

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 143

July/August 1993.

In this Issue:-

Page 1 Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 2 Letters	
Page 6 Ye Must Be Born Again. Bible Essay No. 4	Brother F. Lea
Page 9 More on Zechariah 13:6	John Allfree
Page 10 Legally Dead to Sin & Legally Alive to Christ.	Brother F. J. Pearce
Page 13 In Adam and In Christ	Brother F.J.Pearce
Page 17 Extract from "The Temple at the Time of Christ"	Dr. Edersheim

Editorial

Dear Brethren and Sisters and Friends, Greetings in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

It is with great sadness we report the falling asleep of our Sister Jessie Brady. Sister Jessie had been unwell for sometime but seemed to be rallying after suffering a stroke on the 16th July, but it was not to last and she fell asleep on Saturday, 24th July.

Sister Jessie, from her youth, sought for the Truth of the Gospel and having found it, together with our late Brother Ernest, strove against much opposition in keeping the light of the Truth shining for all who will, by the grace of God, see and appreciate it. Now she is departed in peace and, with her late husband, awaiting the resurrection morn. Meanwhile our prayers and our sympathies are with their daughter, Sister Helen, in her great loss. May the Lord come very soon to the joy of all who love His appearing and to the glory of God.

With Sincere Love to all, in the Master's service. Brother Russell Gregory.

* * *

A Tribute to our late Sister Jessie:

"It is in a sense, very sad to have heard of the falling asleep in Christ of Sister Jessie Brady on July 24th, until then I think the earliest surviving member of the Nazarene Fellowship, though at the age of 82 years, not the oldest. I repeat, very sad, because our Sister Helen, her daughter, is now on her own being the only child of our late Brother and Sister Brady and will no doubt find it more difficult than before to overcome the trial that such a loss of companionship and family life brings. Under such circumstances our thoughts and prayers are with Sister Helen and our minds and hopes centred on the return of our Lord to bring our trials of faith to the climax of joy unspeakable and full of glory.

"Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth" says the Apostle James. Concerning this I think of what our late Brother Ernest Brady said of Jessie's question to him as a girl of eighteen as to why Jesus was tempted in all points as we are and yet the speaker, a Christadelphian, had said it was not possible to be like Jesus because He had derived greater strength to resist temptation by reason of His Divine Fatherhood. Behold what a great spiritual eruption the pursuance of this seemingly chance remark caused, and how thankful many of us should be that God used our late Sister Jessie to cause His Light to shine out of the then pervading darkness of Apostate teaching and give our late Brother Brady the persistence and inspiration to bring to the light the Truth and meaning of Christ's sacrificial death. May we all remember this now our Sister Jessie has been laid to rest with her late husband, Brother Brady, and may the Lord remember them for good when He comes into His Kingdom.

Brother Phil and Sister Rene Parry.

From Your Letters.

In our last Circular Letter readers were invited to express their views regarding the order of events leading up to the establishment of the Kingdom of God. We have received two replies; the first from Brother Leo Dreifuss :-

“This is not an easy matter to predict as there is no clear guide in the Scriptures. Hence the many opinions. I shall however, attempt to present my version arrived at after much thought. I do not want to leave the reader with the impression that this is my unassailable pet theory, by no means. Discussion invited. I doubt whether we are even intended to understand the full time-table of events, because if we did, we might be able to work out the year of His coming, which clearly is not intended by God for us to know. I won't take a guess at this. So here then is the sequence of events in my opinion:

1. A major political crisis, sparked off by the still future 'United Europe' and in conjunction with a papal power due to rise.

2. Leading to war with nations gathered around Jerusalem to battle as prophesied by Zechariah. The time of great tribulation (Zechariah 14).

3. Jerusalem taken, Zechariah 14:2 fulfilled, half of the inhabitants of the city taken captive.

4. The Lord appears on the Mount of Olives. The great earthquake. At roughly this time the first resurrection takes place with those alive meeting the Lord (1 Thessalonians 4:13-18).

5. The Jews now recognise their Messiah. The great national mourning of Zechariah 12:10-14 takes place.

6. The Lord pleading with Israel in the wilderness of the nations (Ezekiel 20: 33-38). Also a great regathering of the Jews to Palestine with many of the Gentiles keenly following (Zechariah 8:20-23). This could be the time of Elijah's appearing but I am by no means certain as to this point of time.

7. Christ with the resurrected saints re-building Palestine. A time of great prosperity and security for Israel, heralding

8. The Gogian invasion, probably Russia, or some Arab countries, followed by a decisive defeat (Ezekiel 38 & 39). Note that by this time there will be no fossil fuels for weapons. These will have been used during the war referred to in section 2 above. Only so can we understand the great burning of weapons in Ezekiel 39.

9. Building the Temple of Ezekiel's vision. Many sincere brethren and sisters think that this building exists in vision only, never to be built in reality. But I cannot see how there should be nine chapters devoted to it, describing the building and the rites performed therein in such minute detail, if it was not intended to be built. Besides, if, as prophesied by Zechariah (14) all nations go up to Jerusalem to worship, there must be some building to enable them to do so. True, the bringing of sacrifices as under the Mosaic Law is somewhat difficult to understand. They may point back to Christ's shed blood. We must accept their full purpose in faith for now.

10. The Millennium.

11. As described in Revelation 20. I will not dwell too much on details. Judgment and final death of the responsible sinners, followed by the everlasting Kingdom of God on earth. I will not be dogmatic as to who is raised at the end of the thousand years, apart from the responsible transgressors.

Let us watch, that that day may not find us unprepared. Even so. Come, Lord Jesus.

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

Our second letter is from Brother Phil Parry:-

Dear Brethren and Sisters, Greetings in our Saviour's Name.

In the May/June Circular Letter Bro. Russell asked for our views on the subject of the Kingdom of God and the sequence of events prior to the millennium.

This is a difficult subject to deal with and much can turn out to be mere speculation, in fact you may think some of my views to be exactly that. Some of you may be aware that I have, in a former C/Letter, expressed the view that no material Temple will be built, for as Paul declared, "God dwelleth not in Temples made with hands." Jesus confirmed this fact by His words to the woman of Samaria (John 4:19-24). I am convinced that to believe in a future material Temple on the lines of that given to Ezekiel would mean a return to the types and shadows of the Old Testament teaching prefiguring Jesus the Lamb of God who was to take away the Sin of the world, which we are informed, the blood of bulls and goats could not do. So that even considering such sacrifices in retrospect, would demand a second sacrificial death of Christ to fulfil them, and such a death would be impossible seeing that Jesus is no longer flesh and blood. "For once at the end of the age (world) he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself" (Hebrews 9:26).

To think of animal sacrifices in a future Temple in Jerusalem is to my mind a rejection of the New and Living Way explained in Hebrews 10. In saying this, I am not ruling out what is termed "spiritual sacrifices, holy and acceptable to God;" which brings me to what is written in Exodus 19:5 & 6, "If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people... And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." These are God's words spoken through Moses to the children of Israel. I will come back later to verses 9 and 10 of this chapter in which some speculative thoughts have come to mind. However we do know that the children of Israel were never a kingdom of priests, this office was limited to the tribe of Levi, but the Apostle Peter takes up the theme which goes beyond this limitation to a process and formulation of a holy nation under the dispensation and principal teaching of Jesus the Messiah and High Priest of God who superseded the Levitical Priesthood under the Law of Moses. This holy nation would constitute twelve tribes of the singular seed of Abraham according to the faith of Christ, and in Christ (Galatians 3:26-29). There is no reason therefore why those in Christ should not be part of, and inclusive in the twelve tribes, for as Paul said, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond or free, male or female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." Here is evidence of what Paul meant by his words to Agrippa, Acts 26:6,7, "The Hope of the promise of God made unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night hope to come."

Where are the twelve tribes? They were scattered as a result of the persecution by those Jews after the flesh of the circumcision who had rejected their Messiah and His teaching, and probably through other adverse circumstances not revealed to us in Gospel records, but there were Jews dispersed or scattered among the Gentiles as stated in John 7:35. James also wrote to members of the twelve tribes scattered abroad, the same twelve tribes spoken of by Paul to Agrippa, the unseen individual members of the mystic Body of Christ - not twelve named tribes dwelling visibly in the lots of their inheritance as under Moses and Joshua, James 1:1, but Jews after the Spirit instantly serving God day and night; "Ye are not in the flesh," said Paul to the Roman believers, "but in the Spirit if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you" Romans 8:9. The Apostle James declared, "Of His own will begat He us with the Word of Truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of His creatures" (Chapter 1, v. 18). Peter confirms the same when he says, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead..." Note the expression "again," does it not signify a second begetting of certain ones who had been led astray as sheep having no Shepherd? Did not Jesus say, I am not come but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel"? And Peter says of Jesus, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls." (1 Peter 2:24,25).

Now these three Apostles, James, Peter and Paul have each referred to the twelve tribes, so there must be some significance and distinction for their doing so. I referred earlier to the word of God through Moses,

Exodus 19:5,6, the message to Israel as a nation was conditional on their keeping the covenant, and we know what Jesus said to those who rejected God and the Prophets He sent unto them, "Therefore the Kingdom shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." And Peter takes up this declaration and reveals the class of people to whom Jesus, the Messiah of Israel, was precious and would bring forth the fruits of the Spirit (1 Peter 2:1-25), note in verses 9 and 10 his quotation of Exodus 19:5-6 in reference now to a chosen generation in Christ, a Royal Priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.

In John 10:16 Jesus says, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." This can be appreciated in the reading of Isaiah 55 and 56 where God speaks of His House as a house of prayer for all people (see Isaiah 56:7-8). Whether it be of significance, Jesus in the gospel records does not refer to the literal Temple as being a house of prayer for all people, He leaves out "for all people" seemingly limiting that literal building to its typical function under the Mosaic Law. And seeing it was destroyed as He said it would be, what took its place? Was it not what Jesus said, a spiritual Temple? Did He not say to the Jewish rulers, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up"? He spake of the Temple of His body, but He could not have meant His physical or His incorruptible body for it was His Father who raised Him incorruptible from the tomb. He could not do this Himself while lifeless. No, His words concerning the Temple of God went much further, as Peter and Paul have explained in their Epistles by illustrating it both by growth and stature according to the measure and stature of Christ spiritually, and by conforming as lively stones formed after His character so that they can be fitly framed together, and being built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone, groweth into an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. See 1 Peter 1:1-10; Ephesians 2:19-22 and 3:15-21 and 4:7-16.

Paul speaks to the Galatians of bondage and freedom, - of Mount Sinai and the Mount Zion, and he declares, "For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth (or is in rank) to 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." Incidentally, how could Sarai be termed free, and Hagar a bondswoman? The clue is there from Genesis where God speaks by promise of the "seed of the woman" which would destroy that power which kept men and women in bondage. The title of "free-woman" belonged to Mary also, yet all this was due to her free-born Son who was begotten of God. So Paul opens his chapter of Galatians 5:1, "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free...."

Abraham looked for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God, Hebrews 11:10. The writer to Hebrews also says, "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem (Hebrews 12:22). The message of Jesus is in harmony with the writer to Hebrews, "Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, which is new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from my God: and I will write upon him my new name." (Revelation 3:12).

This is now the process of conformity to the Will of God by all in Christ that God's Name and all it stands for may be in them. Jesus said, "I am come in my Father's Name." (John 5:43). He manifested that Name to those whom the Father had given Him, "Thine they were and thou gavest them me; and they have kept Thy Word." (John 17:6; Psalm 22:22). It is for us also to keep that word and the Name into which we should have been Baptised, for God could not appear to men as 'Himself - none could see Him and live; God is Spirit, John Baptist could not see Spirit, so God showed or witnessed it's descent in the material form of a Dove, but John heard the Voice. Jesus in the form and image of His Father but nevertheless in flesh and blood, manifested His Father and His Name in Word and Deed, who then could dare to say that God's Name was manifested in "unclean and condemned living flesh" of which He the Creator, was the Begetter in the case of Jesus? There was a grave warning for Israel under Moses - Exodus 23:20-21, "Behold I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for My Name is in him." Did this Angel need redemption before he could go before Israel and keep them in the way? Was not God's Name also in Christ before He died on Calvary? Do not we also bear the name of our eternal Father? Jesus did more than this, as I have remarked, for He was the embodiment of the Word of His Father and the expression of His attributes, therefore God could be in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. Jesus in whom is His Father's Name, can keep us in the Way, and bring us to the place which the Father hath

prepared, "In my Father's house are many abiding places, I go to prepare a place for you, and will return, that where I am, there ye may be also" John 14. It is not so much a Jerusalem of literal stones that we should be desiring, as built by man, but a City which hath everlasting foundations whose builder and maker is God.

What saith God through Isaiah 66:1-2? "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is mine, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? And where is the place of my rest? For all those things hath my hand made, and all those things have been saith the Lord: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word."

Ezekiel 37:26-28 speaks of God's sanctuary being in the midst of a gathered Israel, and of God's tabernacle being with them as revealed in 2 Corinthians 6:16. Stephen speaks of the Tabernacle of witness, the type of Jesus, being carried into the promised land under Joshua but had no rest because they disobeyed the Lord God and allowed the Gentile idolaters to become a snare, so that the Lord was not permitted to dwell in their hearts and minds. Acts 7 is Stephen's declaration of their history up to his time, and they were cut to the heart and stoned him until he died. At this very time the literal Temple was standing when Stephen quoted Isaiah 66, "The Most High dwelleth not in Temples made with hands." The words of Jesus Himself confirm this when He said to the Samaritan woman, "Neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem will men worship the Father - for they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship Him." To the disciples who marvelled at the construction of the literal Temple Jesus said, "See ye all these things? Verily, I say unto you there shall not be left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down" Matthew 24:1. What a tragedy it would have been if God relied on literal and material buildings to dwell in?

Of course, seeing that God is invisible and Spirit He must appoint a material object whereby He could be in contact with people, this was demonstrated by the Ark of the Testament and the Mercy Seat overshadowed by the Cherubim in The Tabernacle of Witness, the pattern of which was important, for it was a type of Jesus. The Temple building afterwards took its place. But Jesus said to the Jews, "In this place is one greater than the Temple" Matthew 12:6. Yes, for Paul said of Jesus, "In him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power" Colossians 2:9-10. The place of God's rest and the place of His Name will be Jerusalem for there must be a literal focal point for the believing Jew and Gentile to look to and visit but they will be under those who consist of the glorified Kings and Priests reigning with Christ on the earth - a spiritual Temple, for John saw no material Temple, as recorded in Revelation 21:22, "For the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple of it."

We are bound to concede that Jerusalem of the past and present was not built by the God of Abraham, yet he looked for a city which hath foundations whose Builder and Maker is God, but indeed the material Temple in Jerusalem was the result of God's architecture according to the Pattern of the Tabernacle first shown to Moses and typical of Jesus, but Paul directs us toward the antitype as in 1 Corinthians 3:9. We know from the prophet Zechariah that when the times of the Gentiles are complete God will begin to take a further active interest in Jerusalem wherein He has declared to place His Name (Zechariah chapters 1 & 2). Also it is said that, of the nations who have survived the destruction and judgment of God, will go up from year to year to worship the Lord of Hosts and to keep the feast of tabernacles (tents), for it appears there will be no more Temple ritual, but they who have been taking part in rituals of sacrifice under the Mosaic Law through blindness of its fulfilment by Jesus the Messiah, will take of the pots in Jerusalem and Judah which will then be "holiness to the Lord" and will use them for seething or boiling instead of their previous use for animal sacrifices, Zechariah 14:21; this is how I interpret it, but I could be mistaken of course.

I did say at the beginning that I would mention some speculative thoughts on Exodus 19:9-10 and it concerns what God had said to Moses, "Go unto the people and sanctify them today and tomorrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon the Mount Sinai." Can we see this of Moses as the type of Jesus who was sent from God to sanctify those who would believe on His Word and allow Him to dwell in their hearts by faith as a Temple of the Spirit and wait patiently for Him to come, not to the mount that might be touched but to the Mount Zion, Hebrews 12:22-29 & 10:21-25. Bodies washed with pure water - exhorting one another: and so much the more as ye see the day approaching.

The third day? Two thousand years almost have elapsed since Jesus went up into Heaven yet His Spirit has been sanctifying the people that they may be ready on the third day of His appearing. Can I speculate on a day for a thousand years in God's sight and show that at the beginning of His reign the third day of a thousand years will begin and as He promised, the Temple of God's dwelling will be complete. 1 Corinthians 15:28 "God shall be all and in all" Revelation 21: verse 1, "A new heaven and a new earth" Isaiah 65:17; 2 Peter 3:9-13,

In conclusion verse 14, "Whereof, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless. And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation." In other words "Be ready against the third day" "And unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin (without our sins upon Him) unto salvation."

Yes, the trumpet shall sound (1 Thessalonians 4:16-17). Even so, Come Lord Jesus

Brother Phil Parry.

No. 4 in a series of Bible essays.

YE MUST BE BORN AGAIN

The above title is taken from the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, as recorded in John chapter 3. Those words are "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Then in answer to the question "How can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God...."

Born of water and of the Spirit: that is the key. Let us consider some of the ways in which birth can take place. First of all we have the natural order in which like begets like; this is the form of birth we have all experienced.

The second idea which we have before us is a birth of water; this is a typical birth - it is symbolical; some of us have been the subjects of such a birth.

Thirdly, is a birth of the Spirit, concerning which Jesus says, "That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." None of us has been the subject of such a birth, for Jesus again tells us, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." Jesus Himself has been the subject of such a birth for he was able to enter a room "the doors being shut," we are told by John in his 20th chapter and 19th verse. Thus He is called "The Lord of the Spirit."

Another idea is brought to our notice by Peter in his 1st Epistle and at verse 23, where it is stated in the following words, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." John expresses the idea as being "born of God," and he says, "He that is born of God overcometh the world," "He that is born of God sinneth not." Thus we have:

- 1) A natural birth
- 2) A birth of water, or typical birth
- 3) A birth of the Spirit, none the less real than natural birth
- 4) A mental, or moral birth; born of the Word of God.

Natural, Typical, Spiritual, Moral. These four are here in the order in which they have come to our notice, but not in the order in which they take place. We will consider them more fully in the order in which they take place.

1) Paul tells us (1 Corinthians 15:44 to 46), that the natural is first, that it is corruptible; that it is earthy; that it is flesh and blood, and cannot inherit the Kingdom of God; that it is in need of a change; that all die. Genesis explains how this came about. In Genesis 2:7 we read, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here we have the first man made from whom all other human beings have been born. There is no suggestion here of incorruptibility or of everlasting existence. All we read here is that God created a body of dust, a body composed of the elements of which the earth is so full, and filled with the breath of life from God just as the beasts of the field. The breath of life we still breathe through the nostrils; it still passes into the blood, as we read in the Scriptures, "The life is in the blood thereof." This breath of life is necessary to our existence that we die if we are deprived of it. This aspect of our subject has been dealt with more fully in our essay No. 2 so we will consider the other forms of birth in greater detail.

In order to inherit the Kingdom of God one must be born of the Spirit, but before this can take place the other two births to which we have referred must have taken place, but in the following order - the moral birth, then the typical birth.

The moral birth must precede the typical birth and prepares for it. One statement of Philip, the Evangelist will clear that point for us. It is to be found in the Acts, chapter 8:36,37. It is in connection with the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch. They came to a "certain water: and the eunuch said, See here is water? What doth hinder me to be baptised?" And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Baptism (or birth of water) can take place only after belief, Philip here tells us. In connection with belief, Paul says in Romans 10:14,15, "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they preach except they be sent?" And in verse 17, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God."

In Psalm 119 we read, "The entrance of the word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple." And so the reading of God's word prepares the mind for the moral re-birth. It is according to how we read and understand God's word that we shall be renewed in our minds, and be born again, "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible; by the word of God." The result of this re-birth is that we shall have a desire to please God; to obey Him; to be like Him. His word, having sunk into our hearts and minds, will bring forth a God-like disposition. A desire to learn more of His word, and being born again, not of corruptible seed, but by the word of God, we will not sin (wilfully) because we are born of God. This attitude of mind is a necessary preliminary to the birth of water. "If thou believest," said Philip, "thou mayest."

After an acceptance of the Divine doctrines and precepts as laid down in God's word, a believer is led to seek the forgiveness and mercy of God by repentance and change of life. How can this change be most acceptably expressed? Has God revealed His mind on this most important subject? Most assuredly He has. It is very clearly expressed in His word. Under the Mosaic Law a man who contracted any ceremonial uncleanness must wash in water before he could hope to be accepted by God. Accordingly when John the Baptist came preaching in the wilderness as the fore-runner of Jesus it was the Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins which he preached. Since the death of Jesus baptism into His name has been preached.

The question now arises, What is baptism? How is it performed? Under what conditions can it take place?

The first essential to make baptism valid is according to Scripture, belief; and knowledge must precede belief. What is it that we are expected to believe? "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, is the Bible expression.

Now in order to believe on Jesus one must know what Jesus taught; one must be acquainted with the Gospel He went about preaching during His ministry when upon earth. The word "Gospel" means "Good Tidings" and the good tidings which Jesus preached had reference to two things in particular: - the Kingdom

of God which is to be established upon earth; and the means by which men and women were to be accepted into it.

Very briefly, the Gospel of the Kingdom of God is that God is going to establish a Kingdom upon the earth; that this Kingdom is to be the ancient Kingdom of Israel restored; that Jesus is to return from Heaven to be its King (Jesus of Nazareth, the Kings of the Jews); that the Apostles will sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel; that the saints of all ages will be resurrected to take part in this Millennial reign; that all earth's wrongs will be righted; that the believers of all ages will enjoy endless life in glorified bodies of Spirit nature; and that peace will extend from end to end over all earth's surface.

The means by which men and women are to be admitted into that Kingdom of righteousness and peace are briefly - baptism by immersion in water upon a recognition of their position in the sight of God as being estranged from Him; this estrangement is the result of sin (as we have seen in earlier essays); mankind has been sold to Sin by their first parent, Adam; that man is in need of redemption; that Jesus is the Redeemer; that He died the death for sin for all man-kind; that as he that is dead is free from sin, so baptism into Jesus is baptism into His death and frees us from sin; that such an association with the death of Jesus assures a rising with Him to a new life (in the present time, to a life of well-doing, and in the age to come a life of incorruptibility and life everlasting); that participation in the resurrection to life eternal is dependant upon a continuance in well-doing - an abiding in Him, as He said.

How does baptism achieve this? And how can baptism be regarded as a re-birth? Birth is a bringing forth - a bringing to light, or into existence, a revealing. Now Bible baptism is just such a thing. It is a burial in water as an answer of a good conscience towards God. So we are told in the words of Scripture. Burial signifies death, death to the old order, the old way of life, the old man. Death and burial then precede resurrection, or a new birth. And thus the baptised person rises to a new life; born of (or out of) water; thus being dead to the old order and alive to the new, they are new creatures "in Jesus Christ," reconciled to God. As He said, "Ye must be born again;" "born of water..."

Now as baptism signifies, or typifies death, burial and resurrection, so also there must be the anti-typical. The anti-typical is Jesus. He was "dead and buried, and He rose again." Now when Jesus rose again He rose to die no more. He was now "the Lord of the Spirit." Not a mere phantom, such as the disciples thought they saw. Jesus told them, "A spirit (phantom) hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." His was a Spirit body, just as God is "a Spirit." This introduces us to the next re-birth; that of the Spirit, which all who inherit the Kingdom of God will experience.

"Born of water and of the Spirit," said Jesus. The Apostle Paul makes this aspect of our subject very clear in his 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, in the 15th chapter. "This chapter commonly called the burial chapter, is also the resurrection chapter. He makes a comparison when he says, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Those who remain "in Adam" will all die, but he goes on to say that those "in Christ" shall all be made alive.

But as Paul tells us in his letter to the Thessalonians, "Every man in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, then they who are Christ's at His coming, and we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them, in the air, and so shall we be for ever with the Lord." What does he mean by this? Simply that when Christ comes the "dead will be raised (as Paul says), incorruptible, and we shall be changed."

This is the birth of the Spirit. "It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory; it is sown a natural body, it is raised a Spiritual body." Only those who have been baptised into Christ have "put on Christ," - only those are "in Christ;" all others are "in Adam," and Paul says "they all die." Those who are in Christ have come out of Adam, and so are associated with Christ, and will rise again to die no more.

"They are equal unto the angels dying no more," said Jesus, "being the children of the resurrection."

So now we have considered four kinds of birth: of the first we have all been subject; of the second we may become subjects; of the third, only if we have already been subject to the second; of the fourth, only if we have remained faithful to the implications and responsibilities of the third (in other words, if we have

remained in Christ), otherwise we shall be “cast forth as a branch and burned” as Jesus said. So we must abide in Him if we are to be saved.

May God grant that those who read these notes will be wise and take advantage of the Divine invitation “while it is called today” and remain in Christ, and thus be accounted worthy of that age and the resurrection of the dead.

Brother F.Lea.

The following article, taken from a Christadelphian Magazine, deals with Zechariah 13:6 which has been the subject of correspondence in recent Circular Letters

“One shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands?
Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded I the house of my friends.”

In a previous article (Christadelphian Magazine, February 1993, page 52) an attempt was made to demonstrate the importance of the correct application of pronouns in our endeavours to expound Scripture. In the Apostle’s statement, “Not of angels doth he take hold” (Hebrews 2:16, R.V.), taking our cue from similar words in Isaiah to which the Apostle appears to be alluding, it was suggested that the “he” in the sentence does not refer to Jesus as might at first be supposed, but to the Father Himself who has previously been introduced much earlier in the chapter. Thus we read, “It became him... in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering... for not of angels doth he (the Father) take hold but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham.”

Another example will serve further to illustrate the need for care in “rightly dividing” the word with respect to the use of pronouns. In this example we examine a verse where in order to find the person to whom the pronoun refers it is necessary to look not to an earlier verse in the same chapter but to the previous chapter.

The False Prophet.

Zechariah 13:6 has puzzled many Bible students. In the day when the land of Israel is cleansed of the paganism that abounds there and when the false teachers of religion are removed, we are told that, “In that day... the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision... but he (the false prophet shall say: I am no prophet, I am an husbandman; for man taught me to keep cattle from my youth” (verses 4 & 5). It would at first sight, appear that it is of this same false prophet that the record proceeds to say, “And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends” (verse 6).

Commentators have put forward various suggestions as to why the false prophet should so speak. Some that he received the wounds during his worship of pagan deities after the pattern of the Baal worshippers in 1 Kings 18:28 who “cut themselves... with knives.” Others, that they were wounds received as the result of chastisement from his parents for his unfaithfulness!

The answer lies in a careful examination of the record itself. First note that the word “one,” in the sentence “one shall say unto him,” is not in the Hebrew text and is supplied in italics in the A.V. With the removal of this added word, the text reads: “In that day... the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision... but he shall say, I am no prophet, I am an husband man; for man taught me to keep cattle from my youth, and shall say unto him, What are these wounds in thine hands? Then he shall answer (i.e. he shall answer the false prophet), Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.”

The Shepherd.

Once we see that there are two personages involved in a dialogue, the context leaves little doubt that the one with wounds in his hands is the Lord Jesus. The very next verse, in fact, proceeds to speak of his death. "Smite the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered" (verse 7), which is quoted in Matthew 26:31 as referring to the crucifixion. Why then is Jesus suddenly introduced to us in the middle of the prophecy about the false prophet? The answer is that he is not introduced at that point. He has already been introduced to us in the previous chapter, and not only this, but introduced to us as one who "was wounded" in the house of his friends. Does not chapter 12:10 tell us that, "In that day they shall look upon me whom they have pierced and mourn for him"? Here is the one who because of his death becomes, in the words of verse 1 of our chapter, "A fountain... for sin and for uncleanness" to Israel and who proceeds to purge the land of its idolatry and remove its false prophets. It is to this one, introduced in the previous chapter, that the false prophet is speaking when he says, "I am no prophet" and then proceeds to ask Jesus, "What are these wounds in thine hands?" - to which the Lord replies: "Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

John Allfree.

LEGALLY DEAD TO SIN AND LEGALLY ALIVE TO CHRIST

We feel that this subject could be enlarged and that we should not conclude it without mentioning the Blessed Hope - the Unspeakable Gift - so we put a few passages for your consideration.

Romans 6:11, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Colossians 3:3, "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

2 Timothy 2:11, "For if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him."

1 Peter 2:24, "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

These referred to had become enlightened and recognised that they were "dead" in Adam under the federal principle and had individually obeyed from the heart the doctrine of baptism. They became alive to the fact that: they were "dead" and responsible; so they died to the Sin and became alive - they rose in newness of life; passed from, or out of, the Death sentence into the Life Sentence again.

Matthew 8:22, "Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead."

Matthew 22:32, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."

Romans 7:4, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ;"

Galatians 2:19, "For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God."

Put these in their respective places, and a study of Romans chapter 5 will show how the one sin of Adam brought legal condemnation, and how the one act of Jesus removed that legal condemnation.

1 Corinthians 15:22, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."

2 Corinthians 5:14, “For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead.”

Colossians 3:9,10, “Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him”

Where the offence abounded, grace did much more abound (Romans 5:20). Let us rightly divide the Word of God which is able to make us wise unto salvation and is able to give us an abundant entrance into the Kingdom of God through faith in the blood of the Lamb of God who died that we might live. Let us read and study the Scriptures because if we speak not according to these oracles there is no light in us, “Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that (in whom, margin) all have sinned” (Romans 5:12). “On account of this as through one man the sin into the world entered, and through the sin the death; and thus to all men the death passed through, in which all sinned.” (See Emphatic Diaglott word for word translation).

This 12th verse of Romans 5 is generally understood and brought up to prove that natural death was the result of sin. We know of none other than ourselves who disagree with the majority. We say that it was a judicial death, a violent death. It is because of this disagreement that this article is written in order to investigate which of the deaths is meant.

The word death in the Greek or in the translations of itself proves nothing as a study of the following examples will show: -

John 5:24	John 11:4 & 13	Romans 5:10 & 12
James 1:15	James 5:20	Romans 5:21
1 John 3:14	Revelation 1:18	Romans 14:17
Revelation 20:6	Revelation 21:4	Romans 6:23
1 Corinthians 15:21,54,55,56.	1 John 5:16 & 17	

We feel sure that none will dispute such passages as Romans 6:23. “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” James 1:15 and Revelation 20:6 are quite decisive as to what kind of death is meant. Each proves that it is judicial - as a result of sin as wages, and is none other than the second death. There is no difficulty in seeing this second death at the end of the age by Christ as being executed upon sinners, as they are corruptible. “Bring hither, and slay them before me” (Luke 19:27). Hence our meaning of a violent death. I must confess that when I first studied the truth as I understand it now, the 12th verse of Romans 5 was a very obstinate difficulty. Therefore I can sympathise with all who through the generally preconceived idea which is so universally believed experience the difficulty of not believing that natural death is meant.

The general way of interpreting any verse is by the context in which it is set. If this is unsatisfactory other scripture must then be compared with the general teaching of the whole subject. It is plain that Adam is the man referred to, who was created out of the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:7), or, in the words of Paul, “The first man Adam was made a living soul... The first man is of the earth, earthy” (1 Corinthians 15:45,47). Let us now consider the evidence of Scripture and reason with a view to ascertaining without any preconceived ideas.

Adam was called a living soul. What is a living soul? The answer to this should be sufficient: the Hebraistic words mean all creatures - man, beast, fish and fowl wherein is life. Who will say that the nature of all these creatures was different from what it is now? How many natures are revealed in Scripture? Two; corruptible and incorruptible.

A law was given to Adam, “Thou shalt not eat...” (Genesis 2:17). Why was a law given? It was given as a test to prove having free will, would he obey or disobey the law. This point should be uppermost in our minds; without law there is no transgression (Romans 4:15). Adam disobeyed and by so doing committed the first sin on record. We have no difficulty in knowing what sin is. “Sin is transgression of law” (1 John 3:4). It should be remembered that whatever nature Adam had it was in this nature that he committed his sin; so there was no need to give him another nature, to make him of a sinful character, to do that which he had already done with the nature he then possessed.

These are the facts of the case which prove that there was first a natural creation. There is no more difficulty here than in our own case as natural creatures. It is no use denying these facts and making such statements that are pure assumption - without any proof from Scripture or reason, such as theses "Adam's nature was changed;" "The tree of life was to keep corruption away;" "It needed a miracle to reduce Adam to the nature of the beast," etc.

So the preconceived idea that Adam at creation was not corruptible before he sinned, in the face of all evidence, must be thrown to the four winds of heaven. This accepted, and all is plain that the sentence of the law could be carried out.

Without going into the study of the Hebraistic words "*Muth Temuth*" and "*Byom*," another proof in itself, let us continue to examine verse 12. Adam was the first man. He committed sin. Death is by sin. The animal was slain in God's mercy, instead of Adam (which is the explanation of the violent death of Jesus Revelation 13:2; Genesis 22:13; Matthew 20:28, etc.). "So death passed upon all men." As there are no plain words in Scripture to prove that this death is what others would have us believe they have had to invent the above phrases. Let us see if these words are capable of being understood in harmony with the facts? "Passed upon" surely cannot mean either of the man-made ideas. Without any words of ours let us go to the same chapter which proves that it was and is a sentence passed upon us by law and does not mean a physical change or any of the above assumptions.

Romans 5:18, Emphatic Diaglott:- "Therefore, indeed, as through one offence, sentence came on all men to condemnation; so also, through one righteous act, sentence came on all men to justification of life."

This verse alone proves (not contradicts) the meaning of those words. Will John 5:24 help? "But has passed out of death into life." Is this not a present legal fact that the death that was passed upon all men can be removed now? Is not this in harmony with the fact of the other half of this verse that the sentence of life came on all through the sacrificial death of Jesus? Again:

Romans 8:1:- "There is therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ"

If the sentence of death or condemnation means either natural death or infused corruption, to suit preconceived ideas, we have no hesitation in saying that these scriptures are useless.

"For all have sinned," or as in the margin, "In whom all have sinned." We know that the marginal rendering is not acceptable to the natural death theory, but a little further thought - it in no way interferes with the sense of the verse, chapter, nor the whole of Scripture that Adam and Jesus are two federal Heads. We ask, Can these words, "for/in whom all have sinned," mean that every soul born of Adam has literally sinned - transgressed law? None can say this; the non-responsible question proves it. Again, let the chapter explain it:

Romans 5:19:- "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

This verse, like the previous, gives the sense how all have sinned in a federal head, made sinners by law or constitution. While the many covers all, we can see that, strictly speaking, it is only man, not all, are doctrinally in Adam, though all are under the law of sin and are corruptible. The same can be seen and applied in the next half of the verse; by the sacrificial death of Christ - shedding of blood - the one act made many righteous. This gift is free to all but it is only the many who will accept it, though corruptible.

Let us take another verse which cannot be understood but in the sense we have explained it in harmony with the whole factual evidence: Romans 5:15, "For if through the offence of one many be dead," (or died - R.V.).

Ask the simple question. Are we literally dead, or have we all literally died? The answer should be enough for you to see that apart from the federal law put into operation by God, there is no solution.

Again, if natural death is the meaning of the 12th verse, we ask, Why did Paul say, “nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses”? There is no sense in making such a statement if natural death is meant. Is not natural death still with us? Will natural death affect the saints at the coming of Christ?

Romans 5:20:- “The law entered that the offence might abound.”

The sin and the death entered into the world by Adam. The Law of Moses entered into the Mosaic world or economy that the offence of Adam might abound in two particular ways: the first, that they by transgression of that law would be sinners, as was Adam; and second, it was to teach them the need for redemption, as in Adam’s case. Eden and the whole sacrificial law was to bring them to Christ.

There is no need to say much on this verse 20 but we should study it, as no solution to the problem can ever be had from the writings of man-made creeds based on the Romish doctrine of the 9th Article of the Church of England. God would leave us in no doubt if He intended us to believe in His injustice. Much more could be said, but if what we have written is not enough to convince the reader we will just use these words as a last resort to show that it is pure blasphemy to uphold such false doctrine which makes God renounce His moral law: God is punishing every creature for the one sin of Adam. After suffering, they with Adam pay his debt, then you provide Jesus to pay the price of sin in a violent death to release all those who have paid it already!!!

But, the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father (Deuteronomy 24:16) Being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath sent forth... through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus (Romans 3:24-26).

Brother F. J. Pearce.

IN ADAM AND IN CHRIST

“For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” 1 Corinthians 15:22.

This passage is very little understood because the general statement of Scripture is left out of account. The foremost reason is the preconceived idea of the fall of Adam which, according to the 9th Article of Faith in the Church of England, is a physical change of nature. (“Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, but it is in the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam”).

Hence the following list of principles: the justice of God’s law; the Federal Principle; the death that came by man; the death that Christ died – these and the first quotation are left to the confusion of each other.

Of course there are many ways of getting round the difficulties - here is one: that all in Adam is like a large circle which includes every soul from Eden to the end of the 1000 years, and all in Christ is like a small circle inside the larger one.

While we agree that, in comparison with the whole of the descendants of Adam, the called, chosen or enlightened are few in number, we have no fear in saying that this idea does not meet the case. If “in Adam” means the physical nature which is the condemnation passed upon all men, then we are in Adam when we are in Christ, because the condemnation is with us so long as we live, and even after resurrection, as we are supposed to rise with it. Here we are faced with a flat contradiction of Romans 8:1 which states that “there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” and the words of Jesus recorded in John 5:24, “He that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation but is passed from (or out of) death into life.” Two passages which prove the justice of God’s law.

It is a general idea that natural death is the result of Adam's sin and that he paid the price 930 years after he had been typically forgiven and redeemed. Also that irrespective of his death all have to pay it individually. Then, the greatest stumbling-block of all is that our beloved Master went through an awful and dreadful ordeal to pay the price of sin which could have been avoided if natural death would have sufficed, and each had a part to play before redemption could be accomplished. Thus the death of Jesus is made to be a mere side issue in comparison with the love and justice of God and the necessity of such a loving sacrifice which Jesus so willingly gave for the sin of the world.

Referring to the context of 1 Corinthians 15 we read "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." Not to save us from dying. First the natural; if natural death is the condemnation then Christ died in vain and all have perished.

Is there any difference between "dying in Adam" and "the soul that sinneth it shall die"? (Ezekiel 18:20). Is there any difference between:

- A) The results of the death of the ignorant? (See Psalm 49:20; Isaiah 27:14 Romans 2:12; John 3:21).
- B) The enlightened responsible? (See James 4:17).
- C) Those who die in Christ? (See 1 Corinthians 15).

How does a person get "in Christ"? Is this a physical change of nature? Can a person be in Christ before being made incorruptible after resurrection?

Here we give some evidence in harmony with Scripture: Dr Thomas wrote, "For an individual cannot be in a federal person unless introduced into him" (Elpis Israel, page 134). R. Roberts wrote, "Baptism is the means of the present (legal) union with Christ. There is a passing out of Adam into Christ."

Are we unreasonable to think that there is a legal union with Christ and Adam as federal heads in contrast to the physical? How does a person become "in Adam"? Is it not upon the same principle of enlightenment and realising that we have been introduced into him by law? Have we not to die by law to Adamic relationship, just as the Jew did by law? (Romans 7:4). Did not Paul recognise that he was alive without the law, though a Pharisee, and that (the) sin revived and he died? (Romans 7:10, 8:2, Galatians 2:19). While the laws of Death and Life are over all they are not operative until we are introduced or enlightened and responsible to such laws.

Adam and Jesus are our "Doctrinal Fathers," and only when we are cognisant of the facts are we related to the respective laws and consequences. The ignorant are not in either of these categories and we have full confidence in the justice of God as to His requirements. We have no doubt that no man dies because of Adam's sin or is responsible for it (Deuteronomy 24:16; Ezekiel 18:20). We see there is a big difference between God "winking at the ignorant" who perish like the beasts, and the just punishment of those who know and obey not His commandments (Mark 16:16; Luke 19:27) .

To sum up. All in Adam die as the wages of sin in the second death and natural death will not be taken into account. All in Christ shall be made alive (zoe) irrespective of being naturally dead. The all in each case is the all in their respective category, with the exclusion of the ignorant. It should be plain from all angles that this verse, 1 Corinthians 15:22, means exactly what it says without any confusion or contradiction.

What wonderful wisdom and Divine justice in mercy and a glorious solution to a problem so simple which babes can see and yet is hidden from the wise and prudent of this world.

"Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness and His wonderful works to the children of men." Psalm 107:8.

What wonderful wisdom and Divine justice in Mercy and a glorious solution to a problem so simple which the babes can see, and yet is hid from the wise and prudent of this world.

Brother F.J.Pearce

Extract from

“THE TEMPLE AT THE TIME OF CHRIST”

Temple Order, Revenues, and Music.

Second Temple inferior in Glory.

To the devout and earnest Jew the second Temple must, “in comparison of” “the house in her first glory,” have indeed appeared “as nothing.” (Haggai 2:3). True, in architectural splendour the second, as restored by Herod, far surpassed the first Temple. But, unless faith had recognised in Jesus of Nazareth “the Desire of all nations,” who should “fill this house with glory,” (Haggai 2:7), it would have been difficult to draw other than sad comparisons. Confessedly, the real elements of Temple-glory no longer existed. The Holy of Holies was quite empty, the ark of the covenant, with the cherubim, the tables of the law, the book of the covenant, Aaron’s rod that budded, and the pot of manna, were no longer in the sanctuary. The fire that had descended from heaven upon the altar was extinct. What was far more solemn, the visible presence of God in the Shechinah was wanting. Nor could the will of God be now ascertained through the Urim and Thummim, nor even the high-priest be anointed with the holy oil, its very composition being unknown. Yet all the more jealously did the Rabbis draw lines of fictitious sanctity, and guard them against infringement.

Lines of Sanctity.

In general, as the camp in the wilderness had really consisted of three parts - the camp of Israel, that of the Levites, and that of God - so they reckoned three corresponding divisions of the Holy City. From the gates to the Temple Mount was regarded as the camp of Israel; thence to the gate of Nicanor represented the camp of Levi; while the rest of the sanctuary was “the camp of God.” It is in allusion to this that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews compares Christ’s suffering “without the gate” of Jerusalem to the burning of the sin-offerings “without the camp.” According to another Rabbinical arrangement different degrees of sanctity attached to different localities. The first, or lowest degree, belonged to the land of Israel, whence alone the first sheaf at the Passover, the first-fruits, and the two wave-loaves at Pentecost might be brought; the next degree to walled cities in Palestine, where no leper nor dead body (Luke 7:12) might remain; the third to Jerusalem itself, since, besides many prohibitions to guard its purity, it was only there lawful to partake of the peace-offerings, of the firstfruits, and of “the second tithes.” Next came, successively, the Temple Mount, from which all who were in a state of Levitical uncleanness were excluded; “the Terrace,” or “Chel,” from which, besides Gentiles, those who had become defiled by contact with a dead body were shut out; the Court of the Women, into which those who had been polluted might not come, even if they “had washed,” till after they were also Levitically fit to eat of “things sacred,” that is, after sunset of the day on which they had washed; the Court of Israel, into which those might not enter who, though delivered from their uncleanness, had not yet brought the offering for their purification; the Court of the Priests, ordinarily accessible only to the latter; the space between the altar and the Temple itself, from which even priests were excluded if their bearing showed that they did not realise the solemnity of the place; the Temple, into which the priests might only enter after washing their hands and feet; and, lastly, the Most Holy Place, into which the high-priest alone was allowed to go, and that only once a year.

Rules of the Rabbis.

From these views of the sanctity of the place, it will readily be understood how sufficient outward reverence should have been expected of all who entered upon the Temple Mount. The Rabbis here also lay down certain rules, of which some are such as a sense of propriety would naturally suggest, while others strangely remind us of the words of our Saviour. Thus no one was to come to it except for strictly religious purposes, and neither to make the Temple Mount a place of thoroughfare, nor use it to shorten the road. Ordinarily the worshippers were to enter by the right and to withdraw by the left, avoiding both the direction and the gate by which they had come. But mourners and those under ecclesiastical discipline were to do the reverse, so as to meet the stream of worshippers, who might address to them either words of sympathy (“He who dwelleth in this house grant thee comfort”), (1 Kings 9:3), or else of admonition (“He who dwelleth in this house put it into thy mind to give heed to those who would restore thee again!”). As already stated, it was expressly prohibited to sit down in the Court of the Priests, an exception being only made in favour of princes of the house of David, probably to vindicate their consistency; as such instances were recorded in the past history of Israel. Alike the ministering priests and the worshippers were to walk backwards when

leaving the immediate neighbourhood where the holy service was performed, and at the gate of Nicanor each one was to stand with his head bent. It need scarcely be said that reverence in gesture and deportment was enjoined while on the Temple Mount. But even when at a distance from Jerusalem and the Temple, its direction was to be noted, so as to avoid in every-day life anything that might seem incongruous with the reverence due to the place of which God said, "Mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually." (1 Kings 9:3). Probably from a similar feeling of reverence, it was ordered, that when once a week the sanctuary was thoroughly cleaned, and repairs found needful should be executed if possible by priests or else by Levites, or at least by Israelites, and only in case of extreme necessity by workmen not Levitically "clean."

Other Rabbinical ordinances, however, are not so easily explained, unless on the ground of the avoidance of every occupation and undertaking other than worship, Thus "no man might go on the Temple Mount with his staff," as if on business or pleasure; nor yet "with shoes on his feet" - sandals only being allowed; nor "with the dust upon his feet;" nor, "with his scrip," nor "with money tied to him in his purse." Whatever he might wish to contribute either to the Temple, or for offerings, or for the poor must be carried by each "in his hand," possibly to indicate that the money about him was exclusively for an immediate sacred purpose. It was probably for similar reasons that Jesus transferred these very ordinances to the disciples when engaged in the service of the real Temple. The direction, "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves," must mean, go out in the same spirit and manner as you would to the Temple services, and fear not - "for the workman is worthy of his meat." (Matthew 10:9,10). In other words: Let this new Temple service be your only thought, undertaking, and care,

Wilful Profanity.

But, guard it as they might, it was impossible wholly to preserve the sanctuary from profanation. For wilful, conscious, high-minded profanity, whether in reference to the Temple of God, the law does not appear to have provided any atonement or offering. To this the Epistle to the Hebrews alludes in the well-known passage, so often misunderstood, "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." (Hebrews 10:26,27). In point of fact, these terms of threatening correspond to two kinds of Divine punishment frequently mentioned in the Old Testament. The one often referred to in the warning "that he die not," is called by the Rabbis, "death by the hand of heaven or of God;" the other is that of being "cut off." It is difficult to distinguish exactly between these two. Tradition enumerates thirty-six offences to which the punishment of "cutting off" attaches. From their graver nature, as compared with the eleven offences on which "death by the hand of God" was to follow, we gather that "cutting off" must have been the severer of the two punishments, and it may correspond to the term "fiery indignation." Some Rabbis hold that "death by the hand of God" was a punishment which ended with this life, while "cutting off" extended beyond it. But the best authorities maintain that whereas death by the hand of Heaven fell upon the guilty individual alone, "the cutting off" extended to the children also, so that the family would become extinct in Israel. Such Divine punishment is alluded to in 1 Corinthians 16:22, under the well-known Jewish expression, "*Anathema Maranatha*" - literally, Anathema when the Lord cometh.

Its Penalties.

To these two Divine punishments corresponded other two by the hand of man - the "forty stripes save one," and the so-called "rebels' beating." The distinction between them is easily explained. The former were only inflicted after a regular judicial investigation and sentence, and for the breach of some negative precept or prohibition; while the latter was, so to speak, in the hands of the people, who might administer it on the spot, and without trial, if any one were caught in supposed open defiance of some positive precept, whether of the Law of Moses or of the traditions of the elders. The reader of the New Testament will remember such popular outbursts, when the men of Nazareth would have cast Jesus over the brow of the hill on which their city was built (Luke 4:29), and when on at least two occasions the people took up stones in the Temple to stone Him. (John 8:59 & 10:31). It is a remarkable fact, that when the Lord Jesus and when His martyr Stephen were before the Sanhedrim (Matthew 26:59, 68; Acts 7:57,58), the procedure was in each case in direct contravention of all the rules of the Rabbinical criminal law. In each case the sitting terminated in "the rebels' beating," both when they "buffeted the Master" and "smote Him with the palms of their hands," and when "they ran upon" Stephen "with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and stoned

him,” For the rebels beating was really unto death. The same punishment was to have been inflicted upon Paul, when, on the charge of having brought a Gentile beyond the enclosure in the court open to such, “the people ran together, and they took Paul, and drew him out of the Temple,” and “went about to kill him.” This summary mode of punishing supposed “rebellion” was probably vindicated by the example of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar. (Numbers 25:7,8). On the other hand, the mildness of the Rabbinical law, where religious feelings were not involved, led to modifications of the punishment prescribed in Deuteronomy 25:2,3. Thus because the words were, “by a certain number, forty stripes he may be given,” instead of a simple direction to give the forty stripes, the law was construed as meaning a number near to forty, or thirty-nine, which accordingly was the severest corporeal punishment awarded at one time. If the number of stripes were less than thirty-nine, it must still be some multiple of three, since, as the scourge was composed of three separate thongs (the middle one of calf’s leather, the other two of asses’, with a reference to Isaiah 1:3), each stroke of the scourge in reality inflicted three stripes. Hence the greatest number of strokes administered at one time amounted to thirteen. The law also most particularly defined and modified every detail, even to the posture of the criminal. Still this punishment, which Paul underwent not less than five times at the hands of the Jews (2 Corinthians 11:24), must have been very severe. In general, we can only hope that it was not so often administered as rabbinical writings seem to imply. During the scourging, Deuteronomy 28:58,59, and at its close Psalm 128:38, were read to the culprit. After the punishment he was not to be reproached, but received as a brother.

Necessity for Discipline.

That strict discipline both in regard to priests and worshippers would, however, be necessary, may be inferred even from the immense number of worshippers which thronged Jerusalem and the Temple. According to a late computation, the Temple could have held “within its colossal girdle” “two amphitheatres of the size of the Coliseum.” As the latter is reckoned to have been capable, inclusive of its arena and passages, of accommodation 109,000 persons, the calculation that the Temple might contain at one time 210,000 persons seems by no means exaggerated. It will readily be believed what immense wealth this multitude must have brought to the great national sanctuary.

The Temple Treasury.

Indeed, the Temple treasury had always been an object of cupidity to foreigners. It was successively plundered by Syrians and Romans, though at the last siege the flames deprived Titus and his soldiers of this booty. Even so liberal and enlightened a statesman as Cicero inveighed, perhaps on the ground of exaggerated reports, against the enormous influx of gold from all lands to Jerusalem. From Biblical history we know how liberal were the voluntary contributions at the time of Moses, of David, and again of Joash (2 Chronicles 24) and of Josiah (2 Kings 22). Such offerings to the Temple treasury continued to the last a very large source of revenue. They might be brought either in the form of vows or of free gifts. Any object, or even a person, might be dedicated by vow to the altar. If the thing vowed were suitable, it would be used; if otherwise, sold, and its value given to the treasury. Readers of the New Testament know how fatally such spurious liberality interfered with the most sacred duties of life. (Matthew 15:5). From Jewish tradition we gather that there must have been quite a race for distinction in this respect. The wood, the incense, the wine, the oil, and all other things requisite for the sacred services, as well as golden and silver vessels, were contributed with lavish hand. Certain families obtained by their zeal special privileges, such as that the wood they brought should always be first used for the altar fire; and the case of people leaving the whole of their fortune to the Temple is so often discussed, that it must have been a by no means uncommon occurrence. To this practice Christ may have referred in denouncing the Scribes and Pharisees who “devour widows’ houses, and for a pretence make long prayers.” (Matthew 23:14). For a good deal of this money went in the end from the Temple treasury to them, although there is no evidence of their intriguing for personal gifts,

The Tribute Money.

Besides these votive offerings, and the sale of the surplusage of incense, flour, etc., the people were wont on the Sabbaths and feast-days to bring voluntary contributions “in their hand” to the Temple. Another and very large source of revenue was from the profit made by the meat-offerings, which were prepared by the Levites, and sold every day to the offenders. But by far the largest sum was derived from the half shekel of Temple tribute, which was incumbent on every male Israelite of age, including proselytes and even manumitted slaves. As the shekel of the sanctuary was double the ordinary, the half-shekel due to the Temple treasury amounted to about 1 shilling and four pence (two *denarii* or a *didrachma*). Hence, when Christ was challenged at Capernaum (Matthew 27:24) for this payment, He directed Peter to give the

'*stater*,' or two *didrachmas*, for them both. This circumstance also enables us to fix the exact date of this event. For annually, on the 1st of Adar (the month before the Passover), proclamation was made throughout the country by messengers sent from Jerusalem of the approaching Temple tribute. On the 15th of Adar the money-changers opened stalls throughout the country to change the various coins, which Jewish residents at home or settlers abroad might bring, into the ancient money of Israel. For custom had it that nothing but the regular half-shekel of the sanctuary could be received at the treasury. On the 25th of Adar business was only transacted within the precincts of Jerusalem and of the Temple, and after that date those who had refused to pay the impost could be proceeded against at law, and goods distrained, the only exception being in favour of priests, and that "for the sake of peace," that is, lest their office should come into disrepute. From heathens or Samaritans no tribute money was to be received, the general rule in reference to all their offerings being this: -

"A votive and a free-will offering they receive at their hands; but whatever is not either a votive or a free-will offering (does not come under either category) is not received at their hands." In support, Ezra 4:3 is quoted. The law also fixed the rate of discount which the money-changers were allowed to charge those who procured from them the Temple coin, perhaps to obviate suspicion of, or temptation to usury - a sin regarded as one of the most heinous civil offences.

Annual Sum of Tribute.

The total sum derived annually from the Temple tribute has been computed at about £76,000. As the bankers were allowed to charge a silver mean, or about one-fourth of a *denar* (2 pence) on every half shekel, their profits must have amounted to nearly £9,500, or, deducting a small sum for exceptional cases, in which the *meah* was not to be charged, say about £9,000 - very large sum, considering the value of money in a country where a labourer received a *denar* (8 pence) for a days work (Matthew 20:2), and the "good Samaritan" left only two *denars* (16 pence) in the inn for the keep of the sick man. (Luke 10:35). It must therefore have been a very powerful interest which Jesus attacked, when in the Court of the Temple He "poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables" (John 2:15) , while at the same time He placed Himself in direct antagonism to the sanctioned arrangements of the Sanhedrim, whom He virtually charged with profanity.

Tribute Enforced by Law.

It had only been about a century before, during the reign of Salome-Alexandra (about 78 B.C), that the Pharisaical party, being then in power, had carried an enactment by which the Temple tribute was to be enforced by law. It need scarcely be said that for this there was not the slightest Scriptural warrant. Indeed, the Old Testament nowhere provided legal means for enforcing any payment for religious purposes. The law stated what was due, but left its observance to the piety of the people, so that alike the provision for the Temple and for the priesthood must have varied with the religious state of the nation. (Malachi 3:8-10). But, irrespective of this, it is a matter of doubt whether the half-shekel had ever been intended as an annual payment. Its first enactment was under exceptional circumstances (Exodus 30:12) and the mode in which, as we are informed, a similar collection was made during the reign of Joash, suggests the question whether the original institution by Moses was not treated rather as affording a precedent than as laying down a binding rule. (2 Chronicles 24:6-11). At the time of Nehemiah we read only of a self-imposed "ordinance," and at the rate of a third, not a half-shekel. (Nehemiah 10:32-34). But long before the coming of Christ very different views prevailed. "The dispersed abroad" regarded the Temple as the one bond of their national as well as their religious life. Patriotism and religion swelled their gifts, which far exceeded the legal dues. Gradually they came to regard the Temple tribute as, in the literal sense of the words, "a ransom for their souls." (Exodus 30:12). So many were the givers and so large their gifts that they were always first brought to certain central places, whence the most honourable of their number carried them as "sacred ambassadors" to Jerusalem. The richest contributions came from those crowded Jewish settlements in Mesopotamia and Babylon, to which "the dispersed" had originally been transported. Here special treasuries for their reception had been built in the cities of Nisibis and Nehardea, whence a large armed escort annually accompanied the "ambassadors" to Palestine. Similarly, Asia Minor, which at one time contributed nearly £8,000 a year, had its central collecting places. In the Temple these moneys were emptied into three large chests, which were opened with certain formalities at each of the three great feasts. According to tradition these three chests held three *seahs* each (the *seah* = 1 peck 1 pint), so that on the three occasions of their opening twenty-seven *seahs* of coin were taken.

How The Money Was Spent.

The Temple revenues were in the first place devoted to the purchase of all public sacrifices, that is, those offered in the name of the whole congregation of Israel, such as the morning and evening sacrifices, the festive sacrifices, etc. This payment had been one of the points in controversy between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. So great importance was attached to it, that all Israel should appear represented in the purchase of the public sacrifices, that when the three chests were emptied they took expressly from one “for the land of Israel,” from another “for the neighbouring lands” (that is, for the Jews there resident), and from the third “for distant lands.” Besides, the Temple treasury defrayed all else necessary for the services of the sanctuary; all Temple repairs, and the salaries of a large staff of regular officials, such as those who prepared the shewbread and the incense; who saw to the correctness of the copies of the law used in the synagogues; who examined into the Levitical fitness of sacrifices; who instructed the priests in their various duties; who made the curtains, etc., - not omitting, according to their own testimony, the fees for the Rabbis. And after all this lavish expenditure there was not only enough to pay for the repairs to the city walls, the roads, and public buildings, etc., about Jerusalem, but sufficient to accumulate immense wealth in the treasury!

The Temple Hymnody.

To the wealth and splendour of the Temple corresponded the character of its services. The most important of these, next to the sacrificial rites, was the hymnody of the sanctuary. We can conceive what it must have been in the days of David and of Solomon. But even in New Testament times it was such that John could find no more adequate imagery to portray heavenly realities and in the final triumph of the Church than that taken from the service of praise in the Temple. Thus, when first “the twenty-four elders” representing the chiefs of the twenty-four courses of the priesthood, and afterwards the 144,000, representing redeemed Israel in its fullness (12 x 12,000), sing “the new song” - the former in heaven, the latter on Mount Zion - they appear, just as in the Temple services, as “harpers, harping with their harps,” (Revelation 5:8 & 14:2,3). Possibly there may also have been an analogy between the time when these “harpers” are introduced and the period in the Temple-service when the music began - just as the joyous drink-offering was poured out. There is yet a third reference in the Book of Revelation to “the harps of God,” (Revelation 15:2), with most pointed allusion, not to the ordinary, but to the Sabbath services in the Temple. In this case “the harpers” are all they “that had gotten the victory over the beast.” The Church, which has come out of great tribulation, stands victorious “on the sea of glass;” and the saints, “having the harps of God,” sing “the song of Moses, the servant of God.” It is the Sabbath of the Church; and as on the Sabbath, besides the psalm for the day (Psalm 92) at the ordinary sacrifice, they sung at the additional Sabbatic sacrifice ‘Numbers 28:9,10), in the morning, the Song of Moses, in Deuteronomy 32, and in the evening that in Exodus 15, so the victorious Church celebrates her true Sabbath of rest by singing this same “Song of Moses and of the Lamb,” only in language that expresses the fullest meaning of the Sabbath songs in the Temple.

Instrumental Music.

Properly speaking, the real service of praise in the Temple was only with the voice. This is often laid down as a principle by the Rabbis. What instrumental music there was, served only to accompany and sustain the song. Accordingly, none other than Levites might act as choristers, while other distinguished Israelites were allowed to take part in the instrumental music. The blasts of the trumpets, blown by priests only, former - at least in the second Temple - no part of the instrumental music of the service, but were intended for quite different purposes. Even the posture of the performers showed this, for while the Levites stood at their desks facing towards the sanctuary, or westwards, the priests, with their silver trumpets, stood exactly in the opposite direction, on the west side of the rise of the altar, by the “table of the fat,” and looking eastwards or down the courts. On ordinary days the priests blew seven times, each time three blasts - a short sound, an alarm, and again a sharp short sound (Thekiah, Theruah, and Thekiah), or, as the Rabbis express it, “An alarm in the midst and a plain note before and after it.” According to tradition, they were intended symbolically to proclaim the kingdom of God, Divine Providence, and the final judgment. The first three blasts were blown when the great gates of the Temple - especially that of Nicanor - were opened. Then, when the drink offering was poured out, the Levites sung the psalm of the day in three sections. After each section there was a pause, when the priests blew three blasts, and the people worshipped. This was the practice at the evening, as at the morning sacrifice. On the eve of the Sabbath a threefold blast of the priests’ trumpets summoned the people, far as the sound was carried over the city, to prepare for the holy day, while another threefold blast announced its actual commencement. On Sabbaths, when, besides the ordinary, an additional sacrifice was brought, and the “Song of Moses” sung - not the whole every Sabbath, but divided in

six parts, one for every Sabbath, - the priests sounded their trumpets additional three times in the pauses of the Sabbath psalm.

The Influence of David.

The music of the Temple owed its origin to David, who was not only a poet and a musical composer, but who also invented musical instruments (Amos 6:5; 1 Chronicles 23:5), especially the ten stringed Nevel or lute. (Psalm 33:2; 144:9). From the Book of Chronicles we know how fully this part of the service was cultivated, although the statement of Josephus, that Solomon had provided forty thousand harps and lutes, and two hundred thousand silver trumpets, is evidently a gross exaggeration. The Rabbis enumerate thirty-six different instruments, of which only fifteen are mentioned in the Bible, and of these five in the Pentateuch. As in early Jewish poetry there was neither definite and continued metre (in the modern sense), nor regular and premeditated rhyme, so there was neither musical notation, nor yet any artificial harmony. The melody was simple, sweet, and sung in unison to the accompaniment of instrumental music. Only one pair of brass cymbals were allowed to be used. But this "sounding brass" and "tinkling cymbal" formed no part of the Temple music itself, and served only as the signal to begin that part of the service. To this the apostle seems to refer when, in 1 Corinthians 13:1 he compares the gift of "tongues" to the sign or signal by which the real music of the Temple was introduced.

The Harp and Lute.

That music was chiefly sustained by the harp (Kinnor) and the lute (Nevel). Of the latter (which was probably used for solos) not less than two nor more than six were to be in the Temple orchestra; of the former, or harp, as many as possible, but never less than nine. There were, of course, several varieties of both the Nevel and the Kinnor. The chief difference between these two kinds of stringed instruments lay in this, that in the Nevel (lute or Guitar) the strings were drawn over the sounding board, while in the Kinnor they stood out free, as in harps. Of wind instruments we know that, besides their silver trumpets, the priests also blew the Shophar or horn, notably at the new moon, on the Feast of the New Year (Psalm 81:3), and to proclaim the Year of Jubilee (Leviticus 25:9), which, indeed, thence derived its name. Originally the Shophar was probably a ram's horn, but afterwards it was also made of metal. The Shophar was chiefly used for its loud and far-sounding tones (Exodus 19:16,19; 20:18; Isaiah 58:1). At the feast of the New Year, one priest with a Shophar was placed between those who blew the trumpets; while on fast-days a priest with a Shophar stood on each side of them - the tones of the Shophar being prolonged beyond those of the trumpets. In the synagogues out of Jerusalem the Shophar alone was blown at the New Year, and on fast-days only trumpets.

The flute (or reed pipe) was played in the Temple on twelve specific festivities. These were: the day of killing the first, and that of killing the second Passover, the first day of unleavened bread, Pentecost, and the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles. Quite in accordance with the social character of these feasts, the flute was also used by the festive pilgrim-bands on their Journey to Jerusalem, to accompany "the Psalms of Degrees," or rather of "Ascent" (Isaiah 30:29), sung on such occasions. It was also customary to play it at Marriage feasts and at funerals (Matthew 9:23); for according to Rabbinical law every Jew was bound to provide at least two flutes and one mourning woman at the funeral of his wife. In the Temple, not less than two nor more than twelve flutes were allowed, and the melody was on such occasions to close with the notes of one flute alone. Lastly, we have sufficient evidence that there was a kind of organ used in the Temple (the Magrephah), but whether merely for giving signals or not, cannot be clearly determined.

The Human Voice.

As already stated, the service of praise was mainly sustained by the human voice. A good voice was the one qualification needful for a Levite. In the second Temple female singers seem at one time to have been employed (Ezra 2:65; Nehemiah 7:67). In the Temple of Herod their place was supplied by Levite boys. Nor did the worshippers any more take part in the praise, except by a responsive Amen. It was otherwise in the first Temple, as we gather from 1 Chronicles 16:36, from the allusion in Jeremiah 33:11, and also from such Psalms as 26:12; 68:26. At the laying of the foundation of the second Temple, and at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, the singing seems to have been antiphonal, or in responses (Ezra 3:10,11; Nehemiah 12:27,40), the two choirs afterwards apparently combining, and singing in unison in the Temple itself. Something of the same kind was probably also the practice in the first Temple. What the melodies were to which the Psalms had been sung, it is, unfortunately, now impossible to ascertain. Some of the music still used in the synagogue must date from those times, and there is no reason to doubt that in the

so-called Gregorian tones we have also preserved to us a close approximation to the ancient hymnody of the Temple, though certainly not without considerable alterations.

But how solemn must have been the scene when, at the dedication of Solomon's Temple during the service of praise, "the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of Jehovah; so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud: for the glory of Jehovah had filled the house of God" (2 Chronicles 5:13,14)!

Such music, and such responsive singing, might well serve, in the Book of Revelation, as imagery of heavenly realities (Revelation 4:8,11? 5:9,12; 7:10-12), especially in that direction of the final act of worship in Revelation 14:1-5, where at the close of their antiphony the two choirs combine, as at the dedication of the second Temple, to join in this grand unison, "Alleluia; for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." (Revelation 19:6,7; compare also Revelation 5:13).