

*Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps, set thine heart  
Toward the highway, even the way which thou wentest (Jer 31:21)*

# THE CHRISTADELPHIAN WAYMARK

**Volume 6**

**Issue 7**

**Devoted to the Defence and Proclamation of the Way of Life  
in Opposition to the Dogmas of Papal and Protestant Christendom**

<i>John The Baptist</i> .....	2
<i>1 Corinthians Chapter 15</i> .....	6
<i>Copyright</i> .....	13
<i>“In the Beginning was The Word”</i> .....	14
<i>“God Manifest in the Flesh” (2)</i> .....	15
<i>A Point of View</i> .....	20
<i>Proverbs Chapter 1</i> .....	24
<i>“Let Your Light Shine Before Men”</i> .....	29
<i>The BASF—it’s Importance and Teaching (Clause XXIX)</i> .....	30



*“I saw, and behold, a white horse; and he that  
sat upon him had a bow; and a crown was  
given unto him: and he went forth conquering,  
and to conquer” (Rev 6:2)*

*“The wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable ...” (Jas 3:17)*  
*“Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3)*

## John the Baptist

The inspired record of Luke chapter 7 recounts our Master's appeal to the people to consider John the baptiser in relation to their expectations:

“what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously apparelled, and live delicately, are in kings' courts” (Lu. 7:25).

Evidently, John did not conform to the people's expectations: He was not a rich man dwelling in a palace – rather, he was a lone voice crying out in the wilderness. The Master continues:

“but what went ye out for to see? A Prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet ... for I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist ...” (Lu. 7:26, 28).

For a time, the people actually did see John as being a prophet: we learn this as it is given as a reason why the chief priests and elders would not openly discount John's claims to be divinely sent: “all hold John as a prophet” (Mat. 21:26). As it is written elsewhere: “he was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light” (Jno. 5:35). But they only followed him “for a season” – as fickle as folk often are, the people soon forgot the message of John, and the One to whom he bore witness (Jno. 1:7), they put to death.

In the example and preaching of John, we find as a consistent principle the way that man was to be brought low, and Yahweh exalted. We see this in the way in which Luke 3 introduces us to John:

“Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip being tetrarch of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came unto John the son of Zecharias *in the wilderness*” (Lu. 3:1-2).

Here we see the greatest men (by human standards) both of the world and of Israel, in all their pomp and array of glory. Yet the Word of God came to none of these. None were accounted worthy to receive divine revelation, that is, none who were “gorgeously apparelled”, dwelling in kings' courts. Rather, the Word came to John, a wearer of camel's hair and a leather girdle, whose diet was locusts and wild honey – far from the delicacies usually favoured by mighty men.

John came in the spirit and power of Elijah (Lu. 1:17), and it would seem that his appearance also was after Elijah's fashion. Of Elijah it was said: “he was a hairy man, and girt with a girdle of leather around his loins” (2 Kings 1:8). And of

John it was written: “the same John had his raiment of camels hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins ...” (Mat. 3:4). In neither of these two men do we see any artificial niceties possessed by those who are great in the sight of men. In neither of these do we behold any pomp and ceremony: but though these were what the populace might have regarded as being “rough” men, they were both men with a mission, and a drive to accomplish the work apportioned to them.

The central theme of John’s message was also to do with man’s glory being brought low. Isaiah chapter 40 introduces us to “the Voice”:

“The Voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of Yahweh, make straight in the desert a highway for our God ... and the glory of Yahweh shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken it. The Voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry? ***All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever***” (Isa. 40: 4-5, 6).

The latter part of this citation is taken up by the Spirit through Peter, who expounds it for us:

“for all flesh is as grass, and all ***the glory of man*** as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: but the Word of the Lord endureth for ever” (1 Pet. 1:24-25).

Notice here, that “*the goodness thereof*” is expounded to be “*the glory*”. The Prophet is describing how that rich men are brought low, and as the flower of grass they shall pass away (cp. Jas. 1:10). Despite the greatness of their position before men, and the transient beauty that they displayed; like all men they es-cended into their long home (Eccl. 12:5): the grave, which has truly been de-scribed as the greatest leveller of mankind.

The prophet declared that though men will fail, “the word of our God shall stand ***for ever***”. So it was, that the emphasis of John’s preaching was concerning this very thing: we are told that he “did no miracle” (Jno. 10:41). Rather, as the Voice, what came through him were words only – divine words nevertheless, but words and not mighty deeds. In this, we again see an allusion to the work of Elijah:

1 Kings chapter 19 recounts how after learning that Jezebel sought his life, Elijah fled into the wilderness, where he presented his complaint before Yahweh. He was then told:

“Go forth, and stand upon the mount before Yahweh. And, behold, Yahweh passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and break in pieces the rocks before Yahweh: but Yahweh was not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; but Yahweh was not in the earthquake: and after the earthquake a fire; but Yahweh was not in the

fire: and after the fire, *a still small voice*. And it was so, when Elijah heard it, that he wrapped his face in his mantle, and went out, and stood in the entering in of the cave. And behold, *there came a voice* unto him, and said, “What doest thou here, Elijah?” (1 Kings 19:11-13).

In these things, Elijah was taught the power of the Word. What would incline the hearts of the people back to the ways of their Fathers was not an earthquake, or fire, or winds (reminiscent of what the people experienced at Sinai following their deliverance from Egypt), but rather the things spoken by the Voice. And in order to receive those things, great diligence is required to listen carefully, as Elijah did before the still small voice. John was that Voice, calling the people to repentance and humility before their God.

### ***TURNING HEARTS***

The prayer of Elijah was:

“Hear me, O Yahweh, Hear me, that this people may know that thou art Yahweh Elohim, and that thou hast *turned their heart back again*” (1 Kings 18:37).

This was again alluded to in the context of John’s ministry:

“Many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, *to turn the hearts* of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord” (Lu. 1:16-17).

Though the fruits of John’s labours are not recorded, we are told that “many” of the people gave ear to the Voice, and repented (turned back) before their God. His purpose was to prepare folk to receive the Lord when he came. It would seem therefore, that through his preaching, many were looking for the Messiah at the appropriate time, when he revealed himself before them all.

By contrast to John who was “the Voice”, his father was made dumb, not being able to speak, because he disbelieved. The Word came to him:

“... behold, *thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak*, until the day that these things shall be performed, because thou believest not my words, which shall be fulfilled in their season” (Lu. 1:20).

Though “glad tidings” was shown to him, Zecharias did not believe the words of the Angel concerning his future son. Verse 18 recounts his response:

“Zacharias said unto the Angel, Whereby shall I know this? For I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years” (Lu. 1:18).

Notice the contrast here with Abraham, the Father of the Faithful:

“... he said, Adonai Yahweh, *whereby shall I know* that I shall inherit it?” (Gen. 15:7)

“... then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, *shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? And shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear*” (Gen. 17:17).

The terms and words are similar, but the difference is that Abraham’s laugh was not one of disbelief, but of joy, being strong in faith. So the Apostle informs us:

“being not weak in faith, *he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah’s womb*: He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief: but was strong in faith, giving glory to God” (Rom. 4:19-20).

### **THE FAITH OF JOHN**

Luke chapter 7 recounts how John sent two of his disciples to Messiah, with the question: “Art thou he that should come? Or look we for another?” (Lu. 7:19). This has puzzled many, for by the voice and descending dove that came when John baptised Messiah, it ought to have been clear who Jesus was. It would seem that the people took this to be a weakness in faith of John’s part, for knowing their thoughts, the Master asks them “what went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A reed shaken with the wind?” The answer is absolutely not! John was no reed being blown backwards and forwards with every wind of doctrine (Eph. 4:14). Rather, as Messiah testified: “among those born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist” (Lu. 7:28). He fulfilled a vital role preparing the ground for Messiah’s work to commence at the appointed time.

John, we are told, came “in the spirit and power of Elijah” (Lu. 1:17), to fulfil a role similar to that when Elijah shall come in person, preparing the way for the Master’s Return. There are those who suggest that John fulfilled the promise of Elijah, and that therefore there is not a future Elijah work. However, John explicitly testified that he was not Elijah “*I am not*” (Jno 1:21).

The prophet Malachi speaks of the future Elijah Mission:

“Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of Yahweh: and he shall turn the heart of the Fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the Fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse” (Mal. 4:4-6).

This is the coming day that we so eagerly desire, the day when the *diaspora* shall be restored to their land and their God. Let us therefore prepare by emulating the work of John the Baptist, by being a voice in the wilderness of the peoples, that some may yet find grace when Messiah comes.

*Christopher Maddocks*

## 1 Corinthians Chapter 15

It is impossible to exaggerate the value of the 15<sup>th</sup> chapter of 1<sup>st</sup> Corinthians. It is not only that it throws a light not otherwise obtainable by us in so full a form on the state to which the resurrection will introduce us, but it supplies a pledge of that resurrection that cannot in the least be weakened by any just method of criticism. It furnishes an absolute demonstration of Christ having risen from the dead so far as evidence can establish such a thing. That evidence can prove things we have not seen is a matter of everyday experience in a thousand matters. How do we know what is going on in the “far East” and on the Nile but by evidence? Have we any doubt that British ironclads and British soldiers are at work in these two fields of action because we have not seen them? How do we know that England conquered India and Canada but by evidence? Our whole knowledge of the past rests on evidence, and it is not any the less certain on that account.

The evidence that Paul furnishes of Christ’s resurrection is far stronger than that on which we believe that Julius Caesar landed on the shores of England B.C. 60. It is the evidence of eye-witnesses living while he wrote, completed by his own evidence, which was also that of an eye-witness.

What led him to introduce it is interesting to consider. It was the state of things among the believers at Corinth. This community had been established by the labours of Paul about sixteen years previously. In the interval, many disorders had risen among them. It must appear natural that it should be so when we consider that the existence of an ecclesia or church among Gentiles

was a new thing—especially when we realise that it was composed of men and women who had been philosophers and idolaters, and whose ideas would be liable to stick to them. Paul had heard of disorders among them—divisions, factions, philosophic contentions, vagaries about marriage, irregularities in the observance of the memorial supper, even hostility to Christ and denial of the resurrection. But the thing that principally stirred him up to write was apparently the receipt of a letter from the leading brethren, who were anxious about the state of things. They had asked his mind specifically on a variety of points, as we gather from the first verse of the 7<sup>th</sup> chapter (“*Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me*”).

It was doubtless an arrangement of the Providence of God that these disorders should be brought under Paul’s notice, for the result was to give all generations of believers afterwards clear guidance on a number of important matters. It may seem strange that such disorders should arise in a community guided by men possessed of the gifts of the Spirit (chapters 12 & 14). But our wonder may cease if we remember that these gifts were subject to the volition of their possessors (1 Cor. 14:32), and that tongues, &c., were for a sign to unbelievers (verse 22), that is, a divine confirmation of the Gospel as furnishing a basis for faith (Heb. 2:4; Mark 16:20). Brethren with wrong ideas on the matters that had arisen would have these gifts as well as brethren with right ideas, so that there would be uncertainty of guidance except by the exercise of that “understanding” which Paul presses so strongly on their attention in

verse 20. Hence the reference by letter to Paul, to whom they were prepared to accord the authority which he claims when he says,

*“The things that I write are the commandments of the lord”*  
(verse 37).

Having disposed of various preliminary matters—faction (1:11; 2:3), philosophy (2:14), fornication (5:1, 11), going to law (6:1-7), the married state (7:1-17), idolatry (8:4), apostolic rights (9:4), the breaking of bread (11:17-34), the use of spiritual gifts (12:7-27), &c., he then addresses himself to the subject of resurrection in the chapter before us. He does not drop right on to it, but makes a skilful detour by way of catching the objectors on their own ground, as it were. This ground was—membership of the Corinthian ecclesia. How had they become members of the Corinthian ecclesia? By Paul’s preaching, for saith he:

*“So we preach, and so ye believed”* (verse 11).

What was this Gospel? He says,

*“I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye received, and wherein ye stand, and by which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory,”* &c.

This was splendid strategy. How could they consistently object to the Gospel that had drawn them out of idolatry and given them their present position? Well, what was it? He does not declare the whole Gospel, but only a particular part. He says nothing about the kingdom, although the Gospel he preached was the Gospel of the Kingdom (Acts 19:8; 20:25; 28:23, 31). He says nothing

about the judgment of the living and the dead at the appearing of Christ, though that he identifies as an element of his Gospel in another place (Rom. 2:16). He says nothing about the promises made to Abraham, though he elsewhere calls them the Gospel (Gal. 3:8). Why not? The reason is plain. He is going to use the Gospel in argument against certain who denied the resurrection: consequently he only reminds them of that part of the Gospel that bore upon that question. This is wise. What man in arguing about any matter would cumber himself with those parts of the subject not in question? So Paul fixes at once on the resurrection part of the Gospel:

*“I delivered unto you first of all (or “among the first things,” which is a more accurate translation of en protois) how that CHRIST DIED for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he ROSE AGAIN.”*

But Paul did more than tell the Corinthians that Christ rose. He reminded them of evidence upon which the fact had been received:

*“He was seen of Cephas (Peter), then of the twelve; after that, he was seen of about 500 brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep; after that, he was seen of James, then of all the apostles.”*

This is in a particular form, what he said at Antioch in Pisidia, as reported in Acts 13:31:

*“He was seen many days of them which came up with him from Gali-*

*lee to Jerusalem, who are his witnesses unto the people.”*

### **BEING SEEN**

But Paul adds greatly to the strength of this testimony when he proceeds, in 1 Cor. 15, to say:

*“Last of all he was **seen of me also**, as one born out of due time.”*

As he exclaims in the 9<sup>th</sup> chapter:

“Have I not SEEN Jesus Christ our Lord?”

Let us consider for a moment the strength of this testimony. First, it is a writing direct from Paul. We may be as certain of this as if we had seen him write it, for it has been in the hands of the Christian community since the very first century, as proved by the concurrent recognition of all writings since, and particularly by the letter of Clement, of Rome, in the first century, to the Corinthians themselves, whom Clement implores to consult Paul’s own letter in support of what he is saying.

A letter recognised without contradiction in the first century as Paul’s letter, must have been Paul’s letter, for it is not possible that any other than Paul’s letter could have obtained such a recognition, especially a letter addressed to a community of many persons like the Corinthian ecclesia, who were so many checks against the circulation of a false letter had such been attempted, and so may guarantees of the genuine when sent abroad.

Secondly, it is the testimony of witnesses at first hand. It is no report of rumour or mere avowal of conviction as to Christ’s resurrection. A man’s

conviction might be no evidence, unless it could be shown the conviction was well founded; but a man telling us what he has seen is a different affair altogether. Paul names the witnesses. By means of this letter, we are in as good a position as regards having evidence of Christ’s resurrection as if we were transported back to the first century and into the presence of the various persons mentioned by Paul:

“He was seen of Cephas (Peter).”

Paul spent over a whole fortnight with Peter (Gal. 1:18), and we may be sure had much conversation on this matter, of such common engrossment to them both.

“Then of the twelve.”

Of this, Paul would hear from Peter and James, whom he met on the same occasion, and also from others casually who would know.

*“After that, he was seen of above 500 brethren at once, of whom **the greater part remain unto this present**, but some are fallen asleep.”*

Here again is a large body of living witnesses, with many of whom Paul as a travelling apostle would have many opportunities of contact.

“After that, he was seen of James.”

Paul saw James at Jerusalem (Gal. 1:19), and therefore would hear from him personally of what he, James had seen, “then of all the apostles,” of which he would also hear from Peter and James.

“Last of all, he was seen of ME ALSO.”

This crowns the pile of testimony—the testimony of **personal witnesses**. Paul does not here tell us when and under what circumstances he saw Christ, but he does elsewhere: in his published speeches (Acts 22 and 26) which are confirmed by the writer of the Acts in his account (chapter 9). These circumstances were such as to afford the utmost guarantee that the occurrence was an actual one and not an affair of hallucination, for it was in the day-light, at noon, and in the presence of neutral witnesses—Paul’s legal escort and officers, who all saw what happened and were thrown to the ground by it; and finally it left physical effects on Paul, for when he rose from the ground he was blind, and had to be led into Damascus by those of whom he had come as the leader. The thing, as Paul said before Agrippa, “was not done in a corner.” It was done in the public eye so far as accessory circumstances were concerned.

Hence, this rehearsal, when logically construed, is absolute proof of Christ’s resurrection. Having laid this impregnable foundation, Paul at once attacks the unbelief in resurrection that had grown up among the Corinthians. He advances with great power:

*“Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?”*

He as much as says, If there is no resurrection in the abstract, of course Christ has not risen; but I have proved that he has risen. Therefore “I have proved you wrong at the start.” And I appeal to my own course of life—well known to you—in support of my contention.

*“To this present hour, we both hunger and thirst, and are naked and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling place . . . and are as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things unto this day (chap. 4:11-13).*

*What advantageth it me all this, if the dead rise not” (15:19, 32).*

*“If Christ be not raised, then is our preaching vain and your faith (for even the objectors believed in their way, estimating Christ as one of the gods) is also vain.”*

*“But now is CHRIST RISEN from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept: for since by man (Adam) came death, by man (Christ) came also the resurrection of the dead.”*

This gives a large and personal bearing to the fact of Christ’s resurrection. It was not merely an extraordinary episode or incident by itself, but an event having a world-wide interest for the race—the establishment of a new hope for the children of death—subject to the conditions disclosed.

*“Every man in his own order: Christ, the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ’s at his coming; then (at) the end when he shall have delivered up the Kingdom to God.” “The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.”*

Having placed the whole subject on this triumphant foundation, he then turns on the Corinthian doubters. “Be not deceived: ‘evil communications corrupt good manners’ (a quotation, this last, from one of their own poets, and there-

fore apposite to them as leaners towards the wisdom of this world).

Awake to righteousness and sin not, for some have not the knowledge of God” (here he suggests that wrong doctrine is sin: that a reception of the truth is righteousness—a sentiment very foreign to the so-called Christianity of our day, which deprecates doctrine as a matter both of uncertainty and insignificance). “I speak this to your shame.” Certainly, it is a disgrace to a man not to know the truth when heaven’s messengers have been here to make it known. It was a shame to the Corinthians, with Paul the apostle within reach, to be so lacking in understanding, and it is a shame to Britons, with Paul’s epistle in their hands, to be similarly lacking.

### THE SEED

“But” (with a compassionate glance at the sincere philosophic difficulties of some of the doubters) “some man will say, How are the dead raised up?” They are buried in the ground; they are dissolved; their substance is absorbed by other organisms, vegetable and animal. How is it possible for a living body having once parted with its life to live again? What is Paul’s answer? First, he reminds them that in the realm of nature, it is a common occurrence for life to come out of death.

“That which thou sowest, is not quickened except it die.”

This is well known. A seed sown in the ground is unproductive if it retain its vitality. It must **die** to germinate and give a new plant. It is what Jesus said:

*“Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground **and die**, it abideth alone” (John 10:24).*

Our hypercritics pounce upon this, and declare it untrue to science. They say if a seed is dead, it will not germinate. True; what then? A dead seed cannot die. Jesus did not mean a dead seed; Paul did not mean a dead seed. They both meant a living seed, and what they said cannot be impugned. If this living seed die not when sown, there will be no sprouting for a new plant. “But even then,” say they, “it but enters on a new form of life.” What? come into the field a new-sprouted grain? Pull up one of those plants by the root: behold the husk of the original seed attached to the root: is that living or dead? Dead undoubtedly, as dead as the most withered leaf you can pick from the roadside.

“Ah, yes, it is dead now,” says our unappeasable friend, “but its life is in the new plant.” Who said it was not? The point is, its life is gone; the seed is dead, and if it had not died, there would have been no new plant. Our friend shakes his head. Come, now, tell us what is death? Give us your definition. It is not a mere transfer of life? Can you destroy life? You know you cannot. You know that all scientific investigation shows that though death is the destruction of the form of life for the time being, whether in plant or animal, insect or human being, the life-principle itself is but given up: it cannot be destroyed (This is not immortality of the creature, you know, but immortality of the Creator, which is a different thing). This being the case, tell me what is the death of a seed? Is it not the transfer of its life, either to the atmosphere or a new organism? Of course it is. Where is your objection, then, about the seed not dying? Dying and transferring life (where the life is wholly transferred) are but different modes of describing the same thing, so that your objection is a mere juggle of words.

Paul does not mean to say that the dead will rise upon the same principle that a seed-grain sprouts a plant, because a dead body does not take with it into the earth any power or organism of self-germination. Resurrection bodies don't grow from corpses in the churchyard or cemetery. What he means to say is this, that if death leading to life is a daily occurrence in the field, there ought to be no philosophic difficulty about the possibility of such a thing in another department, subject to its own peculiar laws, where its operation is proved, as by the resurrection of Christ.

There is force in the argument. A reasonable mind will say that if God can cause a seed to reproduce its kind, He can easily bring about the reproduction of a man who may have died, if He please. It is only a different application of the same power. The first is seen as one of nature's actual ordinances. The second is seen by reason as a thing coming out of facts accomplished and purposes revealed. The "how" will not trouble men who are not fools. We cannot understand the "how" in the sprouting grain, yet we doubt not, because we can see. Why, therefore, should the "how" in the resurrection of dead men trouble us because the process is beyond our ken?

"Ah, but that is not all," says our friend again: "it is not merely the mystery of the process; it is the impossibility of it in view of the scattering of our substance and its absorption in other forms of life and other men." How very clever our friend appears to be, but how truly shallow. Of all forms of shallowness the clever sorts are the most odious—especially when, as in this case, it lifts its sacrilegious hands against manifest truth. This objection to resurrection on the score of the stuff we take

with us into the grave, is really contemptible. Why, my friend, where are your last year's dinners? A pretty heap they would make. Are you less yourself because the stuff that was in you before you got those dinners has got dispersed? The stuff that keeps you going at this moment as you wag your foolish tongue, will be all gone if you live a few years longer; will you be less yourself on that account?

Be wise, and take an honest think. If identity of stuff is so much a matter of indifference during your insignificant life, why do you imagine it becomes so vastly indispensable when it is an affair of making you over again? The thing that is essential to identify is not any particular stuff, but the particular impressions on the brain that constitute our memories. God has those impressions in the storehouse of His infinite memory, and if He choose to write them on a new brain, you will find yourself to be yourself as much as if He hunted creation round to collect the identical atoms that you took with you into the grave. Enough on that.

And now for the Corinthian doubters' further questions:

"With (or to) what body do they come?"

As much as to say, "If they come back with the bodies they have now, they will not be immortal, and how then about everlasting life? And if they come back with another sort of body, they will not be themselves." Paul's answer is as if he had said, "There is no need why the resurrected dead should have the identical flesh of mortal experience. There are various kinds of flesh in the universe, and various kinds of body and glory. God is not beholden

to any particular sort in the rebuilding of His people.

*“The glory of the terrestrial is one, and the glory of the celestial is another.”*”

“Ah yes,” it may be said, “but resurrection is **resurrection**—standing again; and if the dead are to come forth in another order of nature, it loses its character as resurrection.” Paul is ready with the answer: “Yes, if they were to come forth in a new nature; but they are not to do this;

*“We shall be changed, and this mortal shall put on immortality.”*”

Do you not see that is how it is with your grain?

*“You sow, not that body that shall be (ultimately), but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or some other grain, but God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body.”*

When grain has been sown, the body projected above ground at first is not that body that shall be, but a tiny green leaf, out of which slowly comes the stalk, and then the ear—which slowly ripens until it is ready for the sickle. There is a process in the raising of ripe grain from the sown seed.

*“So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown a natural body: it is raised a spiritual body; it is sown in corruption: it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in weakness: it is raised in power; it is sown in dishonour: it is raised in glory.”*

This raising of the dead into glory, power, and incorruption, is no more an instantaneous thing than the raising of sown grain into spring wheat. When the dead re-formed resume life, they are the mortal men and women that toiled through the experience of probation. The process of their perfecting includes their gathering together for a meeting with Christ, their rendering an account to him for judgment, their change (if accepted) into the incorruptible—all together, “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.” Many read the statement “raised a spiritual body, raised in incorruption,” &c., as if there were no judgment, and as if the dead were immortal the moment they emerge from the ground. This comes of a partial reading of the Scriptures, or, in this case, from a defective study of the analogy of sown grain, on which the statements in question are based. Paul is much given to ellipsis in his utterances of truth. He jumps over detail when it is the upshot of a matter he is anxious to bring into view. Thus in this very chapter, in contrasting the two Adams, he appears to leave out of account the whole mortal life of Jesus.

*“The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.”*

No one would know from this if he did not know otherwise, that the Lord Jesus also, in the first stage of his being, was a living soul, of the earth, earthy, as much as Adam. That was only part of the process of his development as the now ever-living and powerful quickening Lord in heaven; and Paul leaves out the process in his desire to show the finished result. So with the resurrection: he leaves out the process and would even appear to assume that there are no rejected ones at the resurrection

“who shall not see life.” He speaks only of the accepted, and only of the upshot of the resurrection in the attainment of glory, power, and immortality.

Thus Paul wholly meets the objections of unbelief with regard to the resurrection. He proves the resurrection of Christ, and by consequence the resurrection by-and-bye of all his people. What a sublime fact is this on which to rest in the midst of all the disappointing mutabilities of this mortal life; and what a consoling prospect to have in the midst of all the clouds and shadows

and heart-breaks of this afflicted life. What greater inducement could we have to that patent conformity to the will of God to which the Gospel invites? What more fitting exhortation than the one with which Paul concludes his whole argument:

*“Wherefore my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.”*

*Robert Roberts, 1898*

---

### **BROTHER ROBERTS WAIVES COPYRIGHT**

“That Brother Roberts waived any copyright to which he may have been legally entitled we have already seen, and it is further evidenced in what he said when informed that someone was infringing his rights in reprinting one of his works. He wrote: “whether or no, it makes very little difference to the Author of *“The Trial”*, who would only be too glad to see any man making a fortune out of *The Trial*” because of the *circulation of momentous truth* it would mean. The latter was what concerned Brother Roberts.

In keeping with that mind, *“The Christadelphian”* has been equally free in the use of other brethren’s labours—in one case for 20 years reprinting thousands of pamphlets without asking the consent of either the Author or his heirs. Hence, in more senses than one, the real *“Christadelphian”* policy has been to ignore vested interests in *Christadelphian* writings, and simply be concerned, like Brother Roberts, in the *circulation of momentous Truth.*”

*FGF, Taken from “The Christadelphian Treasury”*

#### **THE CHRISTADELPHIAN WAYMARK NON-COPYRIGHT NOTICE**

*“All “rights” relinquished. All parts of this publication may be reproduced and transmitted by any means, electronic, digital, or mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. Applications for the copyright owners permission to reproduce any part of this publication should not be addressed to the publisher as permission is not required, reproduction is actively encouraged, and there is no copyright knowingly held on anything produced by The Christadelphian Waymark.”*

## **“In the Beginning was The Word”**

*“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God  
and the Word was God” (Jno. 1:1)*

The above citation forms a very simple statement, yet very few seem to comprehend it. The next verse states:

*“The same was in the beginning with God”.*

So clearly “*the Word,*” or “*Logos*” was, and is, God. They are inseparable, just as our words come from us and are part of us. So the next verse states, “All things were made by him” (Greek ??? Pronoun in masculine, Bro Thomas (Herald 1852, page 47).

*“and without him (God) was not anything made that was made,”*

so in verse 10 He (God) was in the world (dwelling in His Son): “The Father dwelleth *in me*” (Jno. 10:38; 14:10-11). From the time when the Eternal Christ-Spirit which always existed “came down from heaven” in the form of a dove, and dwelt in Jesus, speaking and working through him for 1260 days. John 14:10-11) so he was named “*Immanuel—God with us*” (Mat. 1:23) and “God hath visited his people” (Lu. 7:16). The Eternal Christ spirit was speaking in John 2:19: “destroy this temple and in three days *I* will raise it up” - which he did after Jesus had lain three days and three nights in the tomb of Joseph of Aramathea. Again, in John 6:32: “My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven for the bread of God is *he which cometh down* from heaven, and giveth life unto the world”. The flesh-minded Jews could not understand or receive the idea of him coming down from heaven (v. 41-42) he repeated it in verse 50-51, and also verse 58.

In verse 51, we read:

“if any man eat of this bread, he shall live in the Aion, and the bread *I* wil give is *my flesh*” (see also verses 54-55).

“My flesh” was provided by the Eternal Spirit. “My flesh”, the Spirit’s flesh. Psalm 16:9; 38:3,7; 63:1; 84:2. The flesh, or “body prepared” and produced by “His Only Begotten Son” who he gave as a sacrifice for our sins.

The flesh-minded Jews could not accept or understand it: “how can this man give us his flesh to eat?” to which Jesus responded: “except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” (eternal live = “*to live for the aion*). So Jesus emphasised the absolute necessity of feeding upon the Word which “came down from heaven.” “eat and live” - no eternal life without it, just as Moses had told Israel: “it is your life” (Deut. 32:46-47; and “He is thy life” (Deut. 31:19-20, Col. 3:1-4).

There is another example of the Father speaking through His Beloved Son: John chapter 8, verse 58:

“*verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am*”

Brother Thomas wrote in the Herald 1857, page 46:

“when the dove descended upon him, was the holy spirit of his Father, this was he who said “before Abraham was, I am etc” Jesus was the body or flesh of sin, prepared for Christ” and in Eureka vol. 1, page 124, “he that is risen is the same as he who was before Abraham, and before the crucifixion” etc.

Jesus was also the Mercy Seat from which Yahweh spoke as he did to Moses in the Most Holy - Ex. 25:22; Rom. 3:25; 1Jno 2:2)

*Ted Bailey*

---

## **“God Manifest In the Flesh” (2)**

In our last study of this title, we saw how the idea of God being “Manifest” was to do with *making known* His Character and Purpose. We saw from Psalm 98 and verse 2, that the key elements being revealed are the “*Salvation*” appointed by the Father, and also “*His Righteousness*”. Indeed these two aspects are picked up and brought together by Messiah, who exhorted: “Seek ye first *the kingdom of God* [i.e. salvation], and *His Righteousness*; and all these things shall be added unto you” (Mat. 6:33).

It is an important point to note therefore, that Salvation as appointed by Yahweh is not an end in itself. As we see above, seeking the promised Kingdom is linked with seeking Yahweh’s Righteousness. But by contrast, it is common for religious groups and churches to elevate man, to emphasise the *Self*, and what benefits there may be for man. Thus God is deposed from his High Position in the Heavens, as Ruler over all, to be a benevolent servant to man, doing man’s bidding and bestowing blessings upon anyone who asks.

The Way of salvation revealed in The Word however, is very different. It is true that salvation and all that it involves does include a benefit to man, but that is not an end in itself; it is appointed for a far higher purpose—to show forth Yahweh’s Glory and Righteousness.

Consider the following testimonies:

“Surely his salvation is nigh them that fear him; *that* Glory may dwell in our land” (Psa. 85:9)

“Help us, O God of our salvation, *for the glory of thy name*: and deliver us, and purge away our sins, *for thy name’s sake*” (Psa. 79:9).

A fundamental point is taught in these passages: As we have said, Salvation is for a far higher purpose than to save sinners from death. Rather, it is the means

whereby Glory shall “dwell in the land”, and it is for the “Glory” of the Deity’s “Name”. Bro Thomas wrote of this, in his oft quoted, and equally oft misunderstood words (emphasis ours):

“Men were not ushered into being for the purpose of being saved or lost. **God-manifestation, not human salvation, was the grand purpose of the Eternal Spirit.** The salvation of a multitude is incidental to the manifestation, but it was not the end proposed. The Eternal Spirit intended to enthrone himself on the earth, and, in so doing, to develop a Divine Family from among men, every one of whom shall be spirit because born of the Spirit, and that this family shall be large enough to fill the earth, when perfected, to the entire exclusion of flesh and blood.”

*John Thomas, 1858*

We see then, that an inextricable aspect of “God Manifestation”, is the Father’s Holy Name, with our very salvation being accomplished for His “Name’s Sake”. We need therefore to appreciate the significance of that Name, what it means and how it reflects the Father’s Revealed purpose.

### **THE FATHER’S NAME**

Exodus chapter 3 records Moses’ words to Yahweh, in response to his being instructed to be a captain over Israel’s salvation from the Egyptians:

“Moses said unto God, Behold, When I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, the God of your Father’s hath sent me unto you; and they shall say unto me, **What is his name?** What shall I say unto them?” (Exo. 3:13).

Here then, is a very direct question: “What is his Name”? What is the appellation by which the Deity wishes to be known?

“and God said to Moses: **ehyeh asher ehyeh**, and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, **Ehyeh** hath sent me unto you. And God said moreover, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, **Yahweh**, God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you: **this is my Name Forever**, and this is my memorial **unto all generations**” (Exo. 3:14-15)

The English (AV) version has it thus:

“God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM ... say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you”.

This rendering is most objectionable for reasons which we shall now go on to consider.

## *THE MEANING OF THE NAME*

The Hebrew rendered “I AM” translates the Hebrew (as above) “Ehyeh”. This same word is used in a number of places in Scripture, where present tense is not feasible:

“... and he said, Certainly *I will be with thee*” (Exo. 3:12)

“... *I will be* his Father, and he shall be my son” (2 Sam. 7:14).

In the first citation, the promise is that Yahweh *will be* with Moses in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt.\*

This last citation is of particular importance, as the Spirit translates it into the Greek:

“*I will be* to him a Father, and he shall be my son” (Heb. 1:5)

The Spirit thus sanctions the rendering “*I will be*”, as distinct from “*I am*”.

There is another way in which the meaning of the Deity’s name can be shown. Messiah, as a Son bore his Father’s name as part of his own: *Yah-shua*. *Yah*=*Yahweh*, and *shua*=*salvation*. So, the Spirit translates Messiah’s name as “*he shall save* his people from their sins” (Mat. 1:21). “He shall save” is the Spirit’s rendering of Messiah’s composite name, which by definition therefore translates the Father’s Name as referential of the future: “I will be”.

But the word used in Exodus 3:14: “ehyeh” is different to the name later used in verse 15: “Yahweh” The reason for that is this: “Ehyeh” means “I will be” and is therefore used by the Deity with reference to Himself. Yahweh however, means “he will be”, and is used of his Servants with reference to their Master. When we therefore address the Almighty by his proper name, we do so by using “Yahweh,” and thus give respect to the purpose that Yahweh has Revealed.

## *THE NAME AND THE PURPOSE*

Why does it matter whether or not the Name means “I AM”, or “I Will be”? It is not merely an academic difference, for encapsulated within the Name is the Father’s Purpose. We have already seen that “God Manifestation” is to do with the Revealing of His Salvation, the glory of His Name, and the showing forth of His Righteousness—and these are all things to come. Our Father’s Name is future

---

\* *This is significant in itself: where the Name is revealed here, it is in the context of salvation, as well as the Making Known of the Deity.—CAM*

tense, for it describes His Purpose, which is future. We can understand why the translators had difficulty with the rendering, for to them—and most religious groups—the thing emphasised is the present. Present benefits and rewards; the here and now; salvation also being now (allegedly in heaven). But the glorious Name of Yahweh being expressive of the future just does not accommodate the present desires of men for instant blessing and salvation.

The purpose of the Deity is frequently expressed in various places in Scripture: we shall consider some of them:

“Thus saith Yahweh that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it: he hath established it, he created it not in vain, ***he formed it to be inhabited***: I am Yahweh; and there is none else” (Isa. 45:18).

“For thou hast created all things, and ***for thy pleasure*** they are and were Created” (Rev. 4:11).

“as truly as I live, all the earth ***shall be filled with the glory of Yahweh*** (Num. 14:21)

“... I will be known in the eyes of many nations, ***and they shall know that I am Yahweh***” (Eze. 38:23).

Putting these things together, we find the following points emerge:

- “he formed it to be inhabited” for his pleasure
- The earth, thus inhabited shall be filled with the glory of Yahweh
- This manifestation (making known) shall be before many nations.

It is clear therefore, by drawing a parallel between the earth being filled, or inhabited with an immortal race, and the earth being filled with divine Glory, that it is through many immortal sons that the glorious array of Divine Attributes will be seen throughout the whole earth. Our Father’s very name itself speaks of those future days—infact, those who make up the great company of the Redeemed are said to have “his Father’s Name written in their foreheads” (Rev. 14:1).

### ***THE PRACTICAL OUTWORKING***

As we implied above, the doctrine of God Manifestation is not simply to provide an intellectual exercise (although studying the Scriptures does have the effect of exercising our minds unto godliness – 1 Tim. 4:7). Rather, it motivates us to make our ways Yahweh’s ways. Seeking those things which are above (Col. 3:1), rather than earthly things, we seek to emulate the attributes of Yahweh, that

when His Son comes, there might be found in us something worthy of perpetuation into immortality. The subject is not dry and arid, as some seek to present it as being: rather it powers us to develop a likeness of He Who Will be, living for the kingdom to come, rather than the day at hand. So the Scriptures exhort:

“... Be ye therefore perfect [Gr. Complete] *even as your father in heaven is perfect*” (Mat. 5:48).

“... But as he which hath called you is holy, *so be ye holy* in all manner of conversation” (1 Pet. 1:15)

“... ye should *shew forth the virtues* [Marg.] of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light” (1 Pet. 2:9).

Here is the true Spirit of God-Manifestation. It is to reveal Divine things to those around us, even the qualities and attributes of our Father. As loving children, we ought to seek a paternal likeness in ourselves and each other. What a glorious blessing is to come upon the Redeemed!

“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God ... Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. *And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.*” (1 Jno. 3:1-3).

Chris Maddocks

## ***SPIRITUAL TRANSFORMATION***

*Spiritual transformation MUST be the biggest, most pressing matter in the forefront of our attention all our lives, if we hope for life. Eternal life is well within the reach of any who are WILLING TO PUT FORTH THE REQUIRED LIFE-LONG EFFORT - to make it their foremost and constant concern. Anything less is belittling God and His great promise of love. God earnestly SEEKS men that He may save them. Victory is promised, yea, it is guaranteed "to him that overcometh." Overcometh WHAT? Clearly it is himself, his own flesh, his own lusts, his own natural thoughts and emotions and desires and reactions. We have got to completely change our basic nature from conflict and antagonisms to love and gentleness. This transformation of character is the "overcoming" that is required by God. It is a constant struggle. In many ways the problem becomes more deceptive as we advance in accomplishment in the Truth. Knowledge puffeth up. Achievement creates self confidence (when in reality all good is of God). We can never relax, assuming we HAVE overcome, and the struggle is safely behind us. Greater, more searching tests are always, in the wisdom of God, likely to lie ahead - "Every branch that beareth fruit, he PURGETH it, that it may bring forth MORE fruit" (Jno 15:2)*

Gilbert Growcott

## A Point of View

It is part of the humanistic society in which we sojourn, that all men and women have “human rights” - which includes the “right of conviction” to believe what they will. This, by the very nature of things, involves the notion that men and women who believe different things from ourselves are not “wrong”, just “different”. That we each look at one truth, but from different aspects, or “points of view” - and because we each see different facets to each other and not the overall whole, any apparent discrepancies exist because of our limited “view” not because we are right, and others are wrong (or vice versa).

A popular illustration of this principle is seen in Lillian Quigley’s book *The Blind Men and the Elephant*. She retells the ancient Buddhist fable of six blind men who visit the palace of the Rajah and encounter an elephant for the first time. As each touches the animal with his hands, he announces his discoveries:

“The first blind man put out his hand and touched the side of the elephant. "How smooth! An elephant is like a wall." The second blind man put out his hand and touched the trunk of the elephant. "How round! An elephant is like a snake." The third blind man put out his hand and touched the tusk of the elephant. "How sharp! An elephant is like a spear." The fourth blind man put out his hand and touched the leg of the elephant. "How tall! An elephant is like a tree." The fifth blind man reached out his hand and touched the ear of the elephant. "How wide! An elephant is like a fan." The sixth blind man put out his hand and touched the tail of the elephant. "How thin! An elephant is like a rope."

An argument ensued, each blind man thinking his own perception of the elephant was the correct one. The Rajah, awakened by the commotion, called out from the balcony. "The elephant is a big animal," he said. "Each man touched only one part. You must put all the parts together to find out what an elephant is like."

Enlightened by the Rajah's wisdom, the blind men reached agreement. "Each one of us knows only a part. To find out the whole truth we must put all the parts together."

However attractive the logic of this story may seem to some, it’s flaws when applied to matters of religion are clear:

1. If at best we each only know one part of the Elephant, who can see the whole animal to tell us we are only looking at a part, and not the whole thing?
2. The logic only works in this story if each individual examines his or her part *in isolation from the whole*. Whereas in religious circles, the various parties draw different conclusions regarding *the same parts* of the Elephant. Take for example the Atoning work of Christ: churches teach he died as a substitute for us, whereas Christadelphians teach that he was a representative man. So in this single issue, it is not the case that the

church is validly viewing a different part of the elephant, rather the argument is regarding the particulars of the same part.

2. In the story, each man is assumed to be correct in his understanding of the part he touches - whereas in reality, such correctness is highly questionable - it is by Revelation, not by searching that God is found (Job 11:7).
3. The characters examining the Elephant are solely left to their own devices to determine the truth of the part they examine, and each man is assumed to be correct in his understanding of that part he touches. The facts of the case, however, are that rather than being left to our own abilities to find the Truth about the Deity (Job 11:7), we have been provided with instruction in Scripture. The Bible claim is to be the immutable Word of the Living God, “profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness” (2 Tim. 3:16). So then, the story of a man using his abilities to learn an isolated, single, and small aspect of the truth concerning the Elephant breaks down: a closer analogy would be for men to instead listen to one who has seen all the pieces describe the whole to them.

Several times, the present writer has heard this story of “*The Blind Men and the Elephant*” from the platform, to describe how men come to God with “different points of view,” all equally valid and acceptable. Other times, a similar message is presented, not using this story, but drawing on the same principles as the story is supposed to illustrate. When describing their various opinions on a given matter, it is becoming increasingly common for brethren and sisters to speak of their “point of view”, with opposing ideas being called “a different point of view”. Though the children’s story above may not be always cited, similar principles are brought to bear to teach the same thing.

### ***THE TESTIMONY OF MAN***

One particularly clear example of this mode of thought can be seen from an article entitled: *Thinking About the Atonement* by Nigel Bernard in *The Testimony Magazine* for June 2002. In his article concerning differing opinions on the Atonement, the writer states:

“Just as the children of Israel could approach the brazen serpent on the pole from different angles (Num. 21:7-9), so ***we too can have different perspectives***. Sometimes, instead of “looking unto Jesus” (Heb. 12:2), we look beyond the pole to a brother in the distance ***whose view seems far removed from our own***, but who may be no further away than ourselves from the pole” (Emphasis ours—CAM)

Later in the same article, the writer categorises those who he considers to have such “certain views”:

“(for example, Andrewism, Stricklerism) or particular doctrines (for example, *Alienation theory, Clean Flesh theory*)”.

The problem is immediately apparent: what our earlier brethren classed and opposed as “false doctrine”, Nigel Bernard claims are “certain views,” which are valid even though their “view” is “far removed from our own” perception. Moreover, in his article, the writer categorises those who reject his “view” (by opposing what our earlier brethren regarded as threats to the Truth), as those who make a man “an offender for a word” (Isa. 29:21— but see context). There is a difference between what Nigel Bernard claims, and *The Blind Men and the Elephant*, in that in his comparison the same object is considered as a whole, as opposed to each party comprehending only a part. However, this basic issue is taught by both: that folk can have differing points of view, with none of them being any more invalid or inferior to each other—even though an opposing “view” might be “far removed” from what we personally perceive as being Revealed Truth.

But what saith the Word? Does the Bible support Nigel Bernard’s claim that there are various legitimate and different “views”, or “perspectives” that a man can have?

### ***THE TEACHING OF SCRIPTURE***

The Bible does use the language of Seeing or Not Seeing, in the context of receiving the principles of the Truth. So Messiah spoke of the Pharisees:

“Let them alone: they be ***blind leaders of the blind.*** ***And if the blind lead the blind,*** both shall fall into the ditch” (Mat. 15:140).

Also in Matthew 23, five times Messiah speaks of “the blind”. Again, the inspired Apostle Paul speaks of Israel:

“... ***blindness in part*** is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in” (Rom. 11:25)

Notice the absolute terms employed by the Spirit in each of these places: there are no differing “views” as Nigel Bernard would have us believe. In fact, there is not a single instance in Scripture where alternative “views” are even hinted at. So far as the Bible is concerned, there are only two states: 1) Seeing, 2) Blindness. And by the very nature of things, a blind man cannot see—by definition therefore, he cannot have a “view” on anything!

The Master also speaks of those who can “see”, by contrast to those who shut their eyes at the Truth:

“... this people’s heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and ***their eyes have they closed:*** lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.

But ***blessed are your eyes, for they see:*** and your ears:, for they hear...” (Mat. 13:15-16).

According to Nigel Bernard, it is possible for men to have different “views” on the Atonement—even if they are radically different to each other—and for any to question any one of those “views” is to make a man “an offender for a word”. According to Jesus Christ however, those who close their eyes cannot see a thing. Being “blind” (even when wilfully so), they can have no sight, or “view” at all.

A passage that might be thought to have a bearing on the matter is in Matthew chapter 7:

“... why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye. Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and behold, a beam is in thine own eye. Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.” (Mat. 7:3-5).

This passage is plainly to do with clarity of spiritual vision. However, here, it is not a case of individuals each viewing a different angle of a given thing, which when put together form a complete picture. Rather it is a question of having an overall deficiency of sight—or in other words, an inability to perceive—described by the Master as “blindness” and by the Apostle as “blindness in part” depending on the extent of the deficiency. Both brethren in the parable have a spiritual sight deficiency, no matter what angle they choose for their “viewpoint”.

### CONCLUSIONS

Surrounded by the humanistic philosophies of men, it is difficult for us to keep our garments from being spotted by the flesh (Jude 23). When we see our brother espouse doctrines not taught by Scripture, it is no kindness to him to allege that his belief is simply an alternative “view”, albeit being “far removed from our own.” It is not loving to watch him become blown about by every wind of doctrine, without stepping in at some point, seeking to save him with fear, pulling him out of the fire (Jude 23). In our society, robustness of speech is often decried as being “unloving” “intolerant”, and even “arrogant”. But it is written: “if any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God ...” (1 Pet. 4:11). We must not water down the plain and forthright language of Scripture to make it more palatable to the flesh. Rather, we should bring ourselves to conform to it’s precepts and teaching.

We have no regard for the “views” of those who “speak not according to the word”, (Isa. 8:20) however great they may be in the sight of men, for in scriptural terms, their delusions are not “different viewpoints”, or “perspectives”, but “*damnable heresies*” (2Pet 2:1), and they themselves “*men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith*” (2Tim 3:8). Of such wolves in sheep’s clothing (Mat 7:15), the Master’s Apostle was inspired to write, “*If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*” (Gal 1:9) - with these words we concur, despite their perceived “politically incorrectness” in the sight of the unenlightened. Many would wince at the use of such phrases as these to describe “other Christians,” but the simple fact is that this is the way that Yahweh “views” the situation. And as we have shown, Scripture simply does not accommodate either the story of *The Blind Men and the Elephant*, or the Testimony of Nigel Bernard.

Christopher Maddocks

# Proverbs Chapter 1

The first epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians introduces us to Messiah thus:

“ ... who of God is *made unto us wisdom*, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: that according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord” (1 Cor. 1:30-31).

The citation being made in this passage is from Jeremiah 9:24, the context of which perfectly matches it's exposition in 1 Corinthians 1. The verse immediately preceding the cited words give the exhortation: “Let not the wise man glory *in his wisdom* ...”. This quotation in 1 Corinthians therefore introduces Christ as *the Wisdom of God* to be held in honour, as distinct from the elevation of Man's wisdom, which in the Father's Purpose is brought to nothing (1 Cor. 1:19).

It is commonly recognized that the two themes entwined together in the book of Proverbs are those of Wisdom and Folly. Many verses are brought together to show the virtue of the one, and the shame of the other. “Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom” (Prov. 4:7) is the central exhortation. Our Master, Jesus Christ is “*the word made flesh*” (Jno. 1:14) and is therefore the embodiment of Yahweh's Wisdom - as we have seen from the above, he is “*made unto us wisdom &c.*” Our endeavour in this article is to demonstrate that the things concerning the “Wisdom” of Yahweh revealed in the book of Proverbs, have an application to our Master, as the manifestation and embodiment of that wisdom, knowledge and understanding.

## THE CALL OF WISDOM

Proverbs chapter 1 describes the call of Wisdom:

“Wisdom crieth without: she uttereth her voice in the streets. *She crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the opening of the gates ...*”

And part of wisdom's message is:

“... turn you at my reproof: *behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you*” (Prov. 1:20, 23).

These things find an application to our Master:

“In the last day, that great day of the feast, *Jesus stood and cried*, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But *this spake he of the Spirit*, which they that believe on him should receive) (Jno. 7:37-39).

Here, Jesus, as the embodiment of Wisdom stood in the chief place of concourse, and called out for men to repent. But interestingly, he also makes reference to the Spirit to be bestowed upon those of his day. The Spirit in it's operation, gave verification of the words preached, by providing "signs and wonders" (Heb. 2:4). Those who received not the testimony of the Spirit therefore, brought added reason for their judgment, as we shall proceed to show.

Returning back to Proverbs chapter 1, we find that by contrast to the seekers of Wisdom, men delight in the frivolity of fleshly things:

"How long, ye simple ones, will ye *love* simplicity? And the scorers *delight* in their scorning, and fools *hate* knowledge" (Prov. 1:22)

Here, we have a description which though speaking directly about Israel, also accurately portrays the ways of the flesh as manifested in all ages—including our own. It is not only the case that the "simple" by the nature of their circumstance, have not had the opportunity to hear the wisdom: when it was spoken to them, they refused to hear it. They "hated" knowledge, and instead delighted in their simplicity.

The principles here are highly applicable to our own age. As a rule, men do not receive the things of the spirit of God—and neither can they, for they are spiritually discerned (1 Cor. 2:14). They delight in pleasures, being "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God" (2 Tim. 3:4). They spurn Yahweh's command to repent, and give no regard to the warnings of coming judgment. In our age, a "simple faith" is sometimes said to be all sufficient in Biblical matters - directly opposing our Heavenly Fathers' command to "*study to shew thyself approved unto God*" (2 Tim. 2:15). Rather than to seek the Wisdom that comes from a constant application to the Word, it is increasingly common for those who advocate study to be disparaged as seeking "head knowledge" (as if knowledge could be gained from the use of any other part of the body than the head!), being "academic," and even "showing off". Such is one of many travesties in this generation: seekers of Wisdom are derided, and the "simple" in knowledge are honored. How we long for the situation to be reversed!

The words of Jeremiah come to mind, which are particularly appropriate here:

"the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means; *and my people love to have it so*" (Jer.5:31).

Having what the Apostle calls "itching ears", it seems that men will believe anything but what is the Truth. As a general principle, men hate the Truth as being too restrictive for their liking, and instead seek liberty to indulge the flesh. But Yahweh is not mocked. Though men may preach license and liberty, "they themselves are the servants of corruption" (2 Pet. 2:19), and shall be rewarded according to their deeds.

### ***AN OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT***

Proverbs chapter 1 continues:

“turn you at my reproof: behold, ***I will pour out my Spirit unto you***, I will make known my words unto you. Because I have called, and ye refused, I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded” (Prov. 1:23-24).

We find then, that though an arm of salvation was extended to the people, they refused to take hold of it. Yahweh called, and they refused.

The situation described here is similar to that described in Jeremiah chapter 7, contrasting Israel to the days of Samuel the seer:

“ ... I called you, ***but ye answered not***” (Jer. 7:13)

“... this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice ... ***but they hearkened not***” (Jer. 7:24)

“***yet they hearkened not unto me***, nor inclined their ear, but hardened their neck: they did worse than their fathers. Therefore thou shalt speak all these words unto them, ***but they will not hearken to thee***: but thou shalt also call unto them; ***but they will not answer thee***” (Jer. 7:26-27).

So it was the people refused the spirit of Wisdom that was taught to them. Hebrews 12 also provides a highly relevant exhortation:

“See that ye ***refuse not*** him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven” (Heb. 12:25).

The exhortation therefore, is to give ear to the voice of Wisdom. Though we do not have Holy Spirit guidance and instruction in the same sense as did the 1st Century disciples— though we do not experience the outpouring of that Spirit— we do nevertheless have the complete written Word: a product of the Spirit. And giving due attention to that Word is the only means by which we might receive Divine Wisdom. Israel refused, and though the Holy Spirit was poured out to them at Pentecost, this served only to entrench men in their sins, with a day of judgment to come upon them at unawares.

The chapter continues:

“Ye have ***set at nought*** all my counsel, and would none of my reproof” (Prov. 1:25).

Our Master, as the pre-eminent Voice of Wisdom was similarly rejected by men who sought after their own devices and pleasures. He spoke to his disciples how “that he might suffer many things, and ***be set at nought***” (Mark 9:12) Again, his words were fulfilled: “Herod and his men of war ***set him at nought***, and mocked him, and arrayed him in a gorgeous robe, and sent him again to Pilate” (Lu. 23:11).

There is a significant irony in the terms being used here. Messiah was “set at nought” by men, but in the passage we began at, 1 Corinthians chapter 1, we find that in actual fact those ignorant men who were wise in their own conceits were set at nought by our Father:

“ ... it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and **will bring to nothing** the understanding of the prudent ... God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty” (1 Cor. 1:19, 27).

The wisdom of man being circumvented by the preaching of the cross, the wisdom of the wise was demonstrated to be inferior to the wisdom of Yahweh, to the extent that one will lead to the grave, and the other along the narrow path to the coming Kingdom.

### **HATING KNOWLEDGE**

We already cited Proverbs 1:22, speaking of how the foolish “hate knowledge”. They not only refused to hear it; they *hate* it. The same expression occurs in verse 29:

“for that they **hated knowledge**, and did not choose the fear of Yahweh” (Prov.1:29).

This is the way of the foolish: to scorn, deride, and hate the knowledge of Yahweh’s Revealed Truth. This was the underlying reason for Israel’s destruction. As Hosea prophesied: “my people are destroyed **for lack of knowledge**” (Hos. 4:6) - a characteristic of all men of the flesh since.

A similar principle is seen in the context of the Flood coming upon the earth, as recounted in the Genesis Narrative. Noah is himself described as being “*a preacher of righteousness*” (2 Pet. 2:5). He must, by the very nature of his circumstances, have made reference in his preaching to the coming judgment of the Flood. Yet Messiah tells us that “**they knew not** until the flood came, and took them all away” (Mat. 24:39). How can this be? Men were destroyed through lack of knowledge: “they **knew not**”. They ought to have known, as Noah was preaching to them: the only explanation is that the words uttered fell upon deaf ears: the people did not *want* to know; although they had ears to hear, and eyes to see, both were closed to the things of the Spirit. And this is what Israel were like, in their response (or rather lack of response) to the preaching of the Prophets.

Spurning the call of Wisdom, Israel made themselves ripe for judgment - as Proverbs 1 continues: “I will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction as a whirlwind; when distress and anguish cometh upon you” (Prov. 1:26-27)

Here are the choices set before us in the example of Israel: seek wisdom, and we shall find Life. Spurn wisdom, and our calamity will be well deserved.

*Christopher Maddocks*

## **“Let your Light so Shine before men”**

*“Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven (Mat. 5:16)*

The above citation demonstrate the importance of shining the Light of Revealed Truth to men and women around us. In fact, when we consider the context more carefully, we find that there are two aspects of our shining: to the World, and to those already in the House:

*“Ye are the Light **of the World** ... Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under a bushel, but on a lampstand; and it giveth light unto all that are **in the house**” (Mat. 5:15).*

This latter aspect of light illuminating “the house” reminds us of the manner by which the Lampstand illuminated the House of God in Solomon’s day. Indeed, there are other passages in Scripture which make this direct comparison:

*“do all things without murmurings and disputings: that ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom **ye shine as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life**” (Phil. 2:15-16).*

*“The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden lampstands. The seven stars are the messengers of the seven ecclesias: and **the seven lampstands which thou sawest are the seven ecclesias**” (Rev. 1:20).*

We find then, that our responsibility as recipients of the Light of the Truth, is to allow it to shine within and from us, “holding forth the word of live”, just like the lampstands of the Temple.

When we consider the arrangement of Light in the Temple that Solomon built, we find some highly interesting principles being set forth:

*“ ... and the lampstands of pure gold, **five on the right side, and five on the left**, before the oracle, with the flowers, and the lamps, and the tongs of gold” (1 Kings 7:49).*

Often in expounding the significance of these things, brethren point out that there are ten lampstands, and draw a principle out from the number ten. However, the inspired narrative is careful to specify that there were not ten, but two groups of five: “five on the right side, and five on the left”. Yes, there were ten, but an accurate analysis should be based on the Spirit’s narrative that there were *two groups of five*.

This becomes particularly interesting, when we consider that it is often said that five

is the number of *grace*. Consider that fact with the testimony of the Apostle Paul:

“... being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: by whom also we have access by faith into *this grace wherein we stand*, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God” (Rom. 5:1-2).

Notice the Temple language being used: “the glory of God”, which brings to mind the Glory of God that dwelt in the Most Holy place. But Paul, being guided by the Spirit, speaks of us have “peace with God”, for we have “access by faith”. Here “peace” = “to join together” This matches the High Priest standing in the Holy place before entering in beyond the veil on the Day of Atonement. He is drawing near to Yahweh, with the faith that his offerings will be accepted. And in his position standing before the Vail, he stands in the midst of the lampstands (Rev. 1:13), with five lamps each side of him - or, as the Apostle puts it, “*this grace wherein we stand*”. We find then, that the High Priest stood in such a position of Grace, as he drew near to the Glory of God before him, to make reconciliation and covering for the sins of the people.

There are many important points that emerge from a study of the Day of Atonement, and most expositions draw out principles whereby the High Priest forshadows the work of Messiah. But we need also to draw out the principles by which the People were to occupy their time, as they waited for the return of their High Priest. None other than he were permitted to enter into the Temple; the people and other priests had to patiently wait for his coming. Isaiah 58 describes what the people were to do, and their failure to do it. But the central point to consider is that we, as the people, await the coming of our High Priest—and we must occupy our time with wholesome things, redeeming the time that passes before his coming:

“So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and *unto them that look for him shall he appear* the second time without sin unto salvation”

We who look for Messiah’s appearing, must maintain a constant state of readiness for that day. As another writer expresses it:

“As a thief, as a midnight robber, Christ will steal upon the world. In like manner he will come to many in the brotherhood. But not so to faithful brethren and sisters. To these he will come, not as an unexpected and unwanted intruder, but as a looked for and longed for friend. Their attitude will be one of expectancy, although they may not know the day or hour of the event. What is our attitude in the matter? Are our thoughts fixed on Christ's return? Are we ready and waiting to give him a welcome? Let us not deceive ourselves. It is possible for us to believe that we are the friends of Christ when we are nothing of the kind. The Scriptures foreshadow the bitter humiliation of many who will have been so deluded (Matt. 7:22-23). To avoid such a calamity, let us engage freely in self-examination. Do we keep the commandments? Only those who do are his friends (John 15:14). May his word so motivate us that we may not be put to shame in the approaching day of our Lord's appearing.” (Cited from Logos 1985)

*Christopher Maddocks*

# **The BASF—Its Importance and Teaching**

## **Clause XXIX**

*“That at the close of the thousand years, there will be a general resurrection and judgment, resulting in the final extinction of the wicked, and the immortalization of those who shall have established their title (under the grace of God) to eternal life during the thousand years”*

(Revelation 20:11-15; 1 Corinthians 15:24).

In our previous studies of this section of the Birmingham Amended Statement of Faith (BASF), we have considered various aspects of the coming Kingdom, and it's establishment upon the earth. In this study, we focus more particularly on what will take place at the close of the 1000 years of Messiah's Rule. It is revealed that end of the Millennial age will be marked by a final rebellion of the Flesh against the ways of the Spirit:

“And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them” (Rev 20:7,9).

So it will be, that after 1,000 years of restraint, the bonds of Divine Rule (Ps 2:3) shall be relaxed, and “satan”, the diabolos, or “sin in the flesh”, will be permitted to assert itself once more, in rebellion against the imposed dominion of Christ.

There are those who question how it could be, that after 1,000 years of experiencing the blessings of the Millennial age, that mortals would want to rebel - but such do not take into account the perversity of the human condition. There is, as part of man's physical make up, a law of his being, styled apostolically, “sin”, or “sin that dwelleth in me” (Rom 7:17), which when unrestrained, leads all it's possessors into transgression. And as this principle, or “law”, resident in human flesh (Rom 8:3) can only be removed by death (Rom 6:7, 1Pet 4:1), or transformation to Immortality (Phil 3:21, 1Jno 3:2) it will remain within the mortal populace, albeit under the suppression of Divine Law and it's rigorous enforcement. But once the pressure is released, at the termination of the 1,000 year period of restraint, it will be permitted to exert itself once more, leading it's possessors into rebellion against the immortal rulers.

As Bro Thomas wrote:

“If the apostle felt the workings of “the law of sin” within him, though obedient to “the law of the spirit of life”; need we wonder that the same “law of nature” should gather force in the hearts of nations subdued by

fire and sword to the sovereignty of Israel's King? Man, unrenewed man is essentially ungrateful and rebellious. The whole history of his race attests it. A thousand years of peace and blessedness will fail to bind him, by the bonds of love and a willing fealty, to the glorious and benevolent, yet just and powerful emancipator and enlightener of the world"

*(Elpis Israel, p455).*

So it will be, that the King will permit the Adversary (the diabolos, or Sin) to muster an innumerable company for his army, and march them against "the camp of the saints, and the beloved city" of Jerusalem, in a vain effort to depose the Son of the Most High God, and his brethren, and re-establish a kingdom based upon sinful principles of wickedness.

"But fallacious will be the hopes of the rebel multitude, and dreadful the vengeance to burst upon them. The trembling earth and the blackening heavens warn them of a coming tempest. The dark vapours and thick clouds of the sky, curling in dense and lowering masses, suddenly hiss forth the forked lightening, and the heaven is rent by the deafening roar of the voice of God. Hail, and fire mingle with hail, pour down upon them, and they are destroyed from the face of the land. Thus God will deliver his King; for "fire shall come down from God out of heaven, and shall devour them"

*(Elpis Israel, p456).*

After the final insurrection of Sin's Flesh against the Spirit, the Spirit shall prevail, and the final enemy, even death itself shall be ultimately destroyed. The mortals who lived during the Age of Righteousness, whose names are found written in the book of life (Rev 20:12-15), shall be rewarded with glory and immortality. And "then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death ... then shall the son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all" (1Cor 15:24-26,28).

### ***THE PROPHECY OF DANIEL***

There is an aspect of these events portrayed in Daniel's prophecy, which I would like to consider more fully. Daniel chapter 7 recounts the judgments to come upon the beast-nations:

"I beheld, even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: ***yet their lives were prolonged*** for a season and a time" (Dan. 7:11-12).

Notice these points:

- The Fourth beast is “destroyed”
- However, the other beasts are permitted to exist
- Their lives being prolonged for a season and a time.

Of course, the four beasts of Daniel chapter 7 match the 4 elements of Nebuchadnezzar’s Image as described in Daniel chapter 2. But there is a significant difference in what we are told in each chapter. Although in chapter 2, judgments are also spoken of, they are not the same as chapter 7:

“thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, ***and brake them to pieces.*** Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that ***no place was found for them:*** and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth” (Dan. 2:34-35).

Notice here, the metal nations are all broken to pieces. They were blown away, that “*no place was found for them*”. How does this match the description of Daniel 7, where the same nations are portrayed as being permitted to exist, with their lives “prolonged”? One record teaches they will be utterly destroyed, whereas the other permits their existence, albeit subject to the authority of Christ.

Notice also, that in Daniel 2, the “*iron and clay*” peoples are judged ***twice***, firstly when the stone “breaks to pieces” the iron and clay feet, and then secondly, along with the other nations again being broken to pieces, and blown away, as there is “no place found for them”.

### ***TWO PERIODS OF JUDGMENT***

The answer to the apparent discrepancy seems to lie in the fact that there are fundamentally 2 stages in the judicial establishment of righteousness in the earth, either side of the Master’s Millennial Reign: one at Messiah’s appearing, and the other in response to a confederacy seeking to overthrow the encampment of the saints. Daniel chapter 7 describes how the subject-nations shall exist in the Millennium, whereas Daniel 2 describes both judgments (1000 years apart) in a single verse. At “the end” of the 1000 year reign, the rebellion of man shall be subdued, and all of the earth filled with the glory of Yahweh even as the waters cover the sea.

1 Corinthians chapter 15 as cited in the BASF, describes the work of Messiah during the Millennium, and what shall take place at “the end”:

“Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; *when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power.* For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death” (1 Cor. 15:24-26).

Notice, the kingdom is not delivered up to the Father until “all rule and all authority and power” is put down in subjection to the Divine Will. This is the work of the Millennium: to establish divine rule upon the earth, and suppress the wiles of the flesh. The Millennium stands as a transitional between flesh and spirit, preparing the earth for the ultimate manifestation of Spirit, when the Father shall dwell unveiled with His People.

Bro Robert Roberts wrote thus:

“It will thus be seen that the kingdom of the thousand years is but *a transitional period between the purely animal and purely spiritual ages*. It will blend the elements of both. It will exhibit the perfection of the eternal ages in the Lord Jesus and the saints who will be immortal and incorruptible, and the imperfection of the human age in the mortal population who will constitute the subjects of their rule. Both will co-exist for a thousand years, and will constitute a state of things as superior to the present dispensation as it will be inferior to the glory ages beyond. The kingdom of God will lead us by a bridge of a thousand years from the age of sin and death defection to the age of restoration to the bosom of the Deity, in righteousness and life eternal”.

*(Christendom Astray)*

Revelation chapter 20 describes the second sitting of Messiah’s Judgment-Seat:

“and I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away: and ***there was found no place for them***. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things, which were written in the books, according to their works” (Rev. 10:11-12).

Notice the emboldened phrase - “*There was found no place for them*”. This is a direct quotation from Daniel 2:35, cited earlier, and the Spirit’s application of this phrase to the second judgment further supports our conclusion that Daniel 2 carries us beyond the first set of judgment when Messiah comes, to the completion of those judgments, when there shall be no place found for the things of the Flesh.

In exercising our minds with such things, we ought not do so simply to accrue knowledge, but to obtain Wisdom, and Understanding, that we might know to do Yahweh’s will. In our age, particularly in academic circles, there is the constant effort to be “objective”, and detached in our approach to the Word. But rather, in following after Messiah, as “The Wisdom of God”, we must instead permit the Word to draw us into itself, and we it. Messiah was “the Word Made Flesh”, and although we will never attain to such a thing this side of immortality, nevertheless, it is something we should endeavour to be, that we might become co-possessors of the Kingdom to come.

*Christopher Maddocks*