

Nazarene Fellowship Circular Letter No 152

January 1995

In this Issue:-

Page	1	Editorial	Brother Russell Gregory
Page	1	From your letters	
Page	2	Lord Remember Me When Thou Comest Into Thy Kingdom.”	Brother Phil Parry
Page	6	Thoughts on the Daily Readings - January	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page	7	Correspondence with	Esleigh Feltham
Page	11	Correspondence between	Charles Blanch and Brother Phil Parry
Page	16	Thoughts on the Daily readings - February	Brother Leo Dreifuss
Page	17	Further Extract from “The Temple At The Time Of Christ”	Dr Edersheim

Editorial

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

I wonder how many more New Years we will see before the return of Jesus Christ to establish His reign of righteousness; to the time when we shall experience God’s will being done on the earth “as it is now done in heaven”? It sometimes seems to us, in our impatience, that “all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation” but, how thankful we are that, by the grace of God, having sought, we have found the Gospel message of salvation, for He has given us the knowledge and understanding of His atoning work in and through His beloved Son. So “let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us.”

My Sincere Love to all, your brother in the Master’s service,

Russell Gregory.

From your letters:-

Brother Phil Parry writes:-

“We had a quiet season’s recess. . . and were able to reflect on much of the rubbish expressed by the leaders of the Established churches in regard to the birth of Jesus - for example, “God came down from Heaven and became a defenceless baby” - the Bishop of Stepney. “God sent His Son to the earth (from heaven) etc, etc - the Archbishop of Canterbury. What confusion! This is the incomprehensible doctrine of the Trinity, which makes a mockery of the Abrahamic based promises and The Hope of Israel. It is obvious that the cure must be God’s intervention in religious and world affairs, and we have faith that it will come in His appointed time.”

Brother Leo Dreifuss writes:-

“... another year nearer to the Lord’s return. The signs are very close. Everybody cries “Peace, Peace,” in Ireland, Middle East, Russia, and yet fresh wars are starting all over the globe... but that Japanese earthquake... and the lesson from the earthquake? One moment, and the lives of thousands of people are turned upside down. How unwise it is to make plans not in God’s will; and how wise the advice in James 4:13 - 15, “Go to now, ye that say, Today or to-morrow we will go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain: whereas ye know not what shall be on the morrow. For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away. For that ye ought to say, If the Lord will, we shall live, and do this or that.”

Sister Evelyn Linggood writes:-

“... we enjoy especially Brother Leo’s contributions, and the letters between you and Esleigh Feltham I couldn’t agree more with what you said about the Serpent, in fact, I wrote a short article on the same lines a long time ago. I was surprised to see Brother Phil Parry’s comment (Reference last C.L. page 2, second paragraph) on the Kingdom of God; what Scriptural proof is there that Christ preached of His Atoning work - the evidence is to the contrary. He only divulged it to His twelve disciples and they did not understand Him, Luke 18:31-34. True, it was always there in type and shadow but it remained a “mystery” until after Christ’s death and resurrection when He to the twelve opened unto them the Scriptures concerning Himself, Luke 24:25-27; Colossians 1:24-27. The Atonement is summed up in the words of Paul to the Corinthians, - “Jesus Christ and Him crucified.” If the Atoning work of Christ had been preached before His sacrifice surely John’s baptism would have sufficed. The Kingdom of God is the government of God which will be vested in His Son, and the Saints (His Bride) will be co-rulers with Him in that Kingdom; and restored Israel will doubtless be the head of all other nations that are left after Armageddon. Of course the Temple rituals are abolished for those Hebrews who accept Christ in this age and will yet be abolished for Israel after the Millennium, when God will be all in all. I should have thought enough has been said to establish the fact that a Temple will be built in Jerusalem, to say otherwise is tantamount to a rejection of Scripture - Zechariah 6:12,13, the Lord shall build the Temple or be built at His command.”

Sister Edith Howells writes:-

“... all your work and the writings of all concerned, is much appreciated. I seem to be one of the quiet majority... Why not, perhaps occasionally, re-print some of Ernest Brady’s writings, of the 1960’ & 1970’s? What he wrote is easy to read, he had that gift. I have been looking over some of those old C.L.s to post them over to Tasmania to Grant Pearce. . . He seems so close compared to the rest of the world...”

I send my Fraternal Love to all Brethren and Sisters.”

LORD REMEMBER ME WHEN THOU COMEST INTO THY KINGDOM

What did Jesus say in reply to this request from a dying malefactor who exhibited such remarkable faith while suffering the excruciating pain of crucifixion?

I can only quote the words of Jesus in a way that would harmonize with Scripture knowing that hanging that day on the tree of torture could not in any sense be classed as being in Paradise, or that after death he would come into His Kingdom at His resurrection.

I now quote Jesus as I would understand Him and His authority, “Verily to- day, I say unto thee, thou shall be with me in Paradise.” (Luke 23:43).

This is an authoritative statement which must be qualified. It is qualified by Jesus Himself with the greatest witness available and present, His own Father - see John 5:19 to 23. Now verse 22 reads “For the Father Judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.” We are therefore to honour the Son even as we honour the Father. This is a statement of fact before the death of Christ, not after. Thus Jesus had the authority to judge the malefactor according to his belief and faith. The thief demonstrated the fact of the innocence of Jesus, and of his own confession of guilt and repentance accompanied with the knowledge that despite Jesus submitting to death he would yet come into the Kingdom he had been preaching about during His ministry. This was not repentance without knowledge; the thief must have known more about Jesus than is recorded and he was definitely not a Sadducee, unless he had changed to a belief in the resurrection from the non belief as the Sadducees.

The statement which passes between Pilate and Jesus in John 19 verses 10 & 11, have a very significant importance on the reasons for Christ's death. Pilate said to Him, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?" The answer of Jesus, who could have called on His Father for twelve legions of angels, "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above (a reference no doubt to His Father), therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin."

There can be little doubt that the latter was a reference to Caiaphas whom Jesus at that time considered to be a representative of the prince of this order of things (not of His Kingdom, but of this world). It was entirely wrong for Jesus to have been accused, and things had gone too far, even to the point where Jesus stood before Pilate with the onus on him to make the decision, yet Jesus showed Pilate that God could take away his authority and power if Jesus chose not to die, therefore the greater sin was that of Caiaphas in allowing it to come to that stage.

The Jews and Romans were not therefore instruments of God for the purpose, as falsely taught by some, of condemning sin-in-the-flesh of Jesus. The Jews delivered Him up for envy and Caiaphas accused Him of blasphemy because He said He was the Son of God - another religious element of modern times accuse Him of being a possessor of human-condemned nature which had to be put to death for that reason. This element identifies itself with the greater sin of Caiaphas.

The truth lies in the reading of Isaiah 53, Matthew 20:28, John 10:15 to 18 and if these be not convincing enough, then read Romans 8:30 to 34. Jesus was not therefore delivered up on account of His nature, but as an unblemished sin-offering for all; otherwise we must accuse God of the greater sin. Such would be absurd and blasphemous

At first I had no intention of committing pen to this subject having been warned in the C/L that other subjects deserve mention, to which I agree in their priority.

I had been listening to Classic Radio when two requests came up with the first a choir singing the familiar words from John 3:14 to 17, the one choir sang verse 16 and the second choir verse 17, and it happened that we had read previous to this John 8:28 where Jesus said to the unregenerate Jews, "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he (the Son of God), and that I do nothing of myself; but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Even the Centurion glorified God when he saw what was done, saying, "Certainly this was a righteous man."

I thought as the choir sang verse 17, "For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved;" and wondered where have I read and heard of the very opposite of this - that God sent His Son to condemn the very nature of which the world was constituted, i.e. of one blood all nations for to dwell on the face of the earth? To condemn that very nature in His own Son by inflicted death and so release Sin (or the Devil personified in His physical flesh) thus by dying destroying the Devil or human nature? This is condemnation of nature, not condemnation of sin (i.e. transgression of law).

Let such who hold such doctrine stand in the judgment at the last day with those who accused Jesus, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" It seems to have been in the last hundred odd years the only alternative some could find to justify God allowing the death of a Son who did no sin. The failure being due to false premises based on the teaching and misconception of a man or men, who had ignored the basic teaching of the Scriptures concerning man's nature unchanged from creation like the beasts, all having one breath, all of dust. (Ecclesiastes 3:17-20).

We need only two more references to confirm man's corruptible and limited life span - the first from Genesis chapters 1 and 2, and the second from 1 Corinthians 15 verses 45 to 49. If further proof is needed Genesis 6:6 will give it, "And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." This, a statement about the man, Adam, the Lord God had created and not whom He had modified or changed after he sinned. Don't some people feel clever in their handling of the Bible and pointing to Paul's Epistle to Romans chapter 5 verse 12 as proof that the common death of man and beast came by Adam's sin! When in fact Paul is not talking about that death at all. In actual fact the only death animals suffered on account of Adam's sin was inflicted death by the shedding of blood in order to make

typical atonement until ratified by the blood of the human antitypical Lamb of God on Calvary. Adam did not experience the Death-by-sin but the animal slain did it for him provisionally typifying the death of Jesus incurred by Adam for whom he died as a substitute. God could not pass a sentence upon Adam when it was already in progress from creation unless it be a sentence of inflicted death upon an already corruptible dying creature. Get the basics right and there is no need to add various other properties to an already false conception of the sentence Adam incurred. "Surely die" means inflicted death - the taking away of life, not additives like "defilement by a physical law" or a bias to commit sin and transmit it to posterity, etc., etc. This is the doctrine of "Original Sin" which Jesus condemned. What can we learn then from Jesus' statement in John 8:51? "Verily, verily, I say unto you, if a man keep my sayings, he shall never see death." Was this a trick statement, or was Jesus defining the difference between the natural common death and judicial, inflicted death? It is obvious that He was speaking of judicial death that none who kept His sayings need suffer or taste, for it is written, "He, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man" (Hebrews 2:9). I see no grace of God in suffering a death due to one self, can you? Do we find anywhere in Scripture that a sacrificial lamb's death was of any benefit to it? Of course not. Is it therefore a wise thing to consider what it did or who it benefited? Of course it is. Then be wise, you doubters, and consider what Jesus, the antitypical Lamb has done for you, and despise not the Spirit of Grace by refusing Him as a substitute, not for natural death but the death that came by sin which God passed federally upon all men except One, for by that very exceptional One, righteousness can pass federally upon all who avail themselves of such a Gift. This is the teaching of Jesus and the teaching of Paul who received it of Jesus. (1 Corinthians 15:3).

In this 8th chapter of John Jesus says to the Jews, "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins;" how then could they avoid this position? If, as some maintain, natural death as a result of condemned nature, is the penalty for sin, the position is unavoidable, they die in their sins; but Jesus offered an alternative whereby they could pass from a state of death unto life but not by any physical means, as shown in John 5:24 & 25. To reject such an offer means to die under federal alienation and Sin and also under personal sins as with the Jews to whom Jesus had said, "If I had not come and spoken unto you ye would not have had sin, but now you say, We see, therefore your sin remaineth."

Be warned, if the condemnation is an element of sin in the physical flesh, baptism will not remove it; such a conception confirms what Jesus said, "Ye shall die in your sins." It is inevitable for salvation that the alienated must die now unto Sin, that is, the federal Sin of the world, that God by His infinite wisdom constituted all men under. For what purpose? So that by their faith in One man Jesus Christ He could constitute them under the federal righteousness. (Romans 5).

Herein is the Love of God manifested, not the condemnation of flesh. "God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him mighty be saved." - "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

What is there to believe in Jesus? Primarily, the way back to God from alienation, and as Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me." This should appear strange and absurd to those who say Jesus needed to be redeemed and to die for Himself, but quite understandable when such a view is founded upon a false theory of the meaning of redemption. The false theory being "condemned flesh" and "serpent nature," a theory not taught in the Holy Scripture, but taught without authority by the precepts of men. Men who state that Jesus "shared our death" when in fact we are called upon to share His death, but only in symbol for the purpose of redemption and salvation for us.

We are told that when Moses lifted up the Brazen Serpent so Jesus was lifted up to draw all men to the spectacle of a man of condemned flesh, of serpent nature, to shew the righteousness of God in His condemnation of human nature. Can people of this blasphemous theory identify with the two choirs I heard and the words they sang? Those singers are regarded as aliens because their words sounded too near to the theory of substitution, be that so, but their understanding though probably vague on that subject, was not blasphemous. When I read and consider the chaos and confusion of the various divisions on this problem of the Atoning work of God in Christ, I think how privileged we are as Nazarenes. Australia is struggling in the mire of their own confusion and refusal to accept the death of Christ as a substitute, the natural death penalty being their stumbling block to understanding. The lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness was to draw the sinners unto it to prevent death by sin, not to prevent natural death. It was so in the case of Jesus, "And I, if I

be lifted up will draw all men unto me.” What for? To behold the flesh as obnoxious to God? No! That ye may know that “I am he,” the Lamb of God (not the serpent) “that taketh away the sin of the world,” and “if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.” “When ye have lifted up the Son of man ye shall know that I am he.” Yes, they knew, for the sound of His disciples went throughout all the earth (Romans 10:17 & 18).

So the kingdom is given to Him whose right it is, not by fleshly descent but by birth through the Power and Spirit of God upon Mary, - Heir of God, and of God’s original Kingdom, (see Ezekiel 21:25-27). Genesis 49:10, “Unto him shall the gathering of the people be.” “I will draw all men unto me.”

Brethren and Sisters in Christ, as we have been drawn unto Him, and are prepared to go forth without the camp sharing His reproach (Hebrews 13:12,13 and 11:25,26) with all the reproaches and trials of our faith, may we also rejoice in the words of the choirs who sang them - John 3:16 & 17. Let us have the faith and the confidence like the thief on the tree of torture and pray, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into Thy Kingdom.” Let none of us doubt the reply.

Brother Phil Parry.

THOUGHTS ON THE DAILY READINGS for JANUARY

Another year has just started. We still wait in faith for our Lord’s return. Meanwhile we begin yet again another yearly cycle of our daily readings. We start with the account of the creation in Genesis, to be followed, alas, very soon by the first sin; we start the book of Psalms, and the Gospel according to Matthew.

Looking at the first few chapters of each section we can see a summary of God’s whole scheme of Salvation. We can really say that our readings of the first two days of the year present us with the essentials of the Gospel. First the fall. We read, in Genesis 3:15, of God speaking to the serpent, “...and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” We conclude from this that God must have promised to Adam and Eve a little of His intended plan of Salvation.

Come to think of it this sentence contains quite a bit. The seed of woman was to bruise the serpent’s head. The serpent’s head is not very large, and if man’s foot treads on it, it inflicts a mortal wound on the serpent. So man was to kill the serpent’s seed. The language, of course, is symbolic of the time to come when Christ was to redeem us from bondage to sin and so render the damage done by the serpent in Eden, when putting Eve to the temptation, of no effect. Let me add here that the serpent speaking was real enough; how God caused it to speak we do not know, any more than we know how God caused the ass to speak to Balaam, but what God subsequently said to the serpent clearly pointed forward to the time of Christ.

Just how much of the Gospel God declared to Adam and Eve, again, is not revealed, but He evidently must have introduced the idea of sacrifice to them when He slew an animal, or animals, to clothe them. They will have seen, to their horror, blood being shed and it must have dawned on them that what God had done to the animal was due to them. It must have been a dreadful moment for them. No doubt they learned the hard way that life was in the blood, and that without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins. They no doubt came to realize that God, in His mercy, reprieved them from immediate putting to death, and probably felt not a little relieved that at least they got off this time. They experienced substitution, the animal’s death instead of theirs. Just how much they understood of the then future Saviour giving His own life; how the death of the animal merely pointed forward, in symbol, to the death of Christ and that the blood of animals was not the final redemption for sin; how much of this they understood, we do not know, but it appears from the verse just read that God held out some hope to them of a future reconciliation.

Meanwhile, they were to leave the Garden of Eden to face the world with all its hardships. They had learned a stark lesson about the consequence of disobeying God; but though temporarily reprieved, things

were never to be the same. No longer was God at their beck and call. And what about their conscience? Their experience in Eden was never wiped off their memory. It must have been on their minds for the rest of their lives. As we read in Hebrews 9:8,9, animal sacrifice does not clear the sinner's conscience of sin. That was only to come after Christ's resurrection, when He became our High Priest with power to wipe the slate clean, provided we sincerely repent. We read "The Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest while as the first tabernacle was yet standing, which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience..." But there is also that great consolation we enjoy; no longer are there animal sacrifices. The blood of our Redeemer cleanses us from our sins as long as we do our part. But there is also the stern warning that if we sin wilfully, not in the weakness of the moment, but defiantly, wilfully, there remaineth no more sacrifice. In this case, to use a modern phrase, "we have had it," and must bear the consequences.

We now come to the first chapter of Matthew. There is a time interval of some 4000 years of history from Adam to Christ. But here was the fulfilment of God's promise to Adam. However, little of it was revealed to him, and not to Adam only, but to the many faithful who lived during these thousands of years. It shows, incidentally, how slowly God works from the point of view of our concept of time. We read of Jesus' miraculous birth, and we all have something to be thankful for in that God has given us the understanding of why Jesus had to be born the way He was, and why He only, of all who ever lived, was free to redeem, and the love He has shown by giving His life, His blood, to redeem Adam and all of his posterity who showed faith and kept God's commandments.

After the first sin, Christ's birth, death and resurrection, comes His Kingdom, still future, but as we hope, the not too distant future. And what is more appropriate than the second Psalm where we are told how Christ will subdue the governments of this age and begin His rule from Jerusalem? So the readings of the first two days take us from the fall in Eden to the birth of Christ of the virgin Mary, and on to His reign in the Kingdom.

Another year is before us. The way things are going in the world suggests that the return of our Lord and Master cannot now be long delayed. In fact, the world needs Him. Let us rejoice in this assurance that when we see things around us going from bad to worse we recognize the signs of the times in this. We know there will be tribulation. We may not escape trials, but we also know that for the elects sake, and this includes us if we remain faithful, those days will be shortened, which of course makes His return all the sooner.

I will conclude with Psalm 8, verses 3 and 4, "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; what is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?"

Yes, but we shall be ruling as kings and priests, God willing. Brother Leo Dreifuss.

Further correspondence with Esleigh Feltham:-

Dear Bro. Russell, Re the Sept-Oct Circular Letter, page 7 paragraph 6, last line:

What I wrote was "appearing" not "offering" (which does not make sense); i.e. "without even seeming to condone sin."

Your letter, 28/11/94:-

Page 1. Paras,7,8: Your comments here and elsewhere confirm to me that your whole position is shallow and amoral – too mechanical, unrelated to any moral issue. Jesus did not pay a debt incurred by Adam. Do you believe that if Adam had been immediately killed when he sinned there would have been no further barrier to eternal life? As to the resurrection of Christ, one might meditate on Luke 24:39 and similar

passages. As to the saints, one has to reconcile 1 Corinthians 15:42 with 2 Corinthians 5:10 and Romans 14:10 as best one can.

Re Edersheim: Do (or did) the Jews believe their Messiah would have to die as a sacrifice? The assertion re “substitute” is interesting but needs more evidence.

Page 2, para. 7. Your comment on “superstition” can only refer to the Bible - not to me: I did not write Genesis 3. The record does not say what form the serpent possessed before it was condemned (see Paul, 2 Corinthians 11:3). As to Balaam’s ass, I can only refer you to 2 Peter 2:16. There is no reason why the angel should have spoken the words attributed to the ass.

Page 3, para. 4. Here you reveal your weak, very weak, position. See our para 2 above. It is evident we shall have to leave the matter until a higher Authority takes charge. You are very fortunate (like others in your position) in having the gallery firmly behind you, and having a means by which to address them. Would you care to send me a copy of the C.L., address roll?!

In matters religious people (especially leaders) are largely devoid of self-criticism. What does not accord with their settled views they simply ignore. Upwards of fifty responsible brethren have had the evidence of Christ’s pre-existence, but not a single one has responded,

Sincerely your brother in the hope that the present order of things will soon be abolished and the voice of real Authority made known.

Esleigh Feltham.

In reply I wrote as follows:-

Dear Brother Esleigh, Thank you for your letter of the 9th December.

I’m sorry I miss-read your hand-writing in your letter of the 4th July last. “Appearing” certainly makes better sense than “offering.” (reference C.L.150, page 7, paragraph 6).

I will not be sending you the C.L. Address List. This is confidential and some on the list may not wish me to divulge their names and addresses, I cannot suppose for a moment that you really expected me to send you this list and I am surprised you should ask for it.

You ask if I believe if Adam had been immediately killed there would have been no further barrier to eternal life. You have my answer in the booklet I sent to you, “Why Jesus Christ Chose To Die.” To quote from page 1, “Adam was offered eternal life as a reward for perfect obedience.” Again, this is pointed out in my letter of the 23rd September where I wrote: “Only Jesus Christ had right to eternal life, which He could have lost by disobedience to God’s law. Adam was placed in a similar position...” Therefore, because Adam failed, he could no longer receive the reward for perfect obedience. His sin was the barrier to life.

You ask, “Do or did the Jews believe their Messiah would have to die as a sacrifice?” The Jews were very divided in their beliefs (just as the Churches are today) but I doubt very much whether many Jews would have understood how Redemption would be brought about especially as we read that it was Jesus Christ who “brought life and immortality to light.” (2 Timothy 1:10). The fact remains that sacrifices are necessarily substitutionary or they lose their meaning and value. The Scripture references I have put before you make this abundantly clear and there is no reasonable alternative.

In referring to Luke 24:39; “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” - You seem to think I should have a problem here, but what you suppose my problem to be you do not say and I cannot imagine.

Again in referring to 1 Corinthians 15:42; “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption,” and 2 Corinthians 5:10; “For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that everyone may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether

it be good or bad,” and Romans 14:10; “But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ,” and, in reply, let’s turn to Revelation 20:6 where we have the last information regarding the resurrection and this was given to us by Jesus Christ. Any earlier teaching must therefore agree with it. A careful study of all previous information, such as Matthew 16:27; John 5:28,29; Acts 24:15; Romans 2:5; 1 Corinthians 15; 1 Thessalonians 4; 1 Philippians 3:11, etc., etc., shows there is no contradiction and where some see a problem with regard to the judgment they must look more closely at what the Scriptures teach. Those who are raised to be with Jesus Christ at His return are raised immortal and go before His throne to receive their reward before they commence their reign with Him. This judgment seat is not a court where some are condemned, but a throne at which rewards are given according to how their Master sees fit. In our times, the nearest we have to compare with this, by way of illustration, is to be seen in the Olympic Games where only the winners go before the judges, and they go to receive their reward, either gold, silver or bronze medals. None of the losers are called before the judges as there is nothing for them.

The point regarding Balaam’s ass; Balaam’s ass did not have the capability of human voice let alone human reasoning and apart from miraculous intervention by God the ass could not have spoken or seem to have spoken. Therefore, however or whatever the ass spoke is attributable to God and not the ass which had no choice in the matter. This contrasts sharply with the reasoning of the serpent. Therefore my comment holds firm, and I’m sure Peter, when writing his second letter (chapter 2 verse 1), would have appreciated the same.

You write, “In matters religious people are largely devoid of self-criticism.” This may well apply to the many millions of so called religious people, but surely it does not apply to you and me. I believe that without a great deal of self-criticism, and of self adjustment it is well nigh impossible for anyone to find the truth. We cannot please God unless we make the effort, and this, I am sure, can only come to those who are prepared to make the necessary changes to their behaviour and beliefs as they find greater understanding of the Scriptures. Isaiah 66:2; “To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.” We have for our example the lives of so many such people recorded in the Scriptures.

I find your letter, Esleigh, very sad, because you say my position is weak, shallow and amoral, and yet, in spite of your assertions regarding sin-in-the-flesh and your rejection of Jesus Christ dying in place of Adam, you make no attempt to reason your case from Scripture, and unless you can prove your assertions your own position can be no stronger, no deeper, no more moral than my own.

It is my prayerful purpose to uphold the truth of the Gospel message and in doing so I have put to you many Scriptural facts, such as the references to Muth Temuth, where 10 out of the 11 quotations could not possibly apply to natural death and yet you dismissed this as my opinion where no opinion is involved.

You write, “It is evident we shall have to leave the matter until a higher Authority takes charge.” Very well, if you wish, but first I want to go over the two main points again because I feel it is imperative to our salvation that we have a proper understanding of what Jesus Christ accomplished on our behalf, and this can only come from a correct understanding of events in Eden, which includes the fact that Adam’s flesh was in no way changed to sinful flesh. It is the development of our characters that God is concerned with.

Firstly then, in your letter of the 4th July you say “When Christ of His own free will allowed Himself to be crucified, He was publicly recognizing that the nature He wore had been justly condemned to death.”

The only Scripture available to you supporting your view that Christ had a body of sin is the bad translation of Romans 8:3 which, as I pointed out in my letter of 23rd September, has been misconstrued to say something Paul never wrote and to mean something he never intended. This one verse is used to start the line of argument to show a change in Adam’s nature, and many others are found which appear to give support to it, but of themselves are no proof whatsoever. A correct understanding of Romans 8:3 leaves the rest of the argument without foundation, thus leaving Adam’s nature unchanged and therefore Christ’s nature also unchanged. The nature which Jesus Christ wore was as God made it. Condemning it would show God to be unjust!

Secondly, in your letter of 13th August 94, you say, "I do not agree that Christ paid the penalty imposed on Adam." However, the two booklets I sent to you last March ("The Work of God In Christ" and "Why Jesus Christ Chose To Die") each prove this matter beyond question and the first of the booklets makes mention of Romans 5:7 which proves it conclusively, and to quote from page 3, middle paragraph, "He voluntarily laid down His life even as those who would even dare to die for a good man, and in the fullest sense man for man," for Romans 5:7 reads; "For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die." This cannot be understood in any other way but of Jesus Christ taking our place.

I wish to comment on your point regarding the pre-existence of Jesus Christ.

About 35 years ago I attended lectures at the Birmingham Bible Institute which is a College for those wishing to make a career as a Minister in their chosen Church. It is an interdenominational College but I was the only one there who did not accept the Trinity.

After about six months or so I approached one of the lecturers – a Minister of a small section of the Congregational Church - and asked him if he would mind proving the Doctrine of the Trinity to me from the Bible only, as I had no confidence whatsoever in any other source.

We spent an evening together at his home where he built up in no uncertain way his argument from the Scriptures using just about every book of the Old and New Testaments proving, very convincingly and to his satisfaction, the doctrine of the Trinity.

It was indeed a very convincing and the most conclusive argument supporting the Trinity I have ever heard and having been a Christadelphian for about ten years at the time, I realized that they had never produced any argument to match this Minister's which proved the opposite. This was quite a revelation to me and I viewed Christadelphian arguments from then on with a great deal more scepticism, but the point I wish to make here is that I was, for a time, convinced of, or almost convinced of, the Trinity and this meant, of course, that I was convinced of the pre-existence of Christ in order to accept the Trinity. For many weeks I searched and prayed for answers. They seemed slow in coming. If the Trinity was true then I had not been worshipping God "in truth" as we are required to do. I suppose I must have felt like the woman at the well of Samaria when Jesus said to her, "Ye know not what ye worship."

My knowledge of the Scriptures grew rapidly at this time until I was finally convinced of the falsehood of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and this was on the grounds that it meant Jesus Christ had immortality before he was born to Mary, but I knew Jesus Christ, the second Adam, was placed in the same position as the first Adam, and had He sinned He too, would have lost His reward for perfect obedience. Consider also, that there was no forgiveness available to Jesus Christ; had He sinned He would have perished. If He had immortal life before His crucifixion then He could not perish. Again, He must also have been conscious during His "death", and His resurrection to immortality would have been unnecessary.

However, after His ascension into heaven He was able to say, "I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore" (Revelation 1:18). How hollow His words would sound had He been immortal all the time!

Let us hold fast to sound doctrine that we may be received by Him at His coming.

Sincerely your brother in the glorious Hope of Life Eternal, Russell.

Some months ago Brother Phil Parry was in correspondence with Charles and Joan Blanch in Tasmania and here are some extracts from Charles's letter followed by Brother Phil's reply:-

"Dear Phil and Rene... "You wrote to me previously, about four or five years ago, and I had some photocopies done of some pages on Hebrew grammar re, "He is just and having salvation" - proving that it meant (in the Hebrew) "having salvation himself" - literally it is "saved," but the whole of that part of speech

in Hebrew has relation to “direction toward oneself.” Whatever the verb may be, “killing one’s self, bruising one’s self, taking for one’s self,” etc., - so saving one’s self.

But having started to prepare it, I decided it was more important to preach the gospel to the many contacts we had at that time along the coast who had applied for literature, than to spend time trying to convince you of the errors of Edward Turney’s theory.

I must say I still feel the same way, but I may be able after September to read the matter you have recently sent and reply to it....

With regard to the next section of your letter - being prepared for Christ’s coming etc., I was never brought up to look upon R.Roberts, Dr Thomas., C.C.Walker, W.F.Barling, or A.D.Norris, or any of these as inspired, as you will realise. There are things in the writings of the first three I know I do not entirely agree with. We were brought up to read and study the Word for ourselves, and it was for this reason I looked into the Hebrew and Greek inspired writings for myself. As a result there is still more in the writings of the Nazarene Fellowship with which I totally disagree. I feel your booklets demonstrate more human reasoning, and a reliance on the A.V. translation, which, although good, is biased in its translation in favour of Church of England views on the Trinity, the pre-existence, and substitutional sacrifice.

The A.V. was done under the auspices of the Church of England, and they, like the Catholics, believe Jesus died as a substitute. Nearly all the harlot daughters have retained this teaching. I find it a little amazing that you continually refer to us as retaining the Catholic teaching on original sin. I don’t know whether this is so or not as I do not know the Catholic teaching, but I do believe that the Christadelphian view, that we have a bias toward sin because of Adam’s sin, is soundly based in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. You yourself, on the other hand, have gone back from the Truth to the Catholic teaching on the substitutional aspect of the death of Christ, which to me is not according to Scripture.

My reason for coming to Tasmania was nothing to do with disintegration of society, although we expected it, but because we foresaw from Scripture that Britain would in some way join with Europe to form a sort of U.S. of Europe. As a result the destruction to come upon Europe (the Catholic woman riding the beast) would affect Britain. Britain, as latter day Tyre, we concluded from Isaiah 23, was to suffer with Europe and be desolate for 70 years, at the end of which time she would be restored, and her ships used in the restoration of the Jews.

As far as “Come out of her my people” is concerned, I looked upon that, and I think the others did, as a call to come out of the Territory under the sway of Rome, which we believe Britain will be under European amalgamation. “That ye be not partakers of her sins,” I believe means “that you do not suffer from the things to come upon the woman because of her sins.”

The European Union has taken place, as we believed, although at the time I had no idea it was about to; I had not heard or read anything to indicate that, except in Scripture. Our reason for coming out when we did was because we thought it would become harder to emigrate as time went on...

I am absolutely, thoroughly, and completely convinced that your ideas are wrong. The more I read and compare your literature with Scripture, especially the Greek and Hebrew original, the more convinced I have become.

I will try to pass comments on your booklet when I have time, but at the moment, and until the end of September at least, I can see no possibilities; we have too much to do in the Truth.”

Chas and Joan Blanch.

Brother Phil Parry’s reply:-

Dear Charles and Joan, Thank you for your letter received 10.8.94, but sorry to hear of Joan’s disability and the extra work entailed upon yourself... one of the many trials of faith to face and overcome with God’s help... I have similar trouble... After my collapse in 1982 with a blockage of the spinal artery causing

paralysis of the limbs and especially the fingers so that I had no life in them for a considerable time and could not hold a pen; when this problem ceased I decided that I would use the pen more frequently in the spreading of The Truth which Pilate questioned Jesus about and which He told Pilate was the cause of Him being born into the world, “The Truth shall make you free” said Jesus. But what from, and how, and in what way?

As you should be aware, the whole Christadelphian community has been divided on the true scriptural answer for well over a century, and yet use the terms “The Truth” or “In The Truth” so glibly, and when challenged they maintain a conspiracy of silence because they have no answer without committing their Statement of Faith clauses to be in some cases erroneous and unscriptural.

I have the true evidence before me now of what policies were being pressed for acceptance upon Australian Ecclesias through John Carter’s mission there for unity in co-operation with Cooper, with the result that the same errors were re-worded and dressed up to make the objectionable clauses more acceptable. John Carter deceived the gullible but not Cliff Pryde and several more, so that there is still doctrinal divisions prevailing in Australia and in Britain and the world, under the name Christadelphian. As there is no unity of the faith amongst you, what is this Gospel you say you are preaching when you are not united? Is it confined to the promises of God to Abraham, the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, which people will readily accept, providing the blasphemous teaching of Dr Thomas, R. Roberts, C.C.Walker, W.F.Barling, A.D.Norris and many more as per Christadelphian Statement of Faith Clauses 5 and 12, is omitted and left to the converted to discover at some later date? This was our position at Ellwood and when I began to question the false concept of Hebrews 7:27, - the Angel’s message to Mary, “That Holy Thing born of thee,” – but unclean and unholy to Christadelphians, especially Arthur Latham and also your own sister Ruth to name but two of most of the meeting, the witch-hunt was started by Arthur and I was accused of entertaining the views of the so-called Clean-flesh heretics, whose literature I had never read and of whom I knew nothing. Where then could I have got my views from but the Scriptures? No one wanted to know that; all they were concerned about was that my views (correct as they are) violated the B.A.S.F. and if I continued to express them I would be out of fellowship.

My request to Arthur Latham to be allowed to express to the whole Ecclesia what I believed was turned down with his remark that the arranging Brethren would be a laughing stock if they were not able to judge the matter themselves. As far as I know not even the other A.B.’s were consulted about it, hence his dictatorial attitude that even your own father disapproved of.

It was your father’s love of truth and the proving of all things, that motivated him in lending me Edward Turney’s Lecture “The Sacrifice of Christ,” which confirmed most of what I believed and nowhere did I read that he believed in Clean Flesh, or that he believed Jesus did not come in the same physical flesh of all men, this was a deliberate invention of Robert Roberts to offset the very teaching that he and Dr Thomas first believed when they were said to have revived the Truth of the first century Church of Jesus Christ. It is well known that Thomas and Roberts refused Baptism to a David Handley of Malden on the basis of his belief of the Roman Catholic doctrine of Original Sin as contained in Clause 5 of the B.A.S.F. “the basis now required of the applicants for Baptism in your Ecclesia.

The teaching that Adam’s nature was changed or even defiled is not found in Genesis or any other part of the Bible, and both Dr Thomas and R. Roberts told David Handley that there was no evidence in the Scriptures that this took place when Adam sinned, but that there was a change in Adam’s relationship to God, for by sin he had lost his right to live and his right of sonship by creation. Edward Turney accepted this and was preaching those same views to his Christadelphian brethren in the spirit of humility. Immediately Roberts took the wrong attitude toward him, thinking his own authority was at stake and began teaching the original Apostate views of David Handley; hence the false doctrine in his lecture “The Slain Lamb,” and the resultant false views compiled in the Statement of Faith of changed and defiled flesh with a compulsive bias and tendency to sin put into Adam by the Creator by a miracle, and also causing transmission by the reproductive sexual organs to all posterity.

Thus in 1873 the true value of the meaning of the name Christadelphian was corrupted and degraded by R. Roberts, and even the Lord Jesus included and regarded as no different from Adam – both needing Redemption in his view, a view you are trying to support. How then, if this be true, could Peter accuse the

Jews of killing “The Prince of Life”? And how could Jesus say to His disciples “this is my body which is given for you” and “this is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed for you,” if He were not the antitype of the substitutional sacrifices offered under the law on the Day of Atonement? The animal offered was a substitute for the death of the sinner - not for itself. In the same way Jesus died for Adam and all in his loins but not on account of condemned nature but on account of the sin that entered the world and the death by sin (judicial), not death as a result of created decaying nature of the first man when placed in the Garden of Eden under law. Jesus suffered willingly the death Adam had merited by sin, which was not natural death by decay.

Corruptible nature was Adam’s and that of all other creation, so how can it be said that God changed Adam’s nature after he sinned, to the “level of the beasts that perish” (quoted from “The Visible Hand of God” - R.R.)? Incidentally, it is also from this book that R. Roberts was forced to accept Christ’s death as a Substitute, but not in the way Nazarene’s teach it. The great stumbling block is your conception that the common death experienced by all Creation is the death that passed upon Adam and all men on account of Adam’s sin and therefore if Jesus’ death was a Substitute, we ought not to die and Jesus ought not to have risen. But even the majority of Christendom, including Roman Catholics, hold to your view that we die naturally because of Adam’s sin and that we have, in our nature, a bias to sin which would also affect Jesus, seeing He was the same nature. The Roman Catholics could see the danger here in that a man needing Redemption could not possibly be in a position to die for, or redeem anyone. Hence the Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which, if the true doctrine of Genesis and Romans had been understood in respect of “death by creation” and “death by sin,” it would have been completely unnecessary, including the fact that the teaching that the physical flesh of man is unclean and condemned, is completely false and can only be applied in the legal sense. Edward Turney taught this latter legal sense and only came to the conclusion that natural death common to all the species (animal and human) was not the “Death by Sin,” when he was writing the book “The Two Sons of God,” - a good book and worthy of far more praise than many I can name who contradicted themselves.

Now if you are booked to speak on the subject, “Baptism - is it necessary” or “Why be Baptised?” if you think it is symbolic into the death of Christ, what has His death done for you if you have risen in the same physically-condemned position in which you entered the water with the so-called natural death penalty awaiting you? You cannot kid me that resurrection cancels out this penalty after you have suffered it, especially if you adhere to the Christadelphian view that you rise in the same sin-stricken nature you had when you were immersed.

I know I have tended to wander a little from subject to subject, but I have written my thoughts as they occur to me in the rightly dividing of the word of Truth. You talk of the Nazarene literature as a demonstration of human reasoning, well are we not human? And does not God say, “Come, let us reason together”? How can we reason with God if not on the basis of what He has revealed in His Word? I know a man, an ex-Christadelphian, who left because of the B.A.S.F.’s acknowledgement of the Bible as the inspired word of God but preaching that this and that contained in it were incorrect translations - exactly what you appear to be saying. You then tell me you have studied Hebrew and Greek. Then what do you think of the meaning of “surely die” spoken to Adam, and the same term spoken later in Genesis - 20:7, also 1 Kings 2:37-42, - read also Ezekiel 18:13. This chapter is speaking of a people under God’s covenant who violate His law, the penalty being inflicted death “surely die” - “surely live” the result of doing right - yet the latter of whom God says, “He shall surely live, he shall not die,” does actually die a natural death. So it is evident that the theme of the Hebrew language in this chapter is about inflicted Judicial Death upon people who are already subject by natural inheritance to the death common to creation and are not to blame in any way. It is enlightenment to our alienation and God’s concluding us under Adam’s sin for a special reason, which makes us “constituted sinners” in need of redemption and salvation through the second appointed Federal Head, Jesus, whereby His one sacrifice was operative for all, the blood of bulls and goats being impossible to take away sin.

How can any Christadelphian have the gall to read Hebrews 10 and at the same time believe that body and blood of Jesus to be under condemnation and unable to consecrate the New and Living Way to God? When God demanded the legally clean and unblemished animals for sacrifice is He likely to have offered up His own Son in the very opposite condition? God would have condemned this under the law. How much

more His own Son whom He offered up freely for all? Yet you accept and teach under the name Christadelphian that God offered the unclean and the condemned!

How remarkable! I had just got to this stage of my remarks of this very subject when the phone rang and it was Brian Jones speaking. He had just been reading from the latest Christadelphian Hymn Book, the Hymn number 164, "How few receive with cordial faith... etc., - he asked "Is it correct, we held Him as condemned by heaven?" I answered that as I recalled singing that Hymn, the word was "they" not "we" but the latter "we" would be generally true of Christadelphian teaching, but that the context in Isaiah 53 referred to the Jewish Pharisaic element at the time of Christ's appearance before Caiaphas and Pilate. The Hymn Books in question have been altered; the earlier ones, 1864, read "they" but this later one is dated as produced in 1964 and reads "we" which in effect confirms the Christadelphian view that Christ's nature was condemned, yet contradicts that for our sins only He groaned and bled beneath the accursed load. It being also for Himself - not bearing upon Himself the accursed load (the Sin of the world) Adam's and all in him Federally, but having it in His own flesh and as per Clause 8 - "By dying, abrogated the law of condemnation for Himself and all who should believe and obey him."

I am aware you, Charles, went to Bell's Grammar School and would find it very stupid to think that you could abrogate a law under which you are rightly condemned, by suffering its penalty. If "for himself" was left out of the statement it would be acceptable, but Oh No, the Bogey of "Substitution" would then have to be faced and accepted and this would not do!

Substitution is taught in the whole chapter 53 of Isaiah concerning the Sacrifice of Christ and in it is confirmed the words of Jesus in Matthew 20:28. Also 1 Timothy 2:5.6; and 1 Peter 1:18-21. Was it a living Stone chosen of God and precious that God laid in Zion? Or was it a stone tarnished by indwelling sin chosen by Christadelphians - a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to them that stumble at the Word, - disallowed of you builders because by shedding His contaminated blood? Strong words, but motivated by reason of the Christadelphian false conception of God's begotten Son. One can understand why years ago many Christadelphians rejected these false views concerning Jesus and were victimized for His Name's sake.

You say you may be speaking upon the subject, "Why Be Baptised;" have you considered seriously enough as to why anyone should be Baptised into the death of a condemned man - a man under (as you teach) the same condemnation as Adam? If you believed yourself to be in Adam, why seek to be introduced into a man in the same condition? We are Baptised into Christ's death, not into His resurrection. His disciples were told to remember His death in the words He spoke "This is my body given for you (not myself) and this is my blood of the New Covenant which is shed for you (not myself)" If it had been for Himself, would He not have drank it? But He said, "I will not drink of this fruit of the vine until I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." To the Jews Jesus said, "Your Father's did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead, he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh which I give for the life of the world." John 6, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him." Paul understood this and said, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless, I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Galatians 2:20). Paul was no longer in the flesh but in the Spirit - "The law of sin and death" could not therefore be a physical position but a legal - the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ hath made me free from the law of sin and death said Paul (Romans 8:2). Yet he was still a man of flesh and blood nature. The Christadelphian doctrine of Physical Condemnation is therefore a myth - so I counsel all to be Baptised into the death of a Man who by birth and conduct was free of any condemnation legally and morally, and who, by the Grace of God, tasted death for every man - Hebrews 2:9.

We are only called upon to do this in symbol and no tasting nor suffering is involved or required, only the recognition by faith that Jesus suffered the Just for the unjust, to bring us to God. To live unto God we must die unto sin in the way God has decreed through His Son's death. Without the shedding of blood is no remission of sin. How, in the Genesis account could they have been sons of God unequally yoked with the daughters of men if they had not acquired that title by dying unto sin in the typical sacrifices? They were not born sons of God;

Adam lost that direct relationship and became as adopted son through the sin-covering type God provided, all Adam's posterity required to recognize this. Hence Abel's acceptance and Cain's rejection.

The same conditions apply to us when enlightened to alienation by Adam's sin - John 1:12,13, "As many as received him, to them gave he the right (or privilege) to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." This very fact nullifies your interpretation of Zechariah 9:9 in your stating it meant Jesus needed salvation for Himself. Why should they rejoice greatly if this were the case?

You say you were brought up to study the Bible for yourself and not accept all of man's teaching. Your own father advised me to do the same, yet we finished up with opposing views; you accepting the teaching of R. Roberts and the Apostate Churches, that men have a bias to sin inherited from Adam, resulting in natural death as the penalty. And myself coming to the conclusion by logical reasoning from the Holy Scriptures and through the pastors and teachers appointed by Jesus, that the only thing Jesus needed was a change from the same nature Adam had at Creation to the nature of Angels which God would have given Him were it not that His mission from the Father was to pay Adam's debt of natural life and all whose lives had been in his loins.

It seems the Christadelphian policy to try all means to avoid acceptance of the death of Jesus as Substitution, but will accept His sinless character of righteousness as a substitute for their own sinfulness and failure, thus making His death mere martyrdom. I was never led astray, and I thank God for Albert Blanch, your father, and his advice. Enclosed is a copy of "The Gospel in the Scriptures" stating my views.

May the Lord Bless and Guide you. Our Kind Regards to that end, Phil and Rene.

THOUGHTS ON THE DAILY READINGS for FEBRUARY

As we run through our daily readings year after year, we often associate the time of the year with certain portions of Scripture.

February marks the Exodus from Egypt, and towards the end of the month we come to the happenings concerning the golden calf. When I read through this I always wonder how readily Aaron gave way to the people when he cast this calf; and look at the feebly sounding excuse (Exodus 32:24), "And I said unto them, Whosoever hath any gold, let them break it off. So they gave it me; then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf." That gives the appearance that that calf just came by itself, which, of course is nonsense. What comes out is exactly the shape of the mould, whose maker was Aaron or his workmen. What Aaron said to Moses somehow sounds like a child or a school boy caught after having committed some misdeed and trying to excuse himself. And just consider the speed at which the children of Israel turned to idolatry, so soon after that frightening experience of God's appearing on the mountain.

It seems that part of the trouble was impatience coupled with lack of faith. God had rescued them from the Egyptians at the Red Sea; from Amalek; provided them with Manna; but all this did not give them sufficient faith when anxiety about the whereabouts of Moses set in.

Now not long before, the Israelites had said with one voice, "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." That was when they were afraid of God speaking to them. Now we, like the Israelites at Sinai, have made a promise when we accepted our Lord and were baptised into His Name, dying to sin. Can we say with a clear conscience that we always kept it? None of us turned to idolatry of course, but we all have our faults, none of us lives worthily at all times, of the high calling, and high responsibility we took upon ourselves in that day. And let us consider this: the Israelites were not all that keen to be liberated. True, they were oppressed, but it went on for a long time and they seemed to have got reconciled to it. It appeared they rather preferred it to having to be up-rooted so suddenly they were forced into being liberated when the Egyptians threw them out.

Now the case of our conversion was rather different. We were not forced into it. Our liberation from sin did not come as suddenly as that of the Israelites. Ours was the result of long deliberation and careful thought before we took the step. But after it was taken we, like the Israelites had, and still have our moments of anxieties and worries. Do we always put our problems to God in prayer? Or how often do we try to

persist in our own way and try God's patience with us? Israel committed a grave sin in the golden calf, and but for Moses' intervention would have perished. The One who intervenes on our behalf is Christ, our High Priest, but don't let us forget that there is no commandment which we cannot keep. And we have been shown in God's mercy that there is no such thing as Original Sin, or sin-in-the-flesh, which means we have really no excuse for wrongdoing. After all, sin is sin and it is us who do commit it, and need our High Priest to rescue us. But let us beware not to fall into the error of mistaking God's mercy for slackness. Pharaoh was guilty of this error.

Let us renew and be mindful of our promise on the day of our conversion. Let us at all cost avoid the mistake of the Israelites who completely forsook God at their first moment of anxiety, but let us trust God to guide us to the end of our probation.

Brother Leo Dreifuss.

Further extract from:

THE TEMPLE AT THE TIME OF CHRIST

The Sabbath in the Temple

“The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.” Mark 2:27,28.

The Law not a Burden, but a Gift.

It is a beautifully significant practice of the modern Jews, that, before fulfilling any special observance directed in their Law, they always first bless God for the giving of it. One might almost compare the idea underlying this, and much else of a similar character in the present religious life of Israel, to the good fruits which the soil of Palestine bore even during the Sabbatical years, when it lay untilled. For it is intended to express that the Law is felt not a burden, but a gift of God in which to rejoice. And this holds specially true of the Sabbath in its Divine institution, of which it was distinctly said, “I gave them My Sabbaths, to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I, Jehovah, sanctify them” (Ezekiel 20:12). In the same sense, the Sabbath is called “a delight, the holy of Jehovah, honourable;” (Isaiah 58:13) and the great burden of the Sabbath-Psalm (Psalm 92) is that of joyous thanksgiving unto God.

The term Sabbath (resting), points to the origin and meaning of the weekly festival. The Rabbis hold that it was not intended for the Gentiles, and most of them trace the obligation of its observance only to the legislation on Mount Sinai. Nor is another Rabbinical saying, that “circumcision and the Sabbath preceded the law,” inconsistent with this. For even if the duty of Sabbath-observance had only commenced with the promulgation of the law on Mount Sinai, yet the Sabbath-law itself rested on the original “hallowing” of the seventh day, when God rested from all His works. (Genesis 2:3). But this was not the only rest to which the Sabbath pointed. There was also a rest of redemption, and the Sabbath was expressly connected with the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. “Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.” (Deuteronomy 5:15).

At the close of the work-a-day week, holy rest in the Lord; at the end of the labour and sorrow of Egypt, redemption and rest; and both pointing forward to the better rest (Hebrews 4:9), and ultimately to the eternal Sabbath of completed work, of completed redemption, and completed “hallowing” (Revelation 11) - such was the meaning of the weekly Sabbath. It was this idea of festive rest and sanctification was so closely connected with the weekly festival that the term Sabbath was also applied to the great festivals (as Leviticus 23:15,24,32,39). For a similar reason, the number seven, which was that of the weekly Sabbath (the first seven that had appeared in time), became in Scripture-symbolism the sacred or covenant number.

Later Perversion of the Sabbath

It is necessary to bear all this in remembrance when thinking of what the perverted ingenuity of the Rabbis made the Sabbath at the time of Christ, and probably even more in the generations following. For there is evidence that the Sabbath-law has become stricter than it had been, since, for instance, the practice of taking an ox or an ass out of a pit, to which our Saviour alludes (Luke 14:5) as uncontraverted, would now no longer be lawful, unless, the animal were in actual danger of life; otherwise, it is to receive food and water in the pit. This "actual danger to life," whether to beast or to man (at any rate, to Israelites), determined the only cases in which a breach of the law of Sabbath-observance was allowed. At the outset, indeed, it must be admitted that the whole social Rabbinical legislation on the subject seems to rest on two underlying principles: negatively, the avoidance of all that might become work; and, positively, the doing of all which, in the opinion of the Rabbis, might tend to make the Sabbath "a delight." Hence, not only were fasting and mourning strictly prohibited, but food, dress, and every manner of enjoyment, not incompatible with abstinence from work, were prescribed to render the day pleasurable. "All the days of the week," the Rabbis say, "has God paired, except the Sabbath, which is alone, that it may be wedded to Israel." Israel was to welcome the Sabbath as a bride; its advent as that of a king. But in practice all this terribly degenerated. Readers of the New Testament know how entirely, and even cruelly, the spirit and object of the Sabbath were perverted by the traditions of the elders. But those only who have studied the Jewish law on the subject can form any adequate conception of the state of matters. Not to speak of the folly of attempting to produce joy by prescribed means, nor of the incongruousness of those means, considering the sacred character of the day, the almost numberless directions about avoiding work must have made a due observance of the Sabbath-rest the greatest labour of all. All work was arranged under thirty-nine chief classes, or 'fathers,' each of them having ever so many 'descendants,' or subordinate divisions. Thus, "reaping" was one of the 'father,' or chief classes, and "plucking ears of corn" one of its 'descendants.' So far did this punctiliousness go that it became necessary to devise ingenious means to render the ordinary intercourse of life possible, and to evade the inconvenient strictness of the law which regulated a "Sabbath-day's journey."

The Schools of Shammai and Hillel

The school of Shammai, the sect of the Essenes and strange to say, the Samaritans, were the most stringent in their Sabbath-observance. The school of Shammai held that the duty of Sabbath-rest extended not only to men and to beasts, but even to inanimate objects, so that no process might be commenced on the Friday which would go on of itself during the Sabbath, such as laying out flax to dry, or putting wool into dye. The school of Hillel excluded inanimate things from the Sabbath rest, and also allowed work to be given on a Friday to Gentiles, irrespective of the question whether they could complete it before the Sabbath began. Both schools allowed the preparation of the Passover meal on the Sabbath, and also priests, while on their ministry in the Temple, to keep up the fire in the "Beth Moked." But this punctilious enforcement of the Sabbath-rest became occasionally dangerous to the nation. For at one time the Jews would not even defend themselves on the Sabbath against hostile attacks of armies, till the Maccabees laid down the principle, which ever afterwards continued in force, that defensive, though not offensive, warfare was lawful on the holy day. Even as thus modified, the principle involved peril, and during the last siege of Jerusalem it was not uniformly carried out. Nor was it, so far as we can judge from analogy (Joshua 6:15, etc.), sanctioned by Scripture precedent. But this is not the place further to explain either the Scripture or the Rabbinical law of Sabbath-observance, as it affected the individual, the home, and the social life, nor yet to describe the Sabbath-worship in the ancient synagogues of Palestine. We confine our attention to what passed in the Temple itself.

Scripture Rules for the Sabbath

The only directions given in Scripture for the celebration of the Sabbath in the sanctuary are those which enjoin "a holy convocation," or a sacred assembly (Leviticus 23:3); the weekly renewal of the shewbread (Leviticus 24:8; Numbers 4:7); and an additional burnt-offering of the two lambs, with the appropriate meat- and drink-offerings, "beside the continual" (that is, the ordinary daily) "burnt-offering and his drink-offering." (Numbers 28:9,10). But the ancient records of tradition enable us to form a very vivid conception of Sabbath-worship in the Temple at the time of Christ. Formally, the Sabbath commenced at sunset on Friday, the day being reckoned by the Hebrews from sunset to sunset. As no special hour for this

was fixed, it must, of course, have varied not only at different seasons, but in different localities. Thus, the Rabbis mention that the inhabitants of a low-lying city, like Tiberias, commenced the observance of the Sabbath half an hour earlier, while those who lived on an eminence, such as at Sepphoris, continued it half an hour later than their brethren. If the sun was not visible, sunset was to be reckoned from when the fowls went to roost. But long before that the preparations for the Sabbath had commenced. Accordingly, Friday is called by the Rabbis “the eve of the Sabbath,” and in the Gospels “the preparation.” (Mark 15:42;

John 19:31). No fresh business was then undertaken; no journey of any distance commenced; but everything purchased and made ready against the feast, the victuals being placed in a heated oven, and surrounded by dry substance to keep them warm. Early on Friday afternoon, the new “course” of priests, of Levites, and of the “stationary men,” who were to be the representatives of all Israel, arrived in Jerusalem, and having prepared themselves for the festive season, went up to the Temple. The approach of the Sabbath, and then its actual commencement, were announced by threefold blasts from the priests’ trumpets. The first three blasts were drawn when “one-third of the evening sacrifice service was over;” or, as we gather from the decree by which the Emperor Augustus set the Jews free from attendance in courts of law, about the ninth hour, that is, about three p.m. on Friday. This, as we remember, was the hour when Jesus gave up the ghost. (Matthew 27:45; Mark 15:34; Luke 23:44). When the priests for the first time sounded their trumpets, all business was to cease, and every kind of work to be stopped. Next, the Sabbath-lamp, of which even heathen writers knew, was lit, and the festive garments put on. A second time the priests drew a threefold blast, to indicate that the Sabbath had actually begun. But the service of the new “course” of priests had commenced before that. After the Friday evening service, the altar of burnt-offering was cleansed from its stains of blood. Then the outgoing “course” handed over to the incoming the keys of the sanctuary, the holy vessels, and all else of which they had had charge. Next the heads of the “houses” or families of the incoming “course” determined by lot which of the families were to serve on each special day of their week of ministry, and also who were to discharge the various priestly functions on the Sabbath.

The Shewbread

The first of these functions, immediately on the commencement of the Sabbath, was the renewal of the “shewbread.” It had been prepared by the incoming course before the Sabbath itself, and we might almost say, invariably, in one of the chambers of the Temple, though in theory, it was held lawful to prepare it also at Bethphage. For, although it was a principle that “there is no Sabbath in the sanctuary,” yet no work was allowed which might have been done on any other day. Even circumstances, which, like the Temple services, according to the Rabbis, superseded the Sabbath, was deferred by some to the close of the festive day. Hence, also, if Friday, on the afternoon of which the shewbread was ordinarily prepared, fell on a feast day that required Sabbatical rest, the shewbread was prepared on the Thursday afternoon. (This must have been the case on the Thursday of Christ’s betrayal). The Rabbis are at pains to explain the particular care with which it was made and baked, so that in appearance and colour the lower should be exactly the same as the upper part of it.

But this subject is too important to be thus briefly treated. Our term “shewbread” is a translation of that used by Luther (Schaubrod), which, in turn, may have been taken from the Vulgate *panes praepositionis*, the Scriptural name is “Bread of the Face” (Exodus 25:30; 35:13; 39:36); that is, “of the presence of God,” just as the similar expression, “Angel of the Face” means the “Angel of His Presence” (Isaiah 63:9) from its constant presence and disposition in the sanctuary, it is also called “perpetual bread” (Numbers 4:7) and “bread of laying out” (set in order), which latter most nearly corresponds to the term used in the New Testament (Matthew 12:4;

Luke 6:4; Hebrews 9:2). The placing and weekly renewal of the “Bread of the Presence” was evidently among the principle Temple services (2 Chronicles 13:10,11). The “table of shewbread” stood along the northern or most sacred side of the Holy Place, being ranged lengthways of the Temple, as all its furniture was, except the Ark of the Covenant, which stood broadways.

The Table on the Arch of Titus

As described by the Rabbis, and represented on the triumphal Arch of Titus at Rome, the table of shewbread was two cubits (three feet) long, one cubit broad, and one and a half high. It was of pure gold, the

feet being turned out and shaped to represent those of animals, and the legs connected, about the middle, by a golden plate, which was surrounded by a “crown,” or wreath, while another wreath ran round the top of the table. Thus far its form was the same as that made at the first for the tabernacle (Exodus 25:23), which was of shittim-wood, overlaid with gold. The “table” originally provided for the second Temple had been taken away by Antiochus Epiphanes (about 170 B.C.); but another was supplied by the Maccabees. Josephus tells a story about the gift of yet another and moist splendid one by Ptolemy Philadelphus. But as its description does not tally with the delineations on the Arch of Titus, we infer that at the time of Christ the “table” of the Maccabees stood in the Holy Place

The Vessels of the Table

Considerable doubt exists as to the precise meaning of the terms used in Scripture to describe the golden vessels connected with the “table of shewbread.” (Exodus 25:29). The “dishes” are generally regarded as those on which the shewbread was either carried or placed, the “spoons” as destined for the incense, and the “covers,” or rather “flagons,” and the “bowls” for the wine of the drink-offering. On the Arch of Titus there are also two urns. But all this does not prove, in the silence of Scripture, and against the unanimous testimony of tradition, that either flagons, or bowls, or urns were placed on the table of shewbread, nor that drink-offerings were ever brought into the Holy Place. On the other hand, the Rabbis regard the Hebrew terms, rendered “covers” and “bowls,” as referring to hollow golden tubes which were placed between the shewbread so as to allow the air to circulate between them; three of these tubes being always put under each, except the highest, under which there were only two, while the lowest rested on the table itself, or, rather, on a golden dish upon it. Thus they calculate that there were, in all, twenty-eight of these tubes to support the twelve loaves. The ‘tubes’ were drawn out each Friday, and again inserted between the new shewbread each Sunday, since the task of removing and reinserting them was not among those labours which made “void the Sabbath.” Golden dishes, in which the shewbread was carried, and golden lateral plates, further to protect it on the stand, are also mentioned by the Rabbis.

The Shewbread itself

The shewbread was made of the finest wheaten flour that had been passed through eleven sieves. There were twelve of these cakes, according to the number of the tribes of Israel, ranged in two piles, each of six cakes. Each cake was made of two omers of wheat (the omer = about five pints). Between the two rows, not upon them (as according to the Rabbis), two bowls with pure incense were placed, and, according to Egyptian tradition, also salt. The cakes were anointed in the middle with oil, in the form of a cross. As described by Jewish tradition, they were each five handbreadths broad and ten handbreadths long, but turned up at either end, two handbreadths on each side to resemble in outline the Ark of the Covenant. Thus, as each cake, after being turned up, reached six handbreadths and was placed lengthwise on the breadth of the table, it would exactly cover it (the one cubit of the table reckoned at six handbreadths); while, as the two rows of six cakes stood broadwise against each other (2x5 handbreadths), it would leave between them two handbreadths vacant on the length of the table (2 cubits = 12 handbreadths), on which the two bowls with the incense were placed- The preparation of the shewbread seems to have been hereditarily preserved as a secret family tradition in “the house of Garmu,” a family of the Kohathites. (1 Chronicles 9:32). The fresh cakes of shewbread were deposited in a golden dish on the marble table in the porch of the sanctuary, where they remained till the Sabbath actually commenced.

The Mode of Changing

The mode of changing the shewbread may be given in the words of the Mishnah: “Four priests enter (the Holy Place), two carrying, one of the piles (of six shewbread), the other two the two dishes (of incense). Four priests had preceded them - two to take off the two (old) piles of shewbread, and two the two (old) dishes of incense, those who brought in (the bread and incense) stood at the north side (of the table), facing southwards; they who took away at the south side, facing north: these lifted off, and those replaced; the hands of these being right over against the hands of those (so as to lift off and put on exactly at the same moment), as it is written: “Thou shalt set upon the table bread of the Presence before Me alway” The shewbread which had been taken off was then deposited on the golden table in the porch of the sanctuary, the incense burnt on that heap on the altar of burnt-offering from which the coals were taken for the altar of incense, after which the shewbread was distributed among the outgoing and the incoming course of priests.

The incoming priests stood at the north side, the outgoing at the southside, and each course gave to the high-priest half of their portion. The shewbread was eaten during the Sabbath, and in the Temple itself, but only by such priests as were in a state of Levitical purity.

The Symbolism of the Shewbread

The importance of the service which has just been described depended, of course, on its meaning. Ancient symbolism, both Jewish and Christian, regarded "the bread of the Presence" as an emblem of the Messiah, this view is substantially, though not literally, correct. Jehovah, who dwelt in the Most Holy Place between the Cherubim, was the God manifest and worshipped in the Holy Place. There the mediatorial ministry, in the name of, and representing Israel, "laid before" Him the bread of the Presence, kindled the seven-lamped candlestick, and burnt incense on the golden altar, the "bread" "laid before Him" in the northern or most sacred part of the Holy Place was that of His Presence, and meant that the Covenant-people owned "His Presence" as their bread and their life; the candlestick, that He was their Light-giver; while between the table of shewbread and the candlestick burned the incense on the golden altar, to show that life and light are joined together, and come to us in fellowship with God and prayer. For a similar reason, pure incense was placed between the shewbread - for, the life which is in His Presence is one of praise; while the incense was burned before the shewbread was eaten by the priests, to indicate God's acceptance and ratification of Israel's dependence upon Him, as also to betoken praise to God while living upon His Presence. That this "Presence" meant the special manifestation of God, as afterwards fully vouchsafed in Christ, "the Angel of His Presence," it is scarcely necessary to explain at length in this place.

The Courses on the Sabbath

But although the services of the incoming course of priests had begun with the renewal of the shewbread, that of the outgoing had not yet completely ceased. In point of fact, the outgoing course of priests offered the morning sacrifice on the Sabbath, and the incoming the evening sacrifice, both spending the Sabbath in the sanctuary. The inspection of the Temple before the Sabbath morning service differed from that on ordinary days, inasmuch as the Temple itself was lit up, to obviate the necessity of the priests carrying torches on the holy day the altar of burnt-offering was cleansed before the usual hour; but the morning service commenced later, so as to give an opportunity of attending to as many as possible. All appeared in their festive garments, and each carried in his hand some contribution for the religious purposes. It was no doubt from this that the practice was derived of "laying by in store upon the first day of the week," which Paul recommended to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 16:1,2). Similarly, the apostolic practice of partaking the Lord's Supper every Lord's-day may have been in imitation of the priests eating the shewbread every Sabbath. The Sabbath service was in every respect the same as other days, except that at the close of the ordinary morning sacrifice the additional offering of two lambs, with its appropriate meat- and drink-offerings, was brought. (Numbers 28:9,10). When the drink-offering of the ordinary morning sacrifice was poured out, the Levites sang Psalm 42 in three sections, the priests drawing, at the close of each, three blasts from their trumpets, and the people worshipping. At the close of the additional Sabbath sacrifice, when its drink-offering was brought, the Levites sang the "Song of Moses" in Deuteronomy 32. This hymn was divided into six portions, for as many Sabbaths (verses 1-6; 7-12; 13-18; 19-28; 29-39; 40- end). Each portion was sung in three sections with threefold blasts of the priests' trumpets, the people worshipping at each pause. If a Sabbath and a "new moon" fell on the same day, the Sabbath hymn was sung in preference to that for the new moon; if a feast day fell on the Sabbath, the Sabbath sacrifice was offered before that prescribed for the day. At the evening sacrifice on the Sabbath the song of Moses in Exodus 15 was sung.

The Sabbatical Year

Though not strictly connected with the Temple services, it may be desirable briefly to refer to the observance of the Sabbatical year, as it was strictly enforced at the time of Christ. It was otherwise with the year of Jubilee. Strangely, there are traces of the latter during the period before the return from Babylon. (1 Kings 21:3; Isaiah 5:8; 37:30; 61:1-3; Ezekiel 1:1; 7:12; Micah 2:2), while the Sabbatical year seems to have been systematically neglected. Hence Jewish tradition explains, in accordance with 2 Chronicles 36:21, that the seventy years' captivity were intended to make up the neglected Sabbatical years - commencing the calculation, if it be taken literally, from about the accession of King Solomon. But while, after the return from Babylon, the year of jubilee was no longer kept, at least, as a religious ordinance, the Sabbatical year

was most strictly observed, not only by the Jews, Nehemiah 10:31, but also by the Samaritans. Jewish tradition has it, that as it took seven years for the first conquest, and other seven for the proper division of the Holy Land, tithes were for the first time paid fourteen years after the entrance of Israel into Canaan; and the first Sabbatical year fell seven years later, or in the twenty-first year of their possession of Palestine. The Sabbatical law extended only to the soil of Palestine itself, which, however, included certain surrounding districts. The Rabbis add this curious proviso, that it was lawful to use (though not to store or sell) the spontaneous produce of the land throughout the extent originally possessed by Israel, but that even the use of these products was prohibited in such districts as having originally belonged to, were again occupied by Israel after their return from Babylon. But this, as other rules laid down by the Rabbis, had many exceptions.

Scripture References to it

As Divinely enjoined, the soil was to be left uncultivated at the end of every period of six years, beginning, as the Jews argue, after the Passover for the barley, after Pentecost for the wheat, and after the Feast of Tabernacles for all fruit-trees, the Sabbatical year itself commenced, as most of them hold, on New Year's Day, which fell on the new moon of the tenth month, or Tishri. Whatever grew of itself during the year was to belong to the poor (Exodus 23:10,11), which, however, as Leviticus 25:6 shows, did not exclude its use as "meat," only its storage and sale, by the family to which the land belonged. Yet a third Scriptural notice constitutes the Sabbatical year that of "the Lord's release," when no debt might be claimed from an Israelite (Deuteronomy 15:1-6) while a fourth enjoins, that "in the solemnity of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles," the law be read "before all Israel in their hearing" (Deuteronomy 31:10,11).

The "Prosbul"

It has been strangely overlooked that these four ordinances, instead of being separate and distinct, are in reality closely connected. As the assignment of what grew of itself did not exclude the usufruct by the owners, so it also followed of necessity that, in a year when all agricultural labour ceased, debts should not be claimed from an agricultural population. Similarly, it was quite in accordance with the idea of the Sabbath and the Sabbatical year that the law should be publicly read, to indicate that "the rest" was not to be one of idleness, but of meditation on the Word of God (Isaiah 58:13). It will be gathered that in this view the Divine law had not intended the absolute remission of debts, but only their release during the Sabbatical year. Jewish tradition, indeed, holds the opposite; but, by its ordinances, it rendered the law itself void. For as explained by the Rabbis, the release from debt did not include debts for things purchased in a shop, nor judicial fines, nor yet money lent on a pledge. But, as the great Rabbi Hillel found that even these exceptions were not sufficient to insure the loan of money in view of the Sabbatical year, he devised a formula called "Prosbul" (probably 'addition,' from a Greek word to the same effect), by which the rights of a creditor were fully secured. The Prosbul ran thus: "I, A.B., hand to you, the judges of C.D. (a declaration), to the effect that I may claim any debt due to time at whatever me I please."

The Effect of it

This Prosbul, signed by the judges or by witnesses, enabled a creditor to claim money lent even in the Sabbatical year; and though professedly applying only to debts on real property, was so worded as to cover every case. But even this was not all, and the following legal fiction was suggested as highly meritorious to all concerned. The debtor was to offer payment, and the creditor to reply, "I remit;" upon which the debtor was to insist that "nevertheless" the creditor was to accept the repayment. In general, money owing to Jewish proselytes was to be repaid to them but not to their heirs, even though they also had turned Jews, as by becoming a proselyte a man had separated himself from his kin, who therefore were no longer, strictly speaking, his natural heirs. Still, to make payment in such a case was deemed specially meritorious. The Rabbinical evasions of the law, which forbade the use of that which had grown spontaneously on the soil, are not so numerous nor so irrational. It was ruled that part of such products might be laid by in the house, provided sufficient of the same kind were left in the field for cattle and beasts to feed upon. Again, as much land might be tilled as was necessary to make payment of tribute or taxes. The omer (or "wave-sheaf") at the Passover, and the two wave-loaves at Pentecost, were also to be made from the barley and wheat grown that year in the field. Lastly, Rabbinical ordinance fixed the following portions as being "the law" which was to be publicly read in the Temple by the king or the high-priest at the Feast of Tabernacles in the Sabbatical year, viz., Deuteronomy 1:1-6 6:4-8; 11:13-22; 14:22; 15:23; 17:14; 26:12-19; 27; 28. This service

concluded with a benediction, which resembled that of the high-priest on the Day of Atonement, except that it referred not to the remission of sins.

Rabbinical Perversion of the Sabbatical Year

The account just given proves that there was scarcely any Divine ordinance, which the Rabbis, by their traditions, rendered more fully void and converted into “a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear,” than the Sabbath law. On the other hand, the Gospels bring before us Christ more frequently on the Sabbath than on any other festive occasion. It seemed to be His special day for working the work of His Father. On the Sabbath He preached in the synagogues; He taught in the Temple; He healed the sick; He came to the joyous meal with which the Jews were wont to close the day (Luke 14:1). Yet their opposition broke out most fiercely in proportion as He exhibited the true meaning and object of the Sabbath. Never did the antagonism between the spirit and the letter more clearly appear. And if in their worship of the letter they crushed out the spirit of the Sabbath law, we can scarcely wonder that they so overlaid with their ordinances the appointment of the Sabbatical year as well-nigh to extinguish its meaning. That evidently was, that the earth, and all that is upon it, belongeth to the Lord; that the eyes of all wait upon Him, that He may “give them their meat in due season” (Psalm 104:27; 145:15); that the land of Israel was His special possession; that man liveth not by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth from the mouth of the Lord; and that he giveth us our daily bread, so that it is vain to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows (Psalm 127:2). Beyond it all, it pointed to the fact of sin and redemption: the whole creation which “groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now,” waiting for and expecting that blessed Sabbath, when “creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” (Romans 7:21,22). Thus, as the Sabbath itself, so the Sabbatical year pointed forward to the “rest which remaineth to the people of God,” when, contest and labour completed, they sing, “on the other side of the flood,” the song of Moses and of the lamb (Revelation 15:3,4): “Great and marvellous are Thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, thou King of saints. Who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify Thy name? for Thou only art holy: for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; for Thy judgments are made manifest.”

Dr Edersheim

“These words spake Jesus, and lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee: As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him. And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent. I have glorified thee on the earth: I have finished the work which thou gavest me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.”

- John 17:1 to 5