

The Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No. 258

January/February 2013

In this Issue:

Page 1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 3	The Name Christadelphian	Brother Phil Parry
Page 6	The Holy Spirit	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page 10	Veritas and His Friends	
Page 12	Eli – Judge and Priest	Brother Russell Gregory
Page 15	Psalm 105, A Short History of Israel	

Editorial

In “The Sermon on the Mount,” at the beginning of Jesus’ ministry as recorded in Matthew 7:9-11 He asks, “What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?”; and then at another time we have a similar story recorded in Luke 11:11-13 but with a different ending, for here we read, “If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone? Or if he ask a fish, will he for a fish give him a serpent? Or if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy spirit to them that ask him?”

We wonder why Jesus should conclude the same story with such different endings, but on reflection, are they really so different? In what way are the “good things” and “the holy spirit” which God gives to those who ask Him, to be compared?

First of all we know that the holy spirit is not a person. This has been dealt with elsewhere on many occasions and we will not go into it here but simply accept the fact, except to say that when we think of the spirit of Elijah resting on Elisha (2 Kings 2:15) then we are close to understanding what the holy spirit is – the spirit or the power of God; it is that by which He works. It is not a person, and so capital letters are not being used in this article.

Secondly let us look at the context of the quotation above from Matthew 7:9 to 11 where in the previous two verses (7 and 8) Jesus had said, “Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.” So then, by asking, seeking and knocking we can obtain the good things which Jesus was talking about.

“Ask, and it shall be given you;” but James warns us, “Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts.” (James 4:3). Jesus did not do this; He so loved us that He never asked anything for Himself but only for others – He said, “The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost” and “I and my Father are one”, while in His prayer the night before He was crucified He expressed His desire that His disciples should be one with Him and His Father. We read of this in John’s gospel, chapter 17 verses 20 to 23, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.” And here Jesus adds another element for He goes on to say, “And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.”

We note that this “glory which Thou gavest me I have given them” is a present possession for the faithful followers of Jesus. How can this be, what glory can the followers of Jesus have at this present time? I believe Jeremiah 9 verse 24, helps us here:- “But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am the LORD which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight, saith the LORD.” (From an early age Jesus could glory in His knowledge and understanding of His Father as we can see from Luke 2:47 when in the Temple, at twelve years old, He reasoned with the elders “and all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers.” We are further told that “Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God.”) And the reason Jesus gave for this present gift of knowledge, understanding and wisdom, was so that we “may be made perfect in one” with Him and His Father.

All this was prophesied of Jesus in Isaiah 11:2 and 3, that “the spirit of the LORD shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the LORD; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the LORD.” Again we see the importance of knowledge, understanding and wisdom, but what of “the fear of the Lord”? Jesus was “of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord” and I believe this is where He succeeded every time in overcoming temptation and we do not. Whenever He saw temptation approaching He was always prepared to meet it instantly with “Get thee behind me satan”. We, on the other hand, often weigh up the temptation and if there is something there that we like or wish to know more about we are much more likely to yield to it. It was Jesus’ strength of mind and singleness of purpose in putting His Father’s will before His own where He succeeded - and we fail so miserably.

We saw above that Jesus had said “how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy spirit to them that ask him?” and this was not the only occasion for in John 14:16 and 17 we read, “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the spirit of truth.” Then in verse 25 Jesus tells us “the Comforter... is the holy spirit” and in John 15:26, the “Comforter is... the spirit of truth.”

Some say that the Comforter was given only to the apostles for their immediate benefit because Jesus went on to tell them that this Comforter would bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever things He had said to them. However I believe it also applies to all those disciples who follow after, for Paul, John and Peter tell us so.

Paul in Romans 8:9 to 11 says, “But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness.”

And in 1 John 4:6, we read, “We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.”

While in 1 Peter 10:10 to 12, we read, “Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, 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 by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the holy spirit sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.”

Let us summarize these matters. We have seen how closely linked are all these things; the knowledge of God, of His will and of His purpose; our understanding of these matters, and wisdom from above; the spirit of Christ; the spirit of truth; the spirit of life and the holy spirit, which surely encompasses all.

In 2 Kings 2 we learn how Elisha asked for a double portion of the spirit of Elisha and it was granted him. In Luke 1:15, the angel told Zacharias that John the Baptist “shall be filled with the holy spirit, even from his mother’s womb,” while in John 10:41 we read “John did no miracle: but all things

that John spoke of this man(Jesus) were true.” And John told his disciples regarding Jesus, “For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him.”

Clearly, the holy spirit in some measure is offered to all who wish to receive it. We are called of God and taught of God. “Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me” said Jesus, and Peter said by the holy spirit, “for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.”

“If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy spirit to them that ask him?”

With love in Jesus to all. Russell

THE NAME CHRISTADELPHIAN

What is in a Name?

Who has the sole right to use this name “Christadelphian”? To answer this question we must find the origin of its first adoption for the name of a religious sect. We find that a certain John Thomas, M.D., in his search for the true teaching of the Scriptures, discovered much that was false and erroneous in the teaching and beliefs of the Roman and Protestant churches of his day. Through his sincere efforts, both in preaching and writing, he made many disciples, who being overjoyed with the realisation that the Kingdom of God was something literal to be established upon the earth with Jesus Christ as King, embraced much of the error also from which the Dr. had not extricated himself.

Though the Doctor’s preaching of the Kingdom of God and the things concerning the name of Jesus Christ was more sensible, logical and conformable to the teaching of Jesus Christ in contrast to the fables of the clergy, yet he never freed himself from the shackles of their “original sin” and “sinful flesh” ideas, though anyone given to scriptural reasoning and sensible thinking would realise how foolish it really is.

In opposing the great divines Dr. Thomas went to the extreme, stating that every particle of the flesh was full of sin, leaving us no alternative but to deduce that God was the author of sin, a thing which we know he would most heartily deny were he alive today. Nevertheless we cannot retreat from the fact that he has written things that support such an astounding absurdity; and add to this the fact that he believed that the way Jesus bore our sins in His own body on the tree was by having a body of flesh full of sin, such as ours is supposed (by his teaching) to be, and you see how far out of his depth he really waded.

As I said, the fact of so much truth coming to light through the Doctor’s efforts, as opposed, to the popular fables of the clergy, those who embraced the teaching of the Kingdom with such enthusiasm were blind to the errors, thinking that a man who could bring such truth to light could not be astray on other matters. They accepted his teaching in general; what they did not understand of his writings they never questioned.

This small community were known only as “brethren” in the early stages of growth, but when the American Civil War commenced this community, who were opposed, to taking part in war, had to be recognised or distinguished by some name - this was a Government order. Hence, the name given by Dr. Thomas to his band of followers, “Christadelphian”, which means ‘brother of Christ. Sad to say, the meaning of the word was never achieved by that community, and all that the name conveys to us in our day is “confusion”.

Dr. Thomas had never arrived at a stage where he could say “I have the whole Truth of God.” His writings will verify this to anyone with an unbiased mind. He contradicted his own statements in many parts

of his works, and statements which could be verified as true and supported by every Scripture he has since denounced as error.

His successors as so-called leaders and examples of this community were no exceptions to this rule. Though not immune from errors in their own writings, they have had the audacity to tamper with and alter much of the writings of Dr. Thomas as being erroneous; in fact, the very writings which they ceased to publish for this reason, were those which conformed, to the Word of God. Small wonder then, that such practices should cause chaos and division.

The individual thinking and studying of men of goodwill and unbiased minds, with the help of much of Dr. Thomas's works and above all, the help of God, soon brought to light the faith once delivered to the saints.

The dictatorial and high-handed methods adopted, by one, Robert Roberts, in opposition to these sincere men, can never be forgotten in view of the fact that his misrepresentation of what these men really believed and preached, has done more damage to the cause of those who hold the Faith once delivered to the Saints than ever he thought Roman Catholicism capable of.

In view therefore, of the many divisions and divided opinions of "Christadelphians", we can never consider anyone professing this "name" as anything more or less than a nominal Christian, easily led by the blind guide.

It is very doubtful whether 90% of Christadelphia realise that they are supposed to believe in order to qualify as members of that sect, and if informed would in all probability be angry and astounded.

Why, herein is a marvellous thing that an "alien" should reveal to them what they are supposed to believe to qualify for fellowship. However, the position is such and more so among the younger generation who, unlike the Bereans, accept what is told them rather than verifying it from Scripture or other true sources of information unbiased. Yet they are very forward in condemning others for not doing so; they think they are the custodians of the Truth, which is indeed a very honoured, position, but through the conceit of thinking this they become lazy and blind to their real position and are like the church of Laodicea (Revelation. 3:15-18).

Alas, those who hold the Truth in its purity are regarded by them as more hateful than the members of established and popular religion, and they are even afraid to debate though challenged to do so; "for the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; and reproofs of instruction are the way of life" - this they ignore. "He is in the way of life that keepeth instruction: but he that refuseth reproof erreth"; "correction is grievous unto him that forsaketh the way: and he that hateth reproof shall die"; "the ear that heareth the reproof of life abideth among the wise. He that refuseth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that heareth reproof getteth understanding. The fear of the Lord is the instruction of wisdom; and before honour is humility.

Proverbs: would to God this spirit would prevail among them for their own good; nevertheless, they have no one to blame but themselves, and I am afraid many of them will endeavour to add fuel to their oil-less lamps when it is too late. The advice of the wise virgins to those who had no oil for their lamps was "go to them which sell, and buy for yourselves". There was plenty at the source of supply, but they MUST go to that source, not to "Elpis Israel", not to "Eureka", not to "Christendom Astray", "Visible Hand of God", "Ways of providence", "Slain Lamb", "Witness of Christ", "The Atonement", and many other contradictory works, but to the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever that which is a lamp to the feet and a light to the path.

It may seem strange, and it is certainly foolish, that people professing the name "Christadelphian" should contend with the modern divines of so-called Christianity for the teaching of the Bible, and yet be divided into so many sects on matters of doctrine. When there is division such as this it is useless to inquire of any Christadelphian regarding the Truth, for you would most likely get a different answer in each case to the same question.

What's in a name? A firm of a certain name may build up a reputation for the quality of its goods, and that name becomes or signifies a standard of quality, and though after a certain time the goods deteriorate in quality it is hardly noticed, because people still put their trust in the name.

The same can be said for the name "Christadelphian." Though most of them from the time of Dr. Thomas were sincere in what they believed and were ardent students and practitioners of what they considered right, in our day and generation many are taking on the name and hiding behind the reputation which the former have built up.

The shoddy goods are easily distinguished by those who have the testimony of Jesus Christ. Very few of the younger generation of Christadelphians know what to answer when questioned by one who really has the truth of God; they can be cut down like rotten trees. Were it not for the "Name" it would be a poor show for them also if they had to state their own individual cases at the Military Tribunals - such is the position and state to which "Christadelphia" has descended.

What hope it had in the 19th century of becoming the great representative of the Truth of Yahweh was killed by Robert Roberts and his satellites, and men cannot even consider a glance at the book "Christendom Astray", of which he is the author, when they know that "Christadelphia" itself is also astray.

A Christadelphian by the name of E.R.D. Moye, who lived in Australia, had, in a magazine entitled "Light", of which he was Editor, expressed the view that there are two classes comprising the body known as Christadelphians. He said that fellowship with the one class is conditional upon the acceptance of the man-made constitution known as the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith, while the other fellowships all who accept the Bible as the true Basis of Fellowship. E.R.D.Moye emphasised, and rightly so, that fellowship with the Father and Son is the Fellowship that matters, on the basis of His Word, and that the doctrine of Original Sin and Sinful Flesh, etc., as taught by the former class as a condition of Fellowship, is not only foreign to the Word of God but blasphemy. To this we say "Amen".

You may ask the question, Why bother about such people? The answer is that we have a duty to bother with all people, and we know that there are sincere people under the name of Christadelphians who, if they cast aside the heresy into which they have been brought, read and think for themselves a little more, fearing God instead of fearing the consequences of discarding errors and blasphemies contained in the B.A.S.F., they would soon realise to what extent they have been misled and thank God that He has used such people for this reason.

There is no boasting here on our part, for we are very grateful that through our greater respect for God's Word and our diligent search for Truth, God has seen fit to cause the light to shine in our hearts and so give us a true knowledge and understanding of His Will and Purpose.

Those who are content with the errors which have been handed down to them by R. Roberts, and of which the B.A.S.F. is the embodiment, deserve to die in their ignorance; but those who prevent their members from reading helpful literature under the threat of excommunication should reap the consequences. Such threats only prove that these so-called leaders are afraid that their numbers will discover the Truth, or that they are incapable themselves of discerning between right and wrong, truth and error.

They adopt the same attitude as the priest-craft of Christ's day (John 7:46). "The officers answered, Never man spake like this man. Then answered the Pharisees, Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who knoweth not the law (B.A.S.F.?) are cursed. Nicodemus saith unto them, Doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" It was not supposed to according to Divine rule.

But this cannot be said for Christadelphia under the B.A.S.F.; it will not hear or judge before the whole Ecclesia, but certain usurpers of authority do the excommunicating, and simply tell the rest of the ecclesia that the offenders have violated the B.A.S.F., but in what way they do is not disclosed.

Let us, then, look forward to the coming of Him who will not judge after the sight of His eyes, nor reprove after the hearing of His ears; but with righteousness shall He judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth (Isaiah.9:16), “For the leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are swallowed up. For all this His anger is not turned away, but His hand is stretched out still”.

Christadelphians! “Ye search the scriptures and in them ye think ye have eternal life”. Search again and search diligently; after all, what’s in a name? Unless it be the name of Christ?

They need not criticise the Roman or Protestant Churches, neither the chained Bible practice of years ago. The Christadelphians might just as well have a chained and locked Bible, accessible only to a chosen few, as to profess to be champions of its free study and discussion to the edifying of all concerned. It has been proved beyond all doubt that those who have earnestly studied the Bible and found Truths which cannot be gainsaid, have been rebuked and cast out for persisting in the belief of these Truths because they are opposed to the B.A.S.F. It is fear which is causing so many to stay in its ranks, and it is a fear likened to the fear of hell and purgatory as preached by the Roman Church to preserve its numbers. This, together with its “original sin” and. “Dual Christ” teaching makes it the greatest latter-day ally of the papacy while professing to be its greatest enemy.

But not even Rome stoops so low as the partaking of an unclean Christ every first day of the week, neither is its teaching anywhere near so full of paradoxes as that of “Christadelphia”. For example, “wherefore, come ye out from among them. . . and touch not the UNCLEAN THING”, etc.; “we do so every first day of the week with our un-clean Christ”; “He who was flesh and blood, and un-clean, cleansed, himself with this un-clean blood”; “he possessed condemned flesh and blood nature”; “for my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed.” “Not so, Lord, for I have not eaten anything common or un-clean”; “he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I dwell in him”; “in the flesh dwelleth no good thing” (mis-quoted: see Rom. 7).

These are only a few examples of C.D. misrepresentation of the teaching of Christ and the apostles and prophets; many more could be demonstrated; nevertheless the few already mentioned bear witness to the fact of their rejection of John 6, while John 5:23-26 they reject utterly; this fact they cannot escape, for they have written too much - in fact, so much that they are ensnared in their own net.

Does God forgive sin and. yet exact the penalty for that sin? “Yes”, say Christadelphians, “this was so in the case of Adam” they say. How do they get round, that one? They don’t; they only think they do.

Now, the sect known as Jehovah’s Witnesses is more consistent in this particular matter, for they believe and teach that there is no hope of any future life for Adam. This, indeed, is the only logical deduction to arrive at from Scripture if natural death be the wages of sin, and J.W’s believe that it is. So in both cases the covering of Adam and Eve with coats of skins, necessitating blood-shedding, is superfluous; this Divine act can find no place in the teaching of either of these sects if consistency is to predominate.

Be not deceived, the Scripture is abundantly clear that natural death is not the wages of sin; the statement, “in the sweat of thy face. . . dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return”, etc., was a consequence of Adam’s failure to merit eternal life. God allowing Adam’s natural or corruptible body to run its course of an indefinite period of time.

But the real penalty for sin, i.e., Adam’s sin, is inflicted death, as contained in the Divine statement, “in the day thou eatest thereof thou shall surely die”. Surely then, we cannot exclude a merciful God from the position in which Adam found himself and his wife. Surely, by their own consciences and actions as a result, they realised they had forfeited their existence and were under sentence of death by law, that is, MORTAL; they were corruptible before, but not mortal, for mortal means under sentence of death by Law.

“But where sin abounded Grace did much more abound”. Yes, mercy commenced to operate in Eden; God found a substitute for Adam even His Own Son who gave His life, a ransom not only for Adam but for all in him on the Federal Principle.

Adam recognised this in the slaying of the animal and the provision of the skins for coats; he realised that the death he should have died was operative upon the animal instead of himself and this was accounted to him for righteousness, and he was therefore forgiven and allowed to live out his natural existence under a Divine imposition of religious institution, whereby through the merits of Christ, the seed of the woman, he might be morally justified and a partaker of that which he lost in the first transgression.

Thus, in the words of Andrew Wilson in his booklet “The Atonement X-Rayed”, “God paid this ransom by a paper note (type) in Eden but ever true to His Word, He honestly (Romans 3:26) tabled down His sovereign on Calvary.”

If Genesis 3 be the fulfilment of the statement “in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die”, then Adam might well have charged God with deceit, for He said nothing about the woman “bringing forth children in sorrow and being subject to Adam, nor concerning the ground, being cursed, and bringing forth thorns and thistles, nor concerning Adam eating bread in the sweat of his face till he returned to the ground. No. Just the plain conclusive statement, “thou shalt surely die”.

The key to the understanding of the Bible is lost to those who believe natural death to be the wages of sin, and those who believe in sinful flesh, condemned nature, original sin, and an unclean Christ, condemned, sold under sin, and in need of redemption.

One can pick up and read from a Christadelphian magazine, from any monthly issue of any year, subjects dealt with both controversial and otherwise, and you will find that the respective writer never deals fully with any subject but must continually refer the reader to other men’s weeks on the particular subjects, realising that if he restricted himself to these Christadelphian publications they will not wander far out of the circle confined to the B.A.S.F.

The fact of the matter is that they are afraid to speak their own minds for fear that it might be the truth, and so find themselves on the list of suspects. But whoso loveth the company and the praise of men more than the praise of God is not worthy of Christ. They should get back to the Bible, as they are so fond of telling others to do, not fill their heads with Christadelphian literature which is almost one hundred per cent contradictory.

The sun went down on “Christadelphia” when R. Roberts succeeded Dr. Thomas; the NAME is dead, dead by its own hand, and it has the sole right, therefore, to use it in that meaning only.

Brother Phil Parry.

We reproduce the following article, which was previously published in C.L. for July 1998, because it has a bearing upon the editorial

THE HOLY SPIRIT

Many strange concepts have accumulated on this subject over the centuries. The object of this article is to get down to what the Scriptures do and do not teach on the subject.

The holy spirit is not a person. On this we are all agreed. The idea of the holy spirit being a person stems largely from the doctrine of the Trinity. Now we notice that the terms “Holy Spirit” and “Holy Ghost” are used interchangeably, and in some modern versions the latter has often been replaced by the former, and one feature stands out at a glance. While God’s spirit is mentioned countless times in the New Testament, the term “holy spirit” twice only* in the Old Testament, close together in Isaiah 63:10 and 11 - “But they rebelled and vexed his holy spirit... Where is he that put his Holy Spirit within him?”

Now a look at the Authorized Version shows that “Spirit” is spelt with a capital “S” but you may be interested to know that the Hebrew has no capital letters. It has only one set of 22 letters. So those who edited the Authorized Version took the liberty to spell “Spirit” with a capital, obviously biased with the Trinitarian idea of the “Holy Spirit” being a person.

Another point worth noting is that in all languages other than English, a noun has not necessarily its natural gender. For example the Hebrew word for “wisdom” is “*chokmah*,” feminine gender. This is why wisdom in the Bible, especially in the Book of Proverbs, is spoken of as “she.” As a further two illustrations, the Latin word for “moon” is “*luna*,” feminine gender, so spoken of as “she.” The German language is the most peculiar in this respect. The German word for “girl” is “*Maedchen*,” and surprise, surprise, its gender is not feminine but neuter and therefore a girl in German is referred to by the pronoun “it.” To the writer’s knowledge, English is the only language where a noun representing a male is masculine, a female, feminine and any object or abstract concept is neuter, with the exception of a ship or an engine which are spoken of as “she,” as in “start her up.” So when we read a text in a foreign language we must be careful of how to interpret a pronoun.

Coming back to the holy spirit, the word “spirit” is masculine gender in Latin. It is “*spiritus*,” and it was the Latin Vulgate which was used at the time when the doctrine of the Trinity got its first foothold. So this is why the holy spirit came to be referred to as “He.”

For the same reason, by the way, the word, “logos” also masculine gender in Greek is referred to as “He.” If this was understood properly, many Trinitarian misconceptions could be cleared up. (John 1:1-18).

Now let us get down to what the holy spirit is. It is the influence or force emanating from God and pervading all space. By it God controls everything. By it He created the universe, made the earth habitable for life as we know it, including mankind. He set in motion the laws of nature including Physics, Chemistry, Biology, etc. On the spiritual level God gave man laws to keep, inspired the prophets, caused Mary to conceive and later raised Jesus from the dead, to mention only a few examples.

The Spirit of God is first mentioned in Genesis 1:2 - “And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.” And again in Genesis 6:3 - “And the Lord said, my spirit shall not always strive with man...”

God, through His spirit or force, directed history from creation onwards. But His spirit was manifested in various modes. First, there was the patriarchal period from Noah through Abraham to Moses. During this age God, through angels, spoke to chosen men such as Noah, Abraham, etc. They were always faithful individuals who carried God’s message. Then beginning with Moses the age of the prophets began which lasted up to the time just after the Jews’ return from the Babylonian captivity, coming to its end with Malachi. During this age God again through the holy spirit manifested Himself much more openly. Prophets were commissioned to demonstrate publicly through signs and wonders that they were appointed by God. It was God, by means of the holy spirit that enabled the prophets to perform miracles and so identify themselves as God’s envoys. Very different from the patriarchal age where God dealt with single persons. Now the prophets showed themselves to the public at large by signs and wonders.

Then comes the greatest of all signs of the action of God’s holy spirit, as foretold in Isaiah 7:14 - the miraculous conception in Mary through the holy spirit, of the Saviour Jesus. Enough has been said of the reason for the necessity of this birth, God having given His Son with a life free to buy us back from bondage to sin. The fact that God has had mercy on us to give us this understanding is alone an example of the holy spirit working on our intellect. Jesus of course had more of the holy spirit than anyone else “for he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him” (John 3:34). And for this reason He did more miracles than any before Him, so many that they won’t go into a book if all were mentioned (John 21:25). He was the truest ever replica of the Father, and a further most powerful manifestation of the working of the holy spirit occurred at His resurrection.

We now come to the apostolic period which began with the outpouring of the holy spirit on the Day of Pentecost. Nothing like this ever happened before or after. It was however, another sign which God gave. It was a momentous occasion from the then Jewish point of view, for it was the first time that salvation was

to be extended to the Gentiles, an extremely hard pill to swallow for the apostles' contemporaries. The Jews nurtured a pride in being children of Abraham. They thought of themselves as having the monopoly in access to God and His promises while the Gentiles were disdained as dogs. An attitude prevailing among some Jews to this day. The Gentiles having a part in God's blessings was a great sensation and so required an unusual sign.

But apart from this, the apostles, like the prophets, were God's ministers endowed with a limited power to work wondrously with the sole object of demonstrating publicly their divine authority. After the deaths of the apostles there is no further record of any miracles performed openly and publicly, but the holy spirit never ceased to work in some form or another.

So what about this age? Well, the last apostle, John, died after about 96 AD. But thanks to the action of the holy spirit the Scriptures have been preserved, and does not God, through His spirit, guide us in every decision, if we earnestly pray to Him? And was it not through God's guidance that the knowledge of the truth has come to us? And does not God's spirit control world history? How many battles have been won or lost through weather conditions? And what power controls the weather? To mention only Joshua chapter 10 verse 11 when the Lord sent great hailstones upon His enemies.

It was quite recently that I visited a Bible exhibition showing replicas of the Dead Sea Scrolls where we find that their contents agree nearly word for word with our Bible. So how can we say that the holy spirit was withdrawn? The power to do miracles, yes, but the power of the holy spirit, no, only it now takes a different form.

However, it certainly will manifest itself in its most powerful aspect on that blessed day when the Lord returns and those who sleep come forth, and those alive and worthy will experience that sudden change to immortality. Let us all endeavour to be among them.

I will conclude with two examples of our time that demonstrate how God's spirit intervenes in history. End of June 1940 France had fallen. Why did Hitler not invade us then? He missed his best chance from the human point of view - one of those great mysteries of history. But we know why - Hitler was destined to lose the war. What better example of the unnoticed, unobtrusive working of the holy spirit. Then a little later in September the same year, battle of Britain. Hitler assembled his invasion fleet. All was poised ready. Then severe gales dispersed the boats, but the weather did not stop the RAF from finishing what the gales had started. I still vividly remember the announcer reading this, from the loudspeaker inside the internment camp where I was at the time. Similarly, favourable weather conditions helped the allies on D-day in June 1944.

Brother Leo Dreifuss

P.S. My attention has been drawn by Brother Russell Gregory to John the Baptist who was filled with the holy spirit from birth, but did no miracles. Yet Jesus said of him (Luke 7:28) "...among them that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist." So possession of the holy spirit does not necessarily imply the working of miracles but it is evident that this work was imparted by God as and when the necessity arose.

Leo.

The "holy spirit" also occurs in Psalm 51:11 where David pleads with God, "Take not thy holy spirit from me", after his adultery with Bathsheba. – Editor

VERITAS AND HIS FRIENDS.

“Now a national experience is necessarily a thing of slow growth, and covers a long period of time, and if the world nationally as well as individually is to be taught by experience, a sufficient time must be allowed it. No doubt, by-and-by, when the lesson has been well learned, and the necessary experience acquired, a short-cut will be found to both private and public happiness. Men, by the aid of the Spirit, will be able to ‘cancel’ the sum, and get the desired result more quickly than is possible at present.”

“You seem to me,” said Dubitas, “to be affirming God to be omnipotent with one breath, and then limiting His power with the next.”

“Do I?” said Veritas, “then let me try again. What is omnipotence? It is the power of doing all possible things. The word ‘possible’ here not being the measure of what we may be able to do, but what a perfect being can-do. So when we say that certain things are outside possibility even with God, we only mean that being perfect He cannot do anything that would imply imperfection. In fact, it is the very fact of God’s omnipotence which makes certain things impossible to Him.”

“I don’t see it yet,” said Dubitas. “Well,” continued his friend, “we sometimes say of a man of high principle and honour, whose life for many years has been a humanly noble career, we say of this man, ‘It is impossible for him to do a mean or dirty act.’ What do we intend by this? Do we intend any real limitation of such a man’s power when thus using the word ‘impossible’? Do we not rather intend to exalt and magnify him by that expression? Does the word argue the perfection or the imperfection of such an one?”

“I grant,” said Dubitas, “that in this case it does not imply any limitation of power.”

“Then why should it imply limitation when similarly applied to God?”

“Ah, it is the ‘similar application’ that I am not convinced of.”

“But,” said Veritas, “the two cases are similar in this, that a moral result being contemplated, perfectness can do only that which will make for this result. Human perfection cannot tell a lie: divine perfection cannot treat moral beings as though they were blocks of stone; but the ‘cannot’ does not imply limitation in either case.” Dubitas shook his head.

“Not clear yet? Then let us turn round and study your notion of omnipotence, in which God can be limited by nothing, not even His own perfection. He must be capable of doing things contradictory, as well as things having connection and congruity; He must be capable of folly as well as wisdom; of sin as well as holiness. There can be no such thing as the LAW of his own nature, but omnipotence is an insane capacity of reeling round the universe, boxing the compass of all extravagant as well as of all wise action.”

Mentor and Pietas both laughed at this ludicrous picture of omnipotence, while Dubitas protested that it was not putting his case fairly at all.

“Than put your case yourself,” said his friend, smiling.

“Perhaps I can’t,” he apologised, “but it seems to me that God can’t be omnipotent, and yet be incapable of doing anything that is desirable, such as getting a holy and happy race of beings, without all this prolonged suffering and evil.”

“Ah, I see now where I failed in my putting of your case,” said Veritas; you have imported a new word into the discussion by talking of ‘what is desirable.’ You no longer contend for what is in the insane sense, abstractly possible, but your point is now, that which is desirable. Permit me to ask, how you know what is or is not desirable in arranging the terms of a world’s life and probation?”

“I know the long continuance of pain and evil is undesirable. “

You know nothing of the sort, for before you could know that you must know what the state of things would have been supposing evil had not existed.”

“Why, if evil had not existed,” he chuckled, “surely that would have been the condition of things most desirable ?”

“How do you know but that a greater evil would have supervened in case the world had suffered through no such prolonged history? In other words, how do you know but that the highest good can only be reached by the permission of evil?”

“Of course I don’t know,” said Dubitas, “but if the present world is the best that could be made, I can’t help thinking its maker is not omnipotent.”

“But then,” replied Veritas, “you are falling back on what I have called the ‘insane’ notion of omnipotence. You are saying that this world is perhaps the best that could be made, and then you say there might have been a better if God had only possessed power enough.”

Dubitas was evidently foiled, but not satisfied, and Veritas concluded by saying :

“You will have to revise your notions of omnipotence, and perhaps you will see that it is not limiting it to say that God cannot do a foolish thing; and for all we know it would be foolish to create a race of moral beings without putting them through a probationary experience.”

After this digression Veritas resumed his own account of himself, the attention of the listeners not flagging in the least.

“In reading the Scriptures,” he said, “I learned that DEATH in the literal sense of the word was the penalty attaching unto sin. To die, to be destroyed, to perish, are the constant terms used to describe the consequence of transgression. No reason can be assigned why these words should be taken in any other than a literal sense.”

“But,” said Pietas, “ does not death sometimes take the meaning of depravity? is there no such thing as being morally and spiritually dead?”

“Yes,” said Veritas, “in a very few places, indeed, in the Scriptures this secondary and metonymical meaning is met with, but never in describing punishment; neither would it be common sense to substitute a very occasional and secondary meaning of a word for its constant and primary signification. I have learned that death, considered as the penalty of sin, means dissolution of being in the grave. To be destroyed and to perish mean the same thing, only that they are in the Scriptures frequently connected with those violent means which God will use when he exerts destructive power.”

“Then you do not accept the usual teaching concerning hell? inquired Pietas.

“I certainly do not,” replied Veritas; “ and I am astonished that any careful reader of even the English version of the Scriptures can be satisfied with that teaching. There is not the least warrant for it in the book.”

“Well, you amaze me!” said Dubitas.

“Very likely,” was the answer; “I amazed myself when I made the discovery.”

(To be continued.)

ELI - JUDGE AND PRIEST

After their wilderness journey the Israelites entered the Promised Land led by Joshua.

The conquest of the land was never completed owing to the people's lack of faith in God. By the time of Joshua's death the people had begun to mingle with the surrounding tribes, contrary to the commands of God and after Joshua there was no leader to take his place. The people quickly forsook the Law and the worship of idols became widespread. Because of their evil ways God punished them by bringing evil against them until "they cried unto the Lord" and then for a period of about three hundred years God sent them Judges, leaders from amongst them to lead them as God's representative.

God was their King and the nation was God's Kingdom, though it seems doubtful whether many in the nation thought of themselves in that way. Judges chapter 2 and verses 11 to 23 give us a picture of the times: "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim: 12. and they forsook the Lord God of their fathers, which brought them out of the land of Egypt, and followed other gods, of the gods of the people that were round about them, and bowed themselves unto them, and provoked the Lord to anger. And they forsook the Lord, and served Baal and Ashteroth. 14. And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies round about, so that they could not any longer stand before their enemies. 15. Whithersoever they went out, the hand of the Lord was against them for evil, as the Lord had said, and as the Lord had sworn to them: and they were greatly distressed. 16. Nevertheless He raised up judges, which delivered them out of the hand of those who spoiled them. 17. And yet they would not hearken unto their judges, but went a whoring after other gods, and bowed themselves unto them... 23. Therefore the Lord left those nations, without driving them out hastily; neither delivered he them into the hand of Joshua."

These judges were men chosen and called by God to lead the people out of their troubles and were chosen from among the poor and the humble. None had reason to glory in the flesh. It was a sad period when "every man did that which was right in his own eyes," (Judges 21:25) and the result was civil war, famine, religious confusion and immorality. And whenever the "anger of the Lord was hot against Israel" and "the people cried unto the Lord", the Lord sent them judges, as we read in Judges 3:9, "the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel..." and again at verse 15, "...the Lord raised them up a deliverer, Ehud..." Also 4:3; 6:6; 10:10; and so on. These judges did not follow on one directly after another for there were times when there were two judges and other times when there was no judge.

We come now to the time of Eli, who was the 14th judge. Before him was Samson, the 13th judge, and after him followed Samuel, the 15th judge. The book of Ruth which tells us the stories of Naomi, Elimelech, Mahlon, Chilion, Orpah and Ruth comes within this time and it is possible that Ruth and Boaz would have known Eli as a young man.

Worship at this time was in the high places, which were not necessarily places of idolatry though many were. These high places existed through all the land, and worship of God was acceptable so long as it was true worship, but the influence of other nations corrupted many of these high places with false teachings and evil practices. The Tabernacle, which had for so many years been carried throughout the wilderness journeyings, was now at Shiloh, 'a high place' some 20 miles north of Jerusalem. Because the Ark of the Covenant was here it was regarded as the most important high place, and here too, the priests accepted the offerings and sacrifices of those who were faithful to God and offered according to the Law of Moses.

The sons of Aaron were chosen to be priests before the Lord, and Aaron had four sons, two of whom died in the wilderness for their self-will, leaving Eleazer and Ithamar. The priesthood then followed through the descendants of Eleazer and scripture names 22 generations of this line up to the captivity of Israel. We are told nothing of the descendants of Ithamar until we read that Phinehas, Eli's son, is a descendant and then we hear of three more generations - up to the time of Solomon, when the priesthood is transferred back to Zadok of the line of Eleazor. As Phinehas was a priest of the line of Ithamar then so must Eli have been.

But how did Eli become a judge? All previous judges attained the position by delivering the children of Israel from their enemies. Some commentators think that Samson and Eli became judges at about the same time and while Samson judged Israel for only twenty years Eli continued for a further twenty so making up the forty years mentioned in 1 Samuel 4:18. Of Samson we read in Judges 13:5, that “he shall begin to deliver Israel out of the hand of the Philistines”, so did Eli continue this deliverance after the death of Samson? Eli was a priest and no priests ever engaged in battle so it would seem that his leadership was of a spiritual nature endeavouring to turn the hearts of the children of Israel back to their God and this seems to have been to some extent successful for by the time of Samuel the people were no longer subject to the Philistine yolk.

Let us turn now to the 1st Book of Samuel and chapter 1. Here we find the first mention of Eli who, with his two sons, Hophni and Phinehas were priests at Shiloh. Elkanah and Hannah and Peninnah go “up to worship and to sacrifice unto the Lord of Hosts in Shiloh.” Here, Hannah, in sorrow and affliction goes to the temple (Tabernacle - for the Temple of Solomon was some 170 years later) and prays earnestly for a son and makes her vow to God. Eli watches her and mistakes her distressful behaviour for drunkenness. “How long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee.” (Verse 14). A sharp and unwarranted rebuke to a person of such fine character and one wonders if drunkenness was sometimes seen in the court of the tabernacle for he was quick to remonstrate with Hannah without first making even the simplest enquiry of her and so avoid his blunder. Or, if that is not a right picture, then was it such an unusual occurrence for someone to be praying so earnestly and in tears? Were there so few who came in distress, seeking comfort in prayer that Eli, the priest, was not familiar with the sight that he should think this was drunkenness? However, as soon as Hannah spoke he realised his mistake and answered in the only way possible, saying, “Go in peace; and the God of Israel grant thee thy petition that thou hast asked of him.”

A few years later Eli receives custody of the young child. In verse 26 Hannah comes to him and says, “I am the woman that stood by thee here praying unto the Lord.” Evidently this was sufficient introduction to remind him of the earlier occasion of her visit. “For this child I prayed - the Lord has given me my petition which I asked of Him.” She used the very words that Eli had used to her and no doubt he remembered. “Therefore I have lent him to the Lord: as long as he liveth he shall be lent to the Lord.” Eli at this time was well advanced in years though his two sons are described as young men in the next chapter. And now Eli had another child to take into his care. He knew his sons were wicked and perhaps he saw in Samuel God’s answer to his problem for he was no doubt ashamed of his sons but what could he do? Or what should he do? He had tried to correct them but they took no notice and so here Eli trusted that this child would become great in Israel “and he worshipped the Lord.” (verse 28).

We would no doubt wish to digress here and consider Hannah’s beautiful prayer and spend time studying it, but it is not our subject at present and we reluctantly pass over it to chapter 2 verse 12, “Now the sons of Eli were sons of Belial; they knew not the Lord. And the priest’s custom with the people was, that, when any man offered sacrifice, the priests servants came, while the flesh was in seething, with a flesh hook of three teeth in his hand; and he struck it into the pan, or kettle, or caldron, or pot; all that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself. So they did in Shiloh unto all the Israelites that came thither. Also before they burnt the fat, the priest’s servant came, and said to the man that sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest; for he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw. And if any man said unto him, Let them not fail to burn the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth; then he would answer him, Nay; but thou shalt give it me now: and if not I will take it by force. Wherefore the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord: for men abhorred the offering of the Lord.”

As God fearing people such as Elkanah and Hannah came up year by year to offer their sacrifices to the Lord their hearts must have been greatly saddened to see the abuse of their offerings by Hophni and Phinehas. Why did not Eli remove them from office for he knew of their practice and their adulteries, as we read from verse 22: “Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons did unto all Israel; and how they lay with the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And he said unto them, Why do ye such things? for I hear of your evil dealings by all this people. Nay, my sons; for it is no good report that I hear: ye make the Lord’s people to transgress. If one man sin against another, the judge shall judge him: but if a man shall sin against the Lord, who shall entreat for him? Notwithstanding they hearkened not unto the voice of their father, because the Lord would slay them.”

Under the law the punishment for adultery was death. The very law which they, as priests should have upheld by teaching and example. But such was their baseness, and who would stone them to death as the law required? The law was not upheld by the majority of the Israelites and adultery was not uncommon so who would throw the first stone? Someone equally as guilty? And Eli would not go so far as to have his own sons stoned to death but they should not have been left in office for they were not fit to mediate between God and man. But who would take over their duties? Eli was too old and his eyesight was failing. Where were the descendants of Eleazer at this time? Why were they not in office? Perhaps Eli hoped his sons would one day repent and turn back to God. When they first took up office they were not corrupt and perhaps there was still hope for them. After all, look at the ways of Samson; look at his misdeeds, and yet God never completely forsook him, though he had little respect for the Nazarite vow he was under. He was headstrong and wilful. The lust of the eyes, lust of the flesh and the pride of life overruled all his actions, and in the end he suffered severely for his misdeeds, and when he was weakened, blinded and bound in fetters his faith did not fail him. Would Eli's sons have such faith to see them through? If this was Eli's hope it was in vain for Hophni and Phinehas showed by their actions only contempt and not faith.

But God was not pleased with Eli, for by allowing them to stay in office he was condoning their actions. Eli was placing his sons before God and honouring them rather than the Lord, and the terrible punishments foretold in verses 31 to 34: "Behold the days come that I will cut off thine arm, and the arm of thy father's house, that there shall not be an old man in thine house. And thou shalt see an enemy in my habitation, in all the wealth that God shall give Israel: and there shall not be an old man in thine house for ever. And the man of thine, whom I shall not cut off from mine altar, shall be to consume thine eyes, and to grieve thine heart: and all the increase of thine house shall die in the flower of their age. And this shall be a sign unto thee, that shall come upon thy two sons, on Hophni and Phinehas; in one day they shall die both of them."

In chapter three we find the child Samuel a little older now and here we read of his first calling from God, for he was old enough to see things were not as they should be with the worship of the Lord and were not done in accordance with the law, of which he would at this time be receiving instruction from Eli. When the Lord called Samuel He told him, "Behold, I will do a thing in Israel, at the which both the ears of every one that heareth shall tingle. In that day I will perform against Eli all things which I have spoken concerning his house: when I begin, I will also make an end. For I have told him that I will judge his house for ever for the iniquity which he knoweth; because his sons made themselves vile and he restrained them not. And therefore I have sworn unto the house of Eli, that the iniquity of Eli's house shall not be purged with sacrifice nor offering for ever." God saw no remedy other than to destroy Hophni and Phinehas and the punishments on their descendants were terrible; "All the increase of thy house shall die in the flower of their age." We can follow the fortunes, or rather, misfortunes of this family for three more generations, to the murder by King Saul in his later years, of 85 members of this family. The grandchildren and great grandchildren and the great great grandchildren of Eli. Only Abiather escapes and he joins David in hiding. Later, when Solomon becomes King, Abiather is found conspiring with Joab to make Adonijah king in the place of Solomon. For this Joab and Adonijah are slain, and Abiather, though worthy of death, says Solomon, was banished and not put to death because he was a priest. The priesthood was then taken from Abiather and given to Zadok.

By the time Eli was 98 years old the Philistines again assembled an army and attacked Israel. The battle went against Israel who lost some 4,000 of their army and the Elders said "Let us fetch the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us and save us." An unwise decision. Did they feel that they had a right to be saved and that they could demand such help from the Lord? Hophni and Phinehas go with the Ark of the Covenant and Eli was helpless to stop them even if he knew about it. Samuel would certainly have known but, again, there was nothing he could do against the wickedness of those two sons of Eli and his protests would have been ignored. But the Elders were wrong and the Ark of the Covenant was captured by the Philistines. Hophni and Phinehas were killed along with some 30,000 more of Israel. Eli sat trembling by the wayside, unable to see, and could only wait and listen stricken with a fearful foreboding. In chapter 4 and at verse 14 we read, "And when Eli heard the noise of the crying, he said, What meaneth this? And the man came in hastily and told Eli. Now Eli was 98 years old; and his eyes were dim, that he could not see, and the man said unto Eli, I am he that came out of the army, and I fled today out of the army. And he said, What is there done, my son? and the messenger answered and said, Israel is fled before the Philistines, and there also hath been a great slaughter among the people, and thy two sons, Hophni and

Phinehas, are dead, and the Ark of God is taken. And it came to pass, when he made mention of the Ark of God, that he fell from off the seat backward by the side of the gate, and his neck brake, and he died: for he was an old man, and heavy. And he had judged Israel forty years.”

Looking over his life we see Eli must have been a disappointment to God. In his early life he was perhaps full of zeal for which he was chosen to be a judge and priest, but without strength of character the cares and disappointments in his life and the waywardness of others wore away his resolve and determination to do the Lord’s will to the end. In his rebuke of Hannah we seem to glimpse a past energy in his defence of the Sanctuary of God, but sadly, this energy cannot be seen in the rebuke of his own sons for their very serious abuses of their high calling. His sons showed him insolence and he was helpless. He was too easy going for the position he held and showed himself lacking in determination and self-discipline. Nevertheless God allowed him to fulfil 40 years as judge in Israel and we dare not say that had we been in his place we would have done better.

Brother Russell Gregory

Psalm 105 gives A Short History of Israel in its early days...

The Eternal Faithfulness of the LORD

¹ Oh, give thanks to the LORD! Call upon His name; make known His deeds among the peoples! ² Sing to Him, sing psalms to Him; talk of all His wondrous works! ³ Glory in His holy name; let the hearts of those rejoice who seek the LORD! ⁴ Seek the LORD and His strength; seek His face evermore! ⁵ Remember His marvellous works which He has done, His wonders, and the judgments of His mouth, ⁶ O seed of Abraham His servant, you children of Jacob, His chosen ones!

⁷ He is the LORD our God; His judgments are in all the earth. ⁸ He remembers His covenant forever, the word which He commanded, for a thousand generations, ⁹ the covenant which He made with Abraham, and His oath to Isaac, ¹⁰ and confirmed it to Jacob for a statute, to Israel as an everlasting covenant, ¹¹ saying, “To you I will give the land of Canaan as the allotment of your inheritance,” ¹² when they were few in number, indeed very few, and strangers in it.

¹³ When they went from one nation to another, from one kingdom to another people, ¹⁴ He permitted no one to do them wrong; yes, He rebuked kings for their sakes, ¹⁵ saying, “Do not touch My anointed ones, and do My prophets no harm.”

¹⁶ Moreover He called for a famine in the land; He destroyed all the provision of bread. ¹⁷ He sent a man before them—Joseph—who was sold as a slave. ¹⁸ They hurt his feet with fetters, he was laid in irons. ¹⁹ Until the time that his word came to pass, the word of the LORD tested him. ²⁰ The king sent and released him, the ruler of the people let him go free. ²¹ He made him lord of his house, and ruler of all his possessions, ²² to bind his princes at his pleasure, and teach his elders wisdom.

²³ Israel also came into Egypt, and Jacob dwelt in the land of Ham. ²⁴ He increased His people greatly, and made them stronger than their enemies. ²⁵ He turned their heart to hate His people, to deal craftily with his servants.

²⁶ He sent Moses His servant, and Aaron whom He had chosen. ²⁷ They performed His signs among them, and wonders in the land of Ham. ²⁸ He sent darkness, and made it dark; and they did not rebel against His word. ²⁹ He turned their waters into blood, and killed their fish. ³⁰ Their land abounded with frogs, even in the chambers of their kings. ³¹ He spoke, and there came swarms of flies, and lice in all their territory. ³² He gave them hail for rain, and flaming fire in their land. ³³ He struck their vines also, and their fig trees, and splintered the trees of their territory. ³⁴ He spoke, and locusts came, young locusts without number, ³⁵ and ate up all the vegetation in their land, and devoured the fruit of their ground. ³⁶ He also destroyed all the firstborn in their land, the first of all their strength.

³⁷ He also brought them out with silver and gold, and there was none feeble among His tribes. ³⁸ Egypt was glad when they departed, for the fear of them had fallen upon them. ³⁹ He spread a cloud for a covering, and fire to give light in the night. ⁴⁰ The people asked, and He brought quail, and satisfied them with the bread of heaven. ⁴¹ He opened the rock, and water gushed out; it ran in the dry places like a river.

⁴² For He remembered His holy promise, and Abraham His servant. ⁴³ He brought out His people with joy, His chosen ones with gladness. ⁴⁴ He gave them the lands of the Gentiles, and they inherited the labour of the nations, ⁴⁵ that they might observe His statutes and keep His laws. Praise the LORD!