

"GOD'S COVENANTS"

(The Discourse below is by Benjamin H. Barton, as reported in the 1909 Convention Report.)

Before coming to the consideration of the subject direct, I would like to say a few words in relation to my own experience in connection with the matter. Whenever any thought has been promulgated by Bro. Russell, either in writing or orally, I have always held my judgment in suspense until I have been thoroughly satisfied that the Scriptures corroborate the view he has presented; and so when these thoughts upon the subject of the covenants were presented by him, I could see certain Scriptures which seemingly were corroborative of his view, but there were other passages which seemed to conflict with his view. Instead of hastily concluding that Bro. Russell was wrong, as many seem to have done, I determined to wait until the Lord had made this matter clear and plain. I took a composition book and headed two pages; "The Covenants." At the top of one page, I put the statement: "Scriptures and lines of thought which seem to corroborate the view of Bro. Russell." And on the other page I wrote: "Scriptures and lines of thought which seem to contradict the view of Bro. Russell." I then searched for every passage in the Bible which directly or indirectly seemed to relate to the subject of the covenants, especially the New Covenant. When I found a passage which seemed in perfect agreement with the view of Bro. Russell, I put it on the affirmative side, and when I found a passage which seemed to conflict, I put it on the negative side. I made no attempt to twist any passage nor to force it to conform to the idea which he presented. I then thought of all the points or arguments which would have a bearing upon the subject, and I put them on their respective sides. When I had finished I had a very large number of Scriptures and quite an array of arguments and lines of thought. The majority of them seemed to be confirmatory of Bro. Russell's position, but there were quite a number which seemed to conflict with his position. I then took the matter to the Lord in prayer, I left it entirely with Him, and asked that this matter might be thoroughly settled, and determined to hold my opinion to myself until I had given the subject such a thorough investigation that every Scripture and argument would be removed from one side to the other, and when I had everything in the same column, I would be satisfied as to which view was right, and which was wrong.

It required quite a number of weeks before the subject was thoroughly settled to my satisfaction. There were some passages in the book of Hebrews which seemed almost impossible of understanding as Bro. Russell had presented the matter, and I made no attempt to twist those passages, nor to distort them, or to try to work out of them a significance which the Lord did not intend us to get from them. But, in due time, I was just as thoroughly satisfied upon the subject of the New Covenant as upon any other subject contained in the Word of God. I now see in those passages a depth of meaning, and a harmony with the other statements of the Word of God of which I had once never

dreamed, and I now look back and wonder how it was that I read those passages over and over and over and failed to see the real depth -- the views which I expect to present in the course of this talk.

Suppose we begin this discourse by noticing the occasion when The Lord made His wonderful covenant with Abraham. We must keep in mind that this was not the first covenant that God ever made, for we recall the special covenant God made with Noah, saying that He would never again destroy the earth with a flood of water, but it is this covenant with Abraham around which all other covenants revolve. It is recorded in Gen. 22:15-18: *And the angel of the LORD called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, {16} And said, By myself have I sworn, saith the LORD, for because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy son, thine only son: {17} That in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand which is upon the sea shore; and thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies; {18} And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.*

When we call this a covenant, we are not using liberty, because the Bible itself speaks of it in various places as a covenant. In Luke 1:72, 73 we read *To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; {73} The oath which he sware to our father Abraham.* Here it is stated that this oath which God sware to Abraham was his holy covenant.

Again, Acts 3:25 KJV *Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.* However, there was something very peculiar about this covenant. A covenant is not merely a promise; it includes certain promises, but it implies an agreement. The Hebrew word rendered covenant unmistakably has this meaning. The Greek word translated covenant is sometimes used rather in the significance of a promise, but it also has other secondary meanings, and it is often used as the equivalent of the Hebrew word conveying the thought of an agreement. Yet to a great majority of Christian people God's statement to Abraham has never been considered as a covenant, but merely as a promise. But just as truly as God would never call something death that was not death, so He would never call something a covenant that was not a covenant. The agreement entered into between God and Abraham was a very peculiar agreement. It was a covenant because it was an agreement which involved God and it was also to involve others, but God made it in the nature of an unconditional covenant. He told what He would do according to that covenant, and then left it to the liberty of all those who might come to an understanding of His promise to decide as to what they would do in view of what He had promised to do. If we are pleased to make an entire surrender of ourselves to Him, to live for Him, to glorify Him in thought, word and deed, we thereby become participants in this covenant, and was in harmony with this that the Psalmist

stated in Psalm 50:5 *Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.* This is one reason why the Abrahamic covenant is a covenant of liberty. It is different in this respect from the covenant made through Moses with the Nation of Israel at Mt. Sinai, which was a covenant of bondage, a covenant which did not leave it to the people as to what they would do or would not do, but it stated, Thou shalt do this, Thou shalt not do that, etc.

Because the statements of God to Abraham were spoken of as a promise should not blind us to the fact that they were also in the nature of a covenant. A covenant would be impossible without a promise being included in it. Therefore, we sometimes find it called a promise and sometimes a covenant -- it was both.

We might digress here for a moment to notice an argument which has been used by those opposed to our understanding of the covenants. They say that there is no Scripture where it says that God made the covenant with anybody, but that the thought is always that God made that covenant to a certain one. But I would say that such have not thoroughly familiarized themselves with the Hebrew idiom in connection with the making of covenants. In the Hebrew language, the expression which almost always is made use of is that of making a covenant to a person, even though it is frequently translated as making a covenant with a certain person. As an illustration of this, notice Joshua 9:7, 11, 15: "Make a league with you," while the original Hebrew states it, "Make to us a covenant." The Hebrew expression is equally as proper and accurate as our English, because a covenant binds one to another. Many illustrations of this can easily be found throughout the Old Testament.

We thus see two peculiar covenants brought to our attention in the Old Testament times -- the covenant with Abraham, and the covenant with Israel at Mount Sinai, often styled the Law Covenant. These two are referred to by Paul in Eph. 2:12, where he tells the Gentile converts that previously they had been strangers from the covenants of promise. He put the word covenants here in the plural. What two or more covenants is he speaking of? The Abrahamic and the Law Covenants. Were both of these covenants "covenants of promise"? Most assuredly, though the Law Covenant contained promises which no one of all the imperfect race of Israel were able to keep because of their weaknesses and inability to conform their lives to a perfect law. However, Jesus because of His faithfulness became heir to all the promises of the law covenant, but the Gentile converts had formerly been strangers to these things. And with equal truthfulness, they had been also strangers to that other covenant containing the promise which would ultimately result in the blessings to all.

These two covenants are beautifully portrayed by the Apostle Paul in Gal. 4:21-31: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman." We all

recognize these two sons as Ishmael and Isaac the son of Sarah, the true wife of Abraham. "But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise." In other words, Ishmael was born without any necessity for divine intervention; it was a matter of the flesh altogether, but it was different in the case of Isaac. In the accomplishment of his birth God's special overruling providence was required to work a miracle. "Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants." We know that the larger part of the Old Testament had a typical and allegorical significance; the things recorded actually happened, but they were not recorded because there was any real worth in them from a historical, sociological or ethnological standpoint, but because there was a hidden meaning underneath them, which the Lord realized would be for our edification. Now, if Paul had never told us that the history of Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Ishmael and Hagar was an allegory, we might have known it anyhow, but we feel ourselves on so much safer ground when we have the inspired statement as to what this allegory represented. We might have thought that Sarah was a type of the Church and Hagar of the Jewish Nation, or vice versa, or we might have supposed some other strange idea from our own imaginations. But here we have Paul's positive assertion that those two women were typical of two covenants.

Now we might inquire as to which covenant Sarah and Hagar would typify, and we look to see if there is any special mark peculiar to those two women, which corresponds to these two covenants, and immediately recognize that there is. We remember one of the emphatic things recorded of Hagar is her bondage, and how appropriately this reminds us of the bondage of the Sinaitic or Law Covenant. Sarah therefore represents the other or covenant of grace and special promise, and the Apostle goes on to say: "For these are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." We notice that this word "Agar" is spelled differently than in the Old Testament, not having the initial letter "H," but we might say by way of explanation that there is really no letter in the Greek which corresponds with the letter H in the Hebrew, so that Agar in the New Testament really refers to the same woman who is called Hagar in the Old Testament. "For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." The Apostle thus very clearly shows us the correspondencies between Hagar and the Law Covenant, and between Hagar's child and the children of the Law Covenant. "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband. Now, we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then, he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman. So then, brethren, we are not the children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

Having obtained from Paul the key to this type, let us now consider it in the light of what he has said and see the beauty of the allegory. In other lines of study, we have seen that Abraham is a type of God; for instance, when he offered up his son Isaac, he was there clearly marked as the type of God offering up His Son. Again in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, he is a type of God. In that parable we note that the rich man saw him afar off, which illustrates how the Jews have seen God afar off, since temporarily cast off, not nigh as they once were. We understand from Paul's declaration that Sarah, the wife of Abraham, was a type of the covenant of grace. The fact that Sarah was Abraham's wife emphasizes the preciousness of that covenant which God made. Just think of what it means for God to speak of that covenant as His wife, to be called the husband of that covenant. We also have Scriptural foundation for this statement in Isa. 54:5: "For thy maker." The Maker of that Abrahamic covenant was God Jehovah. "For thy maker is thine husband; the LORD of hosts is his name." This gives us some faint conception of how dear to the heart of the Father in heaven that wonderful covenant must have been. The very name Sarah is significant; it means "princess." The covenant of grace is well called the Sarah covenant; because it is the Princess Covenant, which is going to give birth to the Royal Seed.

However, after Abraham's marriage to Sarah, years passed and there was no Seed as the result of that union, and we remember that this same thing was true of the covenant of which Sarah was a type. After God had married that covenant away back in the days of Abraham, that covenant was unproductive, so far as producing the Seed through which the promises were to be fulfilled. And, in addition to this, it almost looked as though Abraham did not care for his wife Sarah. You remember that on two occasions it looked almost as though Abraham had actually denied his wife and that he did not love her. We recall the experiences with Pharaoh and Abimelech, when he taught Sarah to say that she was his sister. (Gen. 12:10-20; 20:1-13.) It looked as though Abraham was not truthful, but he explained afterwards that she was his half-sister, but she was more. How well that illustrates God's relationship to that covenant which He made. It seemed that God did not care any more for that covenant than Abraham did for Sarah. God likewise made statements which seemed contrary to the covenant which He had made, and it looked as though He had very little love for His covenant.

At length it seemed unlikely that there would be any result from the union of Abraham and Sarah, so Hagar was added to the family of Abraham. (Gen. 16: 1-3.) She did not actually become Abraham's wife -- she did not take Sarah's place, but Abraham treated her as though she were his wife, and as though she had taken Sarah's place.

The same thing is true of the Law Covenant, of which Hagar was a type. In due time the Law Covenant, if we may be permitted to use the expression, was added to the family of God, and so Paul puts it, "The Law (Covenant) was added because of transgression until the Seed should come." (Gal. 3:19.) God treated that Law Covenant as though it was His

wife, and as though it had taken the place of the original covenant, but that was not really the case.

Almost immediately the result of Hagar's relationship with Abraham was Ishmael, and so, we remember that very quick results came from the addition of the Law Covenant -- the development of those of whom Ishmael was a type. We remember that even after the birth of Ishmael, God kept reiterating the promise which He had made respecting Sarah, although each year it looked more unlikely that that promise would have a fulfillment. So likewise, after the Law Covenant had been inaugurated, and after the development of the children of the Law Covenant, God kept reiterating through the prophets the fact that the Sarah Covenant would produce the promised Seed, in due time. But as it seemed unreasonable with Sarah, it likewise seemed unreasonable that the Sarah Covenant would ever have the Seed that was promised. It almost looked in Abraham's case as though the only child he would ever have would be Ishmael, and it also almost looked as though in God's case that the only children He would ever have would be the children that might be developed under that Law Covenant. At length, however, Sarah conceived and Isaac was born. At length, also, the time for the development of the children of the Sarah Covenant, the Isaac Class, arrived. We are to keep in mind that Ishmael was not a type of one individual, but of a whole class; and so likewise, Isaac was not a type of one person, but of a whole class. Thus we read in Paul's statement in Gal. 4:28: "Now we brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise." Isaac thus typified not merely the Lord Jesus Christ, but His faithful followers, His brethren as well. The Lord Jesus Christ was the Head of that Isaac Class, and His faithful followers will constitute the Body of that Isaac Class. In some of the types of the Old Testament, for instance, when Abraham offered up Isaac, Isaac represented only the Lord Jesus, but there are other types in the Old Testament in which Isaac typified not only the Lord Jesus, but the Church also. We remember he was given the name Isaac, because Sarah said: "Now all the world will laugh with me." The word "Isaac" means "laughter." (Gen. 21:1-6.) How appropriate, because Isaac represents a class that will make the whole world laugh, the one that is to displace sorrow with joy, grief with pleasure. We also remember that Ishmael took rather unkindly to Isaac, and as Paul also reminds us in Galatians, he persecuted and mocked Isaac (Gen. 21:9); similarly we remember that the Ishmael Class, the Jews, persecuted and mocked the Isaac Class, the Lord Jesus and His faithful followers. The result of Ishmael mocking Isaac was that Abraham cast off Hagar and her child (Gen. 21:10-14); and, as a result of the Jews rejecting the Isaac Class, our Lord, the Apostles and the faithful ones, God cast off the Law Covenant and its children, the class of which Ishmael was a type. It is by keeping this thought in mind that we find a depth of meaning in many of the Old Testament passages which otherwise would have but little intelligent significance.

Notice Isa. 50:1: *Thus saith the LORD, Where is the bill of your mother's divorcement, whom I have put away? or which of my creditors is it to whom I have sold you? Behold,*

for your iniquities have ye sold yourselves, and for your transgressions is your mother put away. What mother is here referred to? It is evident that the Lord's remarks are aimed at the Jewish Nation, but who was the mother of the Jewish Nation? This very question and our inability to see the correct answer has confused a great many. The Law Covenant was the mother, and the Lord divorced the Law Covenant over 1800 years ago, just as Abraham did with Hagar. The Law Covenant was cast off because of the transgressions of its offspring. We remember how, after being cast off, Hagar and Ishmael had a very hard time, and we remember that the Jewish people have had a very hard time ever since they were cast off. We also recall that Hagar did not die the moment she was cast off by Abraham, neither did the Law Covenant die 1800 years ago when God put that Covenant aside. Hagar lived for some time to afford the best comfort she could to her son Ishmael, and so the Law Covenant is still in existence, trying to comfort, trying to give some measure of help to its children, the Jews. But we also remember that the Scriptures show that at last Hagar was led to recognize and point Ishmael to the well of water. Here notice Genesis 21:19 and the context. This was expressly stated to be in the Wilderness of Beer-Sheba, a word which means, "The well of the oath." (See V. 31.) We see in all of this an intimation of how, in due time, the Law Covenant is going to point the Jews to the truth and the blessings that will come through the wonderful oath-bound covenant made away back there with Abraham in the days of old.

Notice another passage in Micah 5:1-4. The first and second verses have to do with the first advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, and they speak of His birth at Bethlehem, and tell how, instead of the Ishmael class accepting the Lord Jesus willingly, they would "Smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek." Then follows the third verse, "Therefore," that is, in view of the fact that those Jews were willing to smite and persecute our Lord, just like Ishmael persecuted Isaac. "Therefore will he give them up until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel. And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord." There we are told that the children of the Law Covenant were to be given up, to be cast off until the time that the Sarah Covenant, the covenant which during this period of the Gospel age would be travailing and would bring forth the whole Isaac class, and when this had been accomplished, the Lord's favor was going to return to the Ishmael class, and they were to get the blessings which the Lord foretold to them, under the New Covenant.

We thus get the thought that the Covenant under which Christ and the Church were to be developed was not a New Covenant which would supersede the old Law Covenant, but in reality it is a much older covenant than that one made at Mount Sinai -- it was made away back in the days of Abraham. However, it remained barren for 2200 years, and 1800 years ago that Covenant was redeemed from its barren condition. It would not be right to say that when Isaac was begotten Sarah had become Abraham's new wife. She was his true wife much longer, as respects her relationship to Abraham than Hagar. The only difference was that there had not been any visible result from Sarah's relationship to

Abraham up to that time. The same is true of the covenant under which we are developed. It is not a new covenant any more than Sarah was a new wife, and if it is proper to term the Law Covenant the Old Covenant, then it is proper to designate the Covenant under which we are developed as an older Covenant still. Notice the statement in Isaiah in this connection. The Apostle in Gal. 4:27 expressly applies the first verse of the 54th chapter of Isaiah to the Covenant under which Christ and the church are developed. So again we have the key which makes us recognize that we are on safe ground in the application which we are about to make.

We will just briefly comment upon a few thoughts in Isa. 54:1-5, but we will not attempt to go into an exhaustive treatment of all the statements there. "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child." Here the Abrahamic Covenant of grace is personified, being compared to a woman who has been childless for many years, but now has occasion for rejoicing because at last granted a child. She is spoken of as "the desolate," not because she is now desolate, but in remembrance of the long period during which this was the case. In the same verse the Law Covenant is called "the married wife." While this is the rendering in both the King James and Revised Versions it is not a very accurate translation of the original. The usual word for wife (*ishshab*) is so translated several hundred times in the English bible, but the word used in the passage we are considering (*baal*) is a word very seldom applied to a wife, though often to the husband. It is a word which conveys to the mind the idea of ownership, possession. Thus Paul in Gal. 4:27 gives the thought correctly: "She which hath an husband." In an oriental home where there are several wives, if only one of those wives has borne their husband children, she naturally feels that in a special sense he is her husband, he belongs to her. The original Greek of Paul's words emphasize this thought; note the Diaglott: "HER having the HUSBAND." How well this pictures the relative positions of the Abrahamic and Law Covenants during the 1800 years of the Jewish Age.

The prophet Isaiah then foretells in Verses 1 and 2 how much greater will be the results of the Abrahamic Covenant than the Law Covenant, and in verse 3 shows us that the children of the Covenant made with Abraham will not be all found in one part of the earth, but she was to "break forth on the right hand and on the left," in every direction; in contradistinction to the children of the Hagar Covenant, who were all located in that land of Palestine. The remainder of this third verse most unquestionably points to Christ and the Church as the Seed of this formerly barren covenant: "Thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles (nations), and make the desolate cities to be inhabited" (Psalm 2:8 and Rev. 2:26, 27) are examples of the plain statements in the Word of God proving that the Seed of Isa. 54:3 must be Christ and his faithful followers.

In the following verse that covenant still being personified as a woman, is advised to forget the long period during which she was more like an unmarried woman, or, worse

yet, more like a widow. As far as visible results were concerned, it almost looked as though she did not have a husband. Then in verse 5 we are taught that just as the same Abraham who originally made Sarah his wife, in due time with divine assistance delivered her from her barren condition; so likewise the same God who had originally made the Covenant of grace in due time redeemed or delivered it from its barrenness. Israel knew Him in a limited sense, and they recognized Him as their Holy One, but in due time every one was to know this wonderful God and Father. Then He would be the God of the whole earth.

Now having considered the subject sufficiently to have satisfied us that we are under a covenant which is now about 4,000 years old, we would inquire regarding the covenant which is distinguished from either of the two old covenants we have been considering by being called "the New Covenant." And we will begin this portion of our study by considering Rom. 11:25-27: *For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. {26} And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: {27} For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.*

In other words, Israel, like Ishmael, has been rejected or cast off, and this condition was to last until all the Isaac class had been developed, or the entire Church of Christ had been developed out from the nations of earth. (Please read Rom. 11:26 and 27.) Here we have reference to a Covenant which is specially connected with the blessing of Israel after their regathering. It is this Covenant which the Prophets, and our Lord and the Apostles designated as the New Covenant.

Listen to Jer. 31:29-34. *In those days they shall say no more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. {30} But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, his teeth shall be set on edge. {31} 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: {32} Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the LORD: {33} But 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. {34} And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.* In the 29th and 30th verses we have statements which never were true and never will be true until the Millennial reign of the Lord Jesus Christ: Then again in the 34th verse, we have a picture

after the Millennial Age has made considerable progress: (Please read). Now, if verses 29, 30 and 34 have evident reference to the Millennium is it not also probable and proper that the verses 31, 32 and 33 should also point us to something respecting the Millennium? (Please read V. 31.) Now we want to see if there is not something further to identify the time to which this New Covenant applies, and we find there is: (Please read v. 32.) We are thus reminded that there will be some sharp distinctions between the old Law Covenant and the new Law Covenant, and one great difference will be that whereas that old Covenant was disregarded and broken by them, the new Covenant will be respected and kept.

But let us pause here for a little consideration of the last part of this verse, "although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord." You will recall that the Apostle quoted this passage in Heb. 8:9, and if you look at his rendering of this clause you will find it radically different from the English version of Jer. 31:32. Paul has it read: "And I regarded them not, saith the Lord." We must consider Paul a competent translator or judge of translations, especially when it is remembered that he was controlled by the spirit of inspiration; but why is there such a seeming discrepancy between his words and the passage in Jeremiah? That the words of Jeremiah could be rendered just as they are in the King James version there can be no question but we feel compelled to see if they do not have another meaning in harmony with the statement in Hebrews. We could never be satisfied to think of the inspired Apostle as misquoting Scripture. The New Testament writers when quoting from the Old Testament do not always quote the same identical words as they spoke a different language, but while we may note a little difference in the wording it presents the very same thought. That must be so in this instance, too. And it is, for we find quite a number of Hebrew scholars giving to reject, to disregard, as some of the meanings of the word. Thus in Genesis' Hebrew Lexicon we have this very passage in Jeremiah cited as an instance of this significance. The marginal reading in the common version also is in harmony with the thought, though I do not see that it is a really accurate rendering; "should I have continued an husband unto them?" That is, seeing the people of Israel were treating the children of Abrahamic Covenant somewhat like Ishmael treated Isaac, how could they expect God to treat the Law Covenant and the children of that Covenant as a husband would treat his wife and children? No, he would do as Abraham had done, cast off that Law Covenant which for so long time had been treated as a wife, and He would reject the children of that Covenant, the natural Seed of Abraham, until the entire Isaac Seed had been developed.

I have considered this point somewhat in detail because of its bearing on the 33rd verse, which we will now consider: "But this will be the Covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord." After what days? After the days when the Lord would have disregarded them; after those days in which he would not show them the favor formerly enjoyed. And we all instantly recognize that those days of

disfavor have lasted nearly 1900 years. So "after those days" would clearly designate the Millennial Age as the time for this New Covenant. (Please read Jer. 31:33 and 34.)

That this new Covenant was to be inaugurated in the Millennium after the regathering of the Jews, is also proven by Jer. 32:37-40: *Behold, I will gather them out of all countries, whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: {38} And they shall be my people, and I will be their God: {39} And I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them: {40} And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.*

Another pertinent Scripture is found in Ezek. 20:37: "And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the Covenant." Israel's experiences under the chastening rod have been painful and humiliating, but, thank God! her buffeting is almost over and soon the blessings of that new and everlasting Covenant will begin to be showered upon her.

Having considered these quotations from the prophets, let us return to the writings of the Apostle Paul. The book of Hebrews is specially full of statements regarding the New Covenant. Of all the passages in the Bible which might seem to support the idea of the New Covenant most of us once held, these verses in Hebrews are invariably counted among the very strongest; and yet, if I were called upon today to prove that the Church is not under the New Covenant, that the New Covenant did not include the special blessings which the sacrifice of Jesus Christ has made possible to the Church of this age; I would very likely turn to these very passages in the book of Hebrews to prove our position. I believe the statements of the 7th and 8th chapters of this book as convincing as any one could ever ask for. And still I must admit, when this further light began to be seen on the subject of the Covenants, these very verses appeared to me to be almost irreconcilable with it, while now their teachings are so simple and plain that I wonder I did not see it from the first.

Let us turn to Heb. 7:22: "By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better Covenant." The King James version renders the same Greek word, sometimes Covenant and sometimes Testament, but the significance would be more quickly grasped if in all of these places it were rendered Covenant. Both the Revised version and the Diaglott have Covenant in Heb. 7:22. This verse makes it most emphatically evident that this better Covenant, better than the Law Covenant under which Israel previously was, was a thing of the future, not of the present; and the proof of our assertion is the word "surety."

Let me illustrate the significance of this word; suppose that in the same room, within ten feet of me, there was a bag of gold which I desired some one present to bring to me. How strange it would be if, before I allowed that one to touch the bag, I would require surety, or, as we more usually say, security. But if that bag of gold was two or three thousand miles away, then it would be nothing unusual to expect that man to have some one go on his bond as a surety, a guarantee, a pledge, that he would bring the gold to me, if I sent him after it.

Similarly, the Lord Jesus is not the surety for the blessings enjoyed by the Church today. He purchased those blessings for us with his own blood, but we do not need any surety of them, because we have the things themselves. But if our Savior is a surety it implies that there is something yet future coming to somebody, something different from what we are getting today. Paul calls that something a better Covenant, so we conclude that this Covenant is entirely separate and distinct from the high calling of this age. This agrees perfectly with what we have already seen: that the new Covenant has reference to the blessings of restitution, which are soon to be granted to the willing of mankind, beginning with the people of Israel. Jesus, as a result of the sacrifice which He completed at Calvary, is the surety, the pledge, the guarantee, that these things shall be, even though the Jew is still in a castoff condition, yet, in due time, the very one because of whose rejection they were cast off, will be the one who will bring them back.

Heb. 8:6-13 will be now considered, but we will first take the 6th and 7th verses by themselves. *But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises. {7} For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. {8} For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: {9} Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. {10} For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: {11} And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. {12} For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. {13} In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.* The Apostle here calls the Sinaitic or Law Covenant the first covenant, not because it was the first covenant that God ever made, indeed, we know that the Abraham Covenant was not the first covenant, but it is called the first covenant because it was the first covenant given to Israel as a whole. His statement is another way of saying that, if the first covenant had been faultless, it would have done the work that the second covenant is going to do, as a

consequence, the second covenant would have been unnecessary. Now we inquire, What would the first or Law Covenant have done had it been faultless? We must remember that the fault was not in its imperfection, but in the lack of any mediatorial provision to offset the weakness and inability of the people to keep it. If that covenant had been faultless, it would have given the people under it everlasting life. That covenant said that the man that doeth these things shall live by them, and he could have lived as long as he did those things. Furthermore, he would have been free from sickness and disease. In addition to that, his farm would have been a paradise, for God had promised to bless his flocks, and trees, and wine and oil, and to bless him in basket and in store. To sum it up, man would have been a perfect being living eternally in a perfect earthly paradise. But if that first covenant had been faultless, it would not have taken any one to heaven; it would not have made any one a joint heir with Jesus; it would not have begotten any one to the divine nature, nor given them immortality -- it would have accomplished restitution. So if the second covenant is going to do what the first covenant should have done, then that New or Better Covenant will accomplish restitution, and nothing of a spiritual nature at all.

But some one might ask, Why in the 6th verse does the Apostle speak of this covenant in the past tense, as having already been established? Saying: "Which was established upon better promises." We answer that that covenant was established 1800 years ago, but we must distinguish between a covenant being established and becoming operative. In our city the council meet together, and they enact certain laws, these laws then go to the mayor for his signature, and after being properly passed and signed, they are established. Yet it might be explicitly stated in the body of that law that it was not to go into effect or operation until Jan. 1, 1912. It might be that that law appointed the mayor as arbitrator or referee in some particular matter. He is appointed arbitrator, referee or whatever the position might be the moment that law was established, and yet, he does not have any duty to perform in that capacity until the law has gone into effect or become operative, and that is expressly stated to be at a particular future time. It is in perfect accordance with this that the New Covenant was established 1800 years ago, and it is in perfect agreement with this that the Lord Jesus Christ was appointed Mediator 1800 years ago, but all the Word of God agrees in proving that that New Covenant was not to become operative until more than 1800 years after it had been established, and several thousand years after it had been promised.

The Apostle then continues by referring to the passage already noted in Jer 31: (Read Heb. 8:8 to 13..) (In verse 10: "after those days saith the Lord" Bro. Barton comments: After those days in which they would be disregarded, in the cast-off condition.)

This last verse reminds us that the Law Covenant in Paul's day occupied a position somewhat similar to Hagar's position after Abraham had rejected her. There she was in the wilderness, almost ready to die, to vanish away; nevertheless with certain promises

which God had made her and her child Ishmael; so Paul saw the Law Covenant in Hagar's predicament, almost ready to die, to vanish away, but there were certain promises of future blessings which God had made to the children of the Law Covenant, and these would have to be fulfilled after the death of the Hagar Covenant, and in the days of the New Covenant.

We will again digress to note another beautiful point, and yet so liable to be misunderstood. I refer to the word translated "make" in the 8th verse. Those who refer to the Emphatic Diaglott will find this word there translated "complete." In the King James version the Greek word "sunteleo" is rendered by four English words: end, finish, fulfill, make. It is evident in the verse under consideration that the Apostle did not mean to say: after those days God will bring that New Covenant to an end, for in that case it would not have been an "everlasting covenant" at all. When was the Law Covenant finished or completed? In one sense it was finished or fulfilled 1800 years ago, and in still another sense it will be finished at the close of this age, when the Israelites are delivered from its curse, by coming into the bonds of the New Covenant; but in neither of these senses does the Bible use the word "sunteleo." The Law Covenant was finished in the "sunteleo" sense when God had completed the writing of the commandments on the tables of stone, and giving them to Moses, sent him down from the mountain to inaugurate that covenant with the people of Israel. A house cannot be conveniently occupied until it is finished, a horse and vehicle cannot be driven until the harnessing had been completed; similarly a covenant cannot be effective until it has been "sunteleo."

But there is still another thought in this word which must be noticed. In Jer. 31:33, from which Paul is quoting here in Heb. 8, and, in fact, in almost all Old Testament passages where it speaks of "making a covenant," the word translated "make" is not the usual word with that significance, but it is the rendering of the Hebrew word "karath." This word has the sense of cutting off. Jer. 11:19: *But I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter; and I knew not that they had devised devices against me, saying, Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof, and let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name may be no more remembered.* Joel 1:9 says: *The meat offering and the drink offering is cut off from the house of the LORD; the priests, the LORD'S ministers, mourn.* This word was used in connection with covenants in evident reference to the sacrifices that would seal or ratify the covenant entered into. No covenant was really made until the sacrifices had been cut off or accomplished. However, we must distinguish between the sacrifices being cut off, and the covenant being made as a result of the sacrifices being cut off. Jeremiah's word would not mean that, after those days the sacrifices will be cut off; indeed, the sacrifices will all have been made before those days. The thought was, after those days I will covenant a covenant with the house of Israel as a result of the sacrifices cut off.

When Paul came to translate this word into the Greek, he says (see Diaglott rendering of Heb. 8:10): "For this is the covenant that I will covenant with the house of Israel; after those days," etc. But in order to emphasize the thought of the original Hebrew, the Apostle in V. 8 uses a still different word, "sunteleo," from what he has in V. 10. We have already noted the force of this word, but there is another point connected with it that we cannot pass unnoticed. In classic Greek this word was commonly used in a different sense from what it usually has in the New Testament. It meant payments or contributions made by others towards defraying the expenses of some enterprise that had for its object the benefiting of the general public. Thus in Liddell and Scott's Unabridged Greek Lexicon are included such definitions of the word as "a joint contribution for the public burdens. For instance, at Athens, this term was applied to a body of men who contributed jointly each year to equip a ship for the public service. Any similar partnership in bearing public burdens."

I do not lay much stress on the acceptance of the more classic meanings of the New Testament words, and yet there is certainly some food for reflection here. The new covenant promises were not for the benefit of some private class, like the high calling of this Gospel Age, but it was for the blessing of the general public, all the people of the earth, beginning with the Jewish nation. However, certain contribution, certain sacrifices were to be made before the work could begin. The principal contributor, in fact, the sole contributor as far as individual merit was concerned, was the Lord Jesus; but while the Church had no merit of her own to offer, yet the Heavenly Father had graciously arranged that she should have somewhat to contribute also, by bestowing upon her some of the merit borrowed from the Lord Jesus Himself. She has the privilege of contributing that which was reckoned to her through faith in the blood of the Savior. And when all these contributions are in, then this new covenant will begin to operate on behalf of Israel first, and then through Israel to all the remainder of the human family. (Acts 15:15-17; 1 Pet. 4:13.)

Let us next turn to the 9th chapter of this epistle to the Hebrews, Vs. 13 to 15. *For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: {14} How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? {15} And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.* While the verses that follow these three have considerable bearing on the subjects we are considering, yet it is these three that we will give most attention to, because they are recognized by some as amongst the most difficult to reconcile with our views of the covenants, and it is so until you once get the real import of this passage. A casual glance at these words would lead almost anyone to think Paul was here saying that those to whom he was writing had been delivered from the condemnation of the law

covenant by coming under the new covenant. But a little further research would show us that we had failed to grasp the basis of the Apostle's argument. The epistle to the Hebrews was primarily addressed to the Jews and Jewish proselytes who had accepted the Christian religion, and the inspired writer here, as well as in many other places, points out to them that their deserts under that first covenant was condemnation. And just as truly as a murderer with the sentence of death hanging over him could not be put on trial for another crime, until some way had been found of delivering him from the penalty incurred by the first crime; neither could those Jews be accepted to the Lord and enter the race for a heavenly prize, unless some way was found of delivering them from the condemnation of the law covenant, as well as from the more universal sentence resulting from the sin of Father Adam.

However, that law covenant could not be disregarded, nor its condemnation ignored, so the only way whereby the Israelite could have its curse lifted would be by the introduction of that of which the law covenant was a type, a shadow. Then it would be just as it is in nature, where every shadow ends at the substance. But before the law was given the Lord selected the mediator for that covenant, and so the first thing in the introduction of the antitypical law covenant was the election of its mediator. So we recognize God's choice of the Lord Jesus 1900 years ago to be the mediator of this better covenant even though, as we have already seen, He was not to begin to bestow the blessings of that covenant until it had become operative. And now that the Savior had become the Mediator of the new covenant, it was possible for those who had been under the condemnation of the law to accept the Lord Jesus as their Captain and Leader instead of Moses, and through faith in His great offering, the great sacrifice which fitted Him to become the Mediator of the new covenant, they found deliverance from the curse of the law covenant.

Now do not misunderstand me, and think that by this I mean the law covenant ended and the new covenant began 1800 years ago. That is not my thought. I may illustrate it in this manner; there are two classes of people in the world at this time. To the one class we are yet in the Gospel Age, and to them the Millennium will not begin until 1915. But there is another class, among whom we are thankful to be counted, with whom the Gospel ended in one sense and the Millennium began in 1874. So in the days of the Apostles there were two classes, to the one class the law covenant was as dead, but to the other class the law was just as much alive as ever. In Rom. 10:4, Paul refers to the first class, saying, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." But some one may be prompted to remark: I do not see how the law covenant could be said to end even with this class, unless they came under the new covenant first, if it be true that no shadow ends until the substance has begun. To this I answer, the substance has begun with them, but in a wondrous way the Lord arranged for them to share in the distribution of the blessings of the new covenant, rather than in the receiving of the blessings which were to be granted to those under that new arrangement.

In order to appreciate this point, let us note that there were three stages to the law covenant, and similarly there were to be three stages to the new covenant, of which the law covenant was a type.

First, there was the preparatory stage which lasted for forty days, when Moses went up into the mountain and preparations were made for bringing Israel into covenant relationship with the Lord. In due time Moses came down from the mountain. There the preparatory stage ended when the Law went into effect. After it went into effect, then the influence of the Law Covenant began to be felt. Now, 1800 years ago, as respects the class which accepted the Lord Jesus as their Savior and Redeemer, the third stage ended, and there the first stage of the New Covenant began, namely, the preparatory stage. We remember Moses was in the mountain forty days during that preparatory stage, which represented the entire Gospel Age. When Moses came down from the mountain, he had to put a vail over his face, reminding us that at the end of this Gospel Age, the greater Moses was to come down and He would be invisible to the world. He came down to inaugurate the Law Covenant, for which preparations had been going on for forty days, and so when the greater Moses comes down at the end of the Gospel Age, it will be to inaugurate the New Covenant, of which the Law Covenant was a type, and for which preparations have been going on all down through the Gospel Age.

We can thus see that it would be improper to speak of the second stage of the New Covenant, beginning where the third stage of the Law Covenant ended. Where the third stage of the Law Covenant ends, as respects that class, the first stage of the New Covenant began. The first stage, as we have already seen, was the preparatory stage. After this would come the second stage when the New Covenant would become operative, which will last during the Millennial Age. Then, after the New Covenant became operative, the third stage will begin when the effects of the New Covenant would be experienced. How long? -- through all eternity. That is why it is called the Everlasting Covenant. It would be very inappropriate for us to take any other view of this matter. We also recall the Jubilee type. We remember that the Jubilee consisted of two stages: First, the cycle of 49 years, then the Jubilee, the 50th year. When the last typical Jubilee was celebrated, then the antitype began. Not the Jubilee itself, but the antitypical cycle, and when the antitypical cycle ends, then the second state or real Jubilee will begin.

We would also call your attention to the fact that the Apostle Paul in the 3rd chapter of 2 Corinthians is making a comparison between the work of the Gospel Age and that of the Law Covenant, and he clearly shows that the comparison was not with the time when the Law Covenant had gone into effect and become operative, but with the time when the Law Covenant was in process of preparation. He reminds us there that just as up in the mountain the tables were being prepared, so today there is a work going on of which that

was a type. But up in the mountain the Law Covenant was not binding, not operative -- no indeed. But the agents and instruments necessary to put that Law covenant into effect were being prepared, being fitted for the work that they were to do. So, likewise, during this Gospel Age, a similar work is going on, a preparatory work, which is going to make the New Covenant effective in blessing all the families of the earth.

We notice in this connection also the statement of Paul in 2 Cor., 3rd chapter and the 6th verse, "Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Covenant." Remember that the ministers of that Law Covenant were not the people under the Law Covenant, but that the principal minister of that Law Covenant was Moses, and he ministered the Law Covenant largely before the Law Covenant became operative; it was while he was up in the mountain that he was its minister as truly as after he came down. So today we are ministers of the New Covenant, we are ministers of the Lord, servants, sharing with Him the work of preparation which will ultimately inaugurate this New Covenant which is to mean a new agreement on behalf of Israel, and through them to the remainder of the world of mankind. However, what we have been saying applies only to those who have recognized the Lord Jesus as their Redeemer. Christ is the end of the Law to such, but to the remainder of the Jews that Law Covenant is as binding as it ever was; they are still under the control of it, just as Ishmael was under the control of Hagar back there in the wilderness.

Now, this will probably be the most appropriate place for some reference to the type of Abraham and his wives. Someone might say, Why is it if there is to be a New Covenant that God did not illustrate it in the case of Abraham and his wives? Why did God cut the picture short? The Lord has made that picture complete too. We find that there is still another wife mentioned in the 25th chapter of Genesis -- Keturah, and we understand that she is the appropriate type of this New Covenant. One might inquire as to why Paul made no reference to her in the Epistle to the Galatians, and we say, Simply because she had nothing to do with the argument which the Apostle was making. He was endeavoring to show some of those Christians that they were occupying a very improper position, that they were making believe that it was necessary to adhere to all the requirements of the Jewish Law, and the Apostle used this argument to show that that was a wrong position, that it would have been very inappropriate for Isaac to have clung to Sarah, and at the same time to have wanted to go out in the wilderness and to spend the time with Hagar too. So the Apostle was trying to show them that they were not the children of the Hagar Covenant, but that they were the children of the Covenant of which Sarah was a type. Now, to have brought in this New Covenant would only have confused matters and would not have served any purpose, it would have added to the mistiness of the subject to those whom Paul was addressing.

But we find frequent illustrations of this, and we remember that passage in Isa. 61, -- how our Savior quoted only a part of the passage, only so much as was appropriate in His day.

He said (*Isaiah 61:1-2 KJV*) *The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; {2} To proclaim the acceptable year of the LORD.* There he stopped. Why not go on and describe the other things. Because they were not then due. In Eph. 4:8, Paul said, "Wherefore he said when he ascended upon high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." Paul was only partly quoting this passage from Psa. 68:18. He quoted only just as much as appropriate to this Gospel Age, but there is another clause in that verse which refers to the Millennial Age and Paul very properly left that out; he was not talking about the Millennial times then, but about our position in this Gospel Age. It was in perfect harmony with this thought that Paul made no reference to Keturah, but we know that the Lord never puts anything in His Word without a purpose, and it cannot be that this reference to Keturah slipped in here without any real significance or object, but when we look a little deeper, we are surprised to find how appropriate the picture is in this detail also. In Gen. 24:16, it refers to the death of Sarah, and then, the very next verse, the 1st of the 25th chapter, begins, "Then again Abraham took a wife and her name was Keturah." And in the following verses we read of six children whom she bore. The construction leaves no doubt in one's mind but that Keturah was a wife to Abraham subsequent to the death of Sarah. Furthermore, if Keturah had lived previous to Sarah's death, or during her lifetime, why all those statements respecting Isaac, and how he was Abraham's peculiar son, and how he was the only son to whom properly Abraham's inheritance could go. Yet very few Bible scholars and students are willing to admit that after the death of Sarah Abraham did take another wife, Keturah, as recorded here.

I will refer you to the Bible dictionaries and other books treating upon this as a proof of what I have to say. Almost all of them agree notwithstanding the plain reference of this event to the time after the death of Sarah, almost all of them contend that Keturah must have been a wife who lived contemporaneously with Sarah. The reason given for this belief is that Abraham was quite aged at the time of the birth of Isaac, and it seems miraculous that he should have had a child at all, and God had to interfere and work a miracle. Then, they say, is it possible that Abraham could have grown thirty years older, then married, and then had six children more? Evidently it is a lack of faith on their part. But how well this illustrates the very matter under consideration, the New Covenant -- the very things that Bible students have been saying for years and years about Keturah, are being said today about the New Covenant. They say that it is very unreasonable to think that there is going to be any such thing as a Millennium of blessing for the world they say these things seemingly pointing to the future really have reference to things contemporaneous with the selection of the Church of Christ, that the New Covenant does not have to do with anything that will follow the development of Christ and the Church, any more than Keturah had reference to the wife taken by Abraham after the death of Sarah. But we believe that this statement respecting Keturah is true, just as the Bible records it. Just so, we can have the same assurance respecting the New Covenant, of

which Keturah is a type, that it is equally true. We remember, too, the significance of the name "Keturah," the word meaning "incense." How true it is that through this New Covenant such incense and praise and universal honor will ascend to the Heavenly Father, according to the predictions of the prophets. In Mal. 1:11 the word "incense" is from the same root as Keturah.

We may notice also the share which the Church of Jesus Christ was to have in this New Covenant, and we perceive that it was not the share of a beneficiary, but rather that of being sharers with Jesus in the making of this New Covenant. In Isa. 49:8 we have one statement respecting this, and we are right in applying this to the Church, because the Apostle Paul quotes it in 2 Cor. 6:2, applying it to the Church, *(Isaiah 49:8 KJV) Thus saith the LORD, In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee: and I will preserve thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, to establish the earth, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages;* We find here that the Church was to be given for a covenant. For what covenant? Surely not for the Law Covenant, nor for the covenant of special grace, but we can see that it was to be for, on behalf of, or in the interest of the New Covenant, that they might share with Jesus in bestowing its blessings upon the world.

Let us consider the Scripture relating to the making and sealing of the Law Covenant, and see how it illustrates the making and sealing of the New Covenant. In Exodus 24:4-8 especially, *And Moses wrote all the words of the LORD, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. {5} And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the LORD. {6} And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar. {7} And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the LORD hath said will we do, and be obedient. {8} And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning all these words.* The inspired account here tells us of certain oxen which were sacrificed, and we would understand them to properly represent the great sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. There is reason to believe that there were some goats offered, probably at the same time, judging from the account given in the account in the book of Hebrews, but they are left out of this picture, as though they formed a separate picture. We understand that these oxen typified the same thing that the passover lamb did, all pointing to the one great sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. Then it tells us how part of this blood was sprinkled upon the altar, and the other half was put in basins. The word translated here "basins" does not properly indicate any vessel as large as a basin. It is a word that would more properly refer to a smaller vessel, such as a cup. As an instance of this, in the Song of Solomon 7:2, this same word is translated "goblet." We are to keep in mind that this was not a yearly ceremony, but when the time came for the sealing of this Law Covenant, it was done right at that time, and we can readily

imagine Moses calling to the people to bring their cups, their goblets, any kind of small vessels to put the blood of these oxen in. We understand that this is the work antitypically which has been going on for these past 1800 years, that the Lord Jesus, the great ox, the bullock, was slain, and since that time, we have been partaking of His blood, we have been receiving of His life, for, as the Scriptures express it, "the blood is the life thereof."

These cups and small vessels having been gathered together rather hastily, they must have been a peculiar collection, no two of them exactly alike. Probably some had big cracks through them, others had pieces broken out of them -- some injured in one way and some in another way, but that did not matter. The important thing was not the cup, but the blood that was put in it. Thus it has been during the past 1800 years, for we have been receiving the blood of Jesus Christ. Those cups had no blood of their own until it was put into them. So with us, we had no life until we received it reckonedly from Jesus. Jesus was the only one who had life, as we read, "In him was life." But Jesus poured out His life; He gave up His life there, and we have been receiving it, and so the Apostle could say, "I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me." (John 1:4; Gal. 2:20; John 6:53-57.)

How much blood did these cups add to that which came from the ox? Not one single drop. Did they not possess a little blood of their own? Not one bit. Thus was illustrated how entirely void of life we are of ourselves, how the merit or life comes from Christ. But why was this blood put into these cups? In order that through them it might be applied to all the world of mankind, and so in this picture, we are told how that blood was sprinkled over the people. It could not be the blood that was put upon the altar, for that could not be gathered up again, it must have been that put into these cups, and we can thus see how that, in due time, through the Church, the merit of the Lord Jesus Christ is going to reach all and they will all get the blessings promised. Just as the blood had to come from the oxen, and the cups were merely the channel through which it reached the people, so today, we can see that God's people have no merit of their own. They have merit, they have worth, but it is borrowed merit from the Lord Jesus, and it is this merit which they have received from the great bullock which is going to reach the remainder of mankind.

I cannot help but think that this is the real thought found in 1 Pet. 1:2, *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you, and peace, be multiplied.* You will notice that the Apostle is not speaking about how we have been chosen because of the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. We realize that we need the blood of Jesus Christ just as much as the world needs it in the next age, but we recognize that we must get the benefit of the blood before we would be of the elect, but, after becoming the elect, the Lord shows us that we have the privilege of obedience, and so today we are trying to be obedient, but there is going to be a future work. After this has properly developed us, we

are then to share, in due time, in the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. Well, one may ask, Has not the blood of Jesus Christ been sprinkled upon us? We would say, Assuredly. But we must ever bear in mind that there are a great many things true of the Church today that will be true of the world in the Millennial Age, but it would not be reasonable to say that because such things are true of both the Church in this age and of the world in the next age, therefore everything that is true of the Church in this age would be true of the world in the next age. That would lead to some very erroneous conclusions. We know that some things which will be true under the New Covenant are also true under that covenant of grace, but it would not be proper to say that because some of these things are true in both instances that it is all therefore the work of the New Covenant. We know that, according to the New Covenant, the world will be enlightened in respect to the Lord, and we have been; and we know that under the New Covenant the world will be brought to love the Lord, to serve Him, and we have been brought to love and serve the Lord. We are also to bear in mind that we need the blood of Christ just as much as the world under the New Covenant will need the blood of Christ, even though there is some difference in the work accomplished in us and later in the world.

One might be inclined to inquire of us, But are we not reckoned as under the New Covenant when we accept Jesus Christ as our Savior, are we not in the step of justification counted as under the New Covenant? But we answer, No. The New Covenant includes the gradual uplifting process that will bring man to a state of human perfection, and will enable him to actually remain there forever. This is not true of us, because we are not actually brought to a state of human perfection, and at best our standing in this respect is a reckoned one, neither is the work in our case a gradual one, but instantaneous. We thus see that what the world will receive gradually, and actually through the instrumentality of the New Covenant, we receive reckonedly and instantaneously through faith in the great sacrifice of our Savior.

Note the passage in which our Lord's words to His disciples in the upper room are recorded in Matt. 26:27, 28: *And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; {28} For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.* Our Savior invited them to drink what He here called the blood of the New Covenant. When they drank of that cup, they assimilated the wine which it contained, and thus it illustrates well how we assimilate that which we receive of our Lord Jesus. Further-more, it indicates a participation with Him in that same cup of suffering of which He drank. This is also clearly pointed out in Paul's reference to this statement in 1 Cor. 11:25. *After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.* These words show that the Lord Jesus drank of this very cup first, before He gave it to them to drink; and if this implies their coming under a New Covenant, it would indicate that Jesus came under the New Covenant, but if this New Covenant had reference to the benefits that would be enjoyed by all imperfect men,

whether in this age or in the next, then it would lead us to the contradictory conclusion that the Lord Jesus Christ was also an imperfect being, and that He also needed to participate in the imputed merit of His sacrifice. But the very fact that Jesus was a perfect being, and did not require at all the conditions of the New Covenant, is an evidence, and a proof to us that in the drinking of this cup, He had no reference to the coming under the conditions of the New Covenant, but we see now that the real thought of this passage is that, as He had drank of that cup of degradation, bitterness and distress and suffering, and that this even implied the sacrifice of His very life, and all of this was done for the purpose of sealing a New Covenant, then we must likewise believe that the share which Jesus had in this was to illustrate the share which likewise His disciples were to have. If His position was not that of one under the New Covenant, but one who was to seal that Covenant, as a result of the sacrifice of His life, then they likewise, in accordance with the passage already noted in Isa. 49:8, were to share in the sealing of that New Covenant, by giving themselves as He had given Himself. The difference was that in giving Himself, He was perfect and complete, without need of any imputed merit, while with us, we are weak and imperfect, and we need the imputed merit of our Lord and Master. We must get the reckoned righteousness, which comes from the applied merit of our Redeemer, before we are in a fit condition to sit at our Master's table and to participate with Him in the cup which He offers us to drink.

In concluding this discourse it might be well to say a few words respecting why this New Covenant was to be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah -- there is no reference to its being made with the whole world of mankind. We know that all of God's arrangements seem to have been to the Jew first, and then also to the Gentile. We remember that the Apostle Paul said in Rom. 9:4: "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law."

According to the prophetic statements, when the great time of trouble with which this age concludes, has drawn to a close, there will be only one nation on the face of this earth, namely, the Jewish nation. The prophecies lead us to the conviction that the time of trouble will mean the destruction of every nation except the Jewish nation, and to that people it will mean a national resurrection. We remember that in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the Jewish nation was compared to a man, we remember that their national death was represented by the death of that rich man, and that as a nation the Jews have been dead ever since A. D. 70. We recall how in Ezekiel the 37th chapter, reference is made to the resurrection of that nation. The valley of dry bones here spoken of does not refer to the individual Jew, but it refers to them in a national sense. Note the explanation of this fact in the 11th verse: *Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off for our parts.* He does not give us to understand that these bones represent men that are actually dead, because these people are represented as speaking; they are talking about how they were like dried bones, cut off from their parts, their hope

lost. In what sense was this true? Nationally. Then in this passage, we have a picture of the national resurrection of Israel. But the same time of trouble that will result in the national resurrection of Israel will result in the death and destruction of every other nation. In Jer. 30:11, it says: *For I am with thee, saith the LORD, to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee: but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished.* Here the statement is made that the Lord is going to make an end of all nations except the Jewish nation, that He would give them a measure of punishment, and when that period of punishment was over, He was going to restore them and bless them.

When we speak of all other nations being destroyed, we would not have you infer that we mean the individuals of those nations, nor would we have you to understand us to mean that all lines of demarcation will be immediately blotted out, that language and facial characteristics will immediately disappear, but our thought rather is that from their peculiar standpoint as a nation with a government of their own, and with an organization of their own, every other nation on the face of the earth will lose its national individuality and standing in this time of trouble, except this Jewish nation who will gain what the other lose. Why will the Jews survive nationally when the others will not? Simply because the Jewish nation was the only nation established by God; every other nation was man-made, and God had nothing to do with their organization. However, we see that through the Jewish nation that covenant and its blessings will reach all the remainder of the earth's inhabitants in due time. Note a Scripture to this effect in Isa. 14:1: *For the LORD will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land: and the strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob.* Here we would have you specially notice the fact that strangers, those who had been members of other nations, were going to be joined at that time to Israel, to share her blessings. The 2nd chapter of Isaiah is quite a picture of the same thing. Jer. 3:17, 18 also remind us of the way all other nations of the earth will gather about Israel at that time. Notice also Zech. 8:20-23: *Thus saith the LORD of hosts; It shall yet come to pass, that there shall come people, and the inhabitants of many cities: {21} And the inhabitants of one city shall go to another, saying, Let us go speedily to pray before the LORD, and to seek the LORD of hosts: I will go also. {22} Yea, many people and strong nations shall come to seek the LORD of hosts in Jerusalem, and to pray before the LORD. {23} Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you.*

We have a further confirmation of this in Ezek. 16:59-62. First the Lord reminds Israel how they had despised that old Law Covenant that He had made with them, and then He would have them further remember that even though they had been unfaithful, He was not going to forget the beautiful things typified in that Law Covenant, and in due time, He would establish unto them an Everlasting Covenant. Following that in the 61st verse

with the statement, that when He has made that Everlasting Covenant, that New Covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, then He would give to them the people of Samaria, and the people of Sodom, but He specially reminds them that He would not give to Israel those people by that old Law Covenant, but that it was going to be by or through this New Covenant of which we find His Word full of references.

Some might ask why the Lord had determined to send this blessing to other nations through the Jews. One reason is this: The Lord determined to humble the entire human race. There is nothing that will have a more humiliating effect upon a large part of the people of the earth, and especially those who have professed the name of Christ, but have really been unfaithful to His teachings than to be compelled to look up to the Jewish people as the divinely appointed channel through which they will get their blessings. We can well believe many of them at first, in that Millennial time, will refuse to accept the blessing through the Jews, as much as to say, Lord, I want you to bless me, I want to enjoy the blessings of that New Covenant, but I am not going to take it through a Jew. You must send it through some better channel than that. We can imagine the Lord saying, All right, that is the method I have adopted, if you do not wish to accept the blessings through the Jews you need not accept them at all. We realize that in due time that man or woman will come to the humble attitude of mind that will be ready to accept the Lord's blessing through whatever channel He may be pleased to send it. We thus recognize that, beginning with Israel, the blessing of the Lord shall reach ultimately to all the world of mankind, and thus it will be true that the blessings of that time will be to the Jew first and then to the Gentile, the same as it is now. The secret of the Lord respecting the selection of the Church, etc., is with them that fear or reverence Him, and He will show them His covenant. (Psalm 25-14.)