightenment. He is speaking here of those who receive enlightenment who get a taste of it, who seem to everyone to be stepping forward in the Christian life but who actually have only a taste. They do not have a real part and portion. He is saying make sure of your foundation and go forward. And if you're not going forward it's reason to look back and test your foundation pretty

clearly and see if you have it because you're not going to stand still. You're not going to be one who's got a few of the things of Christ you think and people seem to think you have - you give that impression - but you're not moving forward. If you're not moving forward - you've only tasted, you're not really digesting. The Holy Spirit has merely enlightened you. He hasn't taken over your life. He hasn't regenerated you. He hasn't changed you. Well this then is a section - False Believers Will Perish. It is very important for all of us - verse 8, "but that which beareth thorns and thistles is rejected and nigh unto a curse; whose end is to be burnt." Verse 7 - "That which drinks in the rain, brings forth herbs meet for those whom it is dressed, receives blessing from God". "By their fruits ye shall know them" - test ourselves by our fruits. You are not saved because you have done works of righteousness but if you find you're not doing works of righteousness, stop and question whether you have been saved. And if you haven't been saved the thing to do isn't to get busy and try to vigorously do works of righteousness but is to back to the foundation principles and see whether you've been repeating phrases after other people without making them a part of your own being and really understanding whether you're saying that you accept Christ but not having a heart relation to Him in which you really so that the fruits we should test to as well as

End of Record 70

3. The Date of the Epistles: Baur placed them about 100 A.D. on account of what he saw as their attack on Gnosticism. Holtzmann dates them 140 A.D. But Gnosticism is of a far earlier date than Baur gives it.

4. Authenticity. The genuineness of these Epistles was not questioned until 1804. Baur places them in a post-Pauline period, but since his historical view is untenable, the ground of his objections is taken away. Thörnell in his thesis on the Genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles (1931) shows that the objection to certain verbal peculiarities was also untenable. The expression, "sound doctrine" in Tit. 1:9, though not used in any of Paul's other Epistles, is used here to show that the false doctrine referred to is of a special kind. "It is not so much true doctrine which stands as the opposite of false doctrine; it is the pure and simple Gospel, which is set in opposition to unsound developments out of it." (Thörnell, 134). If the Epistles are not authentic, it is psychologically very difficult to explain their existence, for it is impossible to prove that they are dominated by any definite tendency. But the false doctrines which are dealt with in these Epistles are in essence similar to those which Paul had dealt with in earlier Epistles, and the few new traits which are to be found in the Pastoral Epistles are only briefly mentioned. They are not made the subject of a detailed refutation, which one would expect, if a writer of the post-apostolic era had written them with the object of contending against heresy with apostolic authority. Some writers have mentioned what they see as a tendency towards church organization, thereby implying that the Pastoral Epistles aim at establishing a uniform church organization, in which the transition to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church may be traced, particularly the episcopacy. It is nearer the truth to say that what the Pastoral Epistles say of bishops, deacons, elders etc. corresponds to the order which had developed in the church under its first decennium. A comparison with the earliest post-apostolic writings which deal with questions of church organizations shows this, e.g. the Epistles of Ignatius (cf. Ignatius' words on the office of a bishop, Smyrn. 9).

The Epistle to the Hebrews, 1. Readers and Aim. The Epistle does not begin with an introduction and greeting, which has sometimes led to the opinion that it is in reality a doctrinal thesis, not a letter. Against this view it may be contended that the Epistle is addressed to a definite group of readers and refers to concrete circumstances among them, cf. 5:11-14; 6:10; 10:32-34; 12:4; 13:7. Cf. also the conclusion of the Epistle, 13:17-25. "Hebrews begins doctrinally, continues as a letter and closes like one of Paul's letters to the churches." (Wrede: Das literarische Rätsel des Hebräerbriefs, p. 242). The word "Hebrews" may have two meanings: it may mean Jews in general, or it may denote Jews who speak Aramaic (in distinction from Jews who spoke Greek, that is to say who used Greek as their mother tongue). The readers had been Christians for some time, 5:12. From 2:3 it has often been concluded that both the writer and the readers were second generation Christians. Really all that is said here is that neither the writer nor his readers had been the personal disciples of the Lord Jesus. The readers had willingly helped Christians in need, 6:10. They had suffered persecution earlier and had then been imprisoned and suffered the loss of their possessions, 10:32 ff. Some of their leaders had suffered death by martyrdom, 13:7. The readers are also in danger of being led astray by "divers and strange doctrines", 13:9. This fact seems to be the immediate cause of the Epistle's being written. The author hopes, however, that he will soon be able to come to them, 13:19,23, and he will then bring Timothy with him, 13:23. What were these strange doctrines? This question is closely connected with the question as to whether the readers were of Jewish or Gentile origin. The title bears testimony to the fact that in the early church it was generally thought that the readers were of Jewish origin. No voice was raised in contradiction of this opinion until the nineteenth century. Since then it has often been claimed that the readers were Gentile Christians or simply Christians in general without reference to their origin. This is concluded for instance, from such passages as 6:1,2 (a Jew would have believed in God and the resurrection from the dead even before his conversion to Christ) and 3:12 (falling away to Judaism could not be reckoned as falling away

from the living God). Nevertheless there are a number of circumstances that make it probable that the readers were Christians of Jewish origin. There is no suggestion that the readers have a heathen past. Israel is called "the people" all through, 2:17; 4:9; 7:5 etc. Had the readers been Gentile Christians it would hardly have been said to them that God spake to the fathers by the prophets, 1:1. The readers are obviously in danger of falling away to Judaism with its sacrifices and "meats", 13:9. The Epistle speaks of the new Covenant as being better than the old. The word "better" is the keyword of the Epistle (cf. "better sacrifices", 9:23: "better promises" 8:6; "a better testament", 7:22). The Epistle does not make any reference as to where the readers were to be found, but if they were Christians of Jewish origin, they were probably in Palestine.

2. The Author. The Epistle was known to and used by Clement of Rome, (about 96 A.D.) and was regarded by him as holy Scripture. Clement used words from Hebrews alternately with words from the Old Testament. Hebrews was therefore highly regarded in Rome at the end of the first century. There was no direct statement as to its authorship before Origen, (Eus. VI, 25). He gives it as tradition that Paul was the writer of Hebrews ("For it is not without grounds that the ancients have left it to us as a work of Paul"). But he notes at the same time the differences in language and style between Hebrews and the Epistles of Paul. He was of the opinion that the thoughts in Hebrews are Pauline, but that the Epistle had been written by another, "who had kept the discourses of the Apostle in his memory, and so to speak presented his teacher's words with his own explanatory comments." This is, however, as Origen himself says, his own reflexion, but it appears to have some support in tradition, for he says that there are statements that either Clement of Rome had given the Epistle its written form, or that Luke had done so. -Eusebius (Eus. III, 3) says that fourteen epistles of Paul were known and were certainly written by Paul.

"Nevertheless it should be known that some deny his authorship of Hebrews, for

which they refer to the church of Rome which contends that it is non-Pauline." So that the Epistle was recognized as Pauline in the Eastern church (cf. Origen), but in the Western church its Pauline origin was questioned by the church in Rome among others. But there is no statement that the church in Rome connected any other name with the Epistle. Tertullian is the only writer of the early church who mentions another name, namely Barnabas. Gradually, however, the Epistle was recognized as Pauline throughout the whole ancient church. Protestant exegesis has, however, generally rejected the thought that Paul was the writer and has brought forward a variety of guesses about the authorship, (Apollos, Barnabas). A number of the reasons which have been brought forward against the Pauline authorship are untenable (e.g. that the writer of Gal. 1 could not have written Heb. 2:3). The most important objection is the one which is found in Origen: Hebrews differ very clearly from Paul's epistles in the matter of language and style. But this difficulty may well be solved in the way Origen himself pointed out: one of Paul's fellow-workers may have expressed Paul's thoughts in his own way. The explanation as to how Paul's name became connected with the Epistle may be that the writer wrote it at Paul's request and that when it was written Paul recognized it as his own. Paul would thus be auctor though not scriptor.

3. Date. Since Hebrews was used by Clement of Rome, it must have been written before 96 A.D. The Epistle itself does not give any definite data which could lead to fixing its date. It has been concluded that the references in the Epistle to the Jewish forms of worship place it before the destruction of the Temple. This is, however, without ground, since Hebrews does not speak of the Temple, but of the Tabernacle in the wilderness, according to the presentation in the Pentateuch. If the Epistle is Pauline in the sense mentioned above, it must have been written before 67 A.D., the year which is generally thought to be the date of Paul's death.

The First Epistle of Peter. 1. Readers and Author. According to 1:1 the letter is addressed to the Christians of Asia Minor. According to the Acts, the churches

of this area were founded by the Apostle Paul and his fellow-workers. These churches were, therefore, composed of Gentile believers. The expression $\delta \iota \alpha \sigma \pi \rho \acute{\alpha}$ in 1:1 gives expression to the fact that being Christians, they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth, cf. 2:11. Their whole earthly life is characterized as a sojourning, 1:17. There are passages in the Epistle which show that the readers had lived as heathen before their conversion, cf. 1:14, 18; 2:10; 3:6; 4:3 ff. The readers suffered persecution for their faith, 2:12 ff; 3:16 f.; 4:14 f. It is not merely the general enmity which all Christians had to face in the Apostolic times from the heathen world about them, but a particular persecution, which had come upon the readers in an unexpected manner, 4:12, but not only upon them, but upon all Christians, 5:9. Christians were evidently accused of being in rebellion against the civil and social order and duties, 2:12-17; 2:20; 3:1 ff., 15-17; 4:14-16. The writer sends his letter to the Christians of Asia Minor to exhort and comfort them, cf. 5:12.

2. The Author. "Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ", 1:1. According to the statement of Papias, Mark went with Peter on his travels. This agrees with 5:13.

3. Authenticity. Papias uses the letter (cf. Eus. III, 39:16) and so did Pólycarp (ad Phil. 1:3 etc.). Irenæus states that it was written by Peter (Adv. haer, IV, 9:2), as also Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen etc. Its authenticity was, then, strongly attested in the early church. In more recent times its authenticity has been questioned on the ground of internal evidences. The most important reason is that the letter is closely related to several of the Epistles of Paul, specially to Romans and Ephesians. Cf. particularly I Peter 2:4-8 with Rom. 13:1-7; I Pet. 1:3 ff. with Eph. 1:3 etc. But the epistle has also points of contact with the Epistle of James, cf. I Peter 5:5-9 with Jas. 4:6,7,10. It is, therefore, probable that the writer of I Peter knew Romans, Ephesians and James since the text of I Peter must clearly be the later and dependent on the others. It has been put forward that an Apostle would not have used apostolic letters which were already known in this way. But it should

be emphasized that the similarities are limited to certain thoughts and illustrations, so that it is not a question of literary dependence in the strict sense of the word. There is nothing remarkable about the fact that Peter in Jerusalem should know the Epistle of James, nor that he should have learned to know the Epistles of Paul during his long stay in Rome. It has also been cited against the authenticity of the Epistle that it deals with the persecutions by those in authority. Such persecutions are supposed not to have taken place until post-apostolic times. The answer to this is that nothing compels us to think that persecution by the authorities is implied. The Christians were exposed to slander and abuse, but it is not a question of bloody persecution by the authorities. The absence of any special tendency also speaks for the authenticity of the Epistle. If it had been invented, the writer would have had some special aim in doing so, but no such aim can be found.

3. Date and Place of the Epistle. The Epistle was written from Babylon, 5:13. This cannot mean Babylon in the literal sense, as there is no tradition of Peter as ever having been there. Nor is there a tradition which speaks of Peter as having visited Babylon in Egypt. But there is a tradition that Peter lived in Rome, and in the book of Revelation Babylon is the symbolic name of the capital city of the world power which was at enmity with God, Rev. 16:19 etc. The Epistle must have been written in the last period of Peter's life.

The Second Epistle of Peter. 1. Author and readers. The Epistle has no geographically defined address, nor is there a tradition which tells us where the readers were to be found, so that the question as to who the readers were must be answered from the indications given in the Epistle itself. The author calls himself *Συμεών Πέτρος*. The name *Συμεών* only occurs in the New Testament in Acts 15:14 as the name of the Apostle, but it was commonly used among the Jews, cf. Gen. 49:5 (LXX), Luke 2:25 etc. The use of this form of the name may suggest that the readers were Christians of Jewish origin. Nothing in the Epistle suggests that the readers were of Gentile

origin. In 1:16, 17 the author uses the first person plural. Through him and the others who are included in this "we" the readers of the letter had received the Christian message. One of those who is included in this "we" is the Apostle John, according to 1:17. By "we" is meant then, the Apostles and primarily Peter and John. This makes it clear that the Epistle cannot be addressed to the Gentile section of the Church, since that had been founded through the work of Paul and his fellow-workers. The Epistle appears to be addressed to a large circle of churches, which had been founded by the first Apostles. I Cor. 9:5 gives us to understand that they had done missionary work outside Jerusalem in the fifties. According to the decision of the Apostolic Council that the field of service should be divided, (Gal. 2:9) we must conclude that these Apostles worked among the Jews of Palestine and the neighbouring regions. Since 2 Peter is addressed to a circle of readers of Jewish origin, the letter mentioned in 3:1 cannot be our I Peter but must be a letter now lost.

2. Occasion and Aim. The readers stand in danger of falling victims to certain false teachers, who are described in Ch. 2-3 as immoral persons who despised and scoffed at the church's expectation of the Lord's return. They are compared to the false prophets of the O.T., 2:1 ff. Sometimes these false teachers are spoken of as being already in existence, cf. 2:10-22; 3:4 ff., sometimes as not yet come, cf. 2:1; 3:3. They were at work already, though they had not yet reached the readers of this Epistle. The object of the letter is to warn the readers of a threatening danger.

3. Authenticity. Reliable testimonies to the existence of the Epistle do not exist earlier than the third century. Origen is the first to speak of it in clear terms and he says at the same time that it is questioned. Eusebius states that Clement of Alexandria interpreted all the seven General Epistles, which would include 2 Peter (Eus. VI 14:1). Eusebius himself only recognized I Pet. as being "genuine and generally recognized by the ancient authorities" (Eus. III 3). In more recent times the genuineness of the Epistle has been contested very widely for internal reasons. The main objections have been: a) The

relation to the Epistle of Jude: 2 Pet. 2:1 - 3:3 bears an essential similarity to Jude 5-19, and it is generally agreed that the dependence is 2 Pet. on Jude.

b) In 2 Pet. the author's person is strongly marked particularly in 1:16-18, where the author speaks of himself as being an eyewitness and as one who was present at the transfiguration of the Lord. (But in I Pet. the author only speaks of himself with the unassuming *ὁ ὑμῶν προσβύτερος*)

c). In 3:16 the author speaks of many epistles of Paul and puts them on the same level as "the other scriptures", i.e. the Old Testament. It was thought, or at least taken for granted, that this view of the Epistles of Paul did not arise until post-apostolic times. d) In 3:4-9 those who despise the church's hope of the Lord's return are mentioned, which is taken to refer to a post-apostolic period, specially as it speaks of the time "since the fathers fell asleep", v. 4. e) The language of 2 Peter differs considerably from the language of I Peter. The language of I Peter is closely related to LXX while the language of II Peter is more purely Hellenistic. In answer to these objections among other things it may be claimed: a) It cannot be irrefutably proved that II Peter depends on Jude. There are good reasons for the opposite view. Wohlenberg (Zahn's Komm., Vol. XV, p. XLI) maintains that the view that II Peter must depend on Jude is connected with the fact that the authenticity of II Peter is doubted for other reasons. b) The author gives strong expression to his own person in II Peter but this has several parallels in the Epistles of Paul. c) It is by no means certain that 3:16 refers to a finished collection of the Epistles of Paul. On the other hand it is now clear, that the Epistles of Paul and the other apostolic writings were regarded as holy Scripture from the time of their being written. d) Ch. 3:4 simply says that many of the first generation of Christians had fallen asleep. The words of 1:14 refer to the later period of the apostolic time; and we have no reason to doubt that despisers of the Christian hope may already have arisen by this time. e) Concerning the language there is at least the similarity between I and II Peter

that they both contain many references to the Old Testament. It should be borne in mind that many different factors may influence style: personal feelings, the theme dealt with, etc. The explanation why the Epistle was not generally known in the church until a late period must be that it was addressed to Christians of Jewish origin. There is nothing surprising in the fact that it was not for some time that Gentile Christians concerned themselves with a letter which was addressed to churches composed of Jewish believers.

4. Date. As we see from 1:14 the letter must have been written in the later years of the Apostle's life.

The Epistle of James. 1. Readers and Author. The Epistle is addressed to "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad", 1:1. This cannot mean the Jewish nation as a whole, for it was not all scattered abroad. Only the part of Israel which lived outside Palestine was said to live in *διασπορά*. The readers are also taken to be Christians. The author calls them "my beloved brethren," 1:16,19; 2:5, "my brethren", 1:2; 2:1 etc. The author counts the readers as brethren in the sense that they confess their faith in Christ, 2:1. The Christians often described themselves as those who lived in *διασπορά*, cf. I Peter 1:1 since they dwell far from their true Homeland as long as they live on earth. No geographical or other information in the Epistle tells us, however, where the readers lived. It has generally been supposed that the readers were Christians of Jewish origin; since there is no reference in the letter to a ministry among Gentiles of either the Apostles or evangelists, nor does the Epistle treat of the Gentile Christians' liberty from the law. The author takes it for granted that he is a well known person who could not be confused with any other person of the same name. (The name, James, was not uncommon among the Jews). He must therefore have been James, the brother of the Lord, cf. Gal. 1:17-19, possibly the same as James the son of Alphaeus (Matt. 10:3 etc.) and thus one of the twelve. He was the leading man of the church in Jerusalem, cf. Acts 12:17; 15:13 ff. Both Josephus (Ant. XX 9,1) and