

Questions and Answers

By

Rev. William G. Finlay

First Published by:

The Federation of The Covenant People

P.O. Box 3178

Johannesburg

South Africa

PREFACE

"For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater: So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereunto I sent it" **Isaiah 55:10-11**

CONTENTS

- Page 3 - Introduction
- Page 4 - Were the 'days' of Genesis I literal?
- Page 5 - Were Adam and Eve the first and only human beings created by God?
- Page 6 - Was Cain the son of Adam or Satan?
- Page 9 - Why was God so hard on Cain?
- Page 10 - Was all humanity destroyed in the Flood?
- Page 11 - Where does the black man come from?
- Page 13 - Who were the Egyptians?
- Page 14 - Was Ishmael the father of the Arabs?
- Page 16 - Was Abraham a Jew?
- Page 17 - Are the Promises to Abraham important?
- Page 18 - Joseph's wife - who was she?
- Page 19 - Moses and the Ethiopian woman.
- Page 21 - Was the Law given exclusively to Israel?

Page 23 - **What or Who were the 'strangers' in Israel?**
Page 24 - Are we the 'gentiles' of the Bible?
Page 25 - Are the Turks descended from Esau?
Page 29 - Was the separateness of Israel limited to the Old Testament?
Page 32 - Was there an admixture of tribes in captivity?
Page 35 - Has the Law become redundant?
Page 38 - Has the nation Israel any relevance in the New Testament?

QUESTIONS ASKED.

The Bible is the Word of God written.

- In this day and age when revolution marks the course of mankind, many are asking questions and seeking answers to the various aspects of life. The Bible, held in derision by many, discarded by an even larger majority and a source of bewilderment to others, still provides the answers and this booklet is aimed at elucidating several, certainly not all, of the problems which arise in the context of the National Message of the Bible.
- Brevity will be the keynote of this work for it is felt that any reader will only be convinced when they are intellectually satisfied that the answers given not only conform to logic but have the full Authority of the Word of God. This being so, all scriptures are given in support of the answers and the student is advised to check these for himself. Authorities, other than the Bible, too, are used but these are all accessible to the student in Public Libraries and other book shops.
- Over a long period in time, questions ranging from purely personal matters to the impact of nations upon each other have been sent to the Administrative office of the Federation of the Covenant People and these have been answered personally. However, as the questions asked are becoming patternised by repetition, it has been decided to produce this booklet in the sincere hope that the answers given will provide for a renewed

conviction that God is indeed a God of the living and that in His Sovereignty among living men and women, His Plan and Purpose in answer to the Prayer: 'Thy Kingdom come . . .' continues until finally consummated in the Return of Jesus Christ the Lord as King of kings and Lord of lords.

INTRODUCTION

While it is generally held that humanity has now passed beyond the scope of the Bible, there are still those who find it necessary to advance reasons why the Bible should be discarded. These reasons invariably centre on the so-called contradictions in the narrative as well as the incompatibility of its Directives with modern thought and in consequence of which, so it is averred, its reliability or efficacy as the basis for faith is not only debatable but completely out of court.

In view of this attitude, it is necessary to expose, not the fallibility of the Word of God, but that of the human intellect which presumes to sit in judgment on the Work of the Holy Spirit (II Tim. 3:16). For far too long, upholders of the veracity of the Bible have had to be on the defensive, almost apologising for the existence of the Word of God and being made uncomfortable by the supercilious attitude of the majority whose condescension is all too plain in their patronising attitude to folk whose belief is centred in the Bible. Now is the time to 'contend for the faith once delivered to the saints' (Jude 3) --- now is the time to shatter the grandiose delusions by asking for a justification of the relegation of the Bible to the limbo of irrelevant things.

"Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons, saith the King of Jacob. Let them bring forth and shew us what will happen: let them shew the former things, what they be, that we may consider them, and know the latter end of them; declare us things for to come . . ." (Isa. 41:21-22). Produce your cause - bring your strong reasons . . . The rot in human thinking has been allowed to go too far too long. Today, theory, which is unconfirmed hypothesis, is held and propounded as fact while fact is discounted as theory. This attitude, of course, was foreknown by God Who, through Isaiah the prophet, said: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet

for bitter" (Isa. 5:20). Notwithstanding the above, theory is today propounded as fact and fact as theory. An illustration of this is found in the matter of the Bible and its directive in the context of the subject of integration and miscegenation. Having been brainwashed into believing that the Bible Message, in this context, is completely in favour of universal fraternity, instead of supporting claims to justify their theory, proof is invariably demanded to show where integration and miscegenation is wrong, instead of providing proof, i.e., the 'strong reasons', why integration and miscegenation should be enforced, protagonists of this theory demand evidence to disprove their theory. One should answer such instances by quoting the scripture --- produce your cause, show us where the Bible commends integration or miscegenation --- and it will be found that the theory crumbles to the dust for no supporting evidence will be found.

"Bring forth your strong reasons . . ." It is our contention that the Word of God is true and in this booklet, stimulated by questions which are, in fact, a query concerning our faith, we hope to give a reason for our belief that the Bible is indeed the Word of God written.

QUESTION 1.

Were the 'days' of Genesis 1 literal or figurative?

It is an invariable rule that if a student finds an error on the first page of any textbook, his confidence in what follows is understandably shaken. It is therefore fitting that this question concerning the nature of the 'days' in the first chapter of the Bible be considered first.

In answering this question; one is led to broaden the enquiry for the simple explanation of the word 'day' stimulates further questions concerning precisely what happened on those 'days'.

In the first instance, it will be noted that the Hebrew word Yom is used in Genesis 1 as it is throughout the Old Testament when indicating a period of twenty-four hours duration. In the second instance, it will be found that each of the six 'days' is divided by an 'evening and morning' (verses 5,8,13,19,23 and 31) which makes any interpretation other than the normal twenty-four hour day somewhat ludicrous.

However, as was stated at the outset, such an explanation merely serves to broaden the question for there was an 'evening and a morning' on the first day when, in fact, the sun, around which the earth revolves thus providing the measurement of duration, or time as it is understood, only came into existence on the fourth day (Gen. 1:14-19). The solution to this is relatively simple if one is prepared to investigate the subject with an open mind.

An answer to the problems posed in a study of the first chapter of the Bible is found when one considers the first day and a peculiar statement which is made in the 5th verse. It will be noted that God gave names to light and darkness --- why? An architect or craftsman has no need to give names to any thing created or made ***unless identification of the particular object is imperative to others.*** There was no need that God remind Himself of day and night because He was not affected by this nor were any of the heavenly host. God was communicating names as identifying factors to those to whom 'day' and 'night' had meaning. Thus in giving the names of day and night, ***He was telling man*** the difference between light and darkness. Herein lies a key to understanding the narrative in the first chapter of the Bible.

The six days was the period which God took to reveal or to impart the information concerning His Creation of the world in the dateless past. In order to qualify this statement, attention is drawn to the seventh day, the ***shabbath*** or 'rest' day. "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard? that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, ***fainteth not neither is weary . . .***" (Isa. 40:28) "Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep" (Psa. 121:4). As the Lord, the Creator is neither weary nor requires sleep, one is led to ask the reason for the Sabbath of rest. The answer comes right back from the pages of scripture: the sabbath was made for ***man.***" (Mark 2:27).

No doubt the mind of the student will immediately pass to the Fourth Commandment which states: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy (separate) . . . For in six days the Lord ***made*** heaven and earth . . ." In the first instance it will be noted that the Hebrew word for ***made*** is not the same as ***created*** which is ***bara***. The word ***asah*** from which ***made*** was translated is used extensively throughout the Old Testament and on 1500 occasions is translated 'to do' or 'did'. Thus in

a literal translation, one finds that the Fourth Commandment contains: "For in six days the Lord **did** the heavens and earth". It may be argued that the word 'made' is a permissible translation, in answer to which a few illustrations of the use of the word **asah** are now appended.

Gen. 18:8 “... the calf he had **dressed**
(**asah**).

Gen. 20:9 “... thou hast **done** (**asah**)
deeds unto me.

Gen. 20:10 “... that thou hast **done**
(**asah**) **this thing.**

what the Lord 'did' in six days was to reveal to man what He had done.

As the Sabbath or 'rest' was introduced for man's benefit (Mark2:27), it naturally follows that man must have had something to do with each and every one of the six days which preceded it and not the final day alone. This being so, it is obvious that man was present from the first day --- the evening and morning being a dividing period for man who "goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until evening" (Psa. 104:23). The five succeeding days were marked by the expanding revelation by God of what He had done in the dateless past culminating in the creation of the human family --- male and female.

In the light of all the evidence available and particularly the explanation given above, it may be seen that the Bible has no quarrel with Geology which puts the earth's origin somewhere in the vicinity of three and one-quarter billion years ago. There is no argument either concerning the various 'ages' which mark the process by which the earth was completed. All falls into perspective when it is realised that the record in Genesis 1 --- far from being a running commentary on work then in progress --- was a history being revealed to man over a literal six-day period. The whole narrative, carefully examined, will be seen, not as a stumbling block to faith in the Word of God, but a key to the realisation that at some time in the past, God Created the world and all things in it.

QUESTION 2.

Were Adam and Eve the first and only human beings created by God?

As one reads through the many genealogical tables in the Bible which are given to provide the means whereby the origins of people may be traced, one is immediately struck by the fact that there are certain people whose origins are not given and who are definitely not to be found in the genealogies of those descended from Adam. One illustration of this is to be found in the 'giants' (Gen. 6:4) or, as it is recorded in Hebrew, the nephilim or naphal.

One school of thought has it that the nephilim, literally the 'fallen ones', are angelic beings who were cast out of heaven (Rev. 12:9) in consequence of which it is not surprising that no genealogical table is provided concerning them. If nephilim means the 'fallen angels' then all is well but is it correct to apply this word to 'the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation . . .' (Jude 6)? In the first instance, the English word 'angel' is translated from the Hebrew **malak** which, according to all Hebrew scholars, has absolutely no affinity with nephilim. As there are not even root similarities in the words, the contention that the nephilim were 'fallen angels' becomes wishful speculation based on making the Bible history conform to preconceived ideas.

If one reads Romans 1:20-25, one may see that the 'mighty fallen ones' is applicable to man. Living and having their being within the framework of the 'eternal power of God' (Rom. 1:20) this is nowhere said to be the experience of Adam - mankind of that time were surely 'mighty men'. As Paul plainly reveals, they fell having been seduced into believing that their wisdom was greater than God's. The whole of Paul's first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans should be read to appreciate the magnitude of their fall. Thus, they could come within the category of the nephilim, the 'fallen ones'. This conclusion places no strain on the imagination which is most certainly the case if one insists on intruding angels into this context.

The cohabitation of the nephilim ('giants' in the A.V.) with the 'daughters of men' resulted in a progeny which was undoubtedly and Biblically confirmed, as human beings. The children who were born of this union were 'mighty men which were of old, men of renown' (Gen.

6:4). There is no ambiguity in this statement. The genetic inheritance passed on by the nephilim to their offspring is clearly that of human chromosomes for their general traits were in the same mould as were those of their forbears they were mighty men, they were arrogant men, they were rebellious men, they were a violent breed who 'filled the earth with violence' (Gen. 6:11). Where did these 'mighty men of old' come from? Apart from being called the *nephilim*, they are not given individual names and it is therefore impossible to trace them. What is sure is that they were not racially the same as the descendants of Adam for the cohabitation resulted in the 'corruption of all flesh' (Gen. 6:12-13)

From all this a simple NO would be the answer to the question posed. However, there is much more evidence to support the answer. If one correlates both the first and second chapters of Genesis, one is immediately struck by differences which are not accidents but deliberate statements intended to convey precisely what was meant. For instance it will be noted that 'man', both male and female, were created' ' whereas Adam was 'formed', the relevant Hebrew words indicating the difference - *bara*, 'created'; *yatsar*, 'formed'. Another point of interest in this context is that the Name of God is not the same. In the first chapter it will be seen that the Hebrew *Elohim* (God) is used whereas in the second chapter, *Jehovah-Elohim* (Lord God) appears. It will be noted, too, that no mention is made of the creation of sea creatures in Genesis 2 whereas in Genesis 1:20 this is revealed on the fifth day and occupies the whole day.

With regard to Eve, she, according to the narrative, cannot be forced into the context of Genesis 1. It will be noted that in Genesis 2:20 it is stated that “. . . there was not found an help meet for him” which, by implication, suggests that while females were around, there was not one adequate to meet Adam's need. The name, Eve, was not given until some considerable period later but in the giving, an interesting point arises. "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living" (Gen. 3:20). The name 'Eve' in Hebrew is *chava* which, literally means 'to show' and which raises an interesting point. What was there to show and to whom? The use of the phrase 'the mother of all living', too, is interesting. Into Adam's nostrils was breathed 'the breath of life and he became a living soul' (Gen. 2:7) and this appears to suggest that unless one undergoes this experience, one is dead. This subject of the 'dead' will be dealt with in answer to a

later question for it is Biblically attested to that there are those who are 'dead' and who take no part in the Resurrection (Isa. 26:14). The inclusion of **the phrase** that Eve was 'the mother of all living' is intended to 'show' the fact of the existence of others in whom was not the 'breath of life'.

Passing on from Adam and Eve, it is of singular interest to note that Cain, the first-born to Adam and Eve, after the murder of his brother Abel, lamented the punishment passed on him by the Lord. "Behold thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, **that every one** that findeth me shall slay me" (Gen. 4:14). Who are these to whom Cain was making reference and whose antagonism was known to him? Where did he procure his wife? --- no other sons and daughters had, as yet, been born to Adam and Eve why build a 'city' for himself, his wife and son? (Gen. 4:17) --- all these make provision for people other than Adam and his family.

Thus to answer the question again --- No -- Adam and Eve were not the first and only human beings created by God but they are the first named in the Bible which deals with this branch of the human family.

QUESTION 3.

Was Cain the son of Adam or Satan?

"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" (Gen. 3:15).

The above scripture records the dialogue between the Lord God and the 'serpent' Satan in which attention is focused on two seeds --- that of the woman and of the 'serpent'. The seed of the woman rouses very little interest for the student is able to trace this through the genealogical tables which are a prominent feature of the Bible. However, the seed of the serpent is another matter for nowhere is there any genealogical table commencing with: 'These are the generations of the serpent Lucifer . . .'

The Old Testament record is completely silent on the matter of the seed of the serpent and the subject would appear to have passed from the scope of Bible revelation until the Lord Jesus Christ introduced a phraseology which drew the subject back into the mainstream of the narrative. In chastising the Jews, He called them "O generation (race) of vipers. . ." (Matt. 12:34) while to the Pharisees, He said: "Ye serpents, ye generation (race) of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" (Matt. 23:33). In the Gospel of John, He again accused the Jews, but this time He contended that they did not fall within the Fatherhood of God. "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God" (John 8:47). In the same context, He accused them of doing the works of their father the devil (John 8:44) whom, He said was: ". . . a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him."

It is because of this that some have thought that Cain, the first recorded murderer in the Bible, is to be identified here and, as the murderer and liar was equated with the devil, it has been thought that he was sired by Satan himself thus providing a human channel for the seed of the serpent. This, of course, is pure speculation and as one is enjoined to 'prove all things' (1 Thess. 5:21), it behoves the student to weigh the speculation against Bible fact.

While it is undoubtedly true that Cain was a murderer and a liar (Gen. 4:9) he was not the first for Satan was a liar before him (Gen. 3:1) and in his 'weakening of the nations' (Isa. 14:12), was he not guilty of mass murder? With regard to Cain, it will be noted that the Biblical account of the conception and his birth makes no provision for an illegal union between Satan and Eve. "And **Adam** knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain and said, I have gotten a man from the Lord" (Gen. 4:1).

To fully appreciate this account, attention is drawn to the background of the story for there is one point which, at first glance, stands out as irreconcilable. It will be noted that Eve's reaction to the birth was: ". . . I have gotten a man from the Lord." The Hebrew word for 'man' is **ish** and is correctly translated here. Cain, while being of the masculine gender, could not by any stretch of imagination be called a man. In Hebrew, a son is **ben**, while a child is **yeled**, neither of which words are found in the Hebrew text here.

The background story is well-known. Adam, through the suggestion of Eve, transgressed the command of the Lord and when exposed, accused both the Lord and Eve for his waywardness (Gen. 3:12). The situation in the Adamic household became very strained as would be most natural in view of the circumstances and the atmosphere was not conducive to good relations. As has happened throughout the ages, the first move towards reconciliation came from Eve and the mechanism of this was the birth of Cain. Note again the history. "And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived and bare Cain . . ." Directly after the birth, Eve says: "I have gotten a man from the Lord" and, far from being a comment on the birth of Cain, was a cry of victory at the reconciliation between herself and Adam. Looking again at the Hebrew word **ish** which is translated man, it will be noted that this word is also used to denote husband, which translation is followed 69 times in the Old Testament.

A story in similar vein is found in the account of Leah and Jacob in Genesis 29:32. It will be recalled that both wives, i.e., Leah and Rachel, were barren but that eventually Leah gave birth to Reuben which evoked the cry: ". . . now therefore my husband (Hebrew, **ish**) will love me." The bonds between Leah and Jacob were tightened by the birth of Reuben and, similarly, the relationship between Adam and Eve was established by the birth of Cain.

It is thus surely the most illogical theory to suggest that while Eve was working for reconciliation with Adam, she should contrive an illegal union with Satan and then pass off the result of this as Adam's son.

Thus the above answers the question and proves that Cain, for all his shortcomings, was sired by Adam and was indeed his son.

QUESTION 4.

Why was God so hard on Cain?

"And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering: But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect" (Gen, 4:4-5)

From a merely superficial reading of the scripture, it would appear that Cain did receive harsh treatment from the Lord, but when the

background to the story is considered, it will be found that he perpetuated his father's initial transgression. This transgression is seen to be unbelief in God. Adam was placed in an environment which was perfect. He was not required to toil or sweat for his existence --- all was given in the Providence of God. However, it would appear that Adam's belief in this was tested and he was found wanting. No doubt Eve, excluded from direct communication with God (it is nowhere recorded that she saw God or talked with Him) had not the same understanding in the matter of provisions to keep the home going. This, because of the paucity of information on the subject, is admittedly speculation. However, it will be noted that in the conversation between the Lord and Adam subsequent to the transgression, Eve is undoubtedly involved as is the soil. It is quite within the realm of possibility that Adam, after gathering seed, had ploughed the earth in preparation for sowing the seed which, if it is viewed against the promised Providence of God, was a lack of faith in God's ability to keep His Word.

"And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life" (Gen. 3:17). The reason for the ground being 'cursed' was undoubtedly due to something that Adam had done in that context. Thorns and thistles had obviously lain dormant beneath the soil and would have remained in that state had not the soil been disturbed but now, as special mention is made of the fact that the thorns would come forth, there is indication of a disturbance of the soil. One is, of course, familiar with the scripture (Gen. 2:5) which records that ". . . there was no man to till the ground" but the word 'till' does not necessarily mean to plough the ground. The Hebrew word here is **abad** which literally means 'to service' whereas, had breaking the ground through the process of ploughing been meant, the Hebrew word **nir** would have been recorded.

To 'service the ground' and to 'plough the ground' are two different things --- a fact which the two Hebrew words indicate. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread . . ." again draws attention to Adam's transgression being associated with the soil and this fact leads one to a better understanding of why the Lord rejected Cain's offering. He brought 'the fruit of the ground' as an offering to the Lord whereas

Abel brought an offering of the firstling of his flock with which he had nothing to do but tend it.

There is, of course, a further explanation which is stimulated by Hebrews 11:4. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous . . ." 'Faith', by which Abel offered his sacrifice, ". . . cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God" (Rom. 10:17). It would therefore appear that both Cain and Abel were conversant with the word or commands of God which would surely be in the same vein as applied to their father Adam. Cain chose to ignore this and in consequence found that his truculence, not his sacrifice, was totally unacceptable to God. God was not being hard on him --- He was, in righteous judgment, passing sentence on transgression.

QUESTION 5.

Was all Humanity destroyed in the Flood?

"All in whose nostrils was ***the breath of life***, of all that was in the dry land died" (Gen. 7:22).

If there were only eight survivors in a great universal catastrophe as has been contended, the scripture appears to be at fault. However, the scripture, which is concerned with the story of Adam and the 'seed of the woman', deals exclusively with this part of the human family and the Flood is the record of the judgment of God on that family. If, as it is held all humanity was destroyed in the great Flood, one is faced with the dilemma of explaining where the Oriental and Negroid races come from. The Bible does not say that they came from the sons of Noah. This being so, one is encouraged to 'search the scriptures' and find the solution to the problem.

Mention has been made previously of the ***nephilim***, the 'fallen ones', whose impingement on the 'daughters of men' resulted in violence filling the earth and the judgment by water. It behoves the student to consider the word 'earth' in this context for there are several Hebrew words which have all been translated as 'earth'. They are

- (1) ***adamah***, meaning ground, soil or land;

- (2) **ara**, meaning the terrestrial globe of the earth;
- (3) **erets**, meaning land.

The word **ara** is not found in the context of the Flood whereas **adamah** and **erets** are.

The **nephilim** were obviously those into whose nostrils the 'breath of life' was not breathed for it will be found that their progeny in the post-Flood period, bore names which are synonymous with 'death'. The name 'Rephaim' has been translated 'dead' a few instances of which are provided for further study. Job 26:5; Psalm 88:10; Proverbs 2:18; 9:18; 21:16; Isaiah 14:8 and 26:14 the last of which reads: "They are dead (Rephaim), they shall not live; they are deceased (Rephaim), they shall not rise." There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the Rephaim were actually a people for the scripture makes references to them as rebelling against Chedorlaomer, king of Elam (Gen. 14:1-5).

Now if the whole of humanity was destroyed in the Flood, no alternative is left but to spiritualise the **nephilim** for they, or rather their descendants, again make their appearance as the inhabitants of the land of Canaan when Israel was about to take possession of it. The report by the spies of Israel who were sent by Moses to reconnoitre the land is recorded in Numbers 13:33 and is now provided with the relevant Hebrew words. "And there we saw the giants (**nephilim**), the sons of Anak, which come from the giants (**nephilim**) . . ." If all humanity was indeed destroyed in a universal Flood, the existence of the inhabitants of Canaan intrude a discordant note which repudiates the contention.

It was the mongrelised progeny of Adam in whose nostrils was the breath of life that was destroyed in a Flood, the dimensions of which, according to Sir Leonard Woolley, was the Tigris-Euphrates valley. Ferrar Fenton's translation of the closing verses of Genesis 10 summarises the answer by saying: "The above were the families of the sons of Noah, and their descendants, by tribes. From them they **spread themselves amongst the nations on the earth** after the Flood."

QUESTION 6.

Where does the Black man come from?

Any answer to this question must, of necessity, be purely speculative for the Bible does not mention their origins. In fact, the Word of God is singularly silent on the subject of all racial entities except, that of Adam and only the briefest mention is made of others as they impinge on this race. This being so, the only manner in which to answer the question is to show where the Black man does **not** come from.

Firstly, one should consider the implication arising from the contention that as all humanity was destroyed in the Flood, the races of men today must have had their beginnings in the three sons of Noah. The Bible does not make this claim --- man does. In the first instance, because it is necessary to have one of the sons of Noah as the progenitor of the Black man, Ham is selected for this and the incident recorded in Genesis 9:22, bestows God-like powers on Noah. However, as one reads through the incident, one is struck by the absurdity of such a claim. Noah, having become drunk, was lying 'uncovered within his tent'. Ham 'the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without' (Gen. 9:22). The narrative continues that the two brethren 'covered the-nakedness of their father' and 'saw not their father's nakedness'. What is there in this story that justifies the contention that Noah awoke and cursed, not the perpetrator of the unnamed deed, but Canaan who is merely mentioned as the son of Ham? What possible justification can anyone have for using this as the basis for a thesis on the origin of the Black man?

The unnamed 'deed' perpetrated by Ham could have been the incestuous relationship with his own mother for in Leviticus 18:8 it is stated that: "The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover: ***it is thy father's nakedness***". This could give meaning to the cursing of Canaan who might have been the offspring of this illegal union. "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren ... (Gen. 9:25).

It should be noted that Ham had four sons (Gen. 10:6) and that Canaan was the last of these. If the ***curse of Noah*** --- note, not of God --- was that Ham and his descendants were to be black, Canaan,

who was specifically mentioned, should surely have produced a Negroid people. All archaeological excavation in the land of Canaan shows a complete lack of either Negroid character or feature in the people of the land.

There is, of course, another aspect to this. The teaching that the Black man, i.e., his skin colour, is the result of a curse, can have no other effect than that of creating an inferiority complex in the Black people. Those of this particular persuasion should reconsider the implications of such wild speculation which does not enjoy the support of the scripture.

It should be noted again that God had absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the events recorded in Genesis 9 --- it is the record of Noah's spontaneous reaction against his son in which he pronounced a social, not racial, judgment on him. Discounting this, there are those who persist in claiming Noahic origins for the races of men today. One wonders if those of this persuasion have ever examined the Black albino? In this, the blackness of skin pigment is absent but the Negroid features remain, a genetic inheritance which has nothing to do with a social curse. The skin colour is not the result of excessive exposure to the sun --- it is a genetic inheritance factor.

The same may be said of Japheth the third son of Noah who, according to the theory that the three sons are the progenitors of the races of mankind, must have sired the Oriental race. It is of singular importance to note that the Yellow man, living in the Far East and subject to the same equatorial sun, has remained the same shade of yellow without any indication of becoming black as those of the Negro race in the same climatic conditions.

Whichever way one looks at the subject, the problem of accounting for the self-evident fact of the wide and inherently diversified factors in the races and sub-races of mankind, cannot be ascribed to Noahic origins. The Bible does not make this claim either by inference or direct statement.

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots . . ." (Jer. 13:23).

QUESTION 7.

Who were the Egyptians?

This question can only be answered by stating that the land now known as 'Egypt' was not always known by that name. In the first instance, 'Aegypt' is a Grecian word and had its origin, according to Grecian legend, in Aegypt, the son of Belus or Baal, who was said to have been the brother of Danaus of the Tribe of Dan, one of Jacob's twelve sons. Herodotus, the Greek historian (Bk 2; ch 15 and 16), quotes Ionian sources as stating that the name was originally confined to the Delta region of the Nile and was subsequently applied to the whole land previously known as

In Egyptian hieroglyphics, the name appearing most frequently is that of Khem which is said to mean the blackness of the alluvial soil and which had nothing whatsoever to do with the colour of the inhabitants of the land. In the Bible, however, two names are associated with the land and are (1) Mizraim and (2) Pathros. The latter, i.e., Pathros, simply means southland, but the first, Mizraim, is something of an enigma.

A glance at any Concordance which provides the Hebrew and Greek words of the original texts, will show that the name, Mizraim, as describing both the land and the people, appears in different forms. Mizraim, Mesraim, Mesrain which are all plural words for Mesr, Masr, Mazor or Mazr which occur in II Kings 19: 24; Isaiah 19:6; 37:25 and Micah 7:12. In Isaiah 11:11 it will be noted that Pathros and Mizraim are spoken of as two separate sections which is in keeping with Egyptian records and which speak of 'Upper and Lower Mizraim'.

At first glance, it would appear that the answer to the question posed by these variations of the name Mizraim, is comparatively simple --
- the name is that given to the second son of Ham (Gen. 10:6), and subsequent to his migration to the Nile Delta, his name was given to the land. However, in looking for the meaning of the name --- most Biblical names have meanings --- one finds that even the Jewish Encyclopaedia cannot provide any light on the word. It would appear, therefore, that it is not a Hebrew word but one which has been adopted from an older source. It would also indicate that the name given by Ham to his son was taken from an already existing name.

Philologists have suggested that **Mazr**, one of the variations of Mizraim, could indicate 'frontier' or alternatively 'Fortified place' and that the plural **Mizraim** conveys the idea of 'the children of the fortified place'. Others again have indicated that in Mizraim -- - Miz-Ra-yim --- one may see the name of the supreme deity of both the Nile and Tigris river areas, Ra --- Light or the Sun. In consequence of this, it has been suggested that the composite name, Mizraim, may mean nothing less than 'the children of the Light or Sun'.

This latter speculation --- it can be nothing more than this because of the paucity of information --- appears to have more credence particularly as this was the ancient city of On (Gen. 41:45,50; 46:20). The other name for On was **Heliopolis**, the city of the sun god Ra and became the chief city of Egyptian science. The magnificent ruins of this 'city of Light' became the richest adornments of other cities such as Rome and Constantinople and two red Syene granite obelisks gracing the entrance to the temple of Ra in Heliopolis now stand on the Thames embankment in London and Central Park in New York.

With regard to the identity of the people of the land of Mizraim - as with the name - the positive identification is impossible. It has been suggested (Hannay in his **European and Other Race Origins**) that the Mizrayim were a people from the west whose original land was **Pun** and that this was possibly Atlantis. If the paintings on the walls of the royal tombs in the Valley of Kings is any criteria, it would appear that the land now known as Egypt was occupied, at one time or another, by (1) the red man, the Roten-ne-rome; (2) the Black man, the Nehasi; (3) the Asiatic, the Aamu; and (4) the White man, the Tamahu. Whether or not this was intended as a chronological procession of races inhabiting the land remains speculative but what is known is that the Mizraim were a White race, regal in general demeanour, in contrast to the darker and perhaps indigenous people whom they forced into the region later known as 'Upper Egypt'. According to Herodotus it would appear that the Mizraim migrated from the land of Mazr in roughly the 10th century (B.C.) which, while one may accept the fact of migration, one may look askance at the dating. From the 'Egyptian' record, it has been established that in 748-725 B.C. Pankhy 1, founded a dynasty of Ethiopian rulers which positively added a Black dimension to the population of the land.

Successive invasions of Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian and Grecian elements, too, added to a cosmopolitan population.

What actually happened to the Mizraim is not known and where they are to be found in modern nations must, of necessity, be purely speculative.

QUESTION 8.

Was Ishmael the father of the Arabs?

"And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation." (Gen. 17:20).

It will be noted that Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar, the Egyptian handmaid (Gen. 16:2-3) was rejected by God in terms of His Covenant Promise but not rejected in terms of a portion of God's blessing. Notwithstanding the claim by Islam that Ishmael was indeed the Covenant heir, the Bible positively states that he was rejected in favour of Isaac (Gen. 17:19). Because of tradition and claims by the Arabs, many have thought that they are indeed the descendants of Ishmael, but is this true?

If one is able to discard the romancing of French writers on the subject and face the reality of Arab life as it is, one will find that these Arabs have not and do not meet the requirements of the promise made concerning Ishmael. More, if sincere Arab historians are heeded it will be found that they claim Kahtanic or Jektanic origin. By this is inferred that they claim descent from Joktan, the brother of Peleg (Gen. 10:25), the son of Eber of the origin in Peleg (Gen. 11:10-27) which immediately denies the claim of Ishmaelite origin line of Shem. The Abrahamic line had its origin of the Arabs.

If the Bible story is pieced together one finds that the sons of Ishmael dwelt firstly in the Wilderness of Shur (Gen. 25:12-18) on the north-western portion of the Sinai peninsula. They appear, however, to be a wandering people with no desire for a fixed abode. Apart from the one reference in Genesis 37:25 (Ishmeelites) the only other people with whom one could possibly identify Ishmael are the Hagarenes,

Hagrites or Hagarites, a name derived from Hagar, the mother of Ishmael. In 1 Chronicles 5:10, the Hagarites are mentioned as having warred with and been defeated by the Reubenites in the country east of Gilead and later, in the same chapter, is recorded the conflict of the combined forces of Reuben, Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh who made war with the Hagarites, with Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab. (1 Chron. 5:18-19). The name 'Hagarite' is here associated with the names of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. 25:12-15).

The reference in Isaiah 21:11-17, read in conjunction with Genesis 25:12-18, clearly indicates that the sons of Ishmael were a roving people whose headquarters appeared latterly to be the region from which they displaced the Edomites in Mount Sier. This displacement will be dealt with in consideration of the Esau question.

If one follows the first son of Ishmael, Nebaioth, one finds that, according to *Hadyn's Bible Dictionary*, Nebaioth "settled in Mesopotamia where his descendants became united with an ancient Chaldean race, 'the Nabat'; of this mixed race, afterwards known as the Nabathaeans, a part became established in Mount Sier." According to Sir William Smith, the Nabathaeans ultimately controlled the whole of the region of the Gulf of Akaba and from this position of power, they commanded the trade between Arabia and the West. They established regular caravans between Leuce Come, a port of the Red Sea in the north-west part of Arabia, and the port of Rhinocolura (El Arish) on the Mediterranean on the frontiers of Palestine and Egypt.

From Rhinocolura, the Nabathaeon trade route went to Smyrna and then on to Brusa, Broussa, Bursa or Prusa ad Olympum, a great city of Bithynia on the north side of Mount Olympus. It was in Prusa that the Nabathaeon established a flourishing colony. It would appear that the Nabathaeans, always a wandering people, finally decided that Prusa would be their headquarters for, developed by the prolific trade, Prusa and the Nabathaeans wielded considerable political power and a not too puny military influence which resisted the attacks of the Greek kings of Syria.

During the course of the rise of Rome, it is found that the Nabathaeans submitted to rule of Rome - a feature which could only have come about through internal corruptions. The Mohammedan

bid for world conquest in 622 A.D. saw the final dissolution of the Nabathaeon centre and the country and land became a haunt of wandering Arabs of the desert. What happened to the people? In purely hypothetical vein let the student consider the twelve principalities comprising the State of Prussia: (1) Prussia proper, (2) Posen, (3) Pomerania, (4) Silesia, (5) Brandenburg, (6) Saxony, (7) Schleswig-Holstein and Heligoland, (8) Hanover, (9) Westphalia, (10) Nassau, (11) Rhenish Prussia and (12) Hohenzollern.

As stated at the outset, the Arab historians claim descent from Kalitan or Joktan and, in this, no origin in Ishmael can be contemplated. Anthropologically speaking, the Arab question remains an enigma to which no satisfactory answer has been found.

QUESTION 9.

Was Abraham a Jew?

Before answering this question it should be clearly established what is meant by the term 'Jew'. In the Biblical context, one finds that the term is not a racial one. "And many of the people of the land **became Jews**; for the fear of the Jews fell upon them" (Est. 8:17). As must be obvious to even the most uninitiated, one cannot change one's race and become a member of another. Citizenship and religion can be changed and this is precisely what is implied in the word 'Jew'. The word 'Jew' in the New Testament is given to the **inhabitants of Judaea** and in the original Greek was written as such. The religion of the Judeans was Talmudic, i.e., interpretations of the scriptures and was contrasted by Christ when He charged that the Pharisees had 'made the Word of God of none effect by your traditions'. The English word 'Jew' only came into existence in the 18th century A.D. and was translated from the Greek word meaning 'Judean'. (See Young's or Strong's Concordance).

At the time of Abraham, there was no such land as Judaea nor was there the religion known as 'the Jew's religion' (Gal. 1: 13-14) --- how then could he be called a 'Jew'. Abraham was a Hebrew (Gen. 14:13) -- a patronymic name given to the descendant of Eber --- whose progenitor was Shem, the son of Noah, who was 'perfect in his generations (race)' and whose line from Adam shows unbroken continuity. The Bible recognises absolutely nothing of either the Jews

or the Jew's religion at the time of Abraham. The same applies to Isaac, Jacob and his twelve sons. It was only after 536 B.C. that the word 'Jew', as an English word, appears in the Bible --- this being so, it is not only erroneous but utterly misleading to speak of Abraham the Jew.

If the Biblical meaning of the word 'Jew' is adhered to and not the modern political meaning, the impossibility of any of the Patriarchs being Jews would become a self-evident fact.

QUESTION 10.

Are the Promises to Abraham important?

The above question is usually asked by way of contrast to the fact of personal salvation. It has been found that many, completely satisfied that individual salvation is the only matter of importance in the Bible, discard all other Biblical matters as of minor or no importance at all. At the outset it should be stated that this attitude is a case of 'placing the cart before the horse'. Who is of greater importance, man or God? In claiming that individual salvation is the greatest in Biblical importance is to place God, His Holy Name, His Honour and His integrity in a minor or secondary role. Make no mistake about this, it is God to Whom belongs all the Glory, all the Honour and all the Praise ***and not man.***

The fact that people have asked whether the Promises which God made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are important is an indication that Biblical priorities have become somewhat obscured and that man, instead of living, moving and having his being in God, has reversed the order and contends that God lives and moves and has His being in man.

"Now this I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision ***for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers***" (Rom. 15:8.) It is a New Testament doctrine, on Paul's authority, that the truth of God, is bound up with the promises made to the fathers. In asking whether or not the Promises of God are important is, on the authority of the above scripture, asking whether the Truth of God is important.

In enlarging this, one notes that from time immemorial, the problem of establishing the Truth of God has been of top priority. Paul, in his address to the Athenians, went to great pains to reiterate that in the beginning, God "hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him . . ." (Acts 17:26-27). It was within this context that God appointed a national witness in Israel. "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servants whom I have chosen . . . ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God" (Isa. 43:10-12). Here, a nation was formed to show the Truth of God and the manner in which this was to be done was the working of God in fulfilling His promises to them.

These promises were made without any prompting by the recipients. God, within His Own Wisdom and Purpose, endowed the selected progeny of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob with Promises which have no loop-holes by which He could honourably escape fulfilment. Note the wording of a few of these Promises and see if there is any way in which the nation Israel could escape the destiny prescribed in them "I will make of thee a great nation" (Gen. 12: 2); "Abraham **shall surely** become a great and mighty nation and all the nations of the earth **shall** be blessed in him" (Gen. 18:18). "By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord ... in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and **thy seed shall possess** the gate of his enemies..." (Gen. 22:16-17). "And God said unto him, I am God Almighty: be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations **shall** be of thee and kings **shall** come out of thy loins . . ." (Gen. 35:11).

Is the Truth of God established by contending that God did not mean what He said by way of way of Promise? The Bible says otherwise. The Truth of God which is established in His faithfulness to His Promises is the very thing which the Lord Jesus Christ came to confirm. It is not God-honouring to aver that Christ only confirmed the fact of blessing the nations and families of the earth and not **the means** whereby God said He would accomplish this.

There is, however, more to this question. "Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb. 11:1). The faithfulness of God to His Promise of eternal life through faith in the

Lord Jesus Christ, is basic to the Christian Faith. If God's Promises, sworn to on oath, are unimportant and irrelevant, or if God made a mistake and decided to change the Promises and make a new beginning, what guarantee has the Christian that when it comes to the time of fulfilling the Promise of eternal life, the Lord will not again change His mind and say that He really didn't mean what He said? The very people who ask whether the Promises made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are important or not, will be the first to protest that God will honour His Promise of eternal life through Christ Jesus the Lord. How can they be so sure?

The Promises of God are important --- to God. He made them with His servant nation Israel and not only is His honour involved in their fulfilment, but the living tangible proof of His reality --- His Truth.

QUESTION 11.

Joseph's Wife - who was she?

"And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah; and he gave him to wife Asenath the daughter of Poti-pherah priest of On, And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt (Mazr)" (Gen. 41:45).

As has been stated previously under the subject of 'Who are the Egyptians?' the Mizraim were a White people whose chief metropolis was the city of On or Heliopolis. Asenath, Joseph's wife, was the daughter of the priest of On --- a member of the White race. While the general population of the Upper kingdom, i.e., Pathros, the southland, may have been coloured in varying degrees, it will be noted that Joseph, in outward appearance, was identical with the Mizraim for his brothers could not see any difference between him (Joseph) and the rest of the people of the land (Gen. 42:8).

Joseph's two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. 46:20), were taken by Jacob as his own (Gen. 48:5) which, if they had been cross-breeds, would certainly not have been the case. It will be recalled that the background to Jacob's life was the persistent principle of separation. He saw the consequences of his brother Esau's marriage with the forbidden lines of Hittite and Hivite, he knew the need, in terms of the Purpose of God, to keep the Covenanted Abrahamic family line pure, he had obeyed the command to marry within his own kind

(Gen. 28) and one would find it most unusual if he, in his old age, took into his bosom, so to speak, two children whose parents were not racially compatible.

One has but to look on the world scene and identify the descendants of Ephraim who were to become 'a multitude (company) of nations'. This was indeed fulfilled when Ephraim (Britain) became the head of a White Commonwealth which became polluted through political expediency.

To sum up, Joseph's wife was one of the Mizraim --- a White race occupying the land subsequently known as Egypt.

QUESTION 12.

Moses and the 'Ethiopian Woman'.

"And Miriam, and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman whom he had married: for he had married an Ethiopian woman" (Num. 12:1).

By way of answer to this question, attention is drawn to the Hebrew words which have been translated 'married' in the context of Moses and the 'Ethiopian woman'. In Hebrew, the word for a legitimate marriage contract is **chathan** into **which word** is poured the full implication of a God-blessed union of two people. However, the word translated 'married' and of which Miriam and Aaron accused Moses, **is laqach** which means **to take** and is used to describe the action of the **nephilim** in Genesis 6:2 in which they 'took them wives (bed companions) of all which they chose'. It is in this context that Miriam and Aaron charged Moses and not in the context of his legitimate marriage to Zipporah, the daughter of Reul, priest of Midian (Ex. 2:21).

The full history of Moses, while not detailed in the Old Testament, is hinted at in Stephen's speech before the Sanhedrin (Acts 7:20-22). The record by Josephus fills in several gaps and one is able to piece together the story of how it was that Moses could be charged with merely 'taking' the Ethiopian woman and of which he was accused by Miriam and Aaron.

As is known, the daughter of the Pharaoh, Thermuthis, raised Moses as her own child, a fact which created the animosity of the priests who saw in his general demeanour a positive threat to their control over the royal household. Matters came to a head when the Ethiopians, whose country adjoined the Upper kingdom, i.e., the southern boundary of Egypt, began to invade the land. After preliminary skirmishes, it was found that the Egyptians offered no resistance and so the Ethiopian army pressed further northwards and finally took Memphis.

In the consternation which followed, it was decided to appoint Moses as General of the Egyptian forces and in this the priests who, notwithstanding the national emergency continued their opposition to Moses, saw an opportunity by which they could be delivered from Moses' influence in the court. They advised the Pharaoh that it was the wish of the gods that Moses lead the Egyptian army. As is well known, the gods of the Egyptians were wood and stone images which could not, in any way, communicate to the priests and one is able to see that the priests were hoping that Moses would be killed in the battles which had to be fought.

Moses had no intention of being killed for one is able to see the qualities of leadership in his preparations against the Ethiopians. The Ethiopians, contemptuous of the pathetic resistance by the Egyptians, still took no chances and guarded the approaches to Memphis with all vigilance. The flank of the city defences was marshland which was full of serpents --- indeed a death-trap to any force which attempted an attack from this direction. They thus felt sure against any Egyptian counter-attack.

In the vanguard of his army, Moses had a company of ibis tenders and here again; the astuteness of the Hebrew General of the Egyptian forces is seen. The ibis, a bird whose qualities for destroying serpents is well-known, was employed by Moses to clear a path through the snake-ridden approaches and before the Ethiopians were aware of it, the Egyptian army was attacking in force on the undefended flank. The result was confusion for the Ethiopians who fled in panic. This victory stimulated the Egyptians who then destroyed all opposition before them. Pushing southwards, the Egyptian army found no resistance until they came to Meroe, the royal city of the Ethiopians, which resisted all attempts to take it. This city was an island in the

midst of the Nile, Astapus and Astaboras rivers and, in addition, had a strong wall surrounding it.

While Moses sought the means whereby he might take the last fortress of the Ethiopians, he was observed by Tharbis, the daughter of the Ethiopian king, who saw in Moses a mighty and invincible man. She desired to be such a man's wife and consequently sent a messenger proposing marriage with him. Moses readily agreed to this on condition that the way be opened whereby he could take this last bastion of the Ethiopians. This was agreed to and Meroe finally fell. Josephus' record tells that Moses consummated his agreement and left, leading his victorious Egyptian army back to Egypt. No further mention is made of Tharbis and she most certainly was not with Moses at any time subsequent to the Ethiopian expedition.

It was this incident to which both Miriam and Aaron made allusion and not the legitimate marriage with Zipporah when Moses had been forced to flee to Midian. It is thus small wonder that the Lord struck Miriam and Aaron with leprosy for in this accusation they were bringing up a matter that had become history and which had transpired before Moses was called by God to His Service. Far from condemning those who speak out against mixed marriages, God condemned Miriam and Aaron for their insidious suggestions against Moses.

QUESTION 13.

Was the Law given exclusively to Israel?

The subject of 'Law' as it is used in the scripture, falls into two categories:

- (1) That which is enacted by man, and
- (2) that which is the expressed Will of God.

Under the first category, conscience, as the governing factor in human behaviour, having failed, was replaced by government vested in the whole Noahic family the highest function of which was the judicial taking of life (Gen. 9:6). From this point, law, in terms of constitutional government developed and the success or failure of this depended on the moral fibre of the whole Noahic family. One has but

to read the history of nations other than Israel in the Bible to note that man is incapable of formulating laws which enrich the given society by their existence.

In the context of the second category, i.e., that which is the expressed Will of God, one finds that the Wisdom of God crystallises into an expression of His love in providing a way in which man must conduct himself. In the context of Adam, one finds that obedience to God's command is demanded (Gen. 2:16) but apart from the principle of 'thou mayest' and 'thou shalt not', no further information is provided in the scripture as it appears at the moment. It is clearly obvious that the 'command' of the Lord, and consequently the Law of the Lord, was given in detail to the Adamic family for had this not been so, the visitation of God's judgment in terms of the Flood cannot be justified.

'Sin', so says John, is 'the transgression of the law' (1 John 3:4) to which is added the fact that 'sin is not imputed when there is no law' (Rom. 5:13). How could sin, and consequently judgment, be imputed to the Adamic family for their deeds in the days of Noah if God had not provided them with His Directives?

It is a scriptural fact that God's Directives by way of Law was in existence four hundred years before the Sinai experience for it will be noted that the Abrahamic Covenant and consequently the whole of God's Purpose in Israel, was the direct result of Abraham's obedience to them. "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws" (Gen. 26:5). It had been stated earlier of Abraham that his progeny would become 'a great and mighty nation and all the families of the earth shall be blessed in him' because of his inherent predisposition to keep God's Law. "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, **and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment;** that the Lord may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him" (Gen. 18:18-19).

Apart from these two references, no further information is provided in respect of God's Law until one comes to Sinai. Here a mighty change takes place. Sinai marked the transition of Israel from the tribal into the national state --- the national organisation of God's servant nation was here begun. Before proceeding, it would serve a very useful purpose here to note that 'a mixed multitude'

accompanied Israel in the exodus from Egypt (Ex. 12:38) but that these people were indeed thorns in their sides for at the least provocation, this multitude led Israel in rebellion against God (Num. 11:4).

In the giving of the Law, it will be noted that there are three aspects of this. In the first instance, it was given orally (Ex. 20:1-17) and had no reference to worship, the priesthood or the Ordinances of Sacrifice. It dealt with 'judgments' (Ex. 21; 1-23:13), three annual 'feasts' (Ex. 23:14-19) and instructions concerning the conquest of Canaan (Ex. 23:20-33). Having been given these 'words' (Ex. 24:3-8), the people covenanted to keep God's Directives in the mighty acclamation: "All that the Lord hath said will we do and be obedient" and thereafter the people were sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice (Ex. 24:8), and admitted into fellowship with God.

The second aspect of the giving of the Law is to be noted in the fact that Moses then ascended the Mount to receive the Tables of the Law and was given the instructions concerning the Tabernacle, the priesthood and sacrifice. It should be noted here that the whole formula was entirely new for while the subject of sacrifice is implied in Genesis 4:4, there is no record of instructions, such as those given to Moses, given to any other people. It was, on scriptural authority, only given to Israel and occasioned by the unique fact that Government of the nation in terms of Law was God's expressed Will. It now became imperative in the nation, because of God's Purpose in it, to cover or hide the transgression of His Law behind the substitutionary offering. It should be noted again that this formula was only given to Israel and none else.

While the giving of the new instructions was taking place, the people, led by Aaron broke the First Commandment and Moses returning, breaks the Tables 'written by the finger of God' (Ex. 31:18; 32:16-19) to be followed by the third category, namely, the second Tables of stone made by Moses and the Law again written by the hand of Jehovah (Ex. 34:1,28,29; Dent. 10:4).

In the context of the Commandments, a unique and exclusive feature is to be seen in the matter of the Fourth Commandment, namely, to 'keep the Sabbath holy'. In returning to Genesis 2 it will be noted that while 'God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it' He did not

command that man keep it. While, as has been stated in a previous answer, the Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27) it should be noted that this only became a Divine Law when given to Israel. There is no evidence, secular or otherwise, to indicate that any people, prior to the giving of the Law at Sinai, were instructed to keep the Sabbath or, indeed, did keep it.

In summing up, one notes that while Divine Law was obviously in the world prior to Sinai, the form of its codification plus the added instructions concerning the Tabernacle, the priesthood and sacrifice, were given only to Israel and no other nation. "This is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations . . ."

QUESTION 14.

What or Who were the 'strangers' in Israel?

"And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not vex him. But the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you and thou shalt love him as thyself. (Lev. 19:33-34).

Much misunderstanding has arisen because it has become common practice to apply the word 'stranger' to any person, regardless of race, who is unknown in the immediate circle of a given family. It is indeed most unfortunate that the English translators were so free in their handling of the Hebrew text for had they exercised more care, they would have presented this subject in an entirely different light.

Four different Hebrew words have been translated 'stranger' in the Authorised Version and are:

- (1) **ger**;
- (2) **toshabh**;
- (3) **nokri**;
- (4) **zar**.

In the scripture which prefaces this answer, the 'stranger that dwelleth with you shall be as one born among you' is one who is racially identical with Israel and is called the **ger**. The status of the **ger** in Israel is most interesting as indeed is that of the others who are called by the abovementioned names. In the Law, the **ger**, or

plural rendering **gerim**, were to have equal rights in terms of justice with legal provisions enabling them to accumulate wealth within the Israel community (Lev. 25:47 and Deut. 28:43). The **gerim** could participate in the tithes (Deut. 14:29; 26:12), gleanings of various sorts and forgotten sheaves (Lev. 19:10), and was permitted to hire himself out, the employer being bound to refrain from oppression. Nearly all the main 'holy days' applied to the **gerim** --- he was to rest on the Sabbath, he was to rejoice on Weeks and Tabernacles, he was to observe the Day of Atonement and to have no leaven bread on **the Feast** of Unleavened Bread. He was forbidden to eat the Passover until circumcision and was then subject to all the rules of purification against contamination as was any Israelite. From the vision granted to Ezekiel (47:22), one may note that the **gerim** (strangers) are assigned a landed inheritance among the Israelites. **As will be seen, these privileges are not extended to those covered by *toshabh*, *nokri* and *zar*,**

The Hebrew word **toshabh** is used to identify one who is different, in an unspecified way, to the **gerim**. The word is not used very extensively in the Hebrew but what is known is that it covers a person or persons permitted to visit the priest in Israel but denied any further rights. He may not, under any circumstances, eat the Passover or any of the 'holy' things of a priest (Ex. 12:45; Lev. 22:10). His children, in contrast to the **gerim**, could be bought as perpetual slaves with absolutely no recourse to redemption --- the Law of the Jubilee did not apply to them (Lev. 25:45). The **toshabh**, while appearing to have permission to reside in Israel, had no legal status except in respect of justice --- beyond this, the **toshabh** had no rights whatsoever.

The third Hebrew word **nokri**, is defined by the context in which it appears and embraces such people as the Canaanites those descended from Ham's incestuous behaviour, and the Moabites and Ammonites who similarly were descended from Lot's cohabitation with his own daughters. **These *nokri* were strictly taboo with no rights or privileges in the Israel community. Their status was that of a bastard -- Hebrew: *Mamser*, meaning one of mixed or spurious origins -- being specifically prevented by Divine Decree, from entering the congregation of the Lord even to his tenth generation (Deut. 23:2-3).** While the subject of marriage between the **gerim** and the **toshabh**

is not mentioned, that with the *nokri* is positively forbidden (Gen. 24:3).

The fourth and final Hebrew word *zar*, takes its definition, as do the other words, from the context. This word appears in connection with aliens or those of a foreign race. The *zar* had no rights whatsoever in Israel with even justice denied to him. It is not without significance that in the subsequent national disasters in Israel, the *zar* is spoken of as the main contributing factor. "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire, your land, strangers (*zar*) devour it in your presence . . ." (Isa. 1:7). "They have dealt treacherously against the Lord: for they have begotten strange (*zar*) children . . ." (Hos. 5:7). "Strangers (*zar*) have devoured his strength and he knoweth it not. . ." (Hos. 7:9).

The English word 'stranger' thus translated from the four Hebrew words tends to obscure the true relationship, as required by God, in dealing with other people.

QUESTION 15.

Are we the 'gentiles' of the Bible?

If this question is asked in the context of the Biblical word which has been translated 'gentile' the answer is in the affirmative but, if asked in that of the modern appreciation of 'gentile' the answer is a categorical no.

It is truly amazing how words have been wrenched from their original meaning and have been given secondary meanings which, in time, have become dominant and have taken precedence over the primary meaning. This word 'gentile' is one such casualty. The English word has its origin from the Latin *gentelisis* and the French *gentil* both of which are derived from the root stem *gens* - a Latin word meaning **a clan or race**. To apply this to an individual is to violate all sense of language and yet this is precisely what has been done when one finds dictionary definitions of 'gentile' given as meaning 'any person not an Israelite or Jew'. How **any person** can be an acceptable substitute for a 'nation' or 'composite body' remains one of the mysteries of this time.

It would appear (from *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*) that at about the time when the Authorised Version was compiled, a clear definition of the word 'gentile' was not to hand but as it appeared to satisfy the identification of anyone not Jewish, it was summarily inserted as an English translation of the Hebrew **goi** and the Greek **ethnos**. Both of these words mean 'nation' or 'a composite body'. To illustrate the rather loose translation of the two words **goi** and **ethnos** --- which has given rise to much misunderstanding, it is of singular interest to note that **ethnos** has been translated 'gentile' 93 times; 'heathen' five times, and (nation' 64 times. If consistency had been observed throughout the translation and the word 'nation' maintained, much of the current misunderstanding would never have arisen and individuals would never have classified themselves by this name.

If the translators had consistently translated the word **ethnos** as 'nations' the confusion of Romans 15:9-10 would never have arisen. In this it will be noted that Paul is quoting from the Old Testament scriptures and in the tenth verse is recorded "And again he saith, Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people." Observe now the actual portion of scripture from which Paul was quoting and it will be seen that the word 'gentile', plus its current meaning, has no part whatsoever in the scripture concerned. "Rejoice O ye nations, his people" (Dent. 32:43). It will be noted that the word 'with' has been deleted. This is in italics in the Bible which indicates that it is not to be found in the original manuscripts. Nowhere in this context is there any mention of people other than Israel and no provision in the quotation is made for a 'gentile' mass to 'rejoice with his people'.

Thus in summing up, if we, the Anglo-Celto-Saxon and kindred people, ask if we are the 'nations' of the Bible, the answer is yes but conversely, if the question is asked in the modern definition of 'gentile' the answer is most definitely no.

QUESTION 16.

Are the Turks descended from Esau?

The view has long been held that the Turks are the modern descendants of the Edomites but it should be stated that the reason for this has very little, if any, evidence by way of support. Instead of

working from Esau forwards, proponents of this theory have begun with the contention that the Turks are the Edomites and worked backwards. Starting with the Turkish, or Ottoman Empire, they see in Osman or Othman the companion of Mohammed, a connection with "Teman" the grandson of Esau and consequently aver that this is sufficient to justify the claim that the Turks are Edom. What philological connection can be seen between 'Teman' and Othman' is completely obscure for none whatsoever exists.

In order to fully appreciate the subject of Esau, one must begin with whatever history is recorded concerning the man and then follow the evidence forward and in this process, one will see that the claim of Turkish origin in Esau has no historical foundation whatsoever. As the story of Esau is so prodigious, indeed it has filled books, it is here intended to provide only the highlights of the history from which those interested, may draw their own conclusions.

If any credence is given to the Apocryphal writings, it will be observed that "Esau is the end of the world, and Jacob is the beginning of it that followeth" (2 Esdras 6:7-9). This immediately places Esau or his descendants into a place of great prominence at ***the end of the age*** and which end, is caused by Esau. Is it feasible to attach this prominence to modern Turkey? If it is contended that the Apocrypha cannot be taken as inspired writing, the student is then directed to the Book of Obadiah which, too, intrudes Esau into the end of the age scene and implies that Esau is the cause of all the trouble at this time.

Thus, in the light of the scripture, one may see Esau in existence at the end of the age and in such a position of strength that it behoves a deeper study and careful examination.

Isaac, the child of promise born to Abraham and Sarah, and Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel, Abraham's brother (Gen. 22:23) were childless for nineteen years after their marriage. After much prayer, Rebekah conceived and twins were born to her. It will be noted that before birth a pattern was set, for the record in Genesis 25:22 carries a Hebrew word that is used only in this one scripture and none else. This word is ***ratsats*** and is translated 'struggled'. All authorities consulted on this word indicate that the struggling in the womb was more than the usual movement of the developing embryo --- it implies a tangible animosity which is revealed in deliberate physical

conflict. This is supported when one considers that the circumstances were so unusual that Rebekah went to 'enquire of the Lord' (Gen. 25:22) as to the cause.

The reply of the Lord was singularly informative. "In your womb lie nations twain, rival races from their birth; one mastery shall gain, the younger o'er the older reign" (Gen. 25:23, Moffat). The ***Pentateuch and Haftorahs*** (Oxford University Press) establish that the two would be 'separated' from birth in a mutual antagonism which would follow, not only them personally, but their descendants as long as the two people existed. The same authority indicates that the name 'Edom' (Gen. 25:30) subsequently given to Esau, is indicative of his predisposition for the spilling of blood and a complete unconcern for the suffering of others.

In the subsequent history of Esau one finds that the bald story in the closing eight verses of the twenty-fifth chapter, leave one with a sense of incompleteness. The fact that Isaac "loved Esau because he did eat his venison" appears to be a poor excuse for making him the covenant heir. When Esau "came in from the field and was faint" certainly does not warrant the comment that "I am at the point to die." A tradition, and it should be noted that it must be held as such, avers that Esau was a brigand and the leader of nomadic Arabs who preyed on the passing caravans and shared the loot among themselves. In this way, Esau was able to provide the now blind Isaac with all the then available amenities of life. The tradition further avers that after being involved in an unsuccessful attempt against the Assyrian king's life, Esau fled becoming a fugitive and, returning to the home of Isaac was indeed on the point of death from hunger when the bargaining for the birthright took place.

The 'stealing' of the birthright blessing by Jacob is recorded in Genesis 27:1-33 and the remorse of Esau and the answer of Isaac is taken up in the remaining verses of this chapter. One point, however, should be noted and this has to do with the preview given by Isaac of Esau's future. It will be noted that Isaac related that Esau would gain the dominion (Gen. 27:40), i.e., he would take what he had lost and in the process of which he would 'break his yoke from off thy neck'. This 'yoke' is explained by considering that at birth, Jacob's hand held Esau's heel (Hos. 12:3) thus, through the power of God, contained the evil which Esau would do. The removal of this 'yoke' was the removal

of Jacob's restraining hand and Esau being free to do what he liked with the dominion birthright which he had gained. As will be seen that situation was firmly developed at the time of the First Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Prior to the blessing, both Jacob and Esau were now forty years of age, it will be noted that Esau had already married two women who were unacceptable to Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. 27:46). These wives were of Hittite extraction (Gen. 36:2). It would appear that after the blessing and Isaac's command to Jacob to take a wife from the daughters of Laban, his kinsman, Esau sought to propitiate his parents by marrying his cousin, Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael (Gen. 28:6-9). This, however, did not succeed and Esau took his family and they settled among the Horite people whom they displaced (Deut. 2:12).

An interesting feature is to be seen in the naming of Esau's grandson Amalek (Gen. 36:12). Eliphaz, the son of Esau, took Timna the concubine and she bore Amalek. Why call this son Amalek? This was the name of the very ancient race of Amalekites whom Balaam the prophet (Num. 24:20) called 'the first of the nations'. In Abraham's time, i.e., long before the birth of Esau, the Amalekites were in existence and residing in precisely the same locality as Esau occupied after displacing the Horites (Gen. 14:7). This indicates that the Amalekites, displaced by the Horites were not destroyed but simply assimilated by them. The concubine Timna could have been one of these hence the naming of her son by that name. The whole picture of the story of the Amalekites, the Horites and Esau appears to be of merging rather than of extinction.

The Amalekites, whether the descendants of Esau or a section of the original 'first nation' is not known, sought to destroy Israel at Rephidim (Ex. 17:8). The Edomites refused permission for the Israelites to pass through their land (Num. 20:18-21). After this, no more is said of Esau or his descendants until the time of Saul and David (1 Sam. 14:47; 11 Sam. 8:13-14; 1 Kings 11:15-16). Notwithstanding reverses, the Edomites remained firmly in the region of Mount Sier with their capital city Elath very much under their control. This control was weakened and the way paved for the Nabathean occupation of the land by the onslaught of the king of Syria, the record of which makes interesting reading. "At that time

Rezin king of Syria recovered Elath to Syria, and drove the Jews from Elath . . ." (11 Kings 16:6).

All authorities agree that the name 'Jew' or **rather its Hebrew equivalent of 'Judaean' only came into existence subsequent to 536 B.C.** whereas the above incident took place in 739 B.C. There is one of two explanations for this and one may consider:

(a) **that the word 'Jew' was inserted here by some scribe at a later date** which leaves those driven from the city unnamed, possibly because it was self-evident that these were Edomites or;

(b) the name was given to the Edomites because of their adoption of this name when they supplanted the rightful owners of the land of Judaea.

The northern kingdom of Israel having been taken captive by the Assyrians, the remaining kingdom of Judah was then attacked by Nebuchadnezzar and from the record of Psalm 137:7, it would appear that the Edomites were prominent in the atrocities perpetrated in the destruction of Jerusalem. It is at this stage that the Nabatheans had succeeded in removing Edom from the region of Mount Sier, for the Edomites, in return for the service rendered to the king of Babylon, were given the territory extending from the former southern boundary of Judah to Egypt.

With the downfall of the Babylonian Empire, Cyrus the Persian king issued a decree which permitted the return to the land of any of the captives of Judah and Benjamin who felt so inclined (Ezra 1:3). If the record of Ezra and Nehemiah is carefully sifted it will be found that a subtle infiltration of Edomites took place (Ezra 4:1-2). It will be noted that the record commences "Now when the adversaries of Benjamin and Judah hears . . ." Who were the adversaries? They are not named here and the simple explanation is that the adversaries, not only of Judah and Benjamin, but all Israel, had, since inception, been Esau.

Slowly but surely **Edomite infiltration** gathered momentum until, at the time of the Grecian Empire, the land, which had been called Judaea, was also known as Idumea --- the Greek word meaning

Edomite. At the time of the Birth of the Lord Jesus Christ the Edomite take-over had been completed --- the 'dominion' had in deed been taken. Herod was not only an Idumean by race and a 'Jew' by religion but he was the devil incarnate. During his administration of Judaea, he showed all the 'craftiness' of Esau plus the lust for blood. He had nine or ten wives who, on the least suspicion of guilt, were put to death in an orgy which revolted even the callous Augustus in Rome. On his deathbed, indeed five days before he died, Herod ordered his son Antipater to be killed. Augustus remarked: "It is better to be Herod's hog than to be his son."

It was the Lord Jesus Christ Himself Who exposed these Edomites who had taken Judaeans nationality and religion for in offering freedom through faith in Him, the Jews replied: "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free" (John 8:33). This contention was never disputed by the Lord which means that they were entirely correct in their claim. True Israelites had been in bondage --- this was commemorated in observance of the Sabbath (Dent. 5:15). "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Not only does this deny that the Jews were Israel but serves to illustrate that they were not of Judah or Benjamin either. These two tribes had, a mere 400 years previously, been in the Babylonian captivity an experience not easily forgotten. Yet, here were a people claiming exemption from historical bondage and corroborated by the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Jewish Encyclopaedia claims that the Idumeans completely disappear from history and that they were absorbed within Jewry. It would be more correct to say that they displaced the true Judaeans who were Judah and Benjamin and in taking 'the dominion' they presented themselves as Israel and claimed all that had been given to Jacob.

Thus, in answer to the question: "Are the Turks descended from Esau?" one may answer No, as the above conclusively proves.

QUESTION 17.

Was the separateness of Israel limited to the Old Testament?

"And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped" (1 Cor. 14:7).

The principle of separate characteristics is here extended to cover **even** things without life. and was no doubt based by Paul, on the lead given in this respect, by the Lord Jesus Christ. It will be noted that the Lord made pointed references to the biological principle of 'by their fruits ye shall know them' (Matt. 7:20) and stressed the fact that men do not gather grapes from thorns nor do they pick figs from thistles (Matt. 7:16). At a later stage, He pointedly referred to man in this context by saying: "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things" (Matt. 12:35). Again it will be noted that the context in which this principle is expounded is biological for He preceded His discourse with a reference to good and bad trees. Thus, the principle of **inherent** characteristics, i.e., those qualities which are passed from father to son, is not a doctrine which finds opposition in the New Testament.

In passing to the Old Testament, it will be found that the selection of Abraham was not a haphazard gamble based on a facade of righteous living. Faith which is 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen' (Heb. 11:1) was clearly a feature in Abraham (Heb. 11:8-11) but this in itself was not sufficient to earn for him the title of 'friend of God' (11 Chron. 20:7). Search as one may, one will not find another to whom this exclusive title was given which leads one to enquire further into this matter.

Abraham believed God which, in essence, is a progression from believing in God. The latter implies a belief in the existence of God in the religious sense that He exists for the sole purpose of receiving the worship of mankind. This belief excludes God from the everyday politics of life. God commanded Abraham to separate himself from a society which was riddled with a confused belief in God and he obeyed, not knowing what lay ahead of him. "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the

Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and **not by faith only**" (James 2:23-24).

Abraham, the 'Friend of God', had a potential which was known to the Lord (Gen. 18:19). "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord..." The word 'command' in the original Hebrew carries more meaning than the superficial 'instruction' implies. The Hebrew words in this context are **amar or dabar**. However, the Hebrew word used in Genesis 18:19 is **tsavah** which, according to Young's **Concordance**, means 'to set up'. In what way could Abraham 'set up' his children and household?

In tracing Abraham's line backwards, one finds that the characteristics which earned him his title were identical with those of Noah, 'a just man and perfect in his generations and Noah walked with God' (Gen. 6:9) and Enoch who also 'walked with God' (Gen. 5:22). This family line thus appears to have this predisposition that they 'believed God'. Abraham, of course, was married to Sarai (later Sarah) who came from the same family and of whom Abraham said: ". . . she is my sister; she is the daughter of my father, but not the daughter of my mother; and she became my wife" (Gen. 20:12). Whether Sarah was Abraham's half-sister or niece, she came from the same family line with precisely the same characteristics. In the light of this one may see why, out of the eight sons born to Abraham, only that born to him by Sarah was chosen in terms of God's national purpose in the family (Gen. 17:19). Hagar bore Ishmael and Keturah six other sons (Gen. 25: 1-4) none of whom was adequate in terms of God's purpose to bless all the nations and families of the earth.

In the matter of a bride for Isaac (Gen. 24) it will be noted that here the instruction of Abraham to his servant was: ". . . thou shalt go unto my country, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac" (Gen. 24:4). This, it will be seen, was a principle which Isaac, too, followed when instructing Jacob concerning his selection of a wife, for Jacob was instructed to 'go to Padanaram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother's father; and take thee a wife from thence of the daughters of Laban thy mother's brother" (Gen. 28:2).

The family, having been 'set up' on the basis of 'walking with God' and thus 'believing God', it became a matter of logic that these traits he

preserved within a people to whom God had committed Himself on Oath (Gen. 22:16). The prohibition, recorded in Deuteronomy 7, concerning covenants and contracts with the people of the land was against the background of the danger of the pollution of the genetic seed which carried the characteristics required by God for the outworking of His Purpose. "For thou art an holy (separate) people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are on the face of the earth" (Deut. 7:6). "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms: and he shall thrust out the enemy from before thee; and shall say, Destroy them, Israel then shall dwell in safety alone: the fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of corn and wine; also his heavens shall drop down dew" (Deut. 33:27-28).

As one proceeds with the history of Israel, it will be seen that disobedience to God in terms of His prohibitions concerning the 'stranger' (Isa. 1:7 and Hos. 7:9) necessitated direct action by the Lord. Note that it was God's direct action that stirred up the Assyrian (Isa. 10:5-6) to take the house of Israel captive and it should be noted, too, that the Lord intended to cleanse the nation of the superimposed disobedience by making her blind (Hos. 2:6) and alluring her into the wilderness (verse 14). The house of Judah, i.e., the remaining two tribes in Canaan were taken into the Babylonian captivity from which a mere 42600 returned. In this remnant, the feature of knowing that pollution of the seed was abhorrent to the Lord is evident. It will be noted that Cyrus' decree was answered by those whom the Spirit of the Lord had stirred up (Ezra 1:5) and who knew right from wrong. **Pollution of the 'separated' seed (Ezra 9:2) constituted a national calamity in this remnant of Israel which was put down most vigorously (Ezra 10:10-17).**

In the closing Book of the Old Testament, attention is drawn to the unchanging Purpose of God in the Israel nation. At this time, the greater bulk of the nation was outside the boundaries of Palestine with the returned remnant very much in the process of dilution under the impact of Edomite infiltration. ". . . I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed" (Mal. 3:6). Here, in plain, straightforward language, the Lord reiterates the continuity of His Purpose and as 'there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning' (James 1:17) in God, the sons of Jacob, the 'seed of Israel' (Jer. 31:35) would continue to be the composite whole before Him.

The New Testament in no way negates Israel's Old Testament separateness. It will be noted that Paul recognised this for he wrote of the peculiar and separate role of Israel 'to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the promises, and the service of God and the promises' (Rom. 9:4). It will be noted, too, that Peter endorses the continued separate nature of Israel. "But ye are a chosen generation (race), a royal priesthood, an holy (separate) nation, a peculiar people . . ." (1 Peter 2:9).

If the separateness of Israel became redundant with the New Testament, why did the Lord Jesus Christ discriminate against the other nations when He sent His disciples only to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matt. 10:5-6)? Why did He inform the Syrophenician woman that He was only sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. 15:24)?

The Bible, or rather the teaching of it, is giving a very uncertain sound today and it is rather significant that this has been to the accompaniment of the intense form of miscegenation which has taken place in Israel over the last 30 years.

To sum up, let Paul provide an answer remembering that God had promised Israel, in consequence of her transgression, that He would redeem and that they would be called 'sons of the living God' (Hos. 1:10). "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, And will be a Father unto you and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord. Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness (separation) in the fear of God" (II Cor. 6:17-18 and 7:1).

QUESTION 18.

Was there an admixture of tribes in Captivity?

While the 'children of Israel' are spoken of as such, i.e., in a collective and composite sense, the scripture makes it abundantly clear that in 'the latter days', each tribe would have retained sufficient tribal

identity as to enable Jacob to provide a preview of the circumstances obtaining in each of the tribes (Gen. 49:1-28). This being so, the question posed above would appear to have been answered. However, as it is asked within the context of the captivities, a history of the tribes over this period must be considered.

By way of introduction to the circumstances which led to the captivities, attention is focused on the divisions which occurred in the children of Israel at a very early period.

In the first instance it will be noted that while the people were lumped together in the Egyptian slavery, tribal identities were never lost for at the time of the Exodus, "When Israel went out of Egypt . . . Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion" (Psa. 114:1-2). It is thus noted that in circumstances which may be classified as national in dimension, tribal identities are not lost. From the Exodus until the time of the Monarchy in Israel in the land of Canaan -- - notwithstanding the transition from tribal status to that of nationhood --- the various tribes asserted themselves in a general period of unrest in which ". . . every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Judges 21:25).

The era of the Judges did little to stem the tide for corruption was evident among these administrators --- as an example of which was the appointment of Samuel's sons as Judges in Israel (1 Sam. 8:1-3). It was after this that the people, collectively, rejected the Theocracy and demanded ". . . a king to judge us like all nations (verse 5). Saul, a Benjamite, was the first king in Israel (1 Sam. 9:1-21) whose death left the nation in a state of political crisis with civil war following. The house of Judah the royal tribe in Israel --- then anointed David who became king over the house of Judah (11 Sam. 2:4-7) while Saul's son, Ishbosheth, ruled over the rest of the tribes of Israel (11 Sam. 2:10). It was only after the second civil war in Israel that David was finally crowned king over all twelve tribes of Israel (11 Sam. 5:5). Although thus unified, the various tribes in Israel retained their identities within the land apportionments given them by Moses.

The transgression of Solomon (1 Kings 11:4-8) begins to bring the captivities into focus for, because of his evil, the Lord promised to divide the nation of Israel into two unequal portions 1 Kings 11:13) which after the accession of Rehoboam his son, actually came to pass

(1 Kings 12:16-17). It is interesting to note here that the phrase 'all Israel' appears to be indicative of the people and which excludes the tribe of Judah. "And when **all Israel** saw that the king hearkened not unto them, the people answered the king, saying, "What portion have we in David? . . ." To your tents O Israel: now see to thine own house David . . . So Israel rebelled against the house of David unto this day And it came to pass that when **all Israel** heard that Jereboam was returned, that they sent and called him unto the congregation, and made him king over **all Israel**: there was none that followed the house of David, but the tribe of Judah only" (I Kings 12:16-20). The fact that Benjamin is associated with Judah (verse 21) as a 'light bearing' tribe (1 Kings 11:36) would appear to make the Phrase 'all Israel' indicative of the ten tribes now established as the Northern Kingdom of the house of Israel.

In considering Jeremiah 50:17 one is able to see the captivities of the two kingdoms in perspective. "Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away: first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, hath broken his bones." Note here that the king of Assyria 'devoured' Israel while the king of Babylon 'damaged' Judah --- Israel eaten up, disappears, Judah damaged but not lost sight of.

Another feature to be noted --- indeed a most important feature --- is the difference between the circumstances of the two captivities. "And I saw, when for all the causes whereby backsliding Israel **committed adultery** I had put her away, and given her a **bill of divorce**; yet her treacherous sister Judah feared not and went and played the harlot also . . ." (Jer. 3:8). The essential difference in the judgments pronounced on Israel and Judah is to be seen in the fact that while Israel was given a bill of divorce, Judah, although acting 'treacherously' did not come under the same condemnation. A feature of this 'bill of divorcement' was that the 'wife' received the bill and was then sent out of her husband's house (Deut. 24:1). If, however, the wife remarries another man, she cannot be married, on his death, to her former husband (Deut. 24:4).

Now in the case of Israel under the 'bill of divorce', it will be noted that under the metaphor of the 'adulterous wife', she committed harlotry, it does not state that she went to be another man's wife and consequently her former husband could legally woo her and win her

again for himself. This is precisely the pattern revealed in the scripture. In Isaiah 50:1 reference is made to the bill of divorce to be followed by the statement: "Is my hand shortened at all, that it cannot redeem? or have I no power to deliver? . . ." (verse 2). In Hosea 2 the same feature is to be seen wherein the Lord specifically states that He would ". . . hedge up thy way with thorns and make a wall, that she shall not find her paths ... I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and speak comfortably unto her . . . And it shall be at that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me **Isni** (my husband); and shalt call me no more Baali (my Lord) . . . And I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in loving kindness, and in mercies".

It should be noted that all the above could not be achieved until reconciliation through redemption had been achieved. Now, Israel, because of national deviations from the Law of the Lord was 'sent out of her husband's house', i.e., taken into captivity by the Assyrians. One may read of the process by which Israel was taken captive in II Kings 15:29 and corroborated in I Chronicles 5:26. This was the beginning of the end so to speak for in II Kings 17:5 and 18:9 the history of Israel's capital Samaria, is related and ends with the statement: "And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel unto Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan and in the cities of the Medes." Thus was the first stage of Israel's bill of divorce put into operation.

It should be noted, however, that a very small remnant was left in the land indeed, so small that Isaiah the prophet speaks of them as the 'gleanings' left after the harvest. "And in that day it shall come to pass, that the glory of Jacob shall be made thin, and the fatness of his flesh shall wax lean. . . . Yet gleaning grapes shall be left in it, as the shaking of an olive tree, two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost fruitful branches thereof, saith the Lord . . ." (Isa. 17: 4-6). From the general picture of the deportations of Israel under the various Assyrian invasions, the small remnant left would appear to be those of the tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali (Isa. 9:D although it is possible that one or two individuals of other tribes could have been there as well. Indeed, Anna, a prophetess of the tribe of Asher is mentioned as being in Jerusalem at the time when the Lord Jesus Christ was born (Luke 2:36).

Be that as it may, Israel as a national unit was legally debarred from the land under the bill of divorce and until Redemption had been wrought could not return.

Judah, on the other hand, could return not having come under the same Law. That 42,360 of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin did return is confirmed in Ezra 2:64. What happened to the remainder of the southern kingdom of the house of Judah is not known although it is stated that the Assyrians invaded Judah as well (Isa. 36:1). Sennacherib, who was responsible for this invasion, has left a monument (today in the British Museum) which relates that he took well over two hundred thousand captives from Judah and placed them with the captives already in Halah, Habor by the river of Gozan and the cities of the Medes. This must have depleted the population of the kingdom of Judah more than considerably and it is small wonder that the Babylonian forces had very little difficulty in taking this small remnant captive. As has been stated above, what happened to those of the Babylonian captivity who did not return, is not known.

Writing in A.D. 60, James addressed his epistle to the 'twelve tribes which are scattered abroad' (James 1:1) which gives one the impression that they were still twelve in number and still recognisable as such. The significant feature here is that at that time, the Jews were in Jerusalem preparing to stave off the Roman assault which finally destroyed the city 10 years later. They, apparently, did not come under the general classification of the 'twelve tribes' which leaves one to ponder the claim that they are the Israel of God.

Thus, in answering the question concerning an admixture of the tribes in captivity, while it cannot be said precisely where each of the tribes is today (apart from Ephraim in Britain), they must be in existence for Jacob to have been able to relate their various conditions in the 'latter days'.

QUESTION 19.

Has the Law become Redundant?

"Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was

made: and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator" (Gal. 3:19).

To fully appreciate the above scripture it is necessary to once again consider the giving of the Law to Israel at Sinai, for it is against this background and the knowledge of it that Paul makes such frequent references to the Law (Rom. 7:1). As has been stated in a previous answer dealing with the Law, the Codification of all previous Commands given by God took on a new aspect when it became the Divine Directive of the Lord to His people Israel. Violation of any of the Clauses in **this** Constitution was imputed as 'sin' for 'sin is the transgression of the law' 1 John 3:4) and the 'wages of sin is death' (Rom. 6:23).

The Lord God, having committed Himself, His Honour and His Oath to the Israel people in terms of His World Purposes which are found in the Abrahamic Covenant, could not introduce a mechanism which would, in terms of malfunction, invalidate His Plans. Consequently, an addition was made to the Law and became 'the law that was added because of transgression' (Gal. 3:19) and in this law, is found the mechanism of the remission of sin through the shedding of the blood of a substitutionary offering.

It is all too obvious that Paul did not have in mind 'the law of the Lord which is perfect' (Psa. 19:7) but rather the law that was added and was 'the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, see, saith he, that they make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount' (Heb. 8:5). To the Law, i.e., the commandments, statutes and judgments which were perfect, was added the Ordinances of the 'shedding of blood' of animals for the remission of sin and which were a 'shadow' --- an insubstantial and imperfect means of reconciliation between God and Israel.

Bearing these features in mind, it is significant to note that Moses communicated the statutes and judgments to Israel with the specific command to "Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations ..." (Deut. 4:5-6). No mention is made there to the Ordinances of the shedding of blood in the context of the other nations of the earth, while in the eighth verse of the same chapter the statutes and judgments are again

mentioned. "And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day?"

It is common knowledge that the whole family of Israel broke the Law of the Lord. The house of Israel, i.e., the northern kingdom comprising the ten tribes, completely repudiated the Law of the Lord when it came under the 'statutes of Omri' (Mic. 6:16) the seventh king in Israel who 'wrought evil in the eyes of the Lord, and did worse than all that were before him' (1 Kings 16:25). That Israel thus repudiated the Law of the Lord did not mean that the Law had no more effect on them --- it continued to operate in spite of the nation's adherence to the new statutes created by their king. In Leviticus 26:14-33 is set out the progression of chastisements for continued transgression of the Law and, notwithstanding the national repudiation of the Law of the Lord, these continued to be operative in the nation.

It will be noted that drought was one of the effects of transgression of the Law and in I Kings 17 is recorded the devastating drought which ended only after the tremendous demonstration of the reality of God through the intercession of Elijah (1 Kings 18: 25-46). The ravaging of wild beasts throughout the land was another consequence of Law transgression and which the prophet Ezekiel records as the experience of the people (Ezek. 14:21). Pestilence, another chastisement, was experienced by Israel as Haggai relates (Hag. 1:6) while cannibalism within besieged cities was a last grim warning (11 Kings 6:28) of the impending captivity and desolation of the land (11 Kings 17:6). It should be noted that God's Law was an integral part of Israel and absolutely essential for the success of God's National Plan to bless all the nations of the earth (Deut. 4:6). As the Law of the Lord was perfection (Psa. 19:7) it follows that no provision was made for any other code of behaviour.

It is most significant that at the time when the vast majority of Israel had passed into the Assyrian captivity and Judah was in the process of being removed into Babylon that the Lord communicated His intention with Israel in the context of His Law to Jeremiah the prophet. In terms of the Mosaic dispensation when the Laws were administered by the Levites whose responsibility it was to keep the nation instructed in these, the Divine Constitution was, as it were, a remote mechanism under which the people lived. The Lord now

intended to alter this by removing its remoteness and making each individual within the nation a type of Levite. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah . . . this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people . . ." (Jer. 31:31-33). Following this dramatic announcement is the pronouncement that so long as the sun, moon and stars endured, the 'seed of Israel' would be a nation before God for ever (verse 35). It should be noted that the new covenant had to do with the writing of God's Laws and not the Laws themselves.

As one leaves the Old Testament, the Lord's Benediction on all that is written in this should be noted. "I am the Lord, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed" (Mal. 3:6). "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments" (Mal. 4:4). Why should the Lord emphasize the continuity of the seed of Jacob and command the remembrance of the Law given at Sinai if, in a very short period, both the nation and the Law were to be repealed in a new dispensation? As will be seen, the New Testament, far from rescinding the National purpose in Israel and repealing the Laws governing the nation, establishes it until 'heaven and earth pass'.

At the outset of what has commonly come to be known as 'the Sermon on the Mount', it will be noted that the Lord Jesus Christ, Who stressed that He could do nothing in opposition to what the Father had done (John 5:19), warned against any speculation in respect of the Law or the prophets. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. 5:17). He certainly fulfilled the prophecy which had been spoken by Moses and recorded in Deuteronomy 18:15 and which formed the basis of Peter's second address after Pentecost. "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you (Acts 3:22).

Did the Lord fulfil the Law? Let His own words provide the answer. "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt.

5:18). This is followed by the strongest condemnation of those who break or teach the breaking of the laws of God. If one continues with the 'Sermon on the Mount' it will be seen that the Lord attacks, not the Law, but the Talmudic interpretations of the Law which He called, 'the traditions of men' (Matt. 15:6). "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time ..." is the recurring phrase in the 'Sermon' which, in the plainest language, indicates the encrustation of man's opinion concerning the Law of the Lord.

It is generally held today that the law of love has supplanted all else -- - this being based on the Lord's answer to the question: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" The Lord's answer should be carefully noted for He says that the first is to 'Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind' and the second, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'. His reply, however, does not end there although many appear to think that it does. The Lord proceeds to indicate that on these two commandments 'hang the whole law' which is something infinitely different to saying that these are the only two laws applicable. It will be noted further that, the Lord was quoting two passages of the Law, namely, Deuteronomy 6:5: ". . . thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" and Leviticus 19:18 ". . . thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself . . ." It follows that if one were to obey the two mentioned commandments, they would keep the whole --- for they are the foundations on which the Law is based.

Continuing in the vein of the Law, it will be noted that the angelic pronouncement to Joseph concerning the naming of the Child to be born to Mary, had to do with transgression of the Law. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name **JESUS; for he shall save his people from their sins**" (Matt. 1:21). Sin being a 'transgression of the Law', the Hebrew name **Yashuah** --- Deliverer, has a profound significance in terms of Israel's desperate plight.

It will be recalled that God promised that He would make a new covenant with Israel (Jer. 31:31) and on the eve of the Betrayal which led to the Crucifixion, the Lord Jesus Christ ". . . took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the new testament . . ." The Greek word for 'testament' is **diatheke** and carries the identical meaning of the Hebrew **beriyth** which **is covenant**. The literal translation of the Lord's statement is thus: "For this is my blood of the new covenant . . ." --- and the New

Covenant is a Law Covenant. The Levitical order of Priesthood plus the 'law that was added' were now repealed for the Lord Himself became the mediator of the better covenant (Heb. 8:6). Note, not a better Law, for what can be better than perfection.

The Lord ascended to the 'right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens' where, as High Priest after the Order of Melchizedek (Heb. 5:1-10) He makes intercession and acts as Mediator. This brings the answer to the whole question into focus. A 'High Priest' is necessary for only one reason --- to serve the sacrificial law of absolution before the demands of Constitutional Law and this, on the authority of scripture, is precisely the Function of Jesus Christ, High Priest after the Order of Melchizedek, Who, seated on the right hand of the throne in the heavens, mediates until His enemies be made His footstool (Heb. 1:13). ***If the Law of the Lord has become redundant, what need is there for a High Priest?*** In order to obviate this, it has been suggested that the Lord Jesus. Christ now ***rules in heaven*** but this has no scriptural authority whatsoever. He Mediates because the Law exists and will continue to exist 'till heaven and earth' pass away.

QUESTION 20.

Has the nation Israel any relevance in the New Testament?

As one looks at the name 'New Testament' one finds that it has given rise to an unfortunate misunderstanding in that it is thought to be something entirely new and utterly divorced from the 'Old Testament'. The name 'New Testament' has been taken from Matthew 26:28; Mark 14:24 and Luke 22:20, all of which are the record of the words of the Lord Jesus Christ when He said: "This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you". As has been shown in the previous answer, the word 'testament' in Greek is identical in meaning with the Hebrew 'covenant' which therefore makes it the Book of the New Covenant.

This immediately throws the Israel nation into its orbit for whether one chooses to search the record of Jeremiah 31:31 or Hebrews 8:8, it will be found that the New Covenant was made specifically with Israel and not generally with all mankind. This being so, it would appear that the question has been answered without going any further. However, there is positive evidence that the circumstances obtaining

in the Israel nation had a very definite relevance to the events which led up to the Crucifixion on Calvary.

At the outset it will be noted that the Holy Name of God was bound up with Israel and that God did the binding. Because of His world Purposes in which Abraham and his seed were to be the heirs of the world (Rom. 4:13), the Lord guaranteed the fulfilment of this by specifically commanding that His Name be placed upon the people of Israel (Num. 6:23-27). At the time when the nation was in the throes of passing into captivity because of transgression, the Lord spoke through Isaiah the prophet and His words should be noted. "Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified . . ." (Isa. 49:3); "This people have I formed for myself; they shall shew forth my praise" (Isa. 43:21); "For my name's sake will I defer mine anger, and for my praise will I refrain for thee, that I cut thee not off. Behold, I have refined thee, but not with silver: I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction. For mine own sake, even for mine own sake, will I do it: for how should my name be polluted: and I will not give my glory unto another. Harken unto me, O Jacob and Israel, my called; I am he; I am the first, I also am the last" (Isa. 48:9-12).

It should be noted that all this occurred only four days ago in time as it is reckoned by God for "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day" (II Peter 3:8). In the light of this, is it feasible to suggest that God's Covenant, His Oath and the Honour of His Holy Name should all cease and become utterly redundant at the commencement of the New Testament. How would society today, notwithstanding its permissive nature, react if a man entered into an agreement on Monday, affirmed it on Tuesday, emphasised it on Wednesday, reaffirmed it with delight on Thursday and then repudiated it on Friday? The Law Courts of the country would have much to say about the matter and yet this is precisely what is implied when men contend that the New Testament is a repudiation of Israel's relevance to God's Purpose.

As one proceeds with the actual record of the New Covenant (Testament), one finds that while a very small minority of Israel may have been present among the Judaeans, the greater bulk of the nation was in dispersion and, apparently, taboo to the Jews. It will be recalled that on the occasion when the Lord Jesus Christ told the Pharisees that He was soon to leave them and His destination was where ". . . ye cannot come." Then said the Jews among themselves,

Whither will he go, that we shall not find him? Will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles. (John 7:33-35).

Israel was thus very much in existence outside of Judaea indeed they had to be in existence for the opening chapter of Matthew's Gospel to have any meaning. The chapter begins with a genealogy commencing with Abraham and ending with ". . . Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ". The genealogy of Mary (Luke 3:23-38), too, follows the same national line which goes back to Abraham but then continues to Adam. This then gives historical meaning to the statement: ". . . for he shall save his people from their sins" (Matt. 1:21). While it is theologically contended that the phrase 'his people' covers future generations of believers, the Bible relates that, according to the flesh, Christ came from the Israel people (Rom. 9:4-5) --- a people who alone were given the Law at Sinai and whose transgression of this was positively imputed as sin (1 John 3:4).

It will be noted in proceeding that Israel's relevance in the New Testament was such as to warrant a positive act of discrimination by the Lord against all other nations for He specifically commanded His chosen disciples to go to the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matt. 10:5-6). The further relevance of Israel is seen in yet another discriminatory statement by the Lord when He informed the Syrophenician woman "I have been sent only **to the lost sheep of the house of Israel**" (Matt. 15:24, Weymouth). It should be noted that the Lord stated that He had been sent ". . . for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he that sent me" (John 8:42) --- the implication of which in terms of God's Holy Name bound up to the Israel nation is surely self-evident.

Passing on to a further relevance of Israel, it will be noted that it was because of Israel that the Sacrifice on Calvary had to be accomplished. It will be observed that 'salvation' was dispensed by the Lord prior to Calvary which leads one to ask why it was necessary for the Lord to die the agonising death on Golgotha. In Luke 19:1-9 one finds the principle of sincere, not superficial, repentance basic to salvation. Zaccheus was, in the eyes of all, a sinner, i.e., he transgressed the Law of God (Luke 19:7) but as he stood before the Lord, he renounced his former ways and said: "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold" (verse 8). The reply of the Lord to

this is staggering. "And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man is come to seek and save that which is lost" (verses 9-10). Thus, salvation was available before Calvary and without the Sacrifice. Why then was it necessary for the Sacrifice to take place?

The answer usually given here is that 'without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin' --- precisely, but to whom had this formula been given? According to the Bible, it had been given only to the Israel people and as they were at this time in dispersion and prohibited, under the 'bill of divorce', from returning to Palestine in order to make the sacrifice, it was done on their behalf by the High Priest who made any further offering of sacrifice unnecessary.

In passing on, one comes to the Revelation of Jesus Christ to John on the isle of Patmos where the 'woman' who had borne the 'manchild' (Rev. 12:1-4), fled into the wilderness, where she bath a place prepared of God (verse 6). As has been shown, it was from Israel that the Lord was born according to the flesh and in the symbolism of Revelation, the woman is identified with Israel. Israel fled to the place 'prepared of God'. It will be noted that this is an extension of the promise of God made to David through Nathan the prophet. **"Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more . . ."** (II Sam. 7:10). This could not have been Palestine for at that time they were firmly entrenched in the land and certainly more than a formidable force to the surrounding nations. The statement in the Revelation shows the promise of God in the process of fulfilment which shows more than a superficial relevance of Israel in the New Testament times.