THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF ISRAEL

BY

"ELIEL"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF ISRAEL

FOREWORD

In the course of our lives we are given opportunities that are burning bushes, pointers or sign posts that lead us into the ways of God. The actions we take when those opportunities arise are fundamental to our role and position in eternity. The material presented in this book is one of those opportunities; in fact it is more than one opportunity, it is several of them.

To begin with, this book is the culmination of one man's frustration with the limits of orthodox religion. Virtually every one who comes to the truth of the Bible does so through the churches. Sunday School, Scripture Union, youth camps and Fellowship are all part of a process that is the direct equivalent of kindergarten in terms of educating our spirit. But if we are going to develop further, we have to enter primary school. Here we will start to go beyond the simple concepts of "gentle Jesus, meek and mild" and we will start to form a picture of the Bible as a unified whole. As the picture forms in our minds, the limitations of orthodox religion become a barrier to furthering our education. At this point we either break away into seemingly uncharted waters or we decide it is too hard and too complicated and settle for a *status quo* in the church. This book is well suited to those who have reached that point of decision. It provides a structured means by which you can verify that there are good grounds for considering the churches have a limited and blinkered view of the Bible.

If you take the time to check all that is written in this book, you will be making use of another opportunity. We educate our spirit by working with the Word of God. In the same way that we cannot learn arithmetic by merely reading what someone has written in a text book, we cannot educate our spirit by reading what another man has written. In the end we have to do some work ourselves to practice and become skilful with the new knowledge. Checking the references provided in this book [and the context in which they appear] is the exact equivalent of learning multiplication tables and working through the exercises in each chapter of a maths book. It will provide a useful foundation for further education.

High school is the place where we learn to be critical and to investigate - we do practical work in laboratories and the like. The practical work is elementary, of course, but essential and appropriate for the level of education. High school for our spirits consists of taking the first steps in finding what words God used in His Greek and Hebrew text and checking their meaning with the aid of an expository dictionary. This book is an initial attempt at verifying the meaning of some important words. At this point it is important to realise that the material in this book is fundamentally correct - but Strong's Concordance has been used, at times, to determine the meaning of some words. This is a common mistake; the problem is that a concordance is not a lexicon and it will lead you astray more often than it will assist you. Consequently, when you quote such meanings to more knowledgeable people, they are likely to prove you wrong which will undermine your confidence and progress. However, if you remember that the material in this book is fundamentally correct, the opportunity lies in researching the topics, finding the flaws and seeking out the details. You will be immeasurably better off as a result.

Tertiary education for our spirits consists of coming to grips with the grammar of the Hebrew and Greek and commencing our own translations based on the grammar alone. Our post-graduate work consists of analysing the arguments and doctrines of the church and searching for the answers to the questions raised by others. This book has ventured into all these areas and the outcome is commensurate with the author's level of expertise. The long term opportunity is to extend your knowledge to the point where you can amend and fill out these areas yourself.

In summary, this is a useful book for those who are serious about educating their spirit. It is a good starting point, and used properly, will be a goad to further study.

R.N. Phillips, Sydney, Australia. 1997.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

To indicate the purpose of this book, we will consider the two brackets of Scriptures below; one bracket appears to be general in that it includes everybody on the earth, whereas that other is exclusive to Israel as God's people.

BRACKET ONE

John 3:15	*That whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life.*
John 3:16,17	*For God so loved the world … but that the world through him might be saved.*
Mark 16:15	*And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*
Romans 10:13	*For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

BRACKET TWO

Matt 1:21	*… for he shall save **his people** from their sins.*
Luke 1:77	*To give the knowledge of salvation unto **his people** …*
Luke 1:68	*Blessed be the Lord God **of Israel**, for He hath visited and redeemed **His people**.*
Matt 15:24	*… I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of **the house of Israel.***
John 1:31	*… but, that he should be made manifest **to Israel**, …*
Rom 11:26	*And so **all Israel** shall be saved: …*

This book is a presentation of the affirmative answer to the question, "*Is Israel still an exclusive people*?". It shows that both sets of Scriptures apply to the one people. Acceptance of this affirmative answer will cause some conflict with dispensational teachings, a number of popular evangelical doctrines and the *status quo* of some common church teachings. The religious establishment might be displeased, but there are things for which the establishment has no answer. It will be seen that there are plain statements in the New Testament that are usually glossed over and simply not believed. Acceptance of the affirmative answer will eliminate some present conflicts in doctrine and this is totally desirable.

As soon as a subject like this is raised, there are immediate questions about the present identity of Israel. But, before we can make this clear, it is absolutely necessary to establish right doctrine before we can deal with identity. Either it is right that God made exclusive covenants with Israel as a race or He did not. The answer to this one question determines what we must believe about New Testament doctrine, current world events and end-of-age teachings.

NO DISPARAGEMENT OF NON-ISRAEL RACES

Let it be clearly understood from the beginning, that in saying Israel is still exclusive as a race, in covenant terms, there is no implied disparagement of all the other non-Israel races. Race is a fact of life and it is also an insistent Bible fact that cannot be denied throughout both Testaments. But, the Bible is primarily a book about the people of the book, Israel. Israel is declared to be a servant race, not a better race than others. Israel is presented in Scripture as a "stiff necked", rebellious people who have a responsibility given to them to demonstrate to the other races the benefits of compliance with the Laws of God. <u>One great difference between Israel and the other races is that God made a covenant between Himself and Israel that He did not make with other races</u>.. This made Israel accountable for keeping the covenant relationship. Breaking the covenant brought judgement upon Israel. It was with the same people who had the old covenant that God makes the new covenant [Heb 8:8]. If God has not recorded in the Bible His purposes for all the other races in the same way that He has done for Israel, then no one has the right to presume anything about the non-Israel races.

Israel is God's chosen people by covenant relationship. Israel has a heavy accountability and burden that is not laid upon other peoples.
In the Old Testament, there is a clear consistent pattern of indisputable Scriptures that define the exclusive position of Israel in relation to the other races. Few would deny this is a fact of the Old Testament. God's dealings with Israel, as a people, are clearly different from His dealings with other peoples from a covenant point of view. This is found to persist throughout the New Testament. Anyone could be excused for thinking that there are efforts to hide this information, or that the present day fact of Israel is ignored, or that Biblical Israel is transferred to the Israeli state. The Twelve Tribes of Israel are still found in the New Testament, as are references to *the fathers*, that is, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The letters in the New Testament are written to people who had these *fathers*.. In the chapters to follow, this fact will be examined. As this is so, then the meaning traditionally assigned to certain Biblical words like G*entile*, C*hurch* and a number of other words, must be wrong! In the Old Testament, "Israel" refers to a genetic line and despite the common teaching that Israel in the New Testament is no longer a genetic line, there is an abundance of Scripture which has consistency in presenting this genetic line.
It is necessary to decide whether to believe according to the *Unity of the Scriptures*, or according to doctrines which are based on the misuse of words. The latter is the more common! So, it would be well to establish a foundation, by considering the much larger body of Scripture, which clearly shows the exclusive nature of National Israel amongst the other races. In the New Testament, the Twelve Tribes of Israel are still in existence, and this cannot honestly be avoided, although an attempt is definitely made to do just that in some translations by blatant mistranslation, by paraphrasing or by inappropriate and inaccurate Bible footnotes.
The King James Version (KJV), also known as the Authorised Version, (AV), is used throughout this book because it is the most familiar and because Strong's Concordance is linked to it.

THE FOUNDATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THIS BOOK

It is most necessary to lay a sure foundation before making any argument from Scripture. Jesus Himself, and the Apostles, gave us a way to lay a scriptural foundation. Outside this there is the probability of error and/or a lack of certainty. It is certain that nothing can contradict this foundation. So let us look at the foundation, noting the New Testament reference back to the Law and the Prophets:

Luke 24:44	*… all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of* ***Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms*** *…*
Luke 16:31	*… If they hear not* ***Moses and the prophets*** *…*
Acts 15:15	*And to this agree the* ***words of the prophets****; as it is written,*
Acts 17:2,3	*And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them … and … reasoned with them* ***out of the Scriptures****, opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead;*
Acts 24:14	*But this I confess unto thee, that after the way they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written* ***in the law and in the prophets****:*
Acts 26:22	*… saying none other things than those which* ***the prophets and Moses*** *did say should come:*
Isaiah 8:20	*To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not* ***according to this word****, it is because there is no light in them.*

For the Lord to say that there is no light in those who do not speak from this foundation must be taken very seriously. The contexts of the verses above are about Jesus himself and his mission. This was all prophesied:

Romans 16:25,26	*Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, but now is made*

> *manifest, and by the* ***Scriptures of the prophets****, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations* (of Israel) …

The mystery cannot be manifest without *the Scriptures of the prophets.* Those who decry the prophets are destroying their own ability to have understanding.
Throughout the New Testament, the Greek word *graphe* is used for what is written in the Old Testament and it is used approximately fifty times. This is a lot of times so there is no excuse for writing or speaking from another basis. To speak other than from the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms is to deceive. If the deceiving is done in ignorance, then it can be set aside through repentance and a change in direction. So we must be aware that we are dealing with a vitally important subject. For the Apostle Paul to say that he limited his teachings to those things that were based upon Moses and the prophets disallows the popular teachings that Paul had additional revelations about "the Church" that were not contained within Old Testament prophecies.
It might be questioned whether the common basis used today is different from the basis Jesus and the apostles used. What is going to be shown is that there are popular New Testament doctrines taught throughout many of the Christian denominations which do not have this right foundation. In this book, we are not concerned primarily about doctrines concerning elementary practical Christian living on this occaision, but rather, those which concern prophecy, history and end-of-age events.

ON THE RIGHT FOUNDATION, ISRAEL IS EXCLUSIVE

In the Old Testament there is a large body of Scripture which is consistent in spelling out the *Exclusiveness of Israel* in words that are simple and direct. From this Old Testament foundation, it is found that the *Exclusiveness of Israel* continues into the New Testament. Without the Old Testament foundation, the connection might be missed with the consequence that the national message of the Bible and the Kingdom of Heaven can no longer be proclaimed.
The New Testament fulfils the promises made about Jesus and His mission to Israel.

> *Luke 24:44* *… all things must be fulfilled, which were* ***written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms****, concerning me.*

If we move away from the foundation of the Old Testament into New Testament doctrine that does not have Old Testament foundations, then we must "get it wrong".
There are major areas of today's teaching about the New Testament that do not have the Old Testament foundations. These have the appearance of being the Word of God and they are followed by perhaps 90% of denominations today. However, there is undeviating agreement through both Testaments that will surprise many and there are aspects that may not have been thought about previously. This is because they are never presented in most denominations. It is the simplicity of the answers which will register, but this in turn will create other questions that will arise because they will conflict with traditional beliefs. Yes, there will be reactions, and a number of common reactions are listed, with comments, in a later chapter. These reactions will be common to most readers because most readers will have had the same teaching – that "The Jews" are Israel. The words *Jew* and *Gentiles* are key issues in this book.

WE HAVE TO BELIEVE MOSES TO BE ABLE TO BELIEVE JESUS

Jesus asks a question that every Christian today should be able to answer. Most denominations will not teach, ask or answer this question:

> *John 5:46,47* *For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?*

Then we have:

> *John 3:12..* *If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?*

Luke 16:31 *… If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.*

It is a simple thing to test some of the prophetic things that Moses wrote and see if these are commonly accepted by most denominations. If they are not accepted, then it is these denominations that must have a great problem in their understanding of the words of Jesus. This is saying that if we do not believe what Moses wrote, we will not be able to believe Jesus. To ignore Moses means that we cannot help misinterpreting Jesus' words. We will look at some of the writings of Moses to see if it is safe to say that the greater majority of professing Christians do not believe the writings of Moses. When these words of Moses are not believed, the Words of Jesus cannot be properly understood. What this means, is that the great majority of professing Christians are, of necessity, being taught things that are not the whole truth concerning Jesus' Words. **(Please note the Holy Spirit is not another person - it is Yahweh Allmighty)** It might be claimed that the Holy Spirit teaches us and guides us into all Truth and that He speaks of Jesus, but the self-same Holy Spirit of Truth would not encourage us to disbelieve the writings of Moses. He must want us to be guided into believing the writings of Moses in order that we might believe the Words of Jesus.

The matters we are going to look at do not pertain to the Law and what might be or what might not be fulfilled in that Law with regard to sacrifices and rituals. We are told in the Gospels about certain Scriptures that are already fulfilled in Jesus. Jesus speaks about certain things that will yet be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God [for example, Luke 22:16]. The Kingdom of God is presented as being an inheritance yet to be possessed. In the Book of Revelation we are told, *until the Words of God shall be fulfilled*.

Moses is called a prophet and no one can pretend that every Old Testament prophecy and promise is already fulfilled. What we will look at throughout this book, is in whom the Bible states certain things are fulfilled, or will yet be fulfilled. We will see that there is no scope for universalism. For us to believe Moses, there are some things which he tells us that are not commonly accepted. What we believe about these things, conditions what we believe about in the New Testament. In other words, it conditions what we believe about Jesus' words. What are some of these things that are not commonly believed in the writings of Moses?

MOSES WROTE and made statements about the Lord God of Israel and about Israel being God's people. Moses wrote about God's special relationship with Israel as being a separate people from all the other races. As soon as this is accepted, it will be seen that this separation also runs through the New Testament.

MOSES WROTE of covenants and promises made to Israel. The New Testament says that the promise *Which was made unto the fathers* [that is, of Israel], *God has fulfilled unto US THEIR CHILDREN* [Acts 13:32,33]. There is never a mention of fulfilment in any others. We will see that the current popular concepts about "Israel" and the children [*sperma*] of Abraham are inadequate. There is a large amount of pre - conditioning from popular teachings to overcome, and this is never easy for anyone. Moses wrote about election in the same way that the Apostle Paul did and both were concerned with the same one people.

MOSES WROTE about the Word of God and the Law of Moses as being given only to Israel amongst all the other races. As this is so, then only Israel needed redemption from this Law that Israel broke. This is why it is recorded that Jesus came, *To save His people* [that is, Israel] *from their sins* [Matt 1:21, Luke 1:77 etc.]. Throughout both Testaments the people concerned are always God's people before they are redeemed. To be *bought back* means that they must have been in God's favour once before. They can only be Israel.

MOSES WROTE about the different destinies of each individual Tribe of Israel *in the last days*. It is never a common destiny as "The Jews" in the way currently taught. He wrote of the birthright position of the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, *in the last days*. The prophecy made by Jacob [Gen 48:19] and by Moses [Deut 33] for *the last days* concerning the sons of Jacob are commonly ignored. In today's teachings they do not even rate a mention, even if this is an important prophetic subject that has a bearing on the *last days* events.

MOSES WROTE concerning Jesus. In Deut 18:15-19, as confirmed in Acts 3:22,23, we read *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. And, it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people*. Jesus was to be raised up unto Israel [Ye *men of Israel* as being addressed] in the same manner and to the same people. To not hear this and to extend this to include all people of every race is to become destroyed from among the people. As Jesus says, *if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead* [Luke 16:31]. This is not and was not the belief of our popular translators, and the contrary view has thus been written into the translations. While many are prepared to believe that Jesus rose from the dead, they are not prepared to believe what Jesus said.

Jesus spoke in John 6:32-70 about *what if you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before* (v62), making it very clear that: **This verse is referring to the resurrection of Jesus - He will be in the grave**

> *No man can come unto to me, except it were given unto him of my Father* – v65.
> *No man can come to me, except the Father which has sent me draw him* – v44..
> *All that the Father giveth me shall come to me* (that is, His People - the House of Israel, that Jesus redeemed) *and him that cometh to me* (the individuals in Israel who accept/believe what Jesus has done) *I will in no wise cast out* – v37 (and 39)..

The limitations spelled out in these verses still offend people [v61] and is still *an hard saying; who can hear it* [v60]? All the religious tradition, translations, emotion or sentiment are not going to change these limitations.

MOSES WROTE about what Balaam prophesied of the tents of Jacob and the tabernacles of Israel [Numbers 24], and of what God's people would do to Moab, Sheth and Edom in the latter days. Each of these identities are ignored today, even if Jacob is mentioned 24 times in the New Testament and Israel occurs 75 times in the New Testament. One never hears of the destiny of Edom. Israel, together with Jacob, occurs 3,929 times by name through the Bible. This is one reason why the Bible can be said to be a book about Israel.

MOSES WROTE a song of which we are told in Rev 15:3 *And they sing the song of Moses, the servant of God.* At this end time, there is no change in the content of the Song of Moses. In this song we are told, *For the Lord's portion is His people, and Jacob is the lot of His inheritance*. At the end of this song we are told, *And will be merciful unto His Land and to His people* [Deut 32:9,43]. These words were spoken to all Israel, only!

The Psalms and all the Prophets, together with the New Testament, consistently confirm what Moses wrote. They do not, and cannot, oppose each other. We either agree or reject this, but Jesus says we must believe Moses if we say we believe Jesus.

If we really want to know the answer to the question that was asked (in John 5:46,47, at the start of this subsection) and hence for our assemblies to work the works of God, this is the answer Jesus gave:

> *John 6:29* *Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom he hath sent.*

NOT BELIEVING WHAT GOD SAYS BRINGS JUDGEMENT

Over and over again through Scripture, we find that God's people simply would not believe what God said. This continued refusal brought the eventual judgement of God upon this unbelief and this is a very serious consideration for us all. It is recorded how Abraham believed God and there was a good consequence for doing so. Because of traditional teachings and Bible education, it is extremely difficult for Christians today to believe what God says, especially when it comes to believing *the writings of Moses*.. We can learn a lot about faith, but if we do not learn about *THE faith that was once delivered unto the saints* [Jude 3], we find a block in the practical exercising of faith. But Moses did speak of Jesus and for whom [in particular] Jesus would be raised up to save from their sins. If we believe the implication of the phrases *Go into all the world* and *God so loved the world* as they are

commonly presented, then we cannot believe Moses at the same time. These two Scriptures are re-evaluated in this book. Remember once again, Jesus says we must believe Him and what He says about Moses, in order to believe what He is saying.
It is necessary to re-examine the meaning of simple words like "The Jews", "Gentiles", "The Church", "Abraham's seed" and "Israel". Please do not *answer a matter before it has been heard*, because it is wrong to do so. Let us first build our foundation through the Old Testament and then judge this matter.
In this foundation we find statements about "The Law" [statutes and judgements] that God gave only to His people Israel. In no way does this say that non-Israelites are not subject to a law principle, but there is a difference.

Speaking to Israel specifically, we read:

Deut 4:6-8	*Keep therefore and do them, for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people. For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for? And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as all this law …?*
v 13	*And he declared unto you his covenant … even ten commandments …*

This Scripture is addressed exclusively to Israel as a race of people, and it shows the relationship between Israel and the balance of races. This is what this book is about.

CHAPTER OUTLINES

CHAPTER 1: EXCLUSIVE NATURE OF ISRAEL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A book by book look at "Exclusive Israel" through the Old Testament.
The "statutes" and the "judgements" were given as a covenant to Israel only. Only Israel had broken this exclusive Law covenant and needed redemption.
God is spoken of as being the God of Israel and Jacob, only.
God severed Israel from other races.
God loved *the fathers* of Israel and chose their genetic seed after them.
Israel is God's *elect*.
God says He only *knew* Israel of all the races on earth.
The *new heart* prophecy relates to Israel alone.
The New Testament is with the House of Israel and the House of Judah alone, as the same people to whom the Old Testament was made.

CHAPTER 2: EXCLUSIVE NATURE OF ISRAEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

A book by book look at "Exclusive Israel" through the New Testament.
Redemption from the broken Law cannot be multi-racial, because only Israel had been given the Law in the first place.
Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; because He has visited and redeemed ***His people***.
The gospels and the epistles are addressed to Israelites only.
The twelve tribes have NOT disappeared from the New Testament pages.
The New Testament "hope" is always expressed as being the "hope" of Israel.
Jesus confirmed the promises made to "the Fathers" of Israel.

CHAPTER 3: REACTIONS TO AN EXCLUSIVE ISRAEL

A brief examination of eleven of the most common reactions to a racially exclusive Israel.

CHAPTER 4: WHICH WORLD DID GOD "SO LOVE"?

"The world" does not mean every race, or all the inhabited earth. There are many "worlds" in Scripture. The Greek word refers to:

[a] The world of a woman's' hair adornments.
[b] The human tongue.
[c] Both good and bad "systems".
[d] Material chattels.
[e] It can refer to order or disorder, the stars and heaven.
[f] Many other things.

It is somewhat difficult to proclaim the gospel to some of these "worlds".. How the common universalist view produces contradictions within the New Testament.
What is *another gospel*?
Why did Jesus send the disciples only to the *Lost sheep of the house of Israel*?

CHAPTER 5: STUMBLING BLOCKS TO AN EXCLUSIVE ISRAEL

A brief look at individual objections to "an exclusive Israel".
What is *The Israel of God*?
Could there be two Israels, one natural and one spiritual?
"All" is not "all of everything", but only all of that part that is being addressed.

CHAPTER 6: THAT UNFORTUNATE WORD "GENTILE"

"The Jews" and "Israel" are NOT the same!
The origin of the word "Gentile".
How the word "Gentile" is used and misused.
A look at translations of *goi* [Heb] and *ethnos* [Greek].
Both words are also used of Israel as well as non-Israel, and so the popular theology cannot be right.
The two parties are:

[a] The House of Israel [ten tribes] – or *the uncircumcision*.
[b] The House of Judah [two tribes] – or *the circumcision*.

The so-called *Gentiles* in Scripture can only be Israelites.

CHAPTER 7: COULD THE MODERN JEWS BE ISRAEL?

Different words that are used for "The Jews".
The posterity of Judah and the occupants of Judea are not always the same. The difference between Galilee and Judea and their inhabitants.
Jesus condemned "The Jews" and throughout the New Testament the words "The Jews" are used in a bad sense.
The difference between Abraham's seed and Abraham's children.
Jesus' primary teaching was NOT to "The Jews".
Where did "The Jews" come from? Are they mainly "Edom", that is, the descendants of Esau?
The destiny of the Edomites. Can Edom be identified?
Who are those who say they are Jews but are not Jews [Rev 2:9]? What is their blasphemy?
Jews who are non-Semitic.
Is this the master deception of Satan to equate "the Jews" with Israel?
Anti-semitism; it is not what is commonly taught.
Sacred cows of popular beliefs.

CHAPTER 8: GALATIANS AND ISRAEL EXCLUSIVE

A more detailed look into the exclusiveness of Israel through Galatians and Romans.
Israel in the New Testament is still the same people as Israel in the Old Testament.
Were the promises made to Abraham's seed made to Jesus as that seed?
Who are Abraham's seed?
As of one and the anointed seed.
Christos without *Iesou* – are the words *Christ* and *Jesus* always interchangeable?
Can "Christ" refer to an anointed something other than Jesus?
Do *In Jesus* and *In Christ* always have the same meaning?
The difference between "born" and "begotten". *Gennao* is not *mono-genes*.
The *children of promise*.
An examination of *In thee shall all nations be blessed.*

CHAPTER 9: ADOPTION

"Adoption" refers to the adoption of sons out of Israel, not of others into Israel.
The five adoption verses are examined.
Who are the Sons of God?

CHAPTER 10: PILGRIMS, STRANGERS AND ISRAEL

The differences between the words Pilgrims, Strangers, Aliens, Foreigners etc.
The problems caused by poor and inconsistent translations of these words.
What are the different kinds of strangers in both Testaments?
Certain "strangers", etc, are Israelites only.

CHAPTER 11: SEEDS, NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL

What is the seed of Abraham?
What is "offspring"? What does Jesus being "the offspring of David" mean?
The difference between "seed", "offspring", "children", "fruit" etc.
The reason why it is necessary to divide these things that are different.
Zera [Hebrew] and *sperma* [Greek] are genetic only.
The words "spiritual" and "natural".
The Holy Seed and the fact of the Anointed Seed.
Who are the Separated, Chosen, Stone, Elect and Peculiar people?

CHAPTER 12: "BORN AGAIN" OR "BEGOTTEN FROM ABOVE"?

The popular use of the phrase *born again* hides the real meaning.
What *from above* means. What *born* means. When the begetting occurs.
Born of water relates to the time of physical birth.
Whom God did beget and who is God's first born.
Sarah and Abraham as the rock and the pit from which Israel is drawn.
What *from the womb* and *formed from the womb* mean.

CHAPTER 13: THE CHURCH

The origin and the foundation of the "Church".
The words for rock or stone: *petra, petros* and *lithos.*
What constitutes the "church" and the Old Testament origins of the Church.
What the "Church" is as the "Body"; its husband/wife relationship.
The "Church" and the Synagogue.
The "Church" as the basis of Truth.
The synagogue of Satan – the counterfeit within the churches.
Signs and wonders in the Church.

CHAPTER 14: WHY NOT PROCLAIM THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN?

What is the "Kingdom". Is it physical, spiritual, or both?
The Throne of the Kingdom and its eternal nature.
The Throne and the Kingdom in the New Testament.
Why only Matthew mentions the Kingdom of Heaven in the New Testament.
The differences between the Kingdom of Heaven and the Kingdom of God.
Israel in the parables of the Kingdom.
The Kingdom and the Regathering of Israel.

CHAPTER 15: THE REGATHERING OF ISRAEL - OLD TESTAMENT

Why the present Israeli state has no connection with the regathering of Israel.
The popular beliefs do not have Old Testament prophetic support.
The popular beliefs ignore the timing factors given in prophecy.
A book by book examination of the regathering.

CHAPTER 16: THE REGATHERING OF ISRAEL - NEW TESTAMENT

To be fulfilled only in the same people Israel.
The gathering place is the *land which I gave to your fathers.*
Israel is gathered *out of*, not *of*, all nations. The time is not in this present age - it is either concurrent with or after the second advent. To say otherwise is to say the resurrection is past. Why the popular position is dangerous doctrine.
What is *the inheritance*?

CHAPTER 17: THE HEIRS OF JACOB - ISRAEL

The heirs of Jacob are Ephraim and Manasseh and the name "Israel" is also named upon them. Their blessings in *the last days*.
Israel is not named upon "The Jews," or the Church [in the popular concept].
The people and the multitude of nations.
Jacob's descendants to be a fullness of *goi* [g*oi* being the word origin of Gentiles].
New Testament Israel – the *circumcision of the heart*.
When Ephraim repents.

CHAPTER 18: THE SONS OF JOSEPH

His birthright was given to the sons of Joseph.
God does not treat all races the same.
Even each Tribe of Israel is treated differently.
Turning away ungodliness from Jacob.
Who Ephraim [and his brother Manasseh] might be today.
The "New place" appointed for Israel.
Where the new location of Jerusalem might be.
This is not any new doctrine.

CHAPTER 19: THE NON-ISRAEL RACES

Racism in the Bible. Is our unchanging God still racist?
How the other races relate to Israel.
How we should assess our beliefs.
Could some of orthodox Christianity be cultish?

CHAPTER 20: WHAT OF BALAAM'S DOCTRINE?

What is Balaam's doctrine?
Churches still teach Balaam's Doctrine despite Jesus saying He holds this against them.
What *going astray* actually means.
New Testament fornication.
What Jesus means about, *except it be for fornication*.
What is *whoredom*? Is it racial intermarriage. Divorce in this connection.

CHAPTER 1: EXCLUSIVE NATURE OF ISRAEL IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

There are two very interesting facts found in both Testaments that are not commonly accepted. Firstly there are the many statements that show that God redeems those who were already His people prior to the redemptive act, for example, Psalm 111:9, *He sent redemption unto his people* or Luke 1:68, *for he hath visited and redeemed his people*.. The second interesting fact that will be seen in these Scriptures is that what is commonly known as "The Law" as a covenant was given to Israel as a race and it states that it was not given to any other race or people.

These two Biblical facts run counter to popular teachings today that have almost universal acceptance. What is really being taught today is that all races are the same with respect to the broken Law. We do not find this being witnessed in the Old Testament Law and the Prophets. In the New Testament, we still find reference to the Twelve Tribes of Israel; they have in no way disappeared. In this study, it is recommended that you forget what you currently know about the words, *Gentile*, *Jews*, and *The Church* and have another look. We will start by quoting Scriptures making comment upon them.

A BOOK BY BOOK LOOK AT THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF ISRAEL

The verses listed below are all addressed to Israel and not to anyone else! In reading them, please take note of the emphasised words in each verse to see that this is so.

Exodus 6:7 — *And I will take **you** to me for a people, and I will be unto **you** a God: and **ye** shall know that I am the Lord **your** God …*

We start here with the separation of Israel from other peoples. God, who is addressing Israel, is saying that He will be the God of this one people. Here it is Jehovah who is Israel's creator. Throughout the Bible we cannot find any specific verse which says the God of the Bible is other than the God of Israel.

Exodus 19:5,6 — *Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me **above all people**, for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and **an holy nation.***

The words a*bove all people* immediately states that there is a different relationship established between God and Israel that does not apply to other races. It was Jesus who later said that unless a person was born *from above* he would not be able to see the Kingdom of Heaven, confirming they must come from the same people. The very Greek prefix *ano* suggests "upwards" or "superior". Furthermore, the expressions *Kingdom of Priests* and a*n holy nation* as a direct quotation is found in 1 Peter 2:9 [*a royal priesthood*] showing the people are the same. No other race is spoken of in this same unique way.

Lev 20:26.. — *Ye shall be holy* [separate] *unto me, for I the Lord am holy, and **have severed you from other people**, that ye should be mine.*

Here we find a clarity which witnesses the racial separation of Israel from other races. The Hebrew word *badal*' means *to separate, distinguish, select, divide* and *to sever utterly.* The basic meaning of the words *holy* and *holiness* in both Testaments conveys the idea of being *separate* or *set apart*. God Himself is spoken of as *The Holy One of Israel,* but never as being the Holy One of any other race. Thus, in both Testaments, a *holy nation* means a "separated" nation. The Holy Spirit is also the Spirit of separation upon the *holy nation*. In Scripture we can find reference to *The Holy People* [Daniel 8:24], referring to Israel. When God severed Israel from the other races, there is no indication that the separation was to be for any limited period. In fact, it is the opposite that is shown.

Deut 4:7,8.. — *For **what nation is there so great**, who hath God so nigh unto them … **what nation is there so great** that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day.*

This verse establishes that the Law was given to Israel alone. Moses, speaking to Israel alone, declares in verse 13 that this involves the Ten Commandments. The Old Testament was made with Israel alone, even if there were a mixed multitude present with them at that time. The issue here is law and covenant relationship.

Deut 4:37 *And because he loved* ***thy fathers****, therefore he chose* ***their seed*** *after them …*

The genetic relationship between *fathers* and *seed* cannot be avoided! This reference continues through the New Testament!

Deut 7:6 *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 the people that are upon face of the earth.*

This is not a popular teaching, but it is one of the early Bible statements about the unique, racially exclusive, place of Israel among all the other races. If Israel was to disappear as a race from the Bible, prophecy would forecast this. In the New Testament, Paul asks the question, *Hath God cast away His people? – No! – God forbid* [Rom 11:1]. At that point in time, Israel was separated into two Houses of whom "part" were blinded [v7], but Israel as a whole *hath not obtained.*

Deut 32:9 *For the Lord's portion is* ***his people; Jacob*** *is the lot of His inheritance.*

There is not one Scripture anywhere which says any race other than Israel is genetically God's inheritance.

Deut 33:29 *Happy art thou,* ***O Israel****: who is like thee, O people saved by the Lord …*

People are taught or like to think that God is unbiased or unselective, but as a Sovereign God He can do whatever pleases Him. Paul says, *and so ALL ISRAEL shall be saved* [Romans 11:26].

Numbers 23:9 *… lo, the people shall* ***dwell alone****, and* ***shall not be reckoned among the nations****.*

In the New Testament, the call is still to *come out from among THEM and touch not the unclean.* It is God who made this sexual or physical separation for all time. Israel is not to interact with other races in any such common purpose or become unequally yoked with other races, particularly with their idols. This brings God's judgement upon transgressors.

2 Sam 7:23 *And what* ***one nation*** *in the earth* ***is like thy people, even like Israel****, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself and to make him a name …*

We must note the singular emphasis here which tells us the same story about Israel being the one people Jesus came to redeem.

Psalm 78:5 *For he established a testimony* ***in Jacob****, and appointed a Law* ***in Israel****, which he commanded* ***our fathers …***

The triad, *Jacob, Israel* and *fathers* is a three fold bond that cannot be broken. Again we find here the confirmation that the Law was given to Israel. In the New Testament, we find the same expressions, *fathers, Jacob* and *Israel* which show the New Testament is addressed to the same people - those who had the Old Testament. That is, they are all Israelites by race.

Psalm 147:19,20 *He showeth his word* ***unto Jacob****, his statutes and his judgements* ***unto Israel****. … as for his judgements, they* [the other races] *have not known them.*

This is a very clear statement that *His Word* is not given to other races! This is not a popular concept or teaching but it is confirmed in both Testaments. But if God declares that *He hath not dealt so with any nation,* we dare not question it! Israel is unique by God's sovereign choice.

Psalm 148:14 *He also exalteth the horn of* ***his people****, the praise of all his saints, even the* ***children of Israel****, a people near to him.*

This Scripture defines who and who only are saints. *Saints* appears in the New Testament without any new definition. It is God who made this separation for all time. Also, we do not find other races being "near" to God.

Isaiah 41:8-9 *But thou, **Israel** art my servant, **Jacob** whom I have chosen, **the seed of Abraham** my friend.*

"The seed" – this word is very important, as it defines which part of Abraham's seed is continually referred to in both Testaments, as being God's people racially. Not all the nations which spring from Abraham are regarded as his seed. Only the nation 'named' or 'called' IN Isaac is to be so regarded. Jacob and his descendants were accepted as this seed. To show this, Jacob was named 'Israel' - that is, he was given God's name. Thus Jacob was the seed named in Isaac.

Isaiah 43:1 *But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, **O Jacob**, and he that formed thee, **O Israel**, Fear not: for I have redeemed thee, I have called thee by thy name; thou art mine.*

This verse includes the words, "created" and "formed" that are not the same. Jacob was created, but Israel was formed

Formed	*yatsar*	To fashion, form or make.
Created	*bara*	In context, this is to create.
Redeemed	*gaval*	Bought back, ransomed, recovered or avenged.

These things are never said of any other race. If God chose every race there would be no election, choosing or buying back. All mankind would be the same! These expressions continue through the New Testament. Do they sound familiar? There is a difference between the expressions *the sons of Jacob* and the *children of Israel* through Scripture, one being 'created' with the other being 'formed'. Those 'formed' by fully believing God come from among those who are the natural descendants. We find a similar difference between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2.

Isaiah 45:4 *For **Jacob** my servant's sake, and **Israel mine elect**, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee …*

Note: the elect is an important term also which defines God's selection of a people [singular] which is genetic [national Israel]. Elect or *bachiyr* means "chosen one" [singular]. Jesus and the New Testament writers use the term in a way that does not change.

Isaiah 46:3 *Hearken unto me, O House of Jacob, and all the remnant of the house of Israel, which are borne by me **from the belly**, which are carried **from the womb**.*

Note: This defines the racial origin of Israel as being from the womb of Sarah [see also Isaiah 51:1,2, *the hole of the pit*]. This is expanded later in this book.

Isaiah 49:3 *… thou art my servant, **O Israel**, in whom I will be glorified.*

This shows Israel is God's servant people. This again is a continuing expression which is used of those fulfilling God's purposes. "Servant" is sometimes applied to other races which God is using to discipline Israel so that Israel might glorify God. God does not say that He will be glorified in any other race but Israel. In the New Testament we will see that *and they glorified the God of Israel* [Matthew 15:31].

Isaiah 53:8 *… for the transgression of **my people** was he stricken.*

My people here are either God's people or Isaiah's people (who are the same people). It is popular to extend this limitation so that other races can be included. This is not valid; they are Israel only. This much-loved chapter with its *all we like sheep have gone astray* speaks of Jesus being wounded for *our* transgressions with mention of *we* and *our*. *My people went down aforetime into Egypt to sojourn there* in Isaiah 52:4 gives expression and positive identity of the people being addressed and this follows through to the following chapter. The "sheep" who had gone astray are the ones whom the Good Shepherd came to seek and to save.

Isaiah 59:20,21 *And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in* ***Jacob*** *saith the Lord. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord; My spirit that is upon thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth of* ***thy seed's seed****, saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

It is impossible to spiritualise seed or "seed's seed"; they are genetic terms which are on-going.

Yahweh Allmighty through Jesus redeemed His People

There does not appear to be a single reference to any other nation than Israel to whom the Redeemer would come. He is always *The Redeemer of Israel* and it is, as stated, to be forever. ~~Jesus~~ came to *visit and redeem His People* [Luke 1:68]. Jesus is the Kinsman-Redeemer of Israel. There is never any suggestion of any others than Israel being redeemed. From which broken Law-covenant would the other races need redeeming? Recall again how only Israel was given the statutes and judgements and only Israel needed redemption from that Law which they had broken.

We see that the covenant is for all generations to *seed's seed* of Jacob, and it is to those who turn from transgression in JACOB whom the Redeemer saves. Here again we have the Spirit which is of the anointed race. Israel has *My Spirit which IS upon thee*.. This is not commonly taught today. We will see that this is the same presentation as that in the New Testament, believe it or not. This Scripture is not acceptable to tradition. Guess why? It is because racial Israel stays exclusive as being *Jacob's seed.*

Jer 50:4 *In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the Children of* ***Israel*** *shall come, they and the children of* ***Judah*** *together, going and weeping: they shall go, and seek the Lord* ***their God****.*

A much talked about subject is the regathering of Israel which is supposed to be presently taking place in Palestine, but *and at that time* is not the present activity in the Israeli state. What is being established is just who is to be regathered. Is it a multi-racial church or is it only the House of Israel and the House of Judah [that is, the Twelve Tribes of Israel]? The latter is the consistent and frequent Biblical presentation, as it is in the verse above [see also Ezekiel 37:15-28 in particular]. The picture painted is always of a still very exclusive Israel. The House of Israel and the House of Judah are exclusive from the heathen races all around. This shows that at the end of the New Testament age they are still exclusive. So they must be exclusive through the New Testament age, even until the regathering. Note that there is no pattern of prophecy which presents a non-Israel content in the regathering, so something must be wrong with the traditional teachings.

Jer 51:19 *The portion of* ***Jacob*** *is not like them* [that is, Babylon]; *for he is the former of all things: and* ***Israel*** *is the rod of His inheritance: the Lord of Hosts is his name.*

This completely excludes "Babylon" from God's inheritance. The timing of this event is at the end of the New Testament age. Again, national Israel must go through the age. Israel is to be the rod over the other races to rule with God. Israel means *Ruling with God.* Ruling over whom if all races are the same?

Ezek 37:26-28 *Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them* ***it shall be an everlasting covenant*** *with them … and the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify* ***Israel****, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of* ***them*** *for evermore.*

This shows that God's covenant is with Israel alone, and that the other races will be aware of this when God comes to dwell with His People Israel. The timing, again, is the end of the age at Jesus' return and when God's sanctuary is in the midst of Israel and nowhere else.

Daniel 12:1 *And at that time shall Michael stand up … which standeth for the children of* ***thy*** [Daniel's] ***people****: …*

At the end of the age it is still only *thy people* who are delivered. Israel is still in existence as *a people* at the time of the end and through the New Testament age. Michael does not *stand up* for other races.

Hosea 1:11 *Then shall the children of* ***Judah*** *and the children of* ***Israel*** *be gathered together, …*

This and other quotations from the minor prophets are included to show the "unity of the Scriptures" that always presents the exclusive nature of Israel. Hosea again defines who is regathered, and also the timing. We will see that the *children of Judah* and the *children of Israel* are not united until this time. There is no suggestion of there being any other race, or of a multi-racial "Church" comprising of "Jews and Gentiles", as being part of the regathering of the remnant of Israel in these minor prophets. It is always the two Houses who are regathered and come together.

Hosea 14:1-5 ***O Israel****, return unto the Lord* ***thy*** *God … I will be as the dew unto* ***Israel****: …*

This is at the time of the regathering when Israel as a nation returns to *The Lord Thy God*. [v*9, Who is wise … he shall understand these things*]. No other race is being asked to return to Israel's God.

Joel 2:27 *And ye shall know that I am in the midst* ***of Israel*** *…*

Joel 3:2 *I will also gather all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshapet, and will plead with them there for* ***my people*** *and for my heritage* ***Israel****, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land.*

Again, there is no change prophetically about which nation God is in the midst of or which nation He will be in the midst of at this future time.

Amos 3:2 *You* ***only*** *have I known* ***of all the families of the earth****: …*

The word used for *known* cannot be treated fully here, but it does not mean *to acknowledge*. It is used more as *to recognise as a fact*, *revelation knowledge* or *to discern* in an intimate and chosen way. Here there is the complete isolation of Israel from the other races.

Note: This is important when we come to the New Testament where it refers to those who were *foreknown* of God. This identifies the people as being the same nation in both Testaments; those who were *foreknown* in the New Testament are those who were *known* in the Old Testament.

Micah 2:12 *I will surely assemble,* ***O Jacob****, all of thee; I will surely gather the remnant of* ***Israel****: …*

Are there still any lingering doubts that no other races are ever mentioned at this time of regathering?

Habakkuk 3:13 *Thou wentest forth for the salvation of* ***thy People****, …*

Zephaniah 3:13 *The remnant* ***of Israel*** *shall not do iniquity, …*

There are a host of other Old Testament Scriptures that could have been quoted.

GOD PLACES HIS NAME ON THE ONE PEOPLE

Numerous references refer to "My name" as being placed upon the Children of Israel. For example:

Deut 28:10 *And all the people of the earth shall see that thou art called by* ***the name*** *of the Lord; and they shall be afraid of thee.*

Numbers 6:27 *And they shall put* ***my name*** *upon the children of Israel; and I will bless them.*

Deut 26:19 *And to make thee* [that is, Israel] *high above all nations which he hath made, in praise, and* ***in name****, and in honour; and that thou mayest be* ***an holy*** [separate] ***people unto the Lord thy God****, as he hath spoken.*

The name of Jehovah [AV The Lord] is exclusive upon Israel as a race. *All the people of the earth* then does not include the Children of Israel, in this case. The name placed upon the Children of Israel who obey God is that of Jehovah Himself. God Himself decides just where He will place His Name, whether it be on a people or a place [Deut 26:2: *which the Lord THY God shall choose to place His Name there*].

This separation of Israel from all the other races is always distinct, but their blessing is conditional upon their obedience. In the next chapter we can now look at the New Testament in the light of what we have seen in the Old Testament.

CHAPTER 2: EXCLUSIVE NATURE OF ISRAEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The New Testament Scriptures show no disharmony or change of position from that which is written in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. In view of what has been written and shown from the Old Testament, this might be seen for the first time with new eyes. It will come as a shock for some people to realise that exclusiveness of Israel continues throughout the New Testament, because this cuts across the traditional doctrine that Israel is now "The Church" and that this Church is multi-racial. Redemption from the broken Law-covenant can never be multi-racial or universal, since only Israel was given the Law as a covenant. That is why this foundation has to be shown in detail in the last chapter.

In the quotations made from the New Testament you will note many references to *the fathers* referring to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The people addressed in the Acts and the epistles are the children [descendants] of these fathers, the fathers of Israel. It is not just to Abraham in isolation in the way most use this to try to say Abraham's seed is a spiritual seed.

The harmony mentioned concerning the law being given to Israel is amply confirmed in the New Testament.

Rom 9:4 *Who **are Israelites**, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;*

So, the promises, covenants and the adoption do not apply to any but Israelites!

EACH BOOK IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The New Testament Scriptures below are in direct contrast to the way *Go into all the world* is interpreted as a doctrine. This may also be a shock and so we will look through some of these. We will quote from Gospel selections to save repetition and then comment from each book of the New Testament in order. Please note carefully the emphasised words, because this will help understanding.

Luke 1:16 *And many of the **children of Israel** shall he turn to the Lord **their God**.*

There is no suggestion that any other than the Children of Israel will be turned to God. The "many", rather than "all", is found a number of times within the New Testament.

Luke 1:32,33 *He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of **his father David**; and he shall reign over the **house of Jacob** for ever, …*

Jesus is always spoken of as being the ruler of Israel nationally, the "House of Jacob" including all the tribes. The House of Jacob is still the very same entity in the New Testament as it was in the Old Testament. This Throne [indicating Kingdom] is to be restored TO JACOB. God's promises will be fulfilled in those to whom they were made. Everything which offends will be gathered OUT of the Kingdom, Jesus tells us.

Luke 1:54,55 *He hath holpen his servant **Israel**, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed forever.*

Mercy is always spoken of as being to Israel only. This promise of mercy was to The Fathers and to their seed of Israel only. Israel is the servant race as this verse says. "The Fathers" were not the fathers of all races. Scripture does not present God as being the father of all peoples. Is there record of any other seed to whom God *spake* other than to the seed of Abraham? Some want to take the traditional position that the *seed* is now spiritual and not racial. Accordingly this will be looked into further in the chapter titled *Seeds, Natural and Spiritual*. But there is no suggestion of a "spiritual seed" in all of these Scriptures. They are too precise and specific! When we see that they are fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy we have harmony.

Luke 1:68 *Blessed be the Lord God **of Israel**, for he hath visited and redeemed **his people**.*

There is never any mention of redemption for any outside of Israel. Here they are described as *His People*. Jesus is always spoken of as being *The Redeemer of Israel*.. Israel in the Old Testament is a precise racial term. None of all these Scriptures provide evidence of any change in that fact in the New Testament.

Luke 1:73,74 *The oath which he sware to* ***our father*** *Abraham, that he would grant unto* ***us****, that* ***we*** *being delivered out of the hand of* ***our*** *enemies might serve him without fear,*

As in all Scripture, the pronouns cannot be generalised. *We* and *us* contrast with *enemies* as two defined groups. Here the pronouns define a racial origin. There is much more about this through the New Testament as we will see.

Luke 1:77 *To give the knowledge of salvation unto* ***his People*** *…*

Again, is any other race included in the giving of the knowledge of salvation? Is it possible for any race but Israel to know salvation from the sin of breaking the Law since the Law was given specifically to Israel alone? This confirms the Old Testament prophetic Scriptures. This is a very specific statement of God's purpose. Dare we meddle with God's stated purpose?

Luke 2:34 *… this child is set for the fall and rising again of many* ***in Israel****;* ***…***

There is no mention of races other than Israel.

Matt 1:21 *… and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save* ***his people*** *from their sins.*

This again is confirmation of the Scriptures already quoted and is just as specific as to whom would be saved. One of the major problems traditionalists have is to find any continuing pattern of prophecy in the Old Testament which would back up their position that *His People* now includes all races. As pointed out earlier, the people Jesus saves from their sins here are already ~~His~~ people before they are saved.

Yahweh's his fathers people

Matt 2:6 *… for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule* ***my people Israel****.*

This defines the people of whom Jesus is the Lord and the race of which He is King. This is a straight statement of the fulfilment of prophecy made many times.

Matt 15:24 *I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the* ***house of Israel****.*

It is impossible for the followers of the present traditional teachings to cope with this Scripture so it is ignored. There is a translation difficulty in this verse also, the word *but* meaning *if not* and therefore it includes the House of Judah as well. Jesus was then in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon but, as He says, He had *other sheep* which were not of the fold within Palestine. He dispatched His disciples to the House of Israel, the bulk of whom were scattered outside of Judea, mainly about Northern Greece and parts of the old Grecian empire. Note that Jesus even confirms the separation between Galilee and Jewry [John 7:1 and John 11:54].
Why should we not do the same instead of calling both parties "The Jews"? This is an error of tradition. The House of Israel were not so "lost" that the disciples could not find them, were they?

Matt 15:31 *… and they glorified the God* ***of Israel****.*

This is a clear statement of whom He is the God.

Matt 19:28 *… in the regeneration, … ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging* ***the twelve tribes of Israel****.*

Dare we say "The Church" has taken the place of the Twelve Tribes of Israel at the *Time of the Regeneration*, which is yet to come? The "Church" is not what we have been led to believe, as we will see.

Mark 12:29 *The first of all the commandments is, Hear,* ***O Israel****; The Lord* ***our*** *God is one Lord;*

Is anyone other than Israel requested to "hear"? Only Israel can "hear".. Remember how Jesus said in John 8:43 to the Edomite leaders of Jewry, *Ye cannot hear my words*? There is

still the synagogue of Satan who call themselves "Jews" or Judeans [Rev 2:9 and Rev 3:9] who cannot "hear".. These could not be of the House of Judah, as they claimed to be. Could this part of Jewry possibly be part of the Church of God or of the *Israel of God*? It is common to hear that *the Israel of God is the multi-racial church*, and then to use this statement as the basis of argument! It is easy to say anything without backing it up and especially without the full Biblical basis of argument.

John 1:11,12 *He came unto* ***his own****, and* ***his own*** *received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, …*

Jesus came to his own territory, wherein was the temple, but all of His own people there did not receive Him as having any authority over what was His. Those of His own who believed, received, accepted and recognised Him were given the authority to once again become placed [that is, re-instated; AV:*adopted*] as the sons of God.

John 1:31 *… but that he should be manifest* ***to Israel*** *…*

Can we find reference to Jesus being manifest to others than Israelites? That is *all men* of Israel.

Acts 1:6 *Lord, wilt thou at this time restore* ***again the kingdom to Israel****?*

The restoration of the Kingdom to Israel is a subject which the traditional teachings refuse to emphasise, despite Jesus' instruction that this must be our priority prayer and the time to look forward to when His Will will be done IN EARTH, as it is in Heaven. This instruction is a statement of the Will of God. Instead of preaching the Kingdom, and the remnant out of Israel who will *find it*, traditional teaching preaches that the "Church" will be raptured away from Earth! But, the saints [separated ones] are to reign on earth when the Kingdom is restored to Israel. **After the tribulation the saint will return with Jesus to rule this earth**

Acts 2:17 *… **your** sons and your daughters shall prophesy …*

The specific *your* refers to the children of those being spoken to and again there is, as usual, no mention of any who did not have *the Fathers* as their pro-genitors being able to prophesy! The people being addressed are described in verse 22 as being *men of Israel*. And Joel's prophecy which is the basis of this verse was only to Israel!

Acts 2:22 *Ye men* ***of Israel,*** *hear these words, …*

Acts 3:12,13 *Ye men* ***of Israel****, why marvel ye at this? … the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of* ***our*** *fathers …*

Can we pretend these *men of Israel* were from other racial stock?

Acts 2:36 *Therefore let all the* ***house of Israel*** *know …*

This is specifically limited to Israelites.

Acts 2:39 *For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord* ***our*** *God shall call.*

Please note that this verse is post-Pentecost and again isolates to whom the promise is made. The many of Israel are called, but few of Israel are chosen. Those of Israel who were *afar off* and not dwelling in Judea were not excluded. It is still *our God*, the God of *Ye men of Israel* [v22] who were being addressed.

Acts 3:25 ***Ye*** *are the* ***children of the prophets*** *and of the covenant which God made with* ***our*** *fathers, …*

Since every one of the prophets were Israelites by race, their children must be of the same race. [Note: Nationality must not be confused with race. This is a mistake often made by traditional teachers who try to prove non-Israel stock by nationality or place of domicile].

Acts 5:31 *Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance* ***to Israel****, and the forgiveness of sins.*

Yet again, we have definition of race which is post-Passion, and post-Pentecost. It is a definition which carries on through the New Testament.

Acts 7:37 *… A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up* ***unto you of your brethren****, like unto me, him shall ye hear.*

The question that has to be asked here is, "Were Moses and Paul both wrong?" This is what the traditional teachers are saying when they say Jesus was not raised up "UNTO YOU", but *unto all races*. Their teaching is a blatant denial of Scripture and of what Moses and Paul have said. The *of your brethren* fixes very firmly to whom Jesus came as being to Israel only.

Acts 10:36 *The word which God sent* ***unto the children of Israel****, preaching peace by Jesus Christ …*

This confirms the Old Testament teaching that God gave His Word only to Israel, as a race. The peace was proclaimed to those who were near [Judeans] and to those who were afar off [the dispersion – called *Grecians* in Acts]. This is still no different from Psalm 147:19,20, *he showed His word unto Jacob*, or unto all Israel. **Jesus is not the Word - Yahweh got His own WORD**

Acts 13:22,23 *… I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart … of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised up* ***unto Israel*** *a Saviour, Jesus.*

Is there any record of the promise of a Saviour being raised up to people other than Israel? All the references refer to the promise that is made to Israel only. This again shows this is fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy *unto Israel*.

Acts 13:32,33 *And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made* ***unto the fathers****, God hath fulfilled the same unto* ***us their children*** *…*

Note to whom Paul was speaking and that he was speaking at Antioch. This Apostle to the Gentiles was still speaking to Israelites, to those among the *stock of Abraham* who feared God [v26]. For a long time it has been a traditional belief that the word "Gentiles" refers specifically to non-Israelites, but it cannot be avoided that the stock of Abraham is specifically mentioned in verse 26 of this passage! The word for "stock" is *genos* [race and offspring]. The children are shown in relationship to "The Fathers". The *us their children* is too explicit to bend to fit the mould of tradition. There is still no change in the New Testament as to the exclusiveness of Israel.

Acts 26:6 *And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto* ***our fathers****.*

This is a typical example of a Scripture that is commonly generalised to say that the promise made to *our fathers* is now made to everyone of every race. The promise spoken of here is made to Israel alone.

Acts 26:7 *Unto which promise* ***our twelve tribes****, instantly serving God day and night hope to come …*

Some might not like having this Scripture pointed out, along with others in the New Testament that present the fact that the Twelve Tribes still feature in the New Testament, after Pentecost. The time of this quotation is about AD 59. All these Scriptures quoted from Acts onwards are post-Pentecost, after Jesus had fulfilled the Law of Sacrifices. In traditional teachings the people being addressed are supposed to be a multi-racial church as presented in the popular teachings. Again this promise of the resurrection is still made to Israel. Remember that Jesus had already been resurrected so this particular promise of resurrection could not refer to Jesus. This promise of the resurrection is here shown as being made unto the *Twelve Tribes*.. Can we find, in specific direct statements anywhere at all in the Bible, where this promise is shown to be made to non-Israelites?

Acts 28:20 *For this cause therefore I have called for you, to see you, and to speak with you: because that for the hope* **of Israel** *I am bound with this chain.*

This verse, together with the previous one, speaks about "hope". The subjects of this hope are stated to be Israel or *the Twelve Tribes*. Hope is sometimes connected with election [for

example, 1 Thess 1:4] and this is connected with Israel in other passages, particularly in the Book of Hebrews where Law and Hope are contrasted [for example, Heb 7:19, *For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did*].

Rom 1:7 *To all that be in Rome, beloved of God,* ***called*** *to be* ***saints****, …*

Rom 1:13 *…* ***brethren*** *… and … even as among* ***other Gentiles****.*

The people Paul is addressing in Rome are defined as those who are *beloved of God* and *called to be saints*. The emphasised words will be explained later, as will G*entiles*.. These pin-point the racial identity of those Paul was addressing. Called is *kletos* or appointed. These words cannot be found identifying non-Israel races.

Rom 3:19 *Now we know that what things soever the Law saith, it saith to them who are under the Law: …*

The Law is not saying anything to anyone else but to Israel. It is not said to others who were not under the Law. This whole epistle is written to Israelites in Rome at that time.

Rom 4:24 *But for us also to whom it shall be imputed, …*

In context, *for us* does not refer to non-Israelites, but to Israelites who believe, as Abraham did, that the Law of Faith in the Atoning Sacrifice superseded the Law of Sacrifices contained in Ordinances.

Rom 7:1 *Know ye not, brethren, … how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?*

The symbolism here is that of marriage under Israel's law. When we consider this in the light of the Law having been given to Israel only, we can see that Israelites are those being addressed. Paul confirms this by calling them "my brethren," [*adelphos*] or "kinsmen of the womb".

Rom 9:7 *Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but* ***in Isaac shall thy seed be called.***

The seed, [*zera* in Hebrew or *sperma* in Greek], refers to semen product, that is, it refers to a line of people genetically. Through the New Testament, the *sperma* is used this same way. The much-used expression *The Fathers* both implies and emphasises the genetic line.

Rom 11:17 *And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, were grafted in among them …*

Could other than Olive stock be grafted into an Olive tree? This was part of the House of Israel which had "become as aliens" rejoining part of the House of Judah under the New Testament. The House of Israel had become as "wild" Olive trees. This is in full accord with the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. The popular teaching cannot be found prophetically on a proper foundation, or in fact.

Rom 15:8 *Now I say the Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made* ***unto the fathers****.*

Here we have a statement that is important, because it tells us the people to whom Jesus came, and why He came. These promises were not made to any but to Israel and this seed of Israel. The exclusive Israel content of this chapter [Romans 15] is extensive, as shown below. Verse 9 is a quotation from Ps 18:49 which shows David praising God within Israel.

v9 *And that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess thee among the Gentiles, and sing unto thy name.*

v10 *Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people* comes from Deut 32:43 where the people [called Gentiles by the translators] are Israel. *With his people* is all the Israelites together - the dispersed Israelites together with the Israelites in Judea.

v11 *Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles and laud him, all ye people.* Psalm 117 from which this quotation comes, again refers to Israel.

v12 *Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.* Isaiah was talking to Israel. The only nations [translated as Gentiles] who could trust God were Israelites.

v16 *That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles. ….* Paul confirms the statement in Rom 11:13 that he is a minister to Israel.

The word "Gentiles" in this section is a Latin word that is given a manufactured meaning, so do not be misled by it. It will later be shown that the word "Gentiles" often refers to the House of Israel as opposed to the House of Judah. Again, there is no prophecy for the traditional view which arose from the Latin Vulgate and has carried on ever since. Rome made the word "Gentile" to support the view that the Roman church was the *Israel of God*. Let this sink in! Early translators carried on the Roman church word meaning because they were blind to their identity as part of Israel, and they thought that they might be missing out on God's blessing. A later chapter titled, *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile",* examines this word in detail.
Going on to the Book of Corinthians, we find that these so-called Gentiles could only be Israelites. The *brethren, our fathers* and *Moses* confirm this.

1 Cor 10:1-4 *Moreover brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that* ***our fathers*** *were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptised* ***unto Moses*** *… for they drank of that spiritual rock … and that rock was Christ.*

Our Fathers gives definition in a most positive way. The children of *The Fathers* are those who are being addressed. Note: it does not say *and that Rock was Jesus Christ*. ["Jesus" is inserted in some translations to change the meaning to make the verse comply with tradition]. What is said is *and that rock was anointed*.

Gal 3:13 *Christ hath redeemed* ***us*** *from the curse of the Law …*

Only Israel was given the Law so only Israel needed redeeming from the curse of the broken law. The pronouns are so important! To understand that only Israel had been given the Law is most important. It is deception to believe to the contrary against all the clear statements of Scripture. "Us" in this context is still the same exclusive people of Israel.

Gal 4:4,5 *But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,* ***to redeem them that were under the law****, that we might receive the adoption of sons.*

Paul here quotes Isaiah 54:1 which refers to the Redeemer **of Israel**. Again redemption only concerns *them that were under the Law*, and these are the people to whom it is written. Two parties had been under the Law. This is important to understand. These two parties are known as:

[a] Jews and Gentiles [the House of Judah and the House of Israel], or

[b] The Circumcision and the Uncircumcision [the House of Judah and the House of Israel].

Both parties were Israelites and could not be otherwise since only Israel had been under the Law. What is traditionally taught about Jews and Gentiles is simply not right and could not be right because of this.

Eph 2:12 *That at the time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the* ***commonwealth of Israel****, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world.*

Those to whom Paul was writing had become estranged from Israel. Examination of the highlighted words give identification. The words *aliens* and *strangers* are not what they might appear on the surface. These particular *strangers* were the House of Israel. The exclusiveness of Israel in the book of Ephesians will be looked at separately. The *ye* refers to the *saints* as is found in the first verse of this book of Ephesians. A later chapter titled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel* discusses these particular "strangers". In this verse we have the *covenants of promise*. Going back to identify to whom these promises were made, takes us back to Israelites by race.

Phil 3:1 *Finally, my **brethren**, …*

"Brethren", as we will see in James, refers to a brother or a near kinsman.

Phil 3:5 *… of the **stock of Israel**, …*

"Stock" is another genetic term.

Phil 3:9 *… not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, …*

Here, as usual, there is the association with the Law that was only given to Israel.

Phil 4:21 *Salute every **saint** in Christ Jesus. …*

"Saints" are always Israelites. For example, Psalm 148:14, *The praise of all His saints: even the Children of Israel*.

1 Thess 1:4 *Knowing, **brethren**, **your election** of God …*

Isaiah 45:4 defines Israel as being God's elect - *Israel mine Elect*. These elect are chosen by God and so are of Divine origin. They are of the seed "from above". Remember to keep in mind this word "elect. The "your" in "your election" is related to "brethren" [of the womb].

1 Thess 5:9,10 *For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, …*

In Scripture there are those who are appointed to wrath and vessels *fit for destruction.* That is their appointment. 1 Thess 1:4 shows that this book is written to the Elect [*Knowing, brethren, your election of God*].

2 Thess 2:13 *But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren **beloved of the Lord**, because God hath from the beginning **chosen you to salvation**.*

It is the "brethren" who are "chosen" and no one else.. We will soon be looking at the definition of "brethren".

1 Tim 3:15 *… how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house* [that is, household] *of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.*

Examination here will define just who is "The Church". The *Household of God* refers to Israel, as does "*the church*" which is called out of Israel. This is the remnant which still comes from Israel only, according to the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.

2 Tim 1:3 *I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers …*

Paul again will not discount racial origin [*My forefathers*]. He says that he endured all things for THE ELECT'S sake and for the appearing of the Kingdom. Again, this Kingdom is the one of which Jesus is to be the King. The Gospel of the Kingdom, or the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel, is not proclaimed any more. This is because the doctrine of a multi-racial church has taken the place of Israel. *My Forefathers* and *The Fathers* do not signify all races as having come from the loins of Isaac.

Heb 2:16 *For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him **the seed of Abraham**.*

Why would it be necessary to specify *the seed of Abraham* instead of the seed of either Adam or mankind in general? Throughout this chapter we find many references to "brethren" [of the womb], together with Old Testament references to Psalms 8:18 and 22. These are Psalms of Israel among which we find, *all ye seed of Jacob glorify Him; and fear Him all ye the seed of Israel* [Ps 22:23]. The *Ye* is absolutely specific and limited to Israel as the seed.

Heb 3:6 *But Christ as a son over **his own house**; …*

So, there must be other houses [*oikos*] that Jesus is not over! This chapter then goes on to talk about Israel and the fathers of Israel.

Heb 6:13 *For when God made promise to Abraham …*

There is no recorded promise to anyone else but Abraham and certain of his descendants.

Heb 9:28 *So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, …*

We are not told Jesus would bear the sins of every race. "Many" is not "all" of every race. "Sin" is transgression of the Law that was given to Israel only. Isaiah 53:11 and 12 agrees about this word "many" which is limited to "my people".

Compare: *Matt 20:28* *… and to give his life a ransom for many.*

Matt 26:28 *… which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*

Rom 5:15 *… much more the grace of God, … hath abounded to many.*

1 Cor 10:17 *For we* (those Israelites being addressed) *being many, are one bread and one body.*

So, with whom is the New Testament made?

Heb 8:8,9 *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****: 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; …*

Of all the verses in this Book of Hebrews, this verse identifies clearly with whom the New Testament is made. If any one thing is clear, it is the continuing presentation through this book that the New Testament is made with those who had the Old Testament and there is never a statement to the contrary. The two Testaments are contrasted as they relate to one another, to the one people, through this book of Hebrews. Old Testament prophecy says exactly the same [Jer 31:31], where Jeremiah prophesies to whom the New Testament would be made. "The Fathers", again, gives racial definition. The book of Hebrews begins, yet again, with reference to THE FATHERS. The immediate connection is made, *hath in these last days spoken to US by His Son* ["Us" being the children of "the fathers"; those whom Jesus came to redeem; "The Hebrews" being addressed]. These are the children of "The Fathers". When God said *I will put my laws into their minds, and will write them on their hearts*, the Old Testament reference was, and is still, only to Israel. The historical references through this book of Hebrews would have had no meaning to those without the knowledge of Israel's history or of the Law given to Israel. [At this point it is better to forget all you have been previously taught or thought about "Israel"].

James 1:1,2 *James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ,* ***to the twelve tribes*** *which are scattered abroad, greeting. My brethren, …*

For two excellent reasons, this possibly is the best statement to show who the "brethren" are. They are the twelve tribes of Israel by statement, and they are *adelphoi* in Greek. *Adelphos* is translated 346 times as "brother" or "brothers".. Dictionaries and lexicons give the prime meaning as a kinsman [racially related].

Strong 80	from the womb - near or remote.
Vine:	*Adelphos* denotes a brother, or near kinsman: in the plural, a community based on identity of origin, or life.
Thayer	From the same womb.

The words *brotherhood* or *brethren* are mostly used to indicate those having a kinsman-blood relationship, rather than some common belief. From the translations the common belief might sometimes appear to be the meaning but the proper meaning of 'brother' should never be overlooked. The words are used in both the near and remote relationships. Because the words *brethren* or *brothers* are much used word in the New Testament books, it is important to know the common usage. In James it is given as being those of the Twelve Tribes [Israel]. The remote relationship is given in James 2:21 as *our father Abraham*. James suggests a spiritual origin in James 1:18: *Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth.* This only confirms the word of truth being given to Israel. The wrong use of the words in a belief connection or a spiritual application does not eliminate this from its proper relevance to kinsmen of Israel.

In some of the post-KJV translations, either *the Twelve Tribes* or *brethren* are omitted, thus hiding the troublesome-to-them truth of Scripture. This book is addressed to *the Twelve Tribes*. A glance at an interlinear literal Greek-English translation will immediately show the misleading translation in some versions. Sad to say, some modern, religious translators and teachers seek to insert or substitute their particular doctrine, especially when it comes to the racial issues in the Bible. The Living Bible is probably one of the worst in this respect. Paraphrases cannot be used to study the Bible.

James 2:21 *Was not Abraham our father justified by works, …*

"Father" here is *pater* meaning an earlier member of the same family. When we look at these two quotations from James we have to admit or deny that this letter was written in this present age [AD]. Anyone who wants to say this letter is written to other than the Twelve Tribes as well as to those whose father was Abraham, has to explain when the transition took place to make it include everyone else. This explanation is required also for other New Testament books.

1 Peter 1:1,2 *… to the strangers scattered … elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, …*

Comparison of this verse and also *pilgrims and strangers* [1 Peter 2:11] with other places in the New Testament, and with the counterparts in the Old Testament [see Psalm 39:12], will quickly identify these particular strangers as being Israelites who had been living apart from God and the temple system. A chapter titled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel* deals with this in detail. These particular words are used of Israel when Israel is scattered among the other races. They were "elect", a word covered lightly earlier on in the Old Testament texts. They were "holy" or "sanctified" by the Spirit upon them [both are the same word in the original texts, meaning "separated" or "set apart"]. They are holy in a way in which no other race is separated unto God.

1 Peter 1:10 *Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you.*

The "you" here refers to the strangers etc of verses 1 and 2. The prophets all prophesied about grace which would come to Israel. There is no prophecy about this grace being to others. Peter was writing to Israelites!

1 Peter 1:11 *Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify …*

This anointing Spirit was *in them* [note this well because we will come upon this again later] and the Word goes on to say:

1 Peter 1:15 *But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation.*

This is another quotation from the Old Testament which shows that there is no New Testament change in the separate nature of Israel. This separation is to be maintained. The KJV translates Lev 11:45 as*, I am the Lord that bringeth you up out of the Land of Egypt to be your God. Ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy*.. It is God who made Israel a holy people. God is holy now. Israel also is holy [separate] to God now. This is what the verse is saying. "Holy" does not mean righteous as some would lead us to believe.

1 Peter 2:9 *But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood,* ***an holy nation, a peculiar people****; …*

We have looked at this quotation from Exodus 19:5 which Peter quotes here. Israel is still *an holy nation* and not a "church" in the commonly accepted meaning of the word "church".. Peter goes on to show that this nation had a king that they were to honour. This nation must have been in existence at the time of writing. In a later chapter we will show that this king was not the Emperor of the Roman Empire, as some modern translations say in their footnotes.

2 Peter 1:4 *Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: …*

These promises are stated in Romans 9:3,4 to be given to *kinsmen of the flesh who* **are Israelites** and that the promises pertained to them. Peter also wrote to Israelites!

1 Peter 2:17 … *honour the King.*

In prophecy, the House of Israel would always have a monarch on the continuing Throne of David, whereas the House of Judah would not have a monarch in the last days. When the two Houses regather to the Holy [separate] Land, they will have *one Head* again [Hos 1:11 and please note the timing of this]. It has not happened yet!

1 Peter 2:24,25 *Who his own self bare* ***our*** *sins in his own body … for ye were as sheep going astray; but* ***are now returned*** *unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.*

This is under the New Testament which some of the House of Israel had come under. Jesus bare the sins of Israel and Jesus describes Himself as the Shepherd of the sheep, but never as the shepherd of the Tares or the Goats or of any other race. Again, the pronouns refer to those being addressed, again they are *brethren*, etc.

2 Peter 3:2-4 *That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the holy* [that is, separated] *prophets, and the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour.*

These prophets were prophets of Israel. The Lord and Saviour is the Lord and Saviour of Israel and never of others.
The words of the Apostles do not override the words of the Prophets. The Apostles confirm the Prophets. In this verse the Apostles and Prophets are linked together. Peter had already written about the false prophets which would be *among you* and he describes their character. In John's letters there is much separation by pronouns.

1 John 2:12 *I write to you little children, because* ***your*** *sins are forgiven for his name's sake.*

1 John 2:19 *They went out from* ***us****, because they were not of* ***us****; for if they had been of* ***us****, they would no doubt have continued with* ***us****: …*

1 John 2:20 *But* ***ye*** *have an unction from the Holy One, …*

1 John 2:27 *But the anointing which* ***ye*** *have received of him abideth in you, …*

1 John 3:9 ***whosoever is born of God*** [that is, from above by spirit and by water] *does not commit* [practise] *sin.*

1 John 5:18 *We know that* ***whosoever is born of God*** *sinneth not, …*

Your sins refers to the sins of those to whom John is writing. Jesus did come to save *HIS People* from their sins. John also refers to certain people who are false and by pronoun separation these are "they" as opposed to "ye" and "we". *They were not of us* tells us that they were different in some way, even if they professed to believe in Jesus! It becomes self-evident that the anointing *which abideth in you* could only abide because the anointed people are conceived with this potential. How else could it abide? This bears witness to the anointed race in the Old Testament. These alone have the capacity to "hear" and to "believe".
The first chapter of John's epistle speaks of hearing, seeing, looking upon and handling *that which was from the beginning*. These were Israelites to whom Jesus was manifest. John the Baptist said, *that He might be made manifest to Israel* [John 1:31]. In 1 John 2:7, he shows that he is addressing those who had the old commandment *from the beginning*. These can only be Israelites. I John 2:24 indicates that what was heard from the beginning about the old commandment must remain in the hearers in order to continue *in the Son and in the Father*. These also can only be Israelites.

Jude 3 … *the common salvation* [that is, common to Israel and Judah] *the faith which was once* [that is, without change] *delivered unto the saints* – [that is, the separated people].

Jude 19 *These be they who separate themselves, sensual,* ***having not the Spirit****.*

Amongst God's saints are others who separate themselves from God through their disbelief. They were not born in such a state – they become that way by their own choice and their own actions. They are described as *not having the spirit*, that is, they may as well have been born outside Israel. They are in the same category as foreigners who try to separate themselves from other nations by living in Israel - they are not *begotten from above* and hence are also *not having the spirit.*

ISRAEL IN THE REVELATION

Jehovah is not the God of all nations. He is confined to one nation - the sons of Jacob. No Biblical record can be found that Jehovah is the God of any people other than Israel.
In the book of Revelation, THE TWELVE TRIBES still feature! They have in no way become some non-Israel, non-twelve-tribed church! This book begins by speaking of the revelation, *to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass*. This revelation is to His Servants of the twelve tribes only and this is confirmed in many places.

Rev 1:2 *Who bear record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, …*

This book does not bear witness to anything outside of what has been revealed in the Word of God or the Spirit of Prophecy. The testimony of Israel racially has been clearly revealed through the Word.

TO CONCLUDE

These Scriptures show the exclusive nature of Israel as a continuing theme throughout both Testaments. If we do not want to accept all these references, then what is to be done with them? The acceptance or non-acceptance of an exclusive Israel determines the prophetic stream one subscribes to. When *exclusive Israel* becomes the foundation of prophetic interpretation, much of the common conflicts in prophecy are found to disappear. But, above all, the acceptance or non-acceptance determines our ability to believe and to understand Jesus' words.
It is not difficult to conclude that the Bible is a book primarily about Israel [as a people] because Jehovah is consistently declared to be the God of this one people. We find other Biblical statistics, such as:

Israel as *Yisra'el*	2,514 times [Old Testament]
Israel as Israel	70 times [New Testament]
Jacob [KJV]	358 times [24 in New Testament]
Judah	813 times
Ephraim	172 times
Manasseh	143 times
Hebrews	21 times
Lord God of Israel	110 times
God of Israel	90 times
Holy One of Israel	31 times
Lord God of the Hebrews	5 times
Mighty God of Jacob	4 times
Hope of Israel	2 times
Congregation of Israel	160 times [as *qahal*] 173 times [as *edah*]
Assembly of Israel	21 times [as *atsarah*]
Ekklesia	116 times in New Testament
Tribes [*shebet*] of Israel	190 times [Old Testament]
Tribes [*phule*] of Israel	31 times [New Testament]
People of Israel	19 times [KJV]
My people	231 times
Of Israel	1,692 times
To Israel	23 times.
For Israel	24 times

Then we find expressions like, *Israel's God, the Light of, the Rock of, the Redeemer of, the Stone of, the Shepherd of, the Portion of, the God of*; all of which refer expressly to Israel. Then there are expressions like *the God of your fathers* and *fathers of Israel* ["fathers" is mentioned 549 times including 56 in the New Testament].

There is the intimate word *Jeshurun* for Israel. There are about 5,000 direct references that isolate Israel as a people. Their personal God, Jehovah, [*Yehovah*] is mentioned 6,528 times. In most cases the AV wrongly renders this as 'Lord' and only four places as 'Jehovah' The true pronunciation of God's name is unknown.

The remainder of this book is based on the foundation of an exclusive Israel. This presentation might well come as a shock to sincere dedicated Christians and there will be immediate reactions. Accordingly, we must look at these reactions next. Then we will consider the hinge-point Scriptures of those who hold an opposing view. Their hinge-point Scriptures are *Go ye into all the world* and *God so loved the world*. After looking at the reactions we will then look to see what "world" it is that God *so loved*.

CHAPTER 3: REACTIONS TO AN EXCLUSIVE ISRAEL

Through the New Testament there are many topics and words that originate in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament there are words such as *promises, know, elect, called, chosen, seed* and variations of them which are generally agreed to refer only to the Israel nation. We have to ask if there is adequate reason to suggest a switch which might allow the equivalent Greek words to apply to some multi-racial church in the New Testament.
First it would be well to review what was written in the last chapter. It can be seen that there is an overwhelming weight of evidence from simple direct statements against the traditional teachings. The traditional teachings do not arise from any weight of simple direct statements. In a separate chapter we will look into aspects of the basis of the traditional teachings.
To use words like *deception* and *another Gospel* cannot be done lightly. These are very serious considerations and if the weight of evidence as shown in the previous two chapters is accepted, then the popular teachings must have cultish elements. The implications of this conclusion are vast and almost devastating to many Christians and churches. It would have bearing on missionary activity as well. But, please note well, it has not been said or suggested that all the non-Israel nations should not be made subject to the Law of God. Neither has it been said that they are condemned by God.. This matter is a later consideration in this book. When we come to *God so loved the world* as taught, traditionalists have to immediately get around every reference to the exclusiveness of Israel (in both Testaments), if they want to change the nation of Israel into some multi-racial church, or if they want to say there is both a national Israel and a Church consisting of non-Israelites. This is impossible to do from any pattern of consistent direct statements. We would have to get around it from the foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, and this cannot be done.
God has told us that He will do nothing He does not reveal first to his servants the prophets **of Israel**. He will fulfil His Word **to Israel**.. Some of what has already been written in this book will cause immediate (and common) reactions among Christians who think they know their Bible. This is why it has been necessary to lay a good foundation from both Testaments and to demonstrate the consistent direction and weight of evidence in that direction.
Now we can have a look at some of these common reactions. Only brief comments are made on these reactions, because they are all expanded at various places elsewhere in this book.

REACTION ONE [THE MOST COMMON]

> "Yes, that is true, but God was speaking to them, and not to us. Now God is speaking to everyone".

This would be the thought of the majority of church-going people today, and is a thought that is wrongly encouraged. So should we go along with that reaction just because it sounds right? As soon as it is asked, *"When in this church age did God's speaking change from 'them' to 'us'?",* there is no answer at all. If this question cannot be answered from Scripture, then it has no basis.
It would be profitable for any who would like to retain this particular thought and reaction, to look at the root word *grapho* which is used in the New Testament 194 times. It is used in the expression *it is written* and refers to the Old Testament Scriptures. It would be profitable too, to look at *written* in a concordance where it will be seen afresh that many times the basis of all doctrine is *it is written*. *It is written* means written in the Old Testament and so these quotes refer to Israel.
If the basis of a belief or doctrine appears to be in the New Testament alone, it must be suspect because it is not written in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. This is important because there are a number of such ideas which are generally accepted, but which do not have *it is written* as a basis. In fact it might be said that much of what is debated has no foundation at all in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. Some traditional teachings cannot present a clear pattern of simple direct statements from the Old Testament to support these

views. They rely mainly on fabricated "types", "shadows" and analogies. Man's tradition therefore is not established *in the mouth of two or three witnesses* as is required by Scripture. Israel cannot be changed to mean non-Israel just by making such a statement without the right foundation.
If a New Testament book, written in the 'Christian age', [for example, James' Epistle to the Twelve Tribes] was written and addressed to Israelites, then either the writer was wrong or there would need to have been something that happened since Pentecost in order for men to be able to say, *God is now speaking to everyone* [meaning every race].

REACTION TWO

> "Yes, but Israel has now become the church, so all these things belong to the church".

This says that "Israel" and "The Church" no longer have any connection and that Israel has vanished. The church is supposed to consist of non-Israelites, the so-called "Gentiles". However, the Hebrew word *goi*, upon which the "gentiles" thought is based, is also used of Israel. So *goi* does not always equate with so-called non-Israel "gentiles".. The whole subject is simplified when we accept what we find when we build upon the right foundation and have the Cornerstone.

Eph 2:20 *And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, …*

The Cornerstone, the prophets and the apostles all agree. Since "apostles" is put before "prophets", this Scripture is used to say that New Testament apostles have new prophecy and doctrine that was not contained or forecast within the Old Testament. Just to say something like that does not make it fact. In the books of Galatians and Romans in particular, modern teaching says that the Apostle Paul has made a turn around from what is recorded in Acts where he tells King Agrippa that he spoke nothing other than what was said in the law and the prophets! In Romans and Galatians he is now supposed to be writing to certain so-called Gentiles who are supposed to be non-Israelites. The internal statements show that each letter in the New Testament is written only to Israelites. This is discussed in more detail in a chapter titled *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*.
Let us look again at the Apostle Paul's famous speech in Acts 13 which was made long after Jesus' death and resurrection. Here, right in the New Testament age, Israel is still a genetic term. There is still no sign of "The Church" as this is commonly perceived. Consider all the following highlighted words from Acts 13:17-42:

v17 *The God of **this people of Israel** chose our fathers, …*
v23 *Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised **unto Israel** a Saviour, Jesus.*
v24 *… the baptism of repentance to **all the people of Israel**.*
v26 *Men and brethren, children of the **stock of Abraham**, …*
v32,3 *… how that the promise which was made **unto the fathers**, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, …*
v39 *And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which **ye could not be justified by the law of Moses**..*

In the last verse we see the first "all" that people most like to generalise to include everyone on Earth. But the "ye", and the context, nails it down to Israel alone as the ones to whom the Law of Moses was given. All the highlighted words in these verses give a very specific definition of who is being addressed in the New Testament; it is always to a genetic Israel! We can no longer say that these children of the fathers, (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob), come from other stock. These are the people who had been under the Law of Moses! In the above passage, Paul was addressing those whom he described as **MEN OF ISRAEL**, who feared God. The only way we could say that "The Church" has replaced Israel is to prove that the New Testament Church comes from within Israel via the mechanism of the New Testament; this is discussed later in this book.

REACTION THREE

> "The Gentiles are now adopted into Israel, so the promises made to Israel are now made to everyone who believes in Jesus".

A short answer to this reaction is not possible because there are so many aspects to cover. These are covered as individual sections on "gentiles", "the church", "strangers" and "adoption", and the promises made to Abraham and his seed.

REACTION FOUR

> "The seed of Abraham has now become the seed of Jesus … it is now a spiritual Seed".

The promises were made to Abraham's seed, but not to Jesus, who came to fulfil them. The promises were made to Abraham and his seed, which is named in Isaac [Gen 21:12]. The promises were therefore given to the Israel people as a whole. Now, as Jesus was born into Israel, He is regarded as the seed of Abraham and of David [Matt 1:1]. But the promises were not specifically given to Jesus as the 'one seed' of Galatians 3:16. And, of course, Jesus had no 'seed'.. If Jesus was that one seed, then everyone between Abraham and Jesus would be disinherited, including Isaac and Jacob. Israel then, could not have existed as the seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob, if Jesus were that seed. A more accurate translation of Gal 3:16 reads:

> *And to Abraham and the seed of him the promises were spoken. He says not, 'And to the seeds of thee' as of many, but as of one. And to the seed of thee which is anointed.* **Christ should have been translated "anointed"**

Note: "seed" is used here and elsewhere as a collective noun.

REACTION FIVE

> "It is said that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile has been broken down so that all are now one in Jesus."

Here we have another hinge-point of much of what is taught in the evangelical churches today. But, in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, the partition is found to be between The House of Israel and The House of Judah. It is not between Israelites and non-Israelites [see Isaiah 11:13 *Ephraim shall not vex Judah any more*]. In all of the New Testament Scriptures quoted above where the exclusiveness of Israel was shown, all the people addressed by Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles, are clearly shown to be Israelites. All the books of the Bible provide the same evidence. It will be shown that the House of Israel had been "scattered" among the nations and that any pattern showing a gathering or the joining together of Israel with non-Israel races cannot be found in prophecy.

REACTION SIX

> "The Jews are God's natural children, but the members of the Church are God's spiritual children".

Two sets of parallel promises cannot be found in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. Neither are the promises made to Abraham's seed directed specifically to Jesus. The promises made to the fathers are always presented as being fulfilled in *us their children*. Israelites are the children of the promise. There is only one promise in this respect. There is not a second similar promise found for non-Israel races.

> NOTE: The "children" still have to be redeemed individually from the curse of the broken Law. They are born at physical birth as heirs of salvation. This sixth reaction results from attempting to get around the problem of a national and racial Israel and retain tradition at the same time. The word *Jew* has to be made to equate with Israel and the word *Gentile* has to be made to equate with non-Israel. This is not the world of reality! Yet it has been drummed into most Christians, conditioning all their thinking, teaching and writing, on almost every subject.

REACTION SEVEN

"That seems to be true, but no one knows who is an Israelite today."

May we quote 2 Timothy 2:19? *Never-the-less the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his*. There is a holy [separate] people which are *stone, elect* and *precious, above all other people* which have *now obtained mercy*. They are *brethren from the womb* and are anointed *[christos]*. They are *born from above* (that is, *begotten from above*). The Bible does give marks of identification that are clear and unmistakable, but this identity factor is outside the scope of this book.

REACTION EIGHT

"This is all very well, but now everything is spiritualised."

It is unfortunate for such a belief that the Twelve Tribes of Israel keep appearing in the New Testament. In this present New Testament age they are not spiritualised away! To react this way is to say that Jesus and Paul are wrong. Paul said *unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come* - Acts 26:7. How can twelve individual tribes be spiritualised?

REACTION NINE

"The law has been fulfilled, therefore nothing in the law applies any more."

Jesus says in Matthew 5:17,18:

> *Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. 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.*

The Law has different aspects. In Romans 13:8-10 we have a discourse about fulfilling the Law which concludes with, *therefore love is the fulfilling of the Law*. This Scripture is sometimes quoted as proof that everything relating to the Law is finished, but verse 8 is about people, as individuals, fulfilling the Law by their actions. It is not about God fulfilling His covenants and promises. This is confirmed in Matthew 7:12 where Jesus is saying, *therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do YE also unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets*.. Jesus has fulfilled what is written in the Law concerning Himself [Luke 24:44]. His sacrifice has fulfilled that part of the Law concerning sacrifices. Possibly the short answer to the rest of the matter of fulfilling the Law is that heaven and earth has not yet passed away. When they are passed away, all will have been fulfilled. What has been written in the Law, The Psalms and The Prophets will come to pass. The promises to the seed of Abraham still stand and will yet come to pass!

REACTION TEN

"Everyone is now the same because all are one in Christ Jesus."

This epitomises the traditional teachings.

Gal 3:7	*Know ye therefore that they which be of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.*
Gal 3:26	*For ye are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.*

It sounds right at first glance, particularly when the pronouns are ignored. The *ye* are the people being addressed. That is why it is necessary to establish that the so-called Gentiles in the Epistles were Israelites. A later chapter is devoted to this subject. There is no pattern through The Law, The Psalms and The Prophets to support tradition. It is not there, so something must be wrong with the traditional teaching.

REACTION ELEVEN

> "It makes no difference now because all nations are blessed in Abraham. All is now of Grace."

Some teachers actually do say this, believe it or not. Now, if this were true, it means that the Old Testament is invalid. It is like the Roman Catholic idea of saying that the Church is the authority rather than the Bible and yet quoting the Bible wrongly about Peter and the rock to support their view.

But to whom is God gracious if all is of grace? Is it every one of every race on Earth?

Exodus 33:19 *… and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy.*

Rom 9:15-18 *For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, … so then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy … therefore hath he mercy upon whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*

This question of the Grace of God is a subject in itself; but the over-riding principle is the Sovereignty of God. It is *whom He will*. To say glibly, *all is of grace* is to include everyone and to make a mockery of the Sovereignty of God. If redemption is for every man of every race, then the whole choice is man's choice and this is *another gospel* [2 Cor 11:6 and Gal 1:6].

In the New Testament, "grace" refers to *the Divine influence upon the heart*. We can find no reference to God *writing the Law on their hearts* other than to Israel, nor can we find a word of prophecy about a new heart being given to any other than Israel.

ARE THERE TWO OR THREE WITNESSES FOR "EXCLUSIVE ISRAEL"?

2 Cor 13:1 *In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established.*

First witness:

1. The Old Testament is contained in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.
2. The New Testament is contained in the Gospels, the Epistles and Revelations.

Second witness:

1. The Old Testament speaks redemption being for Israel ALONE.
2. The New Testament speaks of redemption being for Israel ALONE.

Third witness:

1. The Old Testament was made with Israel ALONE [Psalm 147:19,20 etc].
2. The New Testament is made with Israel ALONE [Hebrews 8:8].

Let us go on to look further into these issues and to meet the objections and the things that might appear to be at variance.

We will look at a chapter devoted to *the world* as found in *Go into all the world*, and follow this with a chapter on specific stumbling blocks placed in the way to comprehending the whole Bible witnesses concerning the exclusiveness of Israel.

CHAPTER 4: WHICH WORLD DID GOD "SO LOVE"?

When we consider the volume of Scriptures which have been presented in the two chapters detailing the exclusiveness of Israel, if we had no mind-set or pre-conditioning, we would have to agree to the following:

1. They are all consistent statements of fact, [not inferences].
2. They all relate to Israel alone, as a race, no other race being included.
3. Israel alone is God's inheritance.
4. There is no conflict about redemption applying to Israel alone.
5. The covenants and promises referred to were made with Israel only.
6. That Israel is a holy, that is, *set-apart* race [what is commonly called The Chosen Race].
7. That the Statutes [*choq*] and the Judgements [*mishpat*] were given to Israel alone as a servant nation [this is vital to comprehend and remember in the chapters to follow].
8. That the word *Jews* is not mentioned in any of these Scriptures.
9. That there are different *seeds* and that Abraham's seed is genetic.
10. That none of these Scriptures can be 'spiritualised'.

If we come to the conclusion that there is a unique, racial Israel, we will be in conflict with the following viewpoints:

[a] What is inferred indirectly from verses used by universalists.

[b] What we think we see manifest in terms of Christian experience in other races.

Universalists may use what appear to be direct statements. But they rely on certain words that have been given new meanings. Sometimes completely wrong and deceptive meanings have been placed on words and some of these have become accepted modern teachings. To these manufactured word meanings, "types" are added to fit the interpretation. This is the common way of teaching, but it is not teaching that is based upon the foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.

Over the years, accumulated errors in translations have led us away from the meanings contained in the original texts. One consequence has been that the commentaries and reference dictionaries often perpetuate and magnify the problems by using statements such as, *this has come to mean*, and then applying their own interpretations based upon such new meanings. Apart from errors in pure translation, there are errors due to words being added in English that are not supported in the original text. Also there are words deleted from the English text that are supported in the original text. An example of this is the frequent omission of the Definite Article from the English translations, where this is included in the Greek and vice versa.

This chapter provides several typical examples of these deviations.

WORD MEANINGS

In the New Testament there is a call to separation which few will deny. In today's preaching, this is presented primarily as a separation from uncleaness and sin. This is not an incorrect presentation in itself, but it is a half truth.

2 Cor 6:16,17 *… I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be MY PEOPLE. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean [thing], and I will receive you.*

The addition of "thing" [*akathartou*, genitive, singular, neuter] at the end of this verse is grammatically justified. But, preachers use it in the sense of things rather than people. When we look at this verse, it is obvious that "them" signifies the separation of one people [not thing] from another. The word used in Greek is *aphorizo* that means *to border off … to limit*

off … to separate and to sever from the rest. In the next verse below we see how this word is used; it is used of the separation of goats from amongst Israelite sheep. [Note: *nations* is a neuter noun whereas *them* is masculine and thus refers to the people within the nations].

Matt 25:32 *And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: …*

This specifically mentions nations. Any such suggestion of election or national separation horrifies some Christians because of the conflict between this and their understanding of *God so loved the world* and similar Scriptures. So it might be well to immediately look at these verses and see what *the world* means.

GO INTO ALL "THE WORLD"

John 3:16,17 *For God so loved* ***the world*** *that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into* ***the world*** *to condemn* ***the world****; but that* ***the world*** *through him might be saved.*

Mark 16:15 *And he said unto them, Go into all* ***the world****, and preach the gospel to every creature.*

These are two much quoted verses. In each case "the world" is the same word *kosmos* in the original Greek. *Kosmos* is probably one of the least understood and misused words in the New Testament and perhaps we should take a short-cut and make statements about *kosmos* which is usually translated as "world".

- *Kosmos* does not mean every race or the inhabited earth [*oikoumene*]. Nor does it mean the land mass of the earth or its soil [*ge* and *ghay*].
- Kosmos has the prime meaning is "order", "arrangement" or "beauty", but never the common multi-racial meaning as taught.
- *Kosmos* often means that particular world which is being spoken about, to the exclusion of other "worlds". In English we speak of the "world of music" - in Greek we would say the *kosmos of music*.
- *Kosmos* can mean the whole world of wicked and reprobate men as opposed to the "world" of God's elect.
- *Kosmos* is used of the Roman Empire [John 8:23].
- *Kosmos* is used of the world that was before the flood [2 Peter 2:5]. That world was destroyed [Heb 11:7].
- *Kosmos* is spoken of, not only as the world that now is, but also of that which is to come. [Do we preach to the world to come?].
- *Kosmos* can refer to things other than people, for example, the adornment of a woman's hair [see 1 Tim 2:9 where *kosmos* is translated as "modest"]. It is particularly difficult to proclaim the gospel to a woman's hair clip!
- *Kosmos* is used of many other things and these can include either order or disorder, fame and honour, the orderly universe, the stars in the universe and even heaven!

So, which "world" of all these "worlds" did God *so love*? From the Scriptures, we can see that there are differing kinds of worlds. Think about this and how this relates to what has been shown as written in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. In the Old Testament we are told that God loved Israel. There does not seem to be a single direct reference to God loving any other race. Let us consider the Israel order whom God says He loved in the Old Testament.

Deut 7:8 *But because the Lord* ***loved you****, and because he would keep the oath which he sware unto your fathers* … [that is, of Israel].

Psalm 47:4 *… the excellency* ***of Jacob*** *whom* ***he loved****.*

Isaiah 63:7-9 *I will mention the* ***loving kindness*** *of the Lord … and the great goodness toward* ***the house of Israel*** *… in his* ***love*** *and in his pity he redeemed them …*

Hosea 3:1 *… according to the* ***love*** *of the Lord towards the* ***children of Israel****.*

Hosea 11:1-4 *When **Israel** was a child, then **I loved** him … I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of **love**: …*

Zeph 3:17 *The Lord thy God in the midst of thee* [that is, Israel] *is mighty, he will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in **his love** …*

Malachi 1:2 *… yet **I loved Jacob**, and I hated Esau, …*

In the Old Testament we have these expressions of the Israel people that God *so loved.* Cast your mind back to all the Scriptures in the New Testament we have looked at which show the exclusive nature of Israel. Both tell of the love of God for Israel in a way which separates them from the other races. Are we now to believe that this people Israel have somehow disappeared, despite prophecy to the contrary? If God said that He **hated** Esau, then Edom could not be included in the "**all**" or "**the world**" of *Go ye into* **all** *the world* and *God* **so loved the world**.

Just in case anyone still has reservations about "the world" having different meanings, we will look at pairs of verses each of which contain the words "the world".

Pair One:

John 7:7 ***The world** cannot hate you, but me it hateth, …*

1 John 3:13 *Marvel not, my brethren, if **the world** hate you.*

If both of these two "worlds" were the same, then the disciples could not be hated by a world that was not able to hate them. Both worlds are *kosmos*.

Pair Two:

John 17:6 *I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of **the world** …*

John 17:14 *… they are not of **the world**, even as I am not of **the world**.*

In one verse they are out of "the world" and in the second they are not of "the world".

Pair Three:

John 17:9 *… I pray not for **the world**, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine.*

John 3:16 *God so loved **the world**, …*

Might it not be blasphemy to suggest that Jesus would not pray for that world He loved. So He must pray for one "world" and not for another! Here are demonstrated three pairs of Scriptures which show contrasts in the "worlds" they are talking about.

THE WORLD – KOSMOS OR OIKOUMENE?

These two words are both translated "world", but they are different in application and meaning. The meaning of *kosmos* is determined by its context to identify which particular world is under discussion, whereas *oikoumene* means the inhabited or civilised earth of the Mediterranean region. We can see *oikoumene* easily in verses such as Luke 2:1 where Caesar was to tax *all* **the world** and Acts 11:28 about a famine throughout *all* **the world**. In Acts 17:6 we read where the disciples *turned* **the world** *upside down*. In Acts 19:27 we read about *all Asia and* **the world** *worshipping the goddess Diana* and in Acts 24:5 about Paul being said to be *a mover of sedition throughout* **the world**. In Rev 3:10 Jesus speaks about the *hour of temptation which shall come upon all* **the world**. In Romans 10:18 we are told the Word of God went *into all the earth* and *unto the ends of* **the world**.. When we remember that both parts of Israel were scattered among the nations this is easily understood. We might say that the k*osmos* of Israel was scattered throughout the *oikoumene*. Jesus came into the *oikoumene* [Heb 1:6] to minister to the *kosmos* of Israel.

Once we understand this, we can correct verses which the universalists use, such as 1 John 2:2: *And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for* [that is, the sins of] *the whole world*. Here the word for world is *kosmos*, not *oikoumene*. The

"whole" is *holos* which means every bit and every whit of the *kosmos* it refers to. The context shows John is saying that the propitiation applies to all of Israel.
It also helps with Matt 24:14 where Jesus speaks about the gospel being *preached* (proclaimed) *in all the world*. Here we find *oikoumene* for "world", not *kosmos*. The expression *in the world* is not *to the world*.. Here Jesus was addressing Israelite disciples about the gospel being a witness to all the Israel nations who were dispersed in the *oikoumene* at that time.

WHAT "WORLD" DID GOD SO LOVE?

- Does all mankind belong to that "world"?
- Do only certain men belong to that "world"?
- Who are those people then that God loves? Where do they come from?

These are very important questions which have to be answered and faced up to, like it or not. A very solid foundation has been established from both Testaments to build upon and this shows the world of an exceedingly exclusive, chosen, called, predestined and elect race of people. Most people have some thought about the existence of a "chosen people", and somehow they come up with the label "The Jews" for these people. "The Jews" is a generalisation which cannot equate to Israel! And, Jesus always condemned "The Jews" for what they were [John 8], so "The Jews" [as the popular term] cannot be Israel!

THE TWO VIEWS OF "THE WORLD" ARE TWO DIFFERING GOSPELS

The two views commonly taken are really two separate gospels. One of them must be *another gospel.* Those who believe *another gospel*, the Apostle Paul states, are accursed! This is really very serious, so to not be accursed we have to look well at both gospels! Both cannot be right. One is the *gospel of the universal*. One is the *gospel of the particular*.. So think this through well. Either God loves all men, [including those God says that He hates] or He loves only His elect.

> *Gal 1:8* *But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach* (proclaim) *any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached* (proclaimed)*, let him be accursed.*

After a few more paragraphs, we will have summaries of these two different gospel options to consider.

DOES GOD LOVE THOSE HE DECLARES THAT HE HATES?

The Bible tells us of God's hatred as well as God's love. So if God hated even one man, He would not *so love the world*. He does say *Esau have I hated*. If God **hated** just Esau, then Edom could not be included in the "**all**" of *Go ye into* **all** *the world* or "the world" of *God so* **loved the world**. If God failed to save all mankind, then He is not almighty and unchangeable. He must be powerless if *The World* means all mankind. All men are not saved. Could the death of Jesus and the redemptive Love of God ever be in vain?
Quoting from R.K. and R.N. Phillips in "The Book of Revelation", Part Two:

> *For those who are firmly convinced that the one who was crucified is Gentle Jesus, meek and mild, please note that He is capable of hate. The Greek word is* miseo*, to hate, regard with ill-will, to detest, to abhor. This puts the followers of the Nicolaitanes in the same category as Esau [whom God hated before he was born]. If deeds have nothing to do with resurrection, why does Jesus make such a statement about the deeds of the Nicolaitanes? If all men are equal before God, why did God hate Esau before he was born?*

God's love of the Elect is in no way limited. He so loved this "world" of His Elect. This is the order of Israel He loved and sent His Son to redeem. This is for whom Jesus died. We are told He came *to save HIS PEOPLE from their sins.*
Scripture says, *Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life*. We have to look at which "world" is being addressed and see that the "whosoever" refers to "all"

of that part being spoken about and not "all" of everything. The context here is Israel. The *whosoever* is a mistranslation; it literally means *the entire one* which refers to the entire nation of Israel, as determined by the context.
Now we can go back to the Old Testament Scriptures with understanding and see just why it was so important to quote all the Scriptures which show that the Law and the Ten Commandment were given to Israel alone. It is vital to understand this. Redeeming Love can only mean redemption from the curse of a broken Law. This Law Covenant had not been made with all races. Israel is the world Jesus came to save. He *bought back* or redeemed Israel. That redemption price, by Law, could be paid only by a kinsman - according to the Law God gave Israel. Hence Jesus is the kinsman of Israel (He is David's greater son). Jesus is not the kinsman of any other race.

JOHN CHAPTER THREE

Let us go back to John 3 where Jesus was talking to Nicodemus, a Master of Israel. In context, Israel is the "world" they were talking about. Consider, *For God so loved the world;* the word "for" refers to the immediate, preceding discussion. This provides the context. To whom is Jesus speaking? This tells us which *kosmos* is under discussion. The whole subject matter concerns Israelites and a master in Israel, Nicodemus.

v3	They have to be " begotten from above" [not *born again* as translated] to be able to perceive [in their mind's eye] the Kingdom.
v5,7	Unless this spirit is inherited FROM CONCEPTION, none can enter the Kingdom [1 John 3:9].
v8	Those who are thus born of the Spirit (Israelites) respond to the call of the Spirit.
v14,15	And even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.

To which race did Moses lift up that serpent? Which race was then healed and cleansed from the serpent bites? It was only Israel.

WHICH "WORLD"?

At the beginning of this chapter we quoted Mark 16:15 in connection with going into all the *kosmos* and "preaching" [that is, proclaiming] the gospel to every creature. Which "world" were the disciples to go into? This is a fair question. When the disciples were sent to the *lost sheep of the House OF ISRAEL*, to whom and to which "world" were they sent? When Jesus said in Matthew 15:24: *I am not sent BUT unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel*, to what race was He sent? Are we to say Jesus was wrong and that He was sent to every race? Are we to say Jesus was wrong in sending His disciples only to Israelites? If they were told *go ye into all the world*, why did they not go to the Negroes, the Chinese or the Indians? Why did they choose only one direction and proceeded to where the Children of Israel were? The location of the House of Israel at that time can be easily established historically.

Matt 11:1	*… he departed thence to preach in their [disciples'] cities.*
Matt 10:5-7	*Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach* (proclaim), *saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.*

The disciples were instructed specifically not to go to certain peoples. The disciples of Jesus went out from Galilee knowing exactly where to find these "lost" sheep. They were not so "lost" that they could not be found!

"ALL", "EVERY ONE", "WHO-SO-EVER", ETC.

Consider again these two verses:

John 3:16 *God so loved the world …*

Mark 16:15 *Go ye into all the world …*

Such verses are the basis of the thought that the *go and preach the gospel to every creature* of Mark 16:15 refers to going to every person of every race on earth. Let us consider some of the words in these verses.

[a] Preach or *kerusso* means to proclaim, or to announce good news like a town crier. It does not mean "to make disciples" or "to evangelise", as many teach.

[b] But where were they to make their proclamations? Was it to everyone of every race? Let us look at *every creature*. The Greek word *ktisis* is given by:

Strong G2936-7 as original formation, building, creature, and ordinance.

Vine's Dictionary of New Testament Words: ktizo is used among the Greeks to mean the foundation of a place, a city, or a colony ... It is a significant confirmation of Rom 1:20,21 that in all non-Christian Greek literature these words (*ktizo* and its derivatives) are never used by Greeks to convey the idea of a Creator or of a creative act by any of their gods. The words are confined by them to the acts of human beings.

This is the *creature* [or rather, *creation*] of Mark 16:15.. The word *ktisis* in the Greek is used to indicate the product of human building or formation. In this context it refers to a village, or place where people live. A *ktisis* is built by man, not God. The disciples were to go specifically to the places or the villages or places where the Israelites lived.

Matt 10:23 *Ye shall not have gone over the cities* ***of Israel****, til the Son of Man be come.*

We cannot make *the cities* **of Israel** mean the cities of every race. Note here that Jesus is speaking of the time of the end.

What is the area of proclamation? Is it not all the world of Israel?

What were they proclaiming? Was it not the Gospel of the Kingdom?

The Kingdom is what Jesus and John the Baptist came proclaiming *repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*. Who proclaims that today? It is impossible to believe and teach both the modern universal gospel to all races and the exclusive Kingdom of Heaven at the same time. He confines *all the world* to the cities of Israel! In other words, it is to be proclaimed in the dwellings or places where the Israelites live right up to the end of the age.

ARE "ALL" AND "EVERY" LIMITED EXPRESSIONS?

Does "all" usually mean "all of everything" or "all of that part being spoken about"? Does *all the world* mean all the planet, or just all of that part of the planet being spoken about. A look through Young's Analytical Concordance will show how these words are used. This will give an indication without having to go into the Greek. Being certain on this topic is well worth the time involved researching lexicons to determine the correct meanings of the words used. The words for *all*, *every* etc. are often singular, NOT plural. Thus they refer to:

[a] "all" the one [group] or

[b] "the whole" of the class or

[c] "the entire" of the class

To grasp the use of *all* in Greek and Hebrew, consider Deut 28:10 *and all the people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord, and they shall be afraid of thee*. Here, *all the peoples of the earth* does NOT include Israel. In the same way, *go ye into all the world* is NOT inclusive of every race. Failure to understand this is the source of error in the modern popular teaching. Jesus says that it is not given for everyone to hear or to understand. Immediately we have just one exception, then "every" and "all" cannot include that exception, or the other exceptions. If an exception is made about the Edomites who cannot find repentance, or of those Jesus said, *leave them alone*, then these cannot be part of

the "all" being addressed. Jesus did not proclaim to certain peoples, as we have seen. Jesus said He was sent to Israel to save *His people* from their sins. Are we to be wiser than Jesus? And, what are the two differing gospels?

GOSPEL NUMBER ONE [THE FALSE GOSPEL OF THE UNIVERSAL]

This is that gospel which cannot be found throughout the Law, The Psalms, the Prophets or through the New Testament. So, it must be false. It says:

1. The Law and The Ten Commandments were given to every race, as a covenant.
2. Jesus gave His Life so that He becomes the Redeemer of all men, to redeem them from the curse of that broken law, even if the other races did not have the covenant-law relationship.
3. God loves all men and every individual member of all the human races, including those God says He hates.
4. The gospel is for all sinners of every race, [not *the sinners of my people*, Amos 9:10].
5. All are called. There are no Tare or Goats , despite what Jesus says to the contrary.
6. All are chosen. There are no inferior vessels, despite what Paul says to the contrary.
7. There are no Twelves Tribes of Israel any more - even if they are throughout the New Testament.
8. All men are supposed to have faith - even if the Bible says *all men have not faith*.
9. The Father gave Jesus to *all men* of all races, not *all men* of Israel only.
10. All races are pre-destined - God must have been wrong to expect Israel to destroy certain mixed races; all are the same now.
11. There are no elect people nor any election according to grace.
12. God has mercy on everyone, not just on whom He chooses or elects.
13. There are no scriptural differences between men of different origins.
14. *Men* always includes *women*.
15. Non-Israel races can be adopted into Israel - even though the Bible says *who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption*, [Rom 9:4] and *of whom concerning the flesh Christ came*.
16. God may be worshipped acceptably within any culture and religion; all being paths to God.
17. All races are the same in God's sight.
18. It is now up to all sinners of all races to embrace the love of God or not to embrace it.

This gospel says it is up to everyone of every race to either have eternal life or to perish. This would mean God is not sovereign in giving the choice only to Israelites. <u>This is the gospel of individual universal salvation.</u>
<u>This false gospel claims that, in general, mankind is sovereign and makes the choices.</u>

GOSPEL NUMBER TWO [THE TRUE GOSPEL OF THE PARTICULAR]

This is the everlasting gospel, the true gospel in which we stand if we continue in *The Faith* that was once delivered unto the saints and delivered to no one else. This says:

1. God loves only the "world" of His elect nation and that election is established before having done good or evil. There is no reference to God loving "all mankind".
2. Jesus came to those chosen from before the *foundation of the world* (which should read: overthrow of the order).
3. Jesus is the shepherd of the sheep only. He said *I lay down my life for the sheep* [John 10:15]. He did not add "for the goats and everyone else as well"!
4. Jesus came to save His people from their sins. They were already His people. The gospel is for *the transgressions of my people* [Isa 53:8].
5. It is the gospel of grace - *and I will be gracious to whom I will*.
6. It is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.
7. God is merciful to whom He will [Rom 9:18].

8. The Sons [*huios*] of God are "adopted" out of the Children [*tecknon*] of Israel, not out of other races.
9. The Potter makes different vessels, according to His purposes, some for glory and some for destruction [Rom 9:21].
10. All races are not equal in God's sight.
11. God does not accept mixed worship of Ba'al and Himself.
12. The gift is given only to the elect, through regeneration and efficacious calling of God.
13. Jesus is the Redeemer of both houses of Israel.

That is, the true gospel says that God is absolutely sovereign and particular!
This is no new doctrine. It can be found even in the songs of the redeemed people who constitute only one race of people:

*Ye chosen seed **of Israel's race,***
A remnant weak and small
Hail Him who saves you by His grace,
And crown Him Lord of all.

CHAPTER 5: STUMBLING BLOCKS TO AN EXCLUSIVE ISRAEL

Earlier we looked at the general reactions which immediately spring to mind when the consistent pattern of Scripture about *The Exclusiveness Of Israel* is introduced to people. It is time now to look at the stumbling blocks that modern teaching put in our way. It is appreciated that people's objections and concerns are very genuine and that such people are sincere. It is also recognised that it is difficult for people to "unlearn" what they have been taught for years. It is necessary to look at a selection of stumbling blocks which would represent most of those that are raised, so that they will not be hindering progress through the main part of this book.

1. IT IS CONTRARY TO THE NATURE OF GOD

This is a sincere feeling that many have, but it has its origin in an unbalanced view of the character of God. Where there is continual emphasis on the Love of God and almost total neglect of the Righteous Judgements of God, this is understandable. The wrong teaching about "all" and "every", together with the absence of teaching about the sovereignty of God, are the root cause of this feeling. In His nature, God is unchanging. That God should create vessels for different purposes is not readily acceptable to many people, but it is the clear teaching of Scripture. For example:

1. It is God who put the perpetual enmity between the *seed of the serpent* and the *seed of the woman* [Gen 3:15].
2. It was The Lord who put a mark upon Cain [Gen 4:15].
3. It was God who saved Noah and his family because Noah was *perfect in his generations* [Gen 6:9].
4. God gave different destinies for Noah's sons Ham, Shem and Japheth.
5. God even placed different "last days" destinies on each of the 12 Twelve tribes of Israel [Gen 49 and Deut 33].
6. We find scriptural discrimination between "men" as *enowish* or *adam,* etc.
7. We find words for "men" that do not apply to women in both Hebrew and Greek (*iysh* and *aner*).
8. *Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated* [Malachi 1:2,3 and Rom 9:13].
9. God chose Israel and said they should not *be reckoned among the nations* [Num 23:9] and *the God of this people Israel chose our fathers* [Acts 13:17].
10. *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]. They were and are God's people before they are saved.

2. "OF EVERY KINDRED, TONGUE, PEOPLE AND NATION"

Rev 5:9,10 … *for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on earth.*

Rev 7:9 *I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne …*

NOTE: Attention is drawn to *out of* in the first verse and *of* in the second verse. Both are the same Greek preposition *ek* with the literal meaning showing it is not all the nations, peoples etc but a people taken 'out of' them and not 'of' them.

These two passages appear to stand out against what has been written so far. It looks conclusive as a statement to say that before the Throne of God will stand people from every race on earth. This appearance is used as a basis for the teaching about universal racial or national salvation. Because this does not fit with any foundation in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, these verses require closer examination. Firstly, we must look at what this verse is fulfilling. We must ask if there is any stream of prophecy confirming the popular multi-racial view. If there is none, we must go back to the original prophecies.

Exodus 19:5,6 *… ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine, and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation. …*

NOTE: In the Hebrew *all people* is plural with the article giving the meaning *all the peoples.*

These verses are addressed only to Israel, as are a multitude of other Old Testament prophecies.
This is also confirmed in the New Testament by the Apostle Peter regarding the same singular, peculiar people.

1 Peter 2:9 *But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.*

Although there is reference to every tribe, tongue, people and nation, these are all national, not racial, terms. It must be remembered that Israel had twelve tribes which became scattered among nations and peoples.. Their languages became those spoken by their captors and later those of the nations amongst whom they were dispersed or scattered. This is from whence the people of Israel were regathered. They were from among every tribe, tongue, people and nation, as was prophesied. It is repeated again that there is no prophecy about all races being in the Kingdom of Heaven or of any race being redeemed other than Israel. Others had no broken Law-covenant that required redemption. But Israel is redeemed *out of* [not *of*] every kindred, tongue and nation and people.
Quoting R.K. Phillips in *Incontrovertible Facts Of The Bible*, we find:

This 'Holy Nation' was to be the next step in the re-establishment of the Sovereignty of the Kingdom of God on the Earth. This Sovereignty of God denotes a sphere of God's rule and requires that:

1. *It has a territory;*
2. *It has a people;*
3. *It has laws;*
4. *It has a King;*
5. *It has an economy;*
6. *It has an administration*

All these things God was now about to give to the Children of Israel and at Sinai the people accepted God as their King, thus making them a holy nation. God has never rejected that Sovereignty over that throne or that nation.

If every race was included then this would all be meaningless. A number of commentaries refer to the redemption as that of the people who had once been redeemed from Egypt. The Exodus is the first place where there is mention of redemption [Exodus 15:13]. The redemption in Scripture is always that of Israel, and of Israel only. The issue of the redemption of Israel is stated before the Covenant of the Law.
Bullinger comments:

But now the People had been scattered among every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation and therefore they must be redeemed from out of these the second time, like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up, out of the land of Egypt.

Isaiah 11:11 *And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people from Assyria, … and from the islands of the sea.*

The regathering is always of *His People* and not of other races. Contrary prophecy does not exist!

The scene of Rev 5:9 is in heaven as it is in Rev 7:9.. Here there is a great multitude *out of* all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues. It does not say of all races; the word *genos* (races) is not used in this passage.
It may not be appreciated that Israel is spoken of as the *families of Israel*, the Tribes becoming nations.

Jer 31:1 *At the same time, saith the Lord, I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people.*

3. "ALL THE ENDS OF THE EARTH"

Isaiah 45:22 *Look unto me and be ye saved,* ***all the ends of the earth****.*

The word translated as the earth is the Hebrew word *erets* which is mostly translated as "country" or "earth" in the sense of a localised area or that earth belonging to a people [for example, the land, or earth, of Israel]. In context, this whole chapter is about Israel and no other. It certainly is not used in the generalised sense as the universalists who try to prove the expression *the ends of the earth* means every race or place on Earth.

4. THE EXODUS

When Israel made the Exodus from Egypt, it is evident that some Egyptians, or some of mixed blood, came out with the Israelites. The claim has been made that these saw the miracles that God had done in the Land of Egypt, and so they joined themselves to Israel. These are then said to be a type of *non-Israelite Gentiles joining the church*.. This mixed multitude was continually a problem within Israel. It should be remembered that these were not permitted to assemble with Israel, before God, because they were not Israelites. There are two expressions translated*, The congregation of the Lord*, namely the *edah* of Israel and the *cahal* of Israel, and this difference is important because they separate the mixed multitude travelling through the wilderness from the Israelites themselves.

5. "EVERYONE THAT THIRSTETH"

Isaiah 55:1 *Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters …*

The context shows this is addressed to Israel alone. The sure mercies of David [v3] indicate the people of whom He is commander. The everyone [*kole*] of this verse is touched upon at the end of the previous chapter. Concordances do not convey the meaning of this word, but there is a parallel where the Greek equivalent is considered in the next objection.

6. CORNELIUS

This man is used by many as an example of a so-called "Gentile" non-Israelite being saved. The place of birth, or citizenship tells us nothing about race. But this man's race can be determined by Scripture, even if he is not described as a "Jew" [or "Judean"]. In the AV of Acts 10:28, Cornelius is described as being of *another nation* but, the Greek text uses the word *allophulos* which is a compound of *allos* [another of the same kind], and *phulos* [a kindred tribe (*phule*)].
Cornelius was a devout man, we are told, and he feared [the] God, therefore he was one who could believe. According to Vine, *devout* means *careful as to the presence and claims of God*.. So Cornelius knew the Old Testament claims of God upon Israel. We do not find *devout* being used of people other than Israelites. Also, he feared "God" [Acts 10:2] and he prayed to [the]God and was heard by [the]God. "God" here is *ho theos*, the term used to denote the one true God. So, Cornelius was not a Roman polytheist! He was an Israelite!

7. PETER'S SHEET VISION

Universalists use the account of Peter's sheet vision to suggest that the unclean animals in the sheet represent peoples of all races, but the rest of the chapter shows otherwise. That they are called Gentiles by translators in verse 45 only confirms that the wrong meaning is put on this word G*entile*.. Historically, the House of Israel, which was scattered among the nations, was considered unclean and common by those practising the Jewish (Edomite, Tradition of the Elders) religion. In saying that it was unlawful, Peter knew that what he was doing was contrary to the Tradition of the Elders in Judea. As will be shown later, Peter was being shown that the ten Tribes of The House of Israel would be cleansed under the New Testament. The animals in the sheet represented the unclean and uncircumcised members of the House of Israel.

This vision in Acts 10 is also used to promote the idea that the prohibition against eating certain unclean meats is no longer valid. The symbol is taken literally! When Peter declares what God has shown him, God does not tell him that he should eat unclean meats, but that, *God has showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean*. The word *another* in *another nation* [v28] has already been covered in [6] above to show that this refers to people of the same kind. "Nation" here is *phulos* and not *ethnos* or *demos* which are often translated as "nation" and "people".. The distinction is noted by Vine under "nation" and refers to *allos* (another), and *phulon* (a tribe).

Acts 10:36 *The Word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching* (proclaiming) *peace by Jesus Christ*

This follows on to say that a start was made in the Holy Land and continued to the uncircumcised Grecians of the House of Israel [Acts 11:20]. This fulfilled the Word as being sent to all Israel, both circumcised and uncircumcised. In verse 35 we have *every nation* which, as the next verse explains, are the nations of Israel [the former tribes of Israel which were dispersed among all the other nations]. This confirms what the Old Testament says about the Law and God's word being given only to Israel. Israel was scattered among "every nation" [v35], and the Word [*logos*] was sent to Israel specifically, according to this verse. The Word of God was sent to Cornelius, as an Israelite. The *in every nation* of verse 35 is commonly and incorrectly given the general meaning of *every* as being every race, as explained in the previous chapter. Cornelius was one of those who feared and believed God. He had that spiritual capacity within him from his conception. These men had the capacity to believe God and so could accept the 'good news' and be reinstated as God's people. "All men" is thus all the men of dispersed Israel and all the men of the Judean nation who were of Israel.

Acts 10:43 *To Him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.*

The prophets did not witness or prophesy of redemption and remission of sins for all races. Evidently it is thought that they should have, according to the common popular doctrine. The prophets were giving witness about Jesus and Israel [v43].

8. THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH

Here we have a man who went to Jerusalem to worship, and was returning and reading the Scriptures in his chariot. It is impossible for a pagan to be returning from an Israelite feast, let alone reading the Scriptures. Although he was *of Ethiopia*, this says nothing about his race or genes; it only tells us where he was living. If he had been a black man, he would not have been allowed near the temple as he would have been an alien. The Jews would have killed such a person immediately. We can see this when the Apostle Paul tried to take one who was suspected of not being an Israelite into the temple [Acts 21:8]. Would Phillip be sent to one who was not called by God and to one who "could not" receive the Word? The weight of this passage says the Ethiopian was an Israelite, even if his residence was in Ethiopia.

9. THE WIDOW OF SAREPTA

Again, there is nothing conclusive to say the widow was not an Israelite in this passage [Luke 4:24-28]. The principle is no different to that given in Matthew 13:57 where Jesus did few mighty works in His home town. There are however two points that should be noted:

1. The widow woman obviously knew that Elijah was a man of God, and she knew about sin and therefore the Law which was given only to Israel [1 Kings 17:18].
2. Elijah was a prophet of Israel sent to Israel and he said to the woman, *Thus saith the Lord God OF ISRAEL.*

10. "GO INTO THE HIGHWAYS"

Matt 22:9 *Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage.*

Again, the standard universalist doctrine teaches this Scripture wrongly in an endeavour to say everyone of every race is included in this call. There is a lot more in these verses than meets the eye. The servants were told to go to the cross-roads [*diex*] but instead they went to the ways [*hodos*]. Both words are translated as *cross-roads* in the KJV. At the cross-roads there is a separation place, but on the ways, or the path between two places there is no separation place. The consequence of going to the wrong place to invite people to the wedding was to bring in people who were an un-separated mixture of two kinds. In verse 11 there is *a man not having on a wedding garment*. This suggests that one group does not have on the wedding garments and the consequence is that the evil or the bad guests are to be cast into outer darkness.
Where do the churches go today to preach? Do they go to the *hodos* or to the *diex*? Should we be going to the lost sheep of the House of Israel as Jesus commanded His disciples? Should it not be to Israel to whom the New Testament is made? The New Testament still pertains to those who had the Old Testament and direct statements to the contrary cannot be found in Scripture. [Please read Jeremiah 31:31-34 to review the limitation given].

11. "EVERYONE THAT ASKS RECEIVES"

Luke 11:10 *For everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.*

In the New Testament there are many like Scriptures that use the words *all* and *everyone, whosoever* etc. In the Greek the situation is similar to that already pointed out to be the case in the Hebrew. We could take the meanings of these words as either:

[a] All of everything or

[b] All of that part being spoken about.

We are not at liberty to choose which meaning suits us to prove a doctrinal position, but this is what most do. Usually it is done in ignorance or without thought because of the traditional teachings. We cannot mis-apply these words to suit ourselves. We can read the Scriptures from the viewpoint of generalisation or from differentiation, but both cannot be right at the same time. It is always necessary to take note to whom any passage is addressed. This defines the context of the passage. In this passage Jesus isolates those He is addressing. He says twice, *I say unto you* and uses the pronoun *ye*. He was talking to his disciples as Israelites.
We find that many of the stumbling blocks are based upon mis-understanding *of all, all men whosoever, every, everyone* and such words. Lexicons give much space in covering these words. In his coverage of "all" [Greek: *pas*] which is often translated in these various ways. Vine's Expository Dictionary says:

> *Before proper names of countries, cities and nations, and before collective terms like* Israel*, it signifies either* all *or* the whole*, for example, Matt 2:3, Acts 2:36. Used with the article, it means the whole of one object. In the plural it signifies the totality of the persons or things referred to.*

This totality only refers to that part which is the subject of the context. Thus all men [of Israel] cannot mean all of every race in the world.
Thayer confirms this [under ref 3956]:

> *The words "world" and "all" are used in some seven or eight senses in Scripture, and it is very rarely the "all" means all persons, taken individually. The words are generally used to signify that Christ has redeemed some of all sorts -- some Jews, some Gentiles, some rich, some poor, and has not restricted His redemption to either Jew or Gentile ...*

Thayer quoted the last sentence from one of Spurgeons's lectures and this book shows that view to be incorrect. However, the important point to note is that the "all" is recognised as not being a universal "all".. Its precise restriction is the purpose of this book. From a note from Josephus [Wars 2:19.1] we read:

> *Here we have an eminent example of that Jewish language, which Dr. Wall truly observes, we several times find used in the sacred writings; I mean where the words "all" or "whole multitude", etc., are used for much the greatest part only, but not so as to include every person, without exception; …*

In considering all similar objections listed, this must be taken into account.

12. "WHOSOEVER SHALL CONFESS ME"

> *Luke 12:8* *And I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God.*

The "you" Jesus is addressing is not the multitudes, but the disciples only. The word "men" is one of many words translated as "men". There are differing kinds of "men" and different words for "men," in the original languages. Men may have differing origins and be of differing seeds and plantings. To deny this is to deny Jesus' words. To deny and to teach differently is to deny *Me before men..* These things are not being taught today because they do not fit in with the "all" of the *all the world* universal doctrine.

13. THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA

This passage in John 4:12 is easily satisfied in the words, *Art thou greater than OUR FATHER JACOB who gave us this well*. She was a descendant of Jacob and thus was an Israelite. How anyone can use her place of residence to say she was a non-Israelite is hard to comprehend. Samaria contained a mixture of races. In Acts 8:14 we can see that certain of the Samaritans *received the Word of God*. In the first verse we find evidence of the scattering abroad to Samaria. Philip proclaimed the Word in Samaria as did Peter and John. Their proclamation was concerned with the Kingdom of God.

14. PENTECOST

> *Acts 2:21* *And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

Here we have another *whosoever* and so we must determine to whom the *whosoever* relates. This whole chapter is exclusive to the people to whom the prophet Joel made his prophecy. This was made to Israel so how can any say it was made to others? If every prophecy is made to everyone then we have a grey mass and everything is likewise an obscure grey. Nothing is ever clear! What would be the point of prophets giving different messages to different people if all people were the same?
The *whosoever* relates only to those to whom it is spoken. Peter makes this very clear in verse 36 *Let ALL THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL know that God* …. Who was he addressing? The *whosoever* and "all" is exclusive to that group. The *whosoever* and the *all flesh* does not allude to anyone other than genetic Israelites.

At Pentecost some scattered Israelites came to Jerusalem from different countries. This does not say that they were from different races. Would they have come to the feast if they had been pagans or if they were following other cultural beliefs? Such would not even be permitted to enter the temple [Acts 21:28]. Yet this is said to be so to try to prove the generalisation that people of all races came to the feast. The bulk of the House of Israel had become *scattered* among other nations and the majority of these were to be reached later. The gospel was to be proclaimed *which began from Galilee* [Acts 10:37] *and was published through all Judea*. Jesus sent His disciples away to the *lost sheep of the House of Israel* and it is not unreasonable to suggest that some among those sought out attended the Feast of Pentecost. We read about Jews [Judeans] "dwelling" (*katoikeo*) in Jerusalem [Acts 2:5] and of others "dwelling" in other countries [Acts 2:9] attending Pentecost. To infer that nationality and race are always the same thing is far from honest! And, of course, the notion about the "Church" being a "Gentile" Church of non-Israelites following Pentecost is nonsense simply because there were Jews there.

15. ALL MEN JUSTIFIED BY THE FREE GIFT

Romans 5:18 *Therefore as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*

Our prime consideration in this verse is the latter part because we are establishing the identity of these *all men*. In all this book of Romans, the subject people are of the seed of Abraham *according to the flesh* [Rom 4:1] and so this book is not written to any others than Israelites. The subject people are indicated as *we* in this chapter and these people are identified as being Israelites. If there is any hesitation in acceptance of this statement, you should go back and re-read the sections on the exclusive nature of Israel in the book of Romans. In Romans 4:16 we read *that the promise might be sure to all The Seed*. It is not to all seeds on earth, but to that particular seed or *sperma* being addressed.
A similar situation occurs in Romans 7:6 *That we being delivered from the Law*. The pronoun *w*e only refers to those to whom the Law had been given and we have given proof that the Law was given to Israel only. Because of this, the *all men* in this verse applies only to the seed of Abraham through Isaac and to nobody else.

16. "WHO WILL HAVE ALL MEN TO BE SAVED …"

1 Tim 2:4 *Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.*

The notes on "all" and "every" in the last chapter, and within this chapter, apply here. That it does not mean a blanket *every person on earth* is obvious from the fact that all men are not saved. In the following verses there are the words *who gave Himself a ransom for all …* and these words show that the *all* concerns only those who needed to be ransomed, that is, *those who were under the Law* which is exclusively to Israel.

17. SALVATION TO ALL MEN

Titus 2:11 *For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.*

The *all men* in this passage is the same as that in the passage above. It is again limited by those to whom it is addressed, namely God's elect [Titus 1:1], and in Titus 2:14 we can see that this again limits the scope of *all men* to those who were given the law … *who gave himself for US, that he might redeem US from all iniquity ….*

18. "BUT THAT ALL SHOULD COME TO REPENTANCE …"

2 Peter 3:9 *… But is longsuffering to* ***us****-ward, not willing that any* [that is, any of us] *should perish, but that all should come to repentance.*

Here we do not have the word "men" mentioned, but in its place we have the indefinite pronoun *tis* which denotes *some or any person or object … any man … whomsoever, or certain men* etc … see Strong G5100. *Certain men* are not *all men in general*.

Thayer [5100]	It indicates that the thing with which it is connected belongs to a certain class, or resembles it.

In this book Peter is writing to the one Holy Nation. He is writing to the *strangers* of his own blood. Peter again refers to *Our Fathers* indicating that the people to whom it was written were the children of the Fathers, and so the "any" is racially exclusive. All men on Earth do not have "The Fathers" Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as their progenitors. In this passage Peter is pointing out that God is long-suffering to "US-ward" and not to "THEM-ward".. Peter is writing to *an Holy Nation*.. He is not writing to "The Church" as a multi-racial group.

19. THE KINGDOM NOW INCLUDES EVERYONE

Jesus spoke *of The Kingdom*.. The disciples where told to go and proclaim *The Kingdom* and that the time *was at hand*. After His resurrection Jesus spoke to the Apostles about this Kingdom.

Acts 1:3	*… being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.*

This appears to be the prime message of Jesus and He taught it right up to His ascension. But who is willing to teach this today? We hear much about the gospel of universal salvation, but this is not what Jesus taught. Try to find the gospel of universal salvation in the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets. Then try to find it in the New Testament as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. "The Church" might seem to be an answer, but the fulfilment still has to be *in us their children* [Acts 13:32,33]. If this is so, then *The Church* still has to be racial; the members still have to be the children of *The Fathers*.
The disciples asked Jesus before His ascension, *Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom TO ISRAEL*? [Acts 1:6]. Look again at this. To whom is the Kingdom to be restored? Is there ever a suggestion that any but genetic Israel will be included in that Kingdom? The meaning of *Israel* includes *ruling with God*.. If Israel was made up from all the nations, then who are the other nations over which Israel is to rule with God? Jesus used the word 'salvation' only twice, but 78% of the gospels are about the Kingdom.
Consider these expressions:

The KING	Is the King of ISRAEL.
The REDEEMER	Is the Redeemer of ISRAEL.
The HOLY ONE	Is the Holy One of ISRAEL.
The FATHER	Is the Father of ISRAEL ["My Son"].

Look in vain for these titles to apply to other than Israel.

20. THE LORD'S PRAYER

When we pray as Jesus taught, *OUR Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name, THY KINGDOM come,* what are we saying?

Is the pronoun *our* referring to all races or to Israel?

Is God ever called the Father of races other than Israel?

Is *Thy Kingdom* ever other than the Kingdom over which the King of Israel will reign?

A close examination will indicate that the particular "Father" referred to is *Our Father, the One in The Heavens*. It is not "their" father.

21. THE ISRAEL OF GOD [GAL 6:16]

It is common to hear that *The Israel of God* means *The Church*. This statement is used as a basis for sermons about universal salvation. It is so easy to make a wrong statement and then use that statement as a foundation. But being based on a wrong foundation, this doctrine cannot stand. The Israel of God means the Israel of the Supreme Divinity. It says nothing about God being the God of all the races. This book of Galatians is written to *them that were under the Law*, that is to Israel. There will be those who say that there is now a spiritual Israel as well as a natural Israel, as a way of promoting universal salvation. So let us look at this.

22. THERE ARE TWO ISRAELS: ONE NATURAL, ONE SPIRITUAL

To say that there is a natural Israel and a spiritual Israel is the only way out of the dilemma some people have in trying to fit their doctrines and prophecy together. Their dilemma arises from the wrong basic traditional teaching that:

[a] *The Jews are National Israel*, [or "Natural Israel" or "God's natural people"].

[b] *The Gentiles are The Church*, [or "Spiritual Israel" or "God's heavenly people"].

In a later chapter we will labour to show that "The Jews" are not Israel and that "Gentiles" may be Israelites. Obviously there are two groups of peoples concerned. There is no denying this. This is why it is so important to determine exactly who the two groups are.
In the Old Testament there is no dispute about this. Israel separated into two Kingdoms which were basically:

[a] The House of Israel [ten Tribes] … known as *Ephraim.*

[b] The House of Judah [two Tribes] … known as *Judah.*

These two Houses had enmity between them, and according to prophecy, they retain this enmity until unity is restored under the New Testament which the two Houses receive nationally. The timing of the reunion is at the time of the regathering of both Houses of all Israel. Ephraim and Judah are unique identities, through Scripture from the time of the division of Israel into two Kingdoms, until the regathering of Israel as a whole.

Isaiah 11:12,13.. *… and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.*

Here in the Old Testament we find two groups within all Israel which stay two national groups until the time given to once again become one group. They are still the two groups to whom the New Testament was given.

Heb 8:8,9 *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: 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; …*

There is no record in Scripture of the New Testament being made with any other two groups. This verse says that they are the same race with which God was involved in the Exodus from Egypt. Again we have definition in the words *their fathers*.. This gives a racial statement of meaning that cannot be spiritualised. The problem that then arises is, that if the covenant people were to be spiritualised into two different groups, one Israelite and the other non-Israelite, then one of the original two national groups would have to have vanished or the two combined.. Despite the fact that this cannot be found in prophecy in the Old Testament, or in the New Testament as fulfilment of prophecy, the belief about Jews and non-Israel Gentiles is still taught as being truth. In order to accommodate all races, another doctrine had to be created and this is actively promoted.

This non-scriptural doctrine pre-supposes that non-Israel races need salvation from a broken law which they were not given to break in the first place. This cannot be found as a doctrine in either Testament.

> NOTE: No statement about the final destiny of non-Israel races has been made or suggested in this book. The idea about all races needing redemption comes mainly from the misuse of *all, whosoever* etc in the New Testament. But there is no denial that the non-Israel nations should be made subject to the Law of Christ. Jesus will rule with a rod of iron, and the nations will bring their glory to the New Jerusalem, but we are told that the other nations will be outside that City.

The extra-scriptural doctrine about "Jews and Gentiles" arises from interpretations of the books of Romans and Galatians. But, the racial statements cannot be eliminated from these books, even if it is thought God should have given the covenants to every race on Earth. The expressions, *The House of Israel,* and *The Twelve Tribes* still exist through the New Testament.
In concluding his argument about the so-called "Jews and Gentiles", the Apostle Paul says:

Rom 11:26 *And so **all Israel** shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away un-godliness **from Jacob**.*

There is no mention about any but *all Israel* being saved. None other than the seed of Jacob are included in being turned from un-godliness. Other races can never be part of *all Israel* or *Jacob.*

Rom 3:30 *Seeing that it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.*

Those whom God would justify are shown to be:

[a] The circumcision … The House of Judah.

[b] The uncircumcision … The House of Israel.

The House of Israel had become dispersed among the nations and were known as the un-circumcision. They had become as *strangers and aliens* to the Judeans, but they were still Israelites by race. To the Judeans who had the temple worship, the House of Israel was unclean and was despised.

Rom 4:13 *For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.*

It is still to Abraham's seed that the promises were made. This includes all from Jacob to Jesus who believed God. All Israel was saved by Jesus. But it is belief in God that saves the individual person within that seed. The popular doctrine says the seed is only a spiritual seed which can be made up from all races.

Rom 4:16 *… to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; …*

Paul is not talking about other races. It is always to the one seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. These are the children of promise. Prophetically the New Testament is made only with the two Houses, the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Hebrews 8:8 shows the promise of the New Testament concerns only these two Houses. This is the fulfilment of Jer 31:31. Paul sums up the two parties, and declares:

Rom 9:4 *Who **are Israelites**; to whom pertaineth the adoption, …*

All the objections in the world are not going to change what pertains to Israel or to the Word of the Lord. This verse says *Who ARE Israelites.*

23. STRANGERS CAN BECOME ISRAELITES

It is claimed by many that the word *strangers* indicates other than Israelites. In the Book of Peter we find this Apostle to the circumcision writes to *strangers scattered* as also does James, in the first verse of his book.. *The Strangers scattered*, contains the same word that is

used in James, who addresses his book to the Twelve Tribes. Please look this up and make sure about this. So these strangers are still of the Twelve Tribes!
If any want to consider this matter further they can find that looking at the word *pilgrim* as used by Peter will help. This is exactly the same word that is translated as *stranger* in 1 Peter 1:1. The words, *pilgrims* and *strangers,* also appear in Hebrews 11:13 which clearly isolates them as being Hebrews [that is, Israel]. A later chapter titled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel* examines this in more detail.
This again is the language of the Old Testament where David says:

Psalm 39:12 *… for I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.*

My fathers gives immediate racial identity. But, further to this, the Hebrew words used for *stranger* and *sojourner* are:

Ger	meaning a stranger (an unknown person) of ones own blood, tribe, or race.
Toshav	meaning only a pilgrim or a temporary resident, and one who has no rights OR KINSHIP in any way at all with the people of the land in which they have taken temporary residence.

In this Psalm, David is saying that he is a stranger away from his home with God and he has no kinship with any other race around him. Peter make this same distinction.

1 Peter 1:2 ***Elect*** *according to the foreknowledge of God the Father …*

In Chapter 2 of this book we looked at this word "elect" and the elect nation, whom God is saying that He foreknew in the Old Testament.

Rom 11:2 *God has not cast away his people which he foreknew.*

1 Peter 2:10 goes on to quote from Hosea, (which is a book dealing primarily with the ten-tribed House of Israel).

1 Peter 2:10 *Which in time past* ***were not a people****, but* ***are now the people of God****: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.*

In Hosea and Peter, the *not a people* refers to the same people and hence cannot be non-Israelite "Gentiles". Peter would have had trouble in convincing the Judeans that they had become *not a people* at some past time.

24. JESUS IS NOW THE KING

Remember how God said that David would never want for a descendant upon his throne until Jesus came to take this throne?

Jer 33:17 *For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want for a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.*

At the time of Jesus, the throne of the Kingdom of Judah and Solomon's line had long gone from Judea. The throne must therefore be manifest somewhere else and within the ten tribes headed by Ephraim. The Epistles are in full accord with the Law, The Psalms and the Prophets. But they are not in accord with tradition!
The people to whom Peter was writing had a King [1 Peter 2:13 and 1 Peter 2:17]. This again confirms that these people were not the Judeans, although they were Israelites. The people addressed had a king they were to honour. Peter tells us who they were racially. The indicators are given in the expressions *an Holy* [that is, set-apart] *nation* and *a peculiar people* as pointed out in the early chapters of this book.

25. "IN THEE SHALL ALL NATIONS BE BLESSED"

The phrase *all nations* is supposed to mean 'every race'. The reason why this cannot be so is presented at the end of the chapter entitled *Galatians and Israel Exclusive*.

CONCLUSION

We can see that the churches today have a major problem in doctrine. This is simply through wrong teaching that has arisen through failure to base doctrine upon the same basis used by Jesus and the Apostles. The basis must ever be the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.
The Law and the Word of God were given only to Israel among the nations. Because of the misuse of the word *all*, particularly within the New Testament, the presumption is made that the Law of Moses, together with the associated covenant with Israel, was given to every person of every race. In this way, *all have sinned* is taught forgetting the context statement *whatsoever the Law saith, is said to them who are under the Law* [Rom 3:19].
Look at this quotation which is one of many which shows "all" in the reverse situation.

> *Deut 28:10* *And all the people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord, and they shall be afraid of thee.*

Here *all the people of the earth* does not include Israel! This same situation exists more often the other way around with *all* being Israelites. There is yet one more important impediment preventing people accepting an exclusive Israel. It is addressed in the next chapter, *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*. The unity of the Scriptures is made or broken upon this word G*entile* and what that word actually means.

CHAPTER 6: THAT UNFORTUNATE WORD "GENTILE"

When we establish the exclusive nature of Israel as being a *holy* (set apart) race among all the other races of this globe, we find conflicts with the common belief about "Jews and Gentiles". The common teaching is that "The Jews" are Israel and the "Gentiles" are everyone else. The two views are against each other; one cannot be held together with the other because we will show that "The Jews" cannot equate to all Israel and that some "Gentiles" may be Israelites in Scripture. Because the traditional teaching is so ingrained in commentaries, concordances, Bible dictionaries, books and in people's minds, it is very hard for anyone brought up with this belief to shake it off.

Accordingly we will make an examination of both the words "Jews" and "Gentiles" as used in Scripture.

That there are two parties in the New Testament does not mean to say the two parties have to be Jews and Gentiles in the way that this is taught. Rather than that, the existence of the two parties confirms what is taught in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets about the division of Israel into two kingdoms from which arose the House of Israel [ten tribes] and the House of Judah [two tribes]. These two houses are shown in prophecy to be a continual vexation to each other, with a wall of partition between them, until they are reconciled together under the New Testament [Isaiah 11:13].

WHERE DID "GENTILE" COME FROM?

This word, GENTILE, originated from the Latin Vulgate translation, where the Roman doctrine said that the Roman Church had become the Israel of the Bible. Even more recently, Pope Pius XI reinforced this saying, "Spiritually, we Christians are Semites". The inference of the word, Gentile, in the Roman Catholic context is *one who is not of Rome*. In the English translations that were based upon the Latin Vulgate, this Latin word has carried on with a similar meaning but instead of meaning *not of Rome* it has become to mean *not of Israel*.. In the minds of those to whom Rome and Israel were synonymous, there was no difference; to be of the Roman Catholic Church was to belong to and to be part of Israel. Rome accommodated all races who could buy citizenship. Rome calls herself a universal church with a universal Pontiff and is the originator of both modern and ancient universalism in the Christian religion.

But, unfortunately, translators have transliterated this Latin word, Gentile, into their versions, and it has carried forward even into recent translations. By transliterating the Latin form, it has allowed scope for the idea that it referred to Roman and non-Roman to continue. Switch the "Roman" to "Israel" [because Rome said she was Israel] and we then find how Rome expressed the two parties as "Israel" and "non-Israel".. This has continued even to this day. This doctrine has found its way into commentaries and Bible dictionaries and through these media, most Christians are still influenced.

The Latin meaning of Gentiles is confusing in its own right – it does not mean 'nations'. The Latin noun *gen* means 'a nation' and is equivalent to *ethnos*. However, the word *gentiles* does not come from the noun but from the adjective, *gentilis,* which means *of* or *belonging* to a nation. In his epistles Paul does not write to nations as a whole, but to individuals within, or *belonging to* other nations. As all his writings are to Israelites, he uses *ethnos* to refer to his outcast kinsmen of Israel because that is how they were addressed in the Old Testament Scriptures – Gen 19:4-6; Gen 18:18; Deut 32:41 (the "with" is not in the Hebrew text); Ps 22:27,28; Ps 57:9; Ps 67:4; Ps 81:8; Ps 108:3; Ps 117:1; Is 5:26; Is 11:12; Is 34:1; Jer 1:5,10.. The Latin distorts and obscures these facts and we need to check its context every time it appears in the text.

HOW "GENTILE" IS MISUSED

In both the Hebrew and the Greek there is no word even approaching the way "gentile" is used today. In the concordances we can see the influences of the religious teaching of the day and age where the Roman influence is manifest.

Strong H1471.	Gowy or goi [goyim Pl.]: a foreign nation, hence a gentile, also a troop of animals, or a flight of locusts, heathen.
Strong G1484.	Ethnos [Ethne Pl] a race [as of the same] habit, that is, a tribe; spec. a foreign [non-Jewish] one [usually by impl. pagan] gentile, heathen, nation, people.

We must remember that concordances give usage rather than definitions but within these we can see part of the true meaning like *of the same habit* and *tribe*. The lexicons are more definitive.

Thayer:	A multitude [whether of men or beasts] associated or living together … of the same nature or genus.
Vine	Denotes firstly a multitude or company, then a multitude of people of the same nature or genus.. It is used in the singular of the Jews for example, Luke 7:5, Luke 23:2; John 11:48:50-52.

Vine goes on to show that G*entile is used in Scripture of both Jews and non-Jews*. [Strong and Vine use the word "Jew" for "Israel" following the understanding of the periods].

HOW THE HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS ARE TRANSLATED

It is time to look at the words translated as Gentile in the KJV translation of the Bible and immediately something strange will be seen:

Hebrew: gowy, goi, goyim	Greek: ethnos, ethne
374 times as nations	64 times as *nations*
143 times as *heathen*	5 times as *heathen*
30 times as *gentile(s)*	93 times as *gentile(s)*
11 times as people	2 times as *people*

In a later chapter, *Galatians and Israel Exclusive*, we will look at the "Greeks". In the original text the word *Hellen* is used thirty five times, but our translators have also chosen to translate this word (wrongly) as "gentile", particularly in the Book of Romans. *Ethnos* and *Hellen* are quite different words! Sometimes the justification is to say that the Greeks were not Jews and therefore they must be Gentiles. This is not translating; rather it is interpreting Scripture in the translations. There is no rhyme nor reason for all these various translations and mis-translations, other than to perpetuate a belief!

The commonly accepted meaning of the word "gentile" immediately falls flat from the translation point of view alone. When we add the fact that the word in Hebrew is used also of Israel it falls even flatter! When we show the real meaning from the New Testament, it becomes so flat that it cannot be seen! The Hebrew and Greek words mean "nations" as races and peoples. They mean any group of a common origin, including Israel.

Let us look at some Old Testament Scriptures where the word *Gowy, Goi* or *Goyim* are used. If we apply the logic concerning Gentiles for these verse, we can see the ridiculous conclusions that could be reached. Remember that *Goi* and *Ethnos* are used of Israel as well as of other races.

Gen 12:1,2	*Now the Lord said unto Abram ... and I will make of thee a great nation …*
Gen 17:5	*… a father of many nations have I made thee.*

Did God make a great non-Israel "gentile" nation out of Abraham and did Abraham father many Gentiles? Was the great nation other than Israel?

Gen 25:23 *And the Lord said unto her* (Rebecca), *Two nations are in thy womb …*

Could Rebecca have known what would become two non-Israel "gentiles" were in her womb?

Gen 48:19 *… and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.*

There is no evidence in Scripture that Ephraim would produce a lot of non-Israelites.

Gen 46:3 *And he said, I am God, the God of thy father* (Isaac) *fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation.*

Could the sons of Jacob be non-Israel "gentiles"?

Jer 31:36 *If those ordinances* [the sun and the moon] *depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed* ***of Israel*** *shall also cease from being a nation before me for ever.*

As the word for "nation" is the same as that translated "gentile", we could equally read *the seed of Israel shall not cease from being Gentiles before Me*. We could even say Israel would not cease from being heathen! This is absurd!

When we consider the word *ethnos*, which is sometimes translated "gentiles" in the New Testament, we have another block of translations among which we could make transpositions. The consequences are equally absurd!

Luke 7:5 *For he loved our nation, and has built for us a synagogue.*

Would that section of Jewry be pleased if the Centurion had built a synagogue for the so-called gentiles or the heathen? "Nation" is the word *ethnos*.

Luke 23:2 *We found this fellow perverting the nation, …*

Would "The Jews" care so much if Jesus was perverting the "Gentiles"?

John 11:48 *… the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.*

For the Romans to come to Judea and take away "our" gentiles gets a little silly.

John 11:49,50 *Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.*

Caiaphas did not know that this word *ethnos* would be translated as Gentile and heathen and note he used "nation" in the singular. Jesus did die for the sheep which the Father had given Him and only that many. He gave Himself a ransom *for many*; but not every race on earth. It has been explained that the Law and Covenants were given to the seed of Israel only.

Acts 10:22 *Cornelius … of good report among all the nation of the Jews …*

"Nation" is *ethnos* which is often translated as "gentiles", so could we possibly have "Gentiles of the Jews"?

Acts 24:17 *… I came to bring alms to* ***my nation*** *and offerings.*

Here Paul would be saying that he brought alms to his "Gentiles" in Jerusalem. Paul was an Israelite.

We just have to admit that there is no such word in all of Scripture which matches up with the common acceptance of the word "gentile". We can now see that *goi* and *ethnos* can mean both Israelites and non-Israelites.

Some teachers who admit to *goi* and *ethnos* being used of Israel declare that in the singular they refer to Israel and in the plural they refer to all the non-Israel nations. *Galilee of the Gentiles* in Matthew 4:15 is said to refer to "gentiles" because it is the plural. When we make a comparison with Acts 1:11, *ye men of Galilee,* and Acts 2:7, *are not all that speak Galileans*? it has to be admitted that the disciples were Israelites even if they were from Galilee.

POPULAR THEOLOGY ABOUT "GENTILES" … IS IT RIGHT?

We have already made comment on the origin of the word "gentile".. We have pointed out that there appears to be no evidence that the Apostles could properly distinguish between Israelites and non-Israelites in the nations, to which they went. Hence the message had to be taken to the nations in order for the message to reach "all men" of the descendants of the outcast Israelites. These men had the capacity to believe God and so could accept the 'good news' and be reinstated as God's people. But the Roman error was picked up and it has come to prevail. Luther, Knox, Calvin and Wesley together with cult leaders such as William Miller, accepted the error. Of course, the originator, the arch-cult-type, the Roman Catholic Church keeps on its unchanging doctrine. But she is the one with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication and by whom they have been deceived through her sorceries [Rev 17:2 and Rev 18:23]. It was Rome who originated the error in doctrine. But we are told to come out of her *my people* [Rev 18:4]. This is the time to come out. God's chosen people are warned to come out of all of Rome's doctrines, including Rome's universalism! Multitudes today are going Rome's way. What religion leads the ex-communist states? What is sweeping the earth? But the great whore will be cast down; God has so decreed, and none need be partakers of her plagues. Who rejoices when Babylon is cast down? Is it not the holy [set-apart] apostles and prophets? [Rev 18:20]. One has to *come out* to be set-apart! The Faithful and True will come to judge and make war on that false prophet Rome [Rev 19:11]. The "wife" must get ready. It is the saints [Israel by Bible definition - see Psalm 148:1] who wear the white linen [Rev 19:8]. The voice from out of the Throne addresses *His servants*.. This is why time was taken in Chapter Two to establish clearly just who is the servant race and who are the saints in Scripture. They are the ones who have the right to enter the city through those twelve gates. Would there be much point in mentioning this if every race went through those gates?

Rev 21:12 *And a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of* ***the twelve tribes the children of Israel****.*

Rev 21:27 *And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.*

Who works the abomination in doctrine? Is it not the *mother of harlots and abominations*? Who spreads the doctrine of universalism? Who originated it? The meaning of *Catholicism* is universalism! Search the Scriptures and see which race is the only race written in the Book of Life!

THE KINSMAN-REDEEMER

JESUS IS THE REDEEMER OF KINSMEN. This is another view some take. If anyone believes the *go ye into all the world* and *Jesus died to save the world* doctrine in the way Rome interprets *the world*, then that person cannot believe that He is our [that is, Israel's] Kinsman-Redeemer. At the Second Advent Jesus will ignore those who are not His kinsmen.

TO WHOM DID THE APOSTLE PAUL WRITE?

In our second chapter, *The Exclusive Nature of Israel in the New Testament*, many New Testament Scriptures were quoted to show that the Apostle Paul wrote to Israelites and that he could not have been writing to anyone else.

Gal 2:7 *… the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter.*

Rom 11:13 *For I speak unto you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, …*

It is important to remember that the word translated as "gentiles" in these verses is *ethnos* in Romans and *hellen* in Galatians. *Ethnos* refers to Israelites by the same term that applied to

them in the Old Testament. *Hellen* will be discussed in the chapter *Galatians and Israel Exclusive*. Everyone who has been taught that the Gentiles are always non-Israel does experience difficulty in "unlearning". This is understandable, because this doctrine is what theology has taught; this is written into translations in a way which makes unlearning difficult.
Now we can look at some other Scriptures from the New Testament that show Israel as the only people being addressed.

Acts 10:36	*The word which God sent unto* ***the children of Israel****, preaching* (proclaiming) *peace by Jesus Christ.*
Acts 10:43	*To Him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins.*
Acts 13:23	*Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise raised up* ***unto Israel*** *a Saviour, Jesus.*
Acts 13:32,33	*… how the promise which was made unto* ***the fathers****, God hath fulfilled the same* ***unto us their children*** *…*

Here we see direct Scriptures that are particular and exclusive. In Chapter Two many such Scriptures were pointed out. We also have a *whosoever* to which all the prophets of Israel give witness. Now, in the Old Testament books, to what *whosoever* does the Redeemer of Israel come? Is it *whosoever* of Israel as the prophets say, or is it the *whosoever* of every race as translators think it should say? A positive decision has to be made!
Someone might be thinking, *Yes, but there are still two parties*. This problem completely disappears when we take note of the historical fact that Israel separated into two Kingdoms and became known in prophecy as:

[a] The House of Israel [10 tribes].

[b] The House of Judah [2 tribes].

Subsequently, both Kingdoms went into captivity in Assyria and Babylon, respectively. Following the captivities, all of the 12 tribes (except for a small remnant) went North and were dispersed among the nations. These became known as the Dispersion or Uncircumcision. A small remnant of the Babylonian captivity of the Southern Kingdom returned to Palestine and formed the Judean nation. The ruling classes of the Judean nation were dominated by Edomites and their subversion of the Scriptures, the Traditions of the Elders, became the religion of the land. The Judean nation practised circumcision and hence in the Scriptures, are referred to as the Circumcision. Consequently, the New Testament refers to two groups - the Uncircumcision (the Israelites outside the Judean nation) and the Circumcision (the Israelites inside the Judean nation).
The other uncircumcised races are not included in the *uncircumcision*, because the sum of the two groups addressed is *all Israel*.

JESUS' MINISTRY WAS NOT PRIMARILY TO THE JEWS OR IN JUDEA

Most people would question this statement without even thinking about it! But let us look at this matter more closely. In the gospels, Jesus makes a clear distinction between Galilee and Judea, the latter being the territory of "The Jews."

John 7:1	*After these things Jesus walked in* ***Galilee****: for he would not walk* ***in Jewry****, because the Jews sought to kill him.*
John 11:53,54	*Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death. Jesus therefore walked no more openly* ***among the Jews****; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called* ***Ephraim****.*
Matt 19:1.	*And it came to pass, that when Jesus had finished these sayings, he departed* ***from Galilee****, and came into the coasts* ***of Judea****, beyond Jordan.*
Matt 4:12	*Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed* ***into Galilee*** [from Judea].

Acts 9:31 *Then had the churches rest throughout all* ***Judea and Galilee*** *…*

The highlighted words show clearly that the two territories are treated differently. There was a clear barrier between the two.

Matt 4:23 *And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the Kingdom …*

Matt 4:15,16 *The land of Zabulon and the land of Nepthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness saw great light …*

The latter verse identifies these Israelites in Galilee and calls them "gentiles"! In the Thompson Chain Reference Bible, the footprints of Jesus are presented graphically on Pages 274 and 275 showing that Galilee was the major area of Jesus' ministry.

Matt 4:13 *And leaving Nazereth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum …*

Most Christians seem to think that Jesus dwelt among "The Jews" in Jerusalem, but this is not so. Christians seem to think that Jerusalem was the centre-point of Jesus' teaching ministry. Jesus went to Jerusalem at particular times for particular purposes. His disciples did not appreciate these times about going up to Jerusalem, as Jesus once told them, *Your time is always now, but My time is not yet* [John 7:6]. Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament times exactly regarding the Sabbaths and the feasts of Israel. Jesus said He knew the exact day of His crucifixion at Jerusalem [Matt 26:2]. He went to Jerusalem on exactly the right day [Nisan 10th] to be chosen by the Israelite people among the population as their King, and He was delivered to become the all-sufficient sacrifice for the redemption of His people.. Jerusalem was the centre-point where Jesus would fulfil His mission and His Father's Will to be the Passover Lamb for Israel. The institution of the Passover Lamb was only to Israel. Across the border from Judea, mention is made of Ephraimites and Galileans [Benjamites]. Jesus was safe amongst the Israelites in Galilee whereas He was not safe amongst the Judeans. This fulfilled the prophecy made by Moses:

Deut 33:12 *And of Benjamin he said, the beloved of the Lord shall dwell safely by him; and the Lord shall cover him all the day long, and he shall dwell between his shoulders.*

We have seen from Matthew 4:15,16 above that these Israelites in Galilee are called Gentiles. It was Galilee from whence Jesus picked out eleven of His disciples. Judas, the Judean, was the one who betrayed Jesus! Eleven of the disciples were not of "The Jews" and were not *of Judah* either. When Jesus ascended, the witnesses are described as *Men of Galilee* in Acts 1:11 and Acts 2:7. In Acts 2:22 those addressed were *Men of Israel*, but not "Jews". But whilst addressing the *Men of Israel*, the disciples soon came up against "The Jews" in the national leadership. The more we look into this matter, the more impossible it becomes to say *The Jews* and the *Men of Israel* refer to the same people. Today most denominations insist that "The Jews" and "Israel" are the same! We read that some of the priesthood believed in Jesus; all were not Edomites or other proselytes. Nicodemus was a *ruler of the Jews* and so was among the leaders. But his counsel was somewhat different as a non-Edomite! Jesus was speaking primarily of the leadership in general when referring to "The Jews". Jesus described these leaders as *hirelings, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not*. Each such person in the religious leadership was *climbing up some other way* and each was a thief and robber [John 10:1]. In Verse 5 Jesus calls them strangers and they are identifiable because of what they were doing as making them different.

COMMENT

God says that Israel would always be a nation. The word *ethnos* could not apply to a multi-racial church. Israel is a separate people of a common racial origin. They would remain a nation [or nations] as long as the sun and the moon are shining [Jer 31:36].
The Hebrew and the Greek words which are sometimes translated "gentile" have both pagan and Israelite connotations. The words *goi* and *ethnos* are used of any group of a common

racial origin. The idea that the word refers only to non-Israel people comes from the translators, who took their lead from the Latin Vulgate whose interpretation of "gentile" was one who was not of Rome. This can never mean *not a Jew* in the sense it is given today. There are other words that apply to heathen and barbarians and Paul could have used these to describe non-Israelites if that had been his mind. But he did not! What the word "gentile" has come to mean is not the original meaning and therefore not the true meaning.
It is necessary to point out:

[a] If "The Gentiles" does not mean what we have been taught, then the word "Church" may not mean what tradition teaches either.

[b] If we want to declare that "The Gentiles" are non-Israel, then why does God say something different and still isolate Israel and Judah from the other races?

[c] If any want to say that Israel is now "The Church", called out of every race, then they have a problem understanding the difference between race and nationality. These are not identical. Israel was scattered among the nations, and is regathered *out of* [not *of*] them. This means that they are separated from other races.

The Apostle Paul concludes his argument in the Book of Romans by saying:

> *Rom 11:26* *And so shall all Israel be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away all ungodliness from Jacob.*

It is not said that the Deliverer will turn away ungodliness from others as well as from Jacob or that other than all Israel will be saved. We cannot somehow change all races into "Jacob". The parties that make up *all Israel* are still the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Thus says the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets! Thus says the New Testament also! Therefore, the two groups are not "Jews and non-Jews", or "Jews and Gentiles" in the popular concept.

WHAT IS BEING SAID?

This chapter says that the so-called "gentiles" being addressed cannot possibly be other than Israelites. In general, they represent the House of Israel as opposed to the Judean nation. The Bible is a book about the whole nation of Israel and the covenants and promises made to that nation, either as a whole nation or to individual parts of it. The other races are mentioned in the Bible only as they affect Israel.
In the second chapter, we looked at many Scriptures that show the exclusive nature of Israel through the New Testament. The term "Greeks" will be examined in the chapter *Galatians and Exclusive Israel.*
The popular modern use of "gentiles" is wrong!

CHAPTER 7: COULD THE MODERN JEWS BE ISRAEL?

Although the Bible is the main source of information in this paper, there are quotations given in support from various Jewish Encyclopaedias as well as from the Roman historian Josephus. Modern Jewry should find no offence at direct quotations from their own encyclopedia. Modern Jewry talks about being the singular ancient people chosen by God, about being Edom and about being multi-racial, all at the same time. Christians and non-Christians have been mis-lead into thinking that the word "Jews" refers to a singular race of people being God's chosen people, but in fact, this is not so. The "Jews" returning to the Israeli state today are multi-racial and we could hardly admit that a Chinese Jew and a Negro Jew are of the same race!

We will start with three references from "Jewish" sources which may help those who have been led to believe that the word "Jews" relates specifically to Israelites.

1. From Alfred M. Lilienthal's book *What Price Israel*:

   Here's a paradox: an anthropological fact, many Christians have more Hebrew - Israelite blood in their veins than their Jewish neighbours.

2. The Jewish author Yair Davidy in his book *The Tribes – Israelite Origins Of Western Peoples* [Foreword by Rabbi A. Field] tells in much detail that the Saxon folks are Israel.

3. Jewish author Harry Golden wrote in 1967:

   Isaiah the prophet wrote that the remnant of Yahweh's people would be found in the Islands of the Sea.

   These Islands are shown to be North and West of Palestine, that is, the United Kingdom.

4. Modern Jewish authorities who say, *Modern Jewry is Edom* [that is, they descend from Esau, not Isaac].

Quoting from the modern Messianic Jewish writer John Fischer in his book, *The Olive Tree Connection*, we find:

> Page 96. The Jews of today are truly a people from many ethnic, cultural and racial backgrounds.
>
> Page 97. Jewishness, however, consists of many elements: sociological, cultural, ethnic, religious, national, racial, historical, psychological and intellectual. The strength and mixture of these elements varies from person to person. This variety, therefore makes Jewishness elusive to define.

Jewishness is elusive to define simply because *many* racial and ethnic backgrounds cannot be one singular racial and ethnic background at the same time. At the time of the gospels a similar situation existed. The reader might readily see the multi-racial situation with the modern Jew, but at the time of the First Advent, this was not so obvious.

Mr. Fischer goes on to say:

> *Perhaps the Jews of the world are best described as a large community of people undergirded by a strong set of traditions.*

These traditions were, and still are, a strong deceiving spiritual force. Traditions or religion do not specify race; traditions do not make any people The People of The Book. Jesus had problems with the Jewish traditions and we will see that the principles behind these traditions prompted Jesus to say some very disparaging things about the Jews in Judea that highlight both racial and belief factors.

The very title to this chapter might well astound those who have been brought up to believe that "The Jews" always means Israelites. One of the strange things about the words *Jew, Jews,* and *The Jews* as used today, is that these terms are not generalised in the Hebrew and Greek originals the way they are commonly used today.

According to the popular concept, the word "Jew" is supposed to relate to Israel or to all of God's *chosen race* as a single entity. But prophecy from Moses onwards gives separation between each tribe of Israel and separation in destiny between the House of Israel and the

House of Judah, right into the *last days.* Yet the Churches lump all the tribes of Israel together and call them "The Jews" and add in any person of any race who calls himself a Jew. Most Christians talk a lot of nonsense when it comes to the subject of Jews. They can talk about a non-Israel "Church" which is supposed to have inherited the same promises that were made to Israel and at the same time talk about Jews being Israel. In effect Christians talk of two Israels. Furthermore, we hear popular but nonsensical sayings such as *Abraham was the first Jew.* If "Jew" is supposed to relate to Judah, then how could Abraham descend from his own great-grandson, since Abraham pre-dated the Tribe of Judah by three generations?
So, there is much misconception about the word "Jew". In the Book of Revelation, Jesus says that there are people who call themselves "Jews", but who are not Jews in fact. The Greek text uses the term Judeans, not Jews - there are those who call themselves Judean (of the Judean nation set up by the remnant from Babylon) who are not Judeans. Let us work through this to determine the identity of these false Judeans.
Quoting from R.K. and R.N. Phillips in "The Book of Revelation", Part Two:

> *The word* Jews *in verse 9 should be translated* Judeans *– this is a direct reference to John 8:25-59 and John 10:25-39 where Jesus unmasks the Edomite interlopers. In the letter to Smyrna He shows the activities of these interlopers are well known to Him and will not go unpunished in the fullness of time. Mentioning them in this letter sets the contrast between the deeds of the Pharisees with their Traditions of the Elders and those who obey God. The same Judeans are named again in the letter to Philadelphia.*

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

We find the words*, Yehuwdah* or *Yehuwdiy*, used 813 times in the Old Testament and they are usually translated as Judah, but as "Jew" or "Jews" in the books of 1 Chronicles, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Jeremiah and Daniel. In the remainder of the Old Testament, "Jews" usually refers to the remnant of the House or Tribe of Judah which returned to Palestine from Babylon. *Yehudah* simply means 'Judah' and is the name of the patriarch Judah. It is used to refer to the tribe which stemmed from him. It is also used for the land or territory occupied by that people, and following the division of Israel after Solomon's death, it was used for the House or Kingdom of Judah. This was the only term used in this way up to the time of the Babylonian captivity. Following their deportation into Babylon, another term was employed. This was *Yehudi* [plural: *yehudim*]. Originally this word meant an inhabitant of Judea, or the people who came from that country. As such it does not necessarily represent descendants of Judah, but can include any people of other races who resided there. It applies to the Edomites who moved into the land vacated by the Southern Kingdom when it was taken to Babylon. It has come to represent any persons, irrespective of racial origin who embraced the Jewish religion, Judaism.
From Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews*, Book 11.5.7 we read,

> *So the Jews prepared for the work; that is the name they are called by from the day that they came up from Babylon, which is taken from the tribe of Judah, which came first to these places, and thence both they and the country gained that appellation.*

By the time of our Lord, this mixed Edomite/Israelite population had absorbed proselytes from many other sources and made Judaism (the Edomite corruption of the Pentateuch) their religion. This explains the antagonism of the Jews towards Jesus - He made many references to their practice of encouraging proselytes into the nation.

The nation that formed in Palestine after the captivity of the Southern Kingdom in Babylon, was made up initially of people from the Tribes of Judah and Benjamin, together with some Levites. They settled in two regions, with the Judahites primarily in Judea and with Benjamin in Galilee. Internally they are referred to as Judeans and Galileans in the New Testament. The Judeans of the region of Judea came to include all the people living there, regardless of their racial origins. All these people are referred to by translators as "Jews", because they were "of Judea". But this does not mean "of Judah" only. Included in the population were many descendants of Esau [Edomites]; these came to control the temple, and these were the leaders whom Jesus said could not hear [and understand] His words.
This is the view of modern Jewish authorities:

Encyclopedia Judaica 1971, 10, 21:

> *From the division of Israel and Judah, the term Yehudi applied to all the residents of the Southern Kingdom, irrespective of tribal status.*

The words "Jews" and "Judean" did not apply to the Northern Kingdom. They never have!

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In the New Testament we have two different words rendered as Jews:

Strong G2455	*Ioudas*	Of the descendants of Judah [Hebrews 8:8 where it is a racial term].
Thayer		Praised or celebrated … see Gen 29:35 - the tribe of Judah, the descendants of Judah.

Ioudas is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *Yehudah*. In the nine NT references it is rendered as Judah, Judea (the land of Judea) or Judas, always in reference to Judah, his descendants, or their country.

Strong G2453	*Ioudaios*	Belonging to Jehudah or of Judea [in the sense of as a country].
Thayer		The word is also used of Christian converts from Judaism [Gal 2:13] - of Jewish Christians
Vine		It especially denotes the typical representatives of Jewish thought contrasted with believers in Christ.

Ioudaios is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew *Yehudi.* It is translated as "Jew" and includes proselytes to Judaism. This then is more a matter of being a Jew by religion or region, rather than by race.

Thus we can see that the generalisation of the word Jew cannot be sustained in Scripture. One Greek word covers all the peoples occupying the former land of the covenant people, while the other word covers the covenant House of Judah in isolation. *Ioudaios* does not specifically refer to race at all and usually refers to people who are not of the descendants of Judah. This does not mean to say that there were no *Ioudas* [Judahites] or members of other tribes amongst them. From all this we can see that Jew and Judah are not synonymous terms and that there is a sharp distinction between them. It follows that the name, Israel, should not be applied to the Jewish people as a whole or to the country they occupy.

Historically, in the land of Judea, in addition to Judahites, there were Canaanites, Edomites and others, all of whom were proselytes to the Jewish religion. As a consequence these were labelled "Jews" since they were "Jews" by religion and they lived in the land of Judea. But they were not of the descendants of Judah! The territorial term explains how Paul could be called a Jew. Paul was a Benjamite [Philippians 3:5]. Paul and eleven of the disciples did not descend from the Tribe of Judah.

To help with understanding here it must be pointed out that the word *Ioudaios* can cover a mixture of races which may include some of *Ioudas,* both of which were in the territory of Judea. In the New Testament, the words translated as "The Jews" are used in a bad sense, whereas today they are commonly used in a good sense. Jesus continually condemned "The Jews" [plural] as did the Apostle Paul. "The Jew" [singular] as used in Romans is used in a different sense. First of all then, we will consider the bad sense in which "The Jews" is usually used in Scripture.

> IMPORTANT NOTE: This territorial term for *Jews* in Greek is in line with the United Nations and Race Relations Conventions. Under auspices of these bodies, the dictionary definition of *ethnic*, which used to mean *peoples who are other than Christians or Jews,* has been changed. The re-interpretation refers to any group's common or characteristic customs, culture, classification, traditions, beliefs, speech, descent, colour or ethnological division or national origin. In this context multi-racial Jews can thus now be claimed to be an ethnic group. *Anti-Semitic* now is made to refer to anything against the new concept of having this "Jewish" ethnic group.

In Judea, there were many races, and these could all be called Jews in the sense of being "Judeans", having this territory and/or a religious belief in common. Hence the phrase *The Jews* does not necessarily mean any common genetic origin such as physical descent from Abraham through Isaac. In John 8, Jesus was talking to the Judean leadership who historically were mainly of Edomite extraction, and hence this majority were not Israelites in the racial and Biblical meaning. Israelite is a genetic racial-tribal term through Scripture.

In this book, the word translated as "The Jews" and "Judeans" refers to the Judeans of any race in the territorial *or religious sense,* **[not the racial sense]** and this must be taken this way. It does not relate to Israel racially at all. The word "Judahite" is used in this book to refer to the House of Judah, which is racial.

THOSE WHO SAY THEY ARE JEWS, BUT ARE NOT

Rev 2:9 *… I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are of the synagogue of Satan.*

Rev 3:9 *Behold, I will make them of the Synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; …*

At face value, the translation is saying that there are people who say that they are Jews but who are not Jews in fact. The common acceptance of the word "Jew" says every Jew, regardless of race, is a good Jew and that everyone who says that he is a Jew is a Jew. Jesus is contradicting this. Let us go a little further and see some other things Jesus says about "The Jews".

JOHN CHAPTER EIGHT

John 8:21 *… ye shall seek me, but* ***shall die*** *in your sins …*

This thought might upset some Christians who generalise everything and teach that *everyone who seeks will find* in the way they do. The *ye* is to the particular people being addressed. Jesus says of the Jews that they *shall die* in their sins. So it does not include everyone in Judea. The Judahite by race and the "Jew" by religious tradition are not the same thing. We will again see that amongst the Judeans there was a racial mix and that those of the Judahites could believe, whereas the non-Israel proselytes to Judaism could not believe [see v31].

v21 *… whither I go, ye* ***cannot come****.*

Jesus is saying that it is impossible for the Jews to go where He was going.

v23 *… Ye are* ***from beneath****; …*

This is in contradistinction to "from above" in the same verse or the term Christians usually but incorrectly refer to as "born again". The Greek text reads *begotten from above*.

v44 *Ye are of* ***your father the devil****, …*

v47 *… because ye are NOT OF GOD.*

These are clear statements about who they are; that they are not *begotten from above,* nor *of* God.

v19 *… Ye neither know me, nor my Father, if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.*

This matter of knowing and being known of God has already been touched upon in an earlier chapter. *Oida* (know) signifies primarily to have seen or perceived, or to know from observation.

v 37-39 *I know that ye are Abraham's* ***seed*** *… If ye were Abraham's* ***children*** *…*

Here Jesus makes a distinction between Abraham's seed and Abraham's children. All of Abraham's offspring were not heirs of the promises made to Abraham, for it was *in Isaac shall thy seed be called* - these are the children of the promise.

v 43 *Why do ye not understand my speech? even because* ***ye cannot hear my word****.*

Some might like to rationalise this away, but it has earlier been pointed out that only Israel can *hear* [hear and understand and act upon] God's word. We have seen that The Word and The Law are stated in the Old Testament as given only to Israel of all the races on earth, as a covenant.

v 47 *He that is of God heareth God's words: Ye therefore hear them not, because ye* ***are not of God***.

In these last two verses there is the word "hear". Thayer's lexicon gives several meanings, among which we find:

1. To be endowed with the faculty of hearing [not deaf]
2. To attend to [use the faculty of hearing].
3. To understand, perceive the sense of what is being said.

The *cannot* and the *not of God* indicate that the Jews Jesus was addressing could physically hear but could not use their full faculty of hearing. Because they were not begotten from above, they do not have the innate spirit that provides the capacity to hear and understand and act on what Jesus is saying.

v55 *Yet ye have not known him; but I know him: and if I should say I know Him not, I shall be* ***a liar like unto you****: …*

Jesus says here, as well as in Revelation 3:9, that the Jews were liars. If we took "Jew" to refer to Israelites, we have to come to a decision about, *them which say they are Jews, but do lie* [Rev 3:9]. Do false "Jews" [as translated] exist or not? Why should the churches continue to teach that "The Jews" must never be condemned because *they are God's chosen race?* Did Jesus condemn this section of the Judean nation, or not? This matter is of huge importance as a matter of fundamental understanding. It has a great bearing on prophetic interpretation. It has a bearing upon what is going on in the Israeli state today. This is no minor doctrinal point! Incidentally, "The Jews" are never called God's chosen people in the Bible!

John 10:26 *But ye believe not, because ye are* ***not my sheep****, as I said unto you.*

Jesus is talking to the Jews in Judea. Is it not a peculiar thing that the Churches teach that "The Jews" are God's sheep and are God's *natural* children? We have to decide if we are to agree with Jesus or with Christian tradition.

Matt 23:15 *… ye compass land and sea to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the* ***child of hell*** *than yourselves.*

For Jesus to say that the Jews who held sway in the temple were Children of Hell might be a bit much for most Christians to handle, but this is what the record shows. Jesus does not say that all the descendants of Judah in the Judean nation are Children of Hell, but He says that "The Jews" are. It is clear that the two cannot be the same people or that they were capable of believing the same things. The inhabitants of Judea were a mixed bunch of races which included some of the descendants of Judah. Jesus was not talking to the inhabitants of Judea who were the descendants of Judah. In the leadership of the nation, at that time, there was a minority of Judahites amongst the Edomites and the Judahites did not hold the balance of power.

Matt 21:41,45 *They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen … and when the chief priests and Pharisees heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them.*

This is too telling to ignore. The wrong people were in charge of the Vineyard! They were wicked and unbelieving.

In the Old Testament, in persons like Doeg the Edomite and the Amalakite who killed King Saul, the influence of non-Israel in high places of the government of Israel can be seen. In the New Testament, likewise, non-Israelites had become "leaders" and occupied positions of influence. The Herodians were a totally Edomite party. The descendants of Herod Antipater *the Idumean* and how they took control of the Sanhedrin, is detailed in the Encyclopedia

Judaica, 1971, 8, 376-390. They were not only non-Israelite, but were people *against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever* [Malachi 1:2-4]. Since Edom and "The Jews" are so intimately connected, how can the churches preach that "The Jews" always means "Israel"?

WHENCE THE TARES?

Matt 15:13. *Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.*

So, there are those in the field who are not planted by our Heavenly Father! This is not commonly believed.

Matt 19:11,12 *All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given … He that is able to receive it, let him receive it …*

Everyone cannot receive Jesus' sayings! This is contrary to the popular teachings!
In the parable of the sower and the seed Jesus explained:

Matt 13:38 *The field is the world, the good seed are the children of the Kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one.*

The religious churches might not like to think that there are people on Earth who are classified as tares. There are two plantings of different kinds, in the *field*. A "tare" cannot hear or believe. Paul confirms this when he talks about *vessels fitted for destruction* [Romans 9:22].
Jesus states that every plant is not planted by His Heavenly Father. Jesus says that it is the enemy who plants the tares. Jesus also makes it very clear that *every plant, which my heavenly father hath not planted, shall be rooted up* [Matt 15:13]. So, it is very clear that there are two kinds of people, one *from above*, and one *from below*, in the vineyard. It must still be so today on Earth since the two kinds continue to grow together until the harvest. This harvest is at the end of the age; so it is yet to happen. The Churches will never allow this separation of kinds in their teachings and they include everyone as being able to receive the Word. The prophets and Jesus agree that the Word was given to Israel alone. That is why Jesus said to Nicodemus that it was necessary to be *begotten from above* to be able to perceive the Kingdom of God. [The Greek *anothen* is erroneously rendered as "born again" in the traditional teaching].
The problem is to determine whether a tare originates from having a biological beginning or whether it is only a matter of belief. The answer is that both factors are involved. Esau rejected his birthright and founded a line of *sperma* or seed which was not intrinsically good seed. Although tares are not said in Scripture to be "seed", they are sown in the field in the same way as the good seed, although they may not have been sown at the same time. The two were different in their character. The term, *sperma*, is used in Scripture to identify genetic groupings and to separate one group from another. Esau founded a dynasty through rejection of his birthright.
God calls Esau *the border of wickedness and the people against whom the Lord has indignation for ever*. In Malachi 1:4 both the words border (*gebawl*) and people ('*am*) show that the word 'Esau' represents a people. Since Jacob and Esau had the same biological parents, with wheat representing Jacob and tares representing Esau, we can see why tares and wheat are difficult to separate by appearance as they are sprouting up. Both are sown in one field. [Note that a field where the sowing was done was an enclosed area - only a small portion of the whole Earth]. It is at the time of bearing fruit that a physical separation is to be made.
Some of the Judeans were tares and could never be anything else. A tare cannot turn into a wheat plant but both must grow together unto the harvest when the tares are FIRST gathered and set aside for burning. The religious denominations partly recognise that the tares come from those who have turned away from God. Like Esau, who could not find repentance, the tare cannot find repentance [2 Peter 2:15-22, Heb 10:26-29, Heb 12:16,17]. Among the Judeans were descendants of Esau who had inherited a disbelief problem. These descendants

are known as Edomites and although they are of the same biological line as Abraham and Isaac, we are told that they [Isaac and Esau] are two *nations* and two *manner of people* [Gen 25:23].
God says that He hates Edom and that Edom will be destroyed at the time of the harvest. It will be shown how some of Edom have become "Jews" and we have seen that some of the Judeans were not Israelites, even though they descended from Abraham. Jesus told them that much in John 8:37 when He said *I know that you are Abraham's seed [sperma], but you are NOT ABRAHAM'S CHILDREN [teknon]*. The inheritance continued from Isaac through Jacob, not Esau. Esau is not Jacob (who was renamed Israel).

CAN THE JEWS BE IDENTIFIED?

Who were these people against whom Jesus spoke so vehemently? Who were these people the Apostle Paul declared were *contrary* [or antagonistic] *to all men*? [1 Thess 2:15]. Let us explore the connection between "The Jews" and Esau. [Note: Jews are also derived from other races.]

Malachi 1:2-4	*… Was not Esau Jacob's brother? saith the Lord: Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau … They shall build but I will throw down; and they shall call them, The border of wickedness, and, The people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever.*
Romans 9:13	*As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.*
Hebrews 12:16,17	*Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.*

It is contrary to popular evangelical thought to say that one can reject his birthright and not be able to find it again. Esau knew what he was doing and despised what God had to offer him. This is why God hated him. Esau "sold" his birthright. He did not just backslide! But Scripture teaches that the Lord has indignation against Esau for ever [Mal 1:4]. There is a whole line of prophecy against Esau's descendants which is studiously avoided today. This is because of the widely held belief that the modern Israeli state represents the beginning of the regathering of Israel. And so every reference to anyone else being regathered to Jerusalem to be burnt must be hidden. It is time this was uncovered!
In Scripture, the descendants of Esau are also presented by some other names:

Gen 36:8	*… Esau is Edom.*
Gen 36:9	*… the father* [or progenitor] *of the Edomites.*
Gen 36:43	*… the father of the Edomites.*
Deut 2:5	*… I have given mount Seir unto Esau …*
Eze 35:15	*… O mount Seir, and all Idumea …*
Jer 49:13, Amos 1:12	*Bozrah* [city in Edom] *and Teman* [a people descended from Esau].

They are also known as Temanites, Amalakites, and other descendants of the twelve Dukes of Edom [Gen 36:11-42]. It may include the Horites amongst whom Edom settled in Seir. Job's comforters were Temanites and from this we can see their religious bent, but they did not speak that which was right, as did Job [Job 42:7]. Here we find many names where we can look for prophecy about the descendants of Esau. Before we do so, let us look at Esau a little further.
Esau married the daughter of Ishmael, a Hittite, and other Canaanites. His sons married Canaanites. This is a further reason for isolating all his descendants. Israel was later told to exterminate the Canaanites before taking the "Holy Land" as an inheritance. The consequences to Israel of mixed marriage with the Canaanites was known, but it did not stop Esau. This is one of the reasons why God cut him off. The Canaanites were not to enter the congregation of the Lord for all generations. Even if Israel did not finish this task of

destroying the Canaanites, they will yet be destroyed. They cannot be converted. Try telling the Churches today that there is a family of people who cannot be converted. The *all the world* doctrinal interpretation prevents understanding. The Churches refuse to believe Zechariah who says that after the regathering of Israel, *there shall no more be the Canaanite in the House of the Lord of Hosts* [Zech 14:21]. We will shortly look at the destiny of Edomite-Jewry.

In Genesis 27:40,41, God said that Esau was destined to serve his brother and Esau hated Jacob because of this. Esau has been against Jacob ever since. But here Isaac prophesied of Esau that he would break Jacob's service and take the dominion. So Biblically, and historically, the Edomites became the outward religious rulers of the inheritance [the birthright land]. This possibly applies to the "church" scene today because those controlling doctrinal issues have taken the dominion in the same way. These are the Nicolaitanes whom Jesus says He hates with intense hatred [Rev 2:15].

King David conquered Mount Seir and the Edomites and compelled them to obey the Mosaic Law. It was later, after the captivity and under the guise of the new Jewish religion that the Edomites took dominion in "the land" and they became *the rulers of the Jews* over a period of time. Through the New Testament they are referred to as Jews but never are they spoken of as being the descendants of Judah.

So, let us see some things that the modern Jews themselves have to say:

Encyclopaedia Judaica 1971, 6, 376:

> *David made Edom into an Israelite province ruled by appointed governors …*
>
> *2 Sam 8:14 … and all they of Edom became David's servants. …*

Jewish Encyclopaedia 1904, 5, 41:

> *The Edomites were incorporated into the Jewish nation, and their country was called by the Greeks and Romans 'Idumea' [Mark 3:8].*

Encyclopaedia Judaica 1971, 6, 378:

> *John Hyrcanus conquered the whole of Edom, and undertook the forced conversion of its inhabitants to Judaism.*

These quotes show that the authors of these articles in the encyclopaedia saw the Edomites as being different from the Israelites at that time. The Judeans became a racial mixture. Today the modern Jew does not admit outwardly to having any part of descent from Edom. However, we will be looking at statements from Jewish authorities that say, *Modern Jewry is Edom*.

These presentations do not demonstrate how Edom gained control over the nation or temple or how much mixing of races ensued, but Mark 3:8 says that the multitude that followed Jesus came from Galilee, Judea, Idumea, beyond Jordan, Tyre and Sidon. This indicates the level of integration at that time.

JOSEPHUS AND HIS COMMENTS ON THE JEWS

[Quotations are from the 1993 printing of the New Updated Version by William Whiston].

The historian Josephus [*Antiquities of the Jews* 13.9.1] tells of the Idumeans [Edom] submitting *to the use of circumcision, and the rest of the Jewish ways of living; at which time therefore this befell them,* **that they were hereafter no other than Jews**.

The translator's note on this passage states:

> *This account of the Idumeans admitting circumcision, and the entire Jewish law, from this time, or from the days of Hyrcanus, is confirmed by their long history afterwards. See Antiq 14.8.1; 15.7.9. War 2.3.1; 4.4.5. This, in the opinion of Josephus, made them proselytes of justice,* ***or entire Jews****, as here and elsewhere, Antiq 14.8.1. However, Antigonus, the enemy of Herod, though Herod were derived from such a proselyte of justice for several generations, will allow him to be no more than a half Jew, 15.15.2. But still, take out of Dean Prideaux, at the year 129, the words of Ammouius, a grammarian, which fully confirm this account of the Idumeans in Josephus:* ***"The Jews,"*** *says he,* ***"are such by nature, and from the beginning, whilst the Idumeans were not Jews from the beginning, but Phoenicians and Syrians; but being afterward subdued by***

> ***the Jews, and compelled to be circumcised, and to unite into one nation, and be subject to the same laws, they were called Jews."*** *Dio also says, as the Dean there quotes him, from Book 36.37,* ***"That country is called Judea, and the people Jews; and this name is given also to as many others as embrace their religion, though of other nations."*** *But then upon what foundation so good a governor as Hyrcanus took upon him to compel those Idumeans either to become Jews, or to leave the country, deserves great consideration.* ***I suppose it was because they had long ago been driven out of the land of Edom, and had seized on and possessed the tribe of Simeon, and all the southern parts of the tribe of Judah, which was the peculiar inheritance of the worshippers of the true God without idolatry,*** *as the reader may learn from Reland, Palestine, 1.154, 305; and from Prideaux, at the years 140 and 165.*

In *The Wars of the Jews* 4.4.4, one of the commanders in the Idumean army gives an appellation to Jerusalem as being the *common city* to their own nation. This is confirmed in Wars 2.20.4 and in a comment by the translator:

> *We may observe here, that the Idumeans as having been proselytes of justice since the days of John Hyrcanus during about 195 years, were* ***now esteemed as part of the Jewish nation*** *and here provided with a Jewish commander accordingly.*

Also:

> *Wars 6.8.2* *At the time when Titus attacked Jerusalem, the Idumeans were the chief defenders of Jerusalem.*

In 15.7.9, Josephus tells how an Idumean priest, Costobarus, received Jewish law and custom, became governor of Idumea, and married Herod's sister, Salome. Antipater, **the Idumean** was Herod's father! [This is confirmed at length in Dissertation 7].
Then Josephus gives examples of other races being circumcised to receive the Jewish religion and this includes royalty [for example, Queen Helena of Adiabene and her son King Izates - Antiq 20.2.1-5].

> *Wars 7.3.3* *They also made proselytes of a great many of the Greeks perpetually, and thereby, after sort, brought them to be a portion of their own body.*

The racial mixture of the Judeans as containing Israelites and non-Israelites is shown by the following:

> *Wars 28.2* *For there are three philosophical sects among the Jews. The followers of the first of whom are the Pharisees; of the second the Sadducees; and the third sect, who pretends to a severer discipline, and called Essenes. These last are Jews by birth, and seem to have a greater affection for one another than the other sects have.*

It would seem that Josephus is indicating that the Essenes were Israelites and the Pharisees and Sadducees were not.
Elsewhere, Josephus refers to Idumeans as Syrians. He calls Doeg, the Edomite, a Syrian [Antiq 6.12.4]. Wars 6:2.1 indicates that the common language of the Jews in Judea at that time was Syriac dialect.
In Antiq 13.11.3, Hyrcanus's son, Aristobulus,

> *… made war against Iturea, and added a great part of it to Judea, and compelled the inhabitants, if they would continue in that country, to be circumcised, and to live according to the Jewish laws.*

Iturea was North-West of Palestine and this quotation shows that peoples becoming subject to Jewish laws and thus becoming known as "Jews" came from lands both North and South of Palestine. Becoming "Jews" does not make them into Israelites or descendants from Isaac by race.
In these historical records we can see important facts:

1. That the descendants of Esau [Edomites or Idumeans, as well as many others] became known as "Jews".
2. That "Jews" [by religion], many of whom were not of Israel stock, and included the descendants of Esau, existed both inside and outside of Judea, in those times. Even today we do not know the proportions!
3. That in those days the words "Jew", "Jews" and "Judeans" did not equate solely with Judah or with Israel, by race - any more than they do today.

The control of Judea by Edom started from the time of the captivity of Judah and the Edomite aristocracy eventually gained ascendancy over the returnees from Babylon. From this position of power they set about expounding their territory and power base by compelling all and sundry to follow their system of political and religious power.

THE DESTINY OF THE EDOMITES ["THE JEWS"]

This is new ground for most people so the Scriptures below need to be read word for word. There is much detail and identification in them. Esau sold his birthright, but the Scriptures tell us that Edom would try to regain the sold inheritance [The Land] in the last days. This will be done by them as "The Jews". Peoples purporting to be Jews will return to the Holy Land, but they will be a racial mixture containing the offspring from Esau's mixed marriages, and proselytes to Esau's religion. Jesus continually condemned this religion and pronounced woe upon woe upon the teachers of this Jewish religion. There certainly is no reason to suspect that this might have changed in the present day. Jesus said of them, *Bring them hither [to Jerusalem] that I might destroy them* [Luke 19:27]. It has to be questioned who is returning and who is being *brought hither* to the Israeli state today and why.

Mal 1:4 — *Whereas Edom says, We are impoverished, but we will return and build the desolate places; thus saith the Lord of hosts, They shall build, but I will throw down; …*

Eze 33:24 — *… they that inhabit those wastes of the land of Israel speak, saying, Abraham was one, and he inherited the land: but we are many, the land is given us for inheritance.*

Note the "one" and "many" because this will come up again. Here we see what Edom says and what God also says on the same subject.

Eze 35:10-15 — *Because thou* [Esau] *hast said, These two nations* [that is, Israel and Judah] *and these two countries shall be mine, and we will possess it … and thou shalt know that I am the Lord and that I have heard all thy blasphemies which thou hast spoken against the mountains of Israel, saying, They are desolate, they are given us to consume. … as thou didst rejoice at the inheritance of the house of Israel, because it was desolate, so will I do unto thee: thou shalt be desolate, O mount Seir, and all Idumea, even all of it: and they shall know that I am the Lord.*

Eze 36:2-7 — *Because the enemy has said against you, Aha, even the ancient high places are ours in possession: … Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Surely in the fire of my jealousy have I spoken against the residue of the heathen, and against all Idumea* ***which have appointed my land into their possession*** *with the joy of all their heart, with despiteful minds, to cast it out for a prey.*

Obad 1:8,9 — *Shall not I in that day, saith the Lord, even destroy the wise men out of Edom, and understanding out of the mount Esau? And thy mighty men, O Teman, shall be dismayed, to the end that every one of the mount of Esau may be cut off by slaughter.*

Obad 1:12,13 — *But thou shouldest not have looked on the day of thy brother in the day that he became a stranger; neither shouldest thou have rejoiced over the children of Judah in the day of their destruction; neither shouldest thou have spoken proudly in the day of distress. Thou shouldest not have entered into the gate of my people in the day of their calamity; yea, thou shouldest not have looked on their affliction in the day of their calamity, nor have laid hands on their substance in the day of their calamity;*

Isa 34:5 — *For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold it shall come down upon Idumea* [Edom]*, and upon the people of my curse, to judgement.*

Hab 3:3 — *God came from Teman … His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise.*

These Scriptures also give the timing when this is to happen. It is the end of this age when the stars fall from heaven. The judgement is against Idumea who is occupying "The Land". "FOR IT IS THE DAY OF THE LORD'S VENGEANCE AND THE YEAR OF RECOMPENSES FOR THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION."
Even today, there is this controversy about who should be in possession and control of the Holy Land. Today the Pope is seeking control of the holy places and the Papacy has never renounced the Popes' false claim as King of Jerusalem. The prophecy in this chapter alone is not pretty. Like so many other Scriptures, the picture is of a land becoming devoid of grass,

birds and even fish. There has never at any time in history been such a judgement upon the Holy Land. But God's nation will return to a cleansed land and will dwell secure without any enemies at all after all this destruction and cleansing by fire. Some might like to say that the grass, birds, fish and the fire are symbols, but they do not appear to be so. This is to happen at Jerusalem! This is not the present situation in the Israeli state. We are not witnessing a return to a land totally cleansed by fire happening first!

Amos 1:12 *But I will send a fire upon Teman, which shall devour the palaces of Bozrah.*

This judgement upon Edom is the consequence of Esau's anger which *did tear perpetually against Jacob and for Edom's wrath which he kept*. The destruction of Edom in prophecy is always by burning.

Isaiah 63:1-6 *Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, travelling in the greatness of his strength? … for the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come … and I will tread down the people in mine anger …*

Jer 49:7-10 *Concerning Edom … for I will bring the calamity of Esau upon him, the time that I will visit him … but I have made Edom bare … he shall not be able to hide himself: …*

Edom is certainly hiding himself behind a false identity now but is nevertheless an impostor in the Holy Land. Any serious study of the *regathering of Israel* will show that the timing factors are ignored in the majority of the books found in Christian bookshops. Edom does not seem to exist in all the popular books on prophecy that relate to end-of-age events. Neither does the time and the place of Edom's destruction ever get a mention. If there is one major reason for this, it is because Edom is hiding himself as the latter Scripture says. From his hidden position he promotes what must be a lie in saying that "The Jews" and Israel are one and the same people. This continues to influence much New Testament doctrine and what is taught in the denominations today.

In the New Testament, much about this matter can be found in the parables of Jesus, but this study would take a special chapter. When Jesus spoke in parables against the Scribes and Pharisees, *they perceived that He spake of them* [Matt 21:45]. They were to be *cast out into outer darkness* [Matt 8:12]. They could not bring forth good fruit because it was impossible for them to do so. They were destined to be hewn down and cast into the fire. They were *the Children Of The Wicked One* [see John 8:44].

The Edomites were occupying the vineyard but when the Lord of the vineyard comes *he will miserably destroy those wicked men*. The word *wicked* is definitive [see Mat 21:41 where the Pharisees perceived Jesus spake of them].

Proverbs 16:4.. *The Lord has made all things for Himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.*

Psalm 58:3 *The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies.*

These particular wicked ones were born that way. They have a destiny.

DOES EDOM HAVE ANY MARKS OF IDENTIFICATION TODAY?

The word *Edom* or *Esau*, as used in both Hebrew and Greek, refers to the descendants of Esau as a racial group.

Heb 12:16,17 *Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know that afterward, when he would have received the blessing, he was rejected, for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.*

Esau was a fornicator. He married "different" or outside his own bloodline. Esau was profane. He had crossed a threshold according to the meaning of this word. Now, remember what Jesus said of certain of the Judeans in John 8:21 - they could not go where He was going. The descendants of Esau must exist today. Esau cannot find repentance, even with tears, right up to today apart from one provision God has made. The children of Edom may enter the congregation of Israel three generations after marriages with Israelites [Deut 23:7,8]. Debate about whether or not this is genetic or by belief will not alter the fact

about it being so. Now this is quite contrary to popular teaching and contrary to the *all the world* teaching. What is quoted above is a New Testament quotation!
Identification of "The Jews" as Edom is found in many places and indeed in places where it might be least expected. Few would expect this statement **… EDOM IS MODERN JEWRY …** in Jewish Encyclopaedia:

[a] New Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia, 1977, page 586.

[b] Jewish Encyclopaedia 1904, page 41.

[c] Jewish Encyclopaedia 1925, Book 13, 5-41.

This encyclopaedia claims that today Edom is modern Jewry but it also speaks about Jew and Edomite as being separate entities.

[d] Encyclopaedia Biblica 2, column 1187.… says the same thing.

These are not the sorts of things that are told by the popular schools of prophecy, because they do not fit in with the *all the world* doctrine. But even the Jewish Encyclopaedia says modern Jewry is Edom!
Let us look at this from another angle. Edom has always been very jealous and has opposed Israel. Even from the time the Children of Israel were on their way to inherit the promised land, Edom came out to prevent the passage of the Children of Israel.

Num 20:18-21: *And Edom came out against him with much people, and with a strong hand. Thus Edom refused to give Israel passage through his border.*

Has anything changed? Who are among the main enemies of Biblical Christianity in the West today? Who was Jesus continually up against when He walked the Holy Land? It was always "The Jews".. The Pharisees and Sadducees were at odds over teachings, but they were united against Jesus.
Encyclopaedia Judaica 1971, 6:

John Hyrcanus conquered the whole of Edom and undertook the forced conversion of its inhabitants to Judaism [Josephus, Antiq 13.9.1]

The same account can be found in The New Standard Jewish Encyclopaedia 1977, page 589 states: *Thenceforth the Edomites became a section of the Jewish people*. These *Jewish people* then were not Israelites and cannot be Israelites today.

Encyclopaedia Judaica 1971, 6, column 370:

Bozra is Edom.

It quotes Gen 36:1 *Esau which is Edom,* and then points out that Esau married a Canaanite/Hittite *[Gen 36:1 and Gen 36:2],* and also an Ishmaelite *[Gen 28:9]* and Hivites *[Gen 36:2,3].*

Encyclopaedia Judaica 1971, 6, column 378:

Edom is frequently mentioned in Latin Poems of the period, usually as a synonym for Judea**.** Also, Edom appears sometimes in the Aggadah referring to actual Edomites, and sometimes to the Romans who are identified with them.

After the death of Herod in 4 BC, Edom was included with Judea and Samaria in the Ethnarchy of Archelaus - - Edom became part of the Roman province of Judea. Thus Edomites and Judeans became affiliated.

In the next column we find, *the overwhelming majority of homilies about Edom speak explicitly of Rome*.. Then it is stated that Rome was founded by the children of Esau. The continuing attack of Edom against true Israel [not the Israeli state] comes also through Rome.

Encyclopaedia Judaica 1971, 6, column 857:

In the Aggadah, Esau is discussed … as identical with Edom, and sometimes with Rome with whom Edom was identified.

The "Dukes of Edom" is translated from *Alluph* which is the name used of the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces of the Israeli state today. *Alluph* is used in Scripture 57 times

referring to the leaders of Edom and sometimes this refers to the *governors of Judah*.
Gesenius states that *alluph* is *especially used of the leaders of the Edomites*
Thus we find identification of Edom as being "Jews". This connects with modern Jewry.
But, few Protestant denominations will allow it.

JEWS WHO ARE NON-SEMITIC

Jewishness today is primarily related to Edom according to these Jewish sources, but it can also be a matter of religion and upbringing. Jews also come from Ham and Japheth. Thus, they cannot all be from Shem, and those not from Shem certainly cannot be from the Tribe or House of Judah or be Israelites.
Encyclopedia Judaica 1971, 6 column 143:

> *The history of the Falashas* [Ethiopian Jews] *speaks of their Hamitic origin.*

Thus these are not Semitic! It is suggested in this source that they may have come from the marriage of Solomon's son, Menelik, to the Queen of Sheba.
There are strong indications that the Eastern European Jew originated from Japheth and NOT from Shem. If this is so, then this part of modern Jewry is dominated by a non-Semitic people. They certainly could not then be Israelites. We do know for certain that the two major groups in modern Jewry are the Ashkenazim [that is, Eastern] and the Sephardic [that is, Western] Jew and that anthropologically they are not the same race! So both could not be who they claim to be if they both claim to be Israel and of the same race.
There are United Nations papers concerning this matter, and one of their researchers, Raphail Patai declares, in the well documented book, *The Thirteenth Tribe,* by Arthur Keostler:

> *The findings of physical anatomy show that, contrary to popular view, there is no Jewish race [that is, that among those who call themselves Jews]. Documentation suggests that Jews living in one culture are similar anthropologically to the culture in which they live, rather than all being similar to each other in differing cultures*.

Keostler offers proof that the Eastern European Jew is descended from the large Khazar Kingdom which existed in Russia in the early centuries. The Khazars adopted Judaism as the State religion prior to the eighth century, as a political move to create a buffer between Muslims on one side and "Christians" on the other. Documents and correspondence from that period are still available from as far away as Spain and Egypt. One important fact is that the Khazar people themselves claim descent from Japheth. This means they were not Semites so they did not descend from Abraham! Yet they are known today as being "Jews" and to speak against them is said to be anti-Semitic!
The Compact Oxford English Dictionary, Second Edition, 1992 (containing the entire multi-volume set of The Oxford English Dictionary) gives the following definitions:

Semite:	a person belonging to the race of mankind which includes most of the peoples mentioned in Gen 10 as descended from Shem, son of Noah, as the Hebrews, Arabs, Assyrians and Aramaeans. Also a person speaking a Semitic language as his native tongues.
Anti-Semitism:	theory, action or practice directed against the Jews. Hence anti-Semite, one who is hostile or opposed to the Jews.

It is a sad, but nevertheless fact of English language usage that these two words co-exist without proper connection in terms of their definition. One is a racial term, the other is a religious term that is misconstrued as being a racist term.
It is common for certain traditionalists and Jews to declare that it was only the Khazar leaders who adopted Judaism, but records indicate that the state religion was enforced on all the Khazar people.
Encyclopedia Judaica 1971, 10, column 944:

> *Leading Khazars professed Judaism* and in column 948 *says, Khazars became known to their neighbours as Jews.*

Jewish Encyclopaedia 1905, 4, page 1 - CHAZARS:

> *A People of Turkish origin, whose life and history are interwoven with the very beginnings of the history of the Jews in Russia … Historical evidence points to the region of the Urals as the home of the Chazars.*

The historian H.G. Wells in *The Outline of History*, page 494:

> *The Idumeans [Edomites] were … made Jews … and a Turkish people [Khazars] were mainly Jews in South Russia … The main part of Jewry never was in Judea and had never come out of Judea.*

History details the fall of the Khazar empire and how they were driven Westward towards Poland, the Baltic States and Western Russia.
Mr. Keostler says that all the facts about the Jews being one people *looks like the most cruel hoax which history has ever perpetrated*. But, what do the Jews themselves have to say about who is a Jew?
Encyclopedia Judaica 1971, 10, column 23:

> *A child born of Jewish parents or a convert to Judaism are considered Jews.*

Here we have an important statement from modern Jewry which declares that **Jewishness is not just a matter of race**.
An old definition of who is a Jew was *one who had a Jewish grandmother*, but now we can see a new definition emerging. The NZ Jewish Chronicle of May, 1994 states a Jew is a person whose children and grandchildren will be Jewish! That is they will be Jewish in religion and practice. They may be of any race at all. So, the Jews themselves are confirming and teaching that the term "Jew" is not a racial term. They are admitting that the term "Jews" does not relate solely to Israelites.
The widest, most all embracing definition is given in the Encyclopaedia Britannica CD 1997:

> *Jew – any person whose religion is Judaism. In the broader sense of the term, a Jew is any person belonging to the worldwide group that constitutes, through descent or conversion, a continuation of the ancient Jewish people who were themselves descendants of the Hebrews of the Old Testament.*

The definition is capable of embracing the whole of mankind - in absolute contradiction of what we have seen that God says on the subject!

SOME COMMENTS FROM HISTORY

There is much evidence from recorded history that the seed of Esau may certainly and safely be identified with "The Jews" and modern Jewry. There is much in the Encyclopaedia Britannica that points this out - look up any of the key words we have seen in this chapter [see also "Ottoman"]. The historian Josephus details much about Esau and gives much coverage of wars and the Amalekites' continuous hatred of Israel through the time of Antiochus Epiphanes until after the fall of Jerusalem. He does not identify Esau with Israel, but with those he calls *the Jews* whom he says were not Israelites.
The Idumeans came also to be known as "Jews" when John Hyrcanus destroyed their cities and incorporated them into the Judean state. He forced observance of circumcision and Jewish laws upon them and to all outward appearances they became as Jews.
As we have seen, Aristobulos annexed Iturea and forced them to accept Judaism in 105 BC. They were no longer a separated people and they were considered one people by virtue of their embracing Judaism. This mixture, together with others who later took on Judaism, constitute modern Jewry. As such, they have absolutely no right or claim on Palestine under the Abrahamic covenant.

THE RELIGION OF THE JEWS

The binding force of the Judean religious leaders was the Babylonian Talmud. The name suggests that this started to develop when Judah was in captivity in Babylon. It migrated to the religious leaders in Judea well before the time of Jesus. Their religion, the Tradition of The Elders, was condemned by Jesus. The practice of this religion by peoples of various

races has created a pseudo-race which has perpetuated isolation through religion. Marriage was mainly confined to be with people of the same religion and hence with the pseudo-race. This creates the appearance of being a race, but it is not.
Using their interpretation of the Old Testament as their religion, the Jews appear to worship the Lord God. It may be remarked that Roman Catholicism does likewise. But Jesus says they worship God IN VAIN. Some may think that they are worshipping God, but they are in the synagogue of Satan. Jesus says this is so!
Copies of the Talmud are not easy to secure, and it is spread over many volumes, but there are hundreds of quotations that show that the Talmud is essentially at odds with the Christian Bible. For instance, the following are condoned:

Sodomy	Sanhedrin 54b
Bestiality	Yebamoth 59b
Harlotry	Abodah Zarah 62b - 63a
Not keeping vows	Nedarim 23a - b
Murder by multiple attackers	Sanhedrin 78a
Cursing parents	Sanhedrin 66a

Some of these items are what we see being promoted by those pushing for Human Rights and for Children's Rights. We can see the United Nations Covenants progressing towards the elimination of Christianity and the institution of Talmudic values. The Talmud seeks to convey some deviation or exception to every Biblical moral law. Christianity did not originate from Judaism, whose followers state, *The Talmud is to this day the circulating heart's blood of the Jewish religion … It is our common law* [Herman Wouk, New York Herald-Tribune 17/11/59].
Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Volume 8, page 474:

> *The Jewish religion, as it is today, traces its descent, without a break, through all centuries, from the Pharisees … The Talmud is the largest and most important single member of that literature.*

Jesus said that the Pharisees rejected the commandments of God so that "The Jews" might keep their own traditions [of Babylon]. The Talmud represents a defiance towards God. "The Jews" therefore are still the enemy of God's people. Any show of their using the Old Testament is a mechanism of deceit!
Jesus is referred to in the Talmud as a sorcerer, a fool, an idolater and a blasphemer, and that Jesus committed those things listed above. Jesus said that their father is a liar and that they are the same. Many Jewish works, including the Talmud, show the hatred of "The Jews" towards Christianity. This is inherent in the nature of "The Jews" according to Ezekiel 35:5. This is a perpetual hatred.

WHAT IS THEIR BLASPHEMY?

Jesus says in Rev 2:9 that He knows the blasphemy of those people calling themselves "Jews".. Let us look at this. In publications from pro-Zionist sources, Messianic Jewish sources and sometimes in Christian media, we can find an unusual insistence in saying that Jesus was a "Jew". This is used in the sense of Jesus having a common racial blood relationship with those who call themselves "Jews" today. The so-called Jew of today is not of one race, and so this insistence can not be true. Jesus was not *made like* unto this people of highly mixed blood.
Jesus was *made like* unto His brethren:

Heb 2:14-18 *Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels: but* ***he took upon him the seed of Abraham*** *… Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be* ***made like unto His brethren …***

His brethren are not what we know today as "The Jews" who are of multi-blood stock. *His brethren* are not Edomite; they are Israelite, the kinsmen of the womb of Jacob's line. It is blasphemy to say Jesus was a Jew of any variety.
Another blasphemy has already been quoted, as given in Ezekiel 35:12 *And thou shalt know that I am the Lord and that I have heard all they blasphemies which thou hast spoken against the mountains of Israel, saying, They are laid desolate, they are given us to consume*. Many Christian Churches might be agreeing with this blasphemy in their support of the Israeli state. This Scripture has a partial fulfilment in Edom's take over of Judea following the captivity.

EDOM, THE ETERNAL ENEMY OF ISRAEL

Jewish authorities agree with Scripture where God states that Israel would have *war from generation to generation* against Esau and his descendants [Exodus 17:16].
Encyclopedia Judaica 1971, 6, column 379:

> *Edom is the eternal enemy of Israel and Judah.*

It continues on to link Rome and Esau, both of whom destroyed the temple. Both use Eagles as symbols, and then says:

> *The similarity to the name Rome and Romans in several verses that speak of Edom, Seir and Esau – all these combined to cause the application of Rome to the Biblical references to Edom, the eternal enemy of Israel.*

Compare the first Enc Judaica quotation with the following:

Amos 1:11	*He did pursue his brother with the sword … and he kept his wrath for ever.*
Ezek 35:5-7	*Because thou hast had a perpetual hatred, and hast shed the blood of the children of Israel by the force of the sword in the time of their captivity, in the time that their iniquity had an end: Therefore as I live, saith the Lord God, I will prepare thee unto blood, and blood shall pursue thee; since thou has not hated blood, even blood shall pursue thee. Thus will I make mount Seir most desolate …*

"The Jews" [Edom] are ever at war with God's people, propagating doctrine that our God is not a God of righteousness and justice, but only a God of love and mercy only. God says He actually hates Edom and so Edom is concerned to try to eliminate any reference to hate. From modern "Jewish" sources we are seeing increasing anti-hate statements such as, *Christians hate homosexuals* and that any attempt to reveal Edom is construed as *hating Jews*.. In this the perpetual hatred of God's real people and Bible teaching is demonstrated.

ANTI-SEMITISM

It has already been pointed out that the United Nations Conventions have the effect of changing race into any group having an ethnic belief, religion, common customs, national origins, etc, so that in this context multi-racial Jews can now claim to be an ethnic group. As we have seen, *anti-Semitic* is made to refer to anything against the concept of this "Jewish" ethnic group.
The word, "anti-Semitism" was first printed as late as 1880, according to the Jewish Encyclopaedia 1901, 1, page 641. The Compact Oxford Dictionary gives an example of its usage in 1881. The word is used as a cover-up by those claiming to be Israelites or Shemites, *but who are not* [Rev 2:9]. These are those who are known and identified as International Jewry today; they themselves state that they are Edom, as has been shown.
Today we find a push for world government by these people - usually through the socialist platform. For example, Jewish Encyclopaedia, Volme 11, page 418:

> *Jews have been prominently identified with the modern Socialist movement from its very inception.*

We also find evidence of the Communist ideal surfacing in the United Nations Conventions. Very soon after the Communist revolution in Russia, the Jewish Chronicle of April 4, 1919 said:

> *There is much in the fact that the ideals of Bolshevism are at many points consonant with the finest ideals of Judaism.*

The essence of the New Age teachings, although couched in different language, are the same as Communism. An earlier quotation spoke of the affinity of Bolshevism and Talmudic Judaism. The New Age association with Jewry goes back a long way. For Example, from The American Hebrew newspaper of the 10th September, 1920:

> *"The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia was the work of Jewish brains, of Jewish dissatisfaction, of Jewish planning, whose goal was to create a new world order. What happened in Russia, shall also, through the same Jewish mental and physical forces become a reality all over the world".*

From 1994 we have been seeing more open mention by world leaders of the "New Age", global politics and global economics. We can read statements of politicians made to Jewish and Zionist organisations which leave us in no doubt that the statement quoted above is becoming a reality. We now see the potential through the 1995 World Trade Organisation for a completely managed world society modelled upon the Soviet pattern, supported in the same way by force of arms. This time it is the armies of the United Nations. Note the quote above, "*what happened in Russia*", and who made that statement.
Communism sought to eliminate all opposition to its control and objectives and we find a similar operation emerging today against those who would contravene the UN conventions. Zionism and the United Nations have dominating "Jewish" contents. We will soon see more world-wide cries of anti-Semitism against those who oppose Edom in their war of extermination against Biblical Israel and Christianity.
Further to this, we have the recorded statement of Pope Pius X1 who said that Christians *are spiritual Semites* and it would be logical to say from this that to speak against Christians [meaning Roman Catholics] would also be anti-Semitic!

NON-ISRAELITE JEWS

There are Jews of many racial origins.

1. THE ASHKENAZIM JEWS

Some claim a link between Edom and the Khazars, but apart from that there is more than one identity calling themselves "Jews"; none of these have claim to the name 'Israel'.. Regarding the Ashkenazim Jews who speak Yiddish, most dictionaries and encyclopaedia define Ashkenazim in words like *after 'Ashkenaz'*, *the second son of Gomer*. This confirms Scripture concerning the sons of Noah, [Shem, Japheth and Ham], and their offspring:

> *Gen 10:1-3* … *the sons of Japheth, Gomer, … the sons of Gomer, Ashkenaz.*

2. THE KHAZAR JEWS

The Khazars claimed descent from Japheth, and from their adoption of Judaism, they became known as Jews. But they did not descend from Shem, and therefore they are not Semitic in origin. To relate the term "anti-Semitism" to Jews of this origin is nonsense and part of the great deception! Eastern European Jews of this origin have no Israelite connection. Anti-Semitism could not apply to them! These are the majority in the Israeli state.

3. THE SEPHARDIM JEWS

The American People's Encyclopaedia, 1925, indicates that these people descended from Edomites who were cast out of Palestine by Prince Titus in AD 70. From thence they spread to North Africa and to Spain converting Berber Tribes and others to Judaism. There were Cardinals and Popes who were Sephardim Jews. They have no simple blood line, being Edomites diluted with Syrian, Canaanite, Phoenician and North African blood.

4. THE SEPHARDIM / ASHKENAZIM JEWISH MIXTURE

It is impossible to determine the degree of intermarriage between these two groups of non-Israelites, but there is evidence that this has been common.

5. THE ETHIOPIAN DESCENDANTS OF HAM [The Falashas]

These are known as "Jews" because of acceptance of Judaism. The Encyclopaedia Judaica states:

> *The history of the Falashas speaks of their Hamitic origin.*

The joke here is that Ham, as a son of Noah, was not a black man. It is amazing that these people, who are supposed to be the educated and erudite, could make such a stupid statement.

6. BABYLONIAN JEWS

In the days of Mordecai and Esther - many who obviously were not of Judah took up Judaism -

> *Esther 8:17 And many of the people of the land became Jews*

7. PROSELYTES TO JUDAISM

These are people from other Semitic and non-Semitic origins, who became known as Jews because of religious spirit and belief. There are Asiatic Jews and Jews of almost every race on earth.

8. THE SHEMITE DESCENDANTS OF ESAU

These people also known as Edomites and some other names in Scripture. Historically, and Biblically, most of these were made proselytes to Judaism and became known as "Jews".

RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL NONSENSE

The points raised in this chapter render the following as being religious and political nonsense:

[a] The popular use of the term "anti-Semitism" as meaning "anti-Jew" (and suggesting "anti-Israel") and using it as a racial term.

[b] The popular use of "Jews" implying "Israelites" in the way it is used, (even if it is a common understanding and usage) in our denominations and in Messianic circles. It is also used politically through Zionism and Jewish control in United Nations to further the end of those against the Israel of God.

[c] The Israeli state represents "The regathering of Israel".

[d] "The Jews" are a single race.

Anyone who wants to identify the Jews as "Israel" is not speaking about the true Israel of God, as defined in the Bible. If we have another Israel, we have another gospel. But the same people will insist that Jews of much racial mixture are a single race when they are not. They want it both ways.

The term *Ioudaios* [Judean] is wrongly accepted as the "racial" term *Ioudas* [Jew] when reading the New Testament and is the root of the misunderstanding. The use of the territorial term, Judean, is not a measure of race, although some Israelites were amongst the proselytes to Judaism in Judea.

The local New Zealand leader of the Messianic Jewish Alliance, Mr. Murray Dixon, writes in his book, *The Rebirth And Restoration Of Israel*:

> *It is very important for us to understand the extent of the Gentile's separation.* Gentile *is the Greek word of the Hebrew equivalent goyim, meaning the people of the nations, or anyone who is not Jewish.*

We have covered this wrong meaning of "gentile" earlier. The interesting observation is that *goi* and *goyim* is used in Scripture of Israel also, so Mr. Dixon's statement cannot be correct unless "Jewish" is interpreted in the multi-racial context. The explanation that the word *has come to mean non-Jewish*, will not change original Scripture. The wrong use of the word is the political and religious usage, not the scriptural usage.

Goi in Scripture conveys the sense of being a defined group of people politically, ethnically or territorially without any religious or moral connotation. Thus we find *goi* is used of Israel

in Scripture [for example, Gen 12:2, 17:20, 21:18; Ex 33:13; Is 1:4; etc]. The plural form is used of Jacob and Esau as two nations.
Therefore, in Mr Dixon's eyes, Jacob (and Esau) are non-Jewish - that means the Jews cannot claim descent from Abraham via these two lines - Yet John 8:33 shows us they do claim descent from Esau. Esau was the line that descended from the promised son but was never in bondage in Egypt. Mr Dixon does not know his "Jewish" history very well. On the other hand, if Mr Dixon considers that "being Jewish" means belonging to a religion rather than a race, then he can certainly label Jacob as non-Jewish. But where does that leave Esau, who the Pharisees claimed as their father?

ARE THE CHURCHES TEACHING THESE THINGS TODAY?

What are some of the things the churches teach or infer today?

That "The Jews" are Israel. Some teach that there is no racial Israel today and that there is no synagogue of Satan.

That everyone of every race can hear and understand God's words.

That *All the world* means everyone of every race.

That Abraham's seed and Abraham's children are the same.

That all the people who listened to Jesus were Israelites.

That every plant is planted by God [see Matt 15:13].

That Esau's physical descendants no longer exist.

That people today cannot ever become like Esau and not be able to find repentance.

That it is not God's nature to condemn anyone of any race.

That there is no racial Israel today [that is, the church has taken Israel's place].

That the Jews are God's natural children.

That the Church is God's spiritual children.

All who say that they are Jews are Jews.

That the Jews have no blasphemy.

That the Seed of Abraham is now the seed of Jesus through belief only [that is, race is no longer relevant].

That the throne of David does not exist.

That the Gentiles are never Israelites.

That the Old Testament promises are not exclusive to Israel.

That there is no difference between the House of Israel and the House of Judah, and so prophecy addressed to one House applies equally to the other House, in all cases.

That Jesus was a Jew.

That the regathering of Israel is now taking place - simply because people calling themselves "Jews" are gathering in Palestine.

That Israel is a place, as well as a people.

That the promises made to Abraham's seed apply to all other seeds of all races. All *sperma* are the same.

That Christianity sprang out of Judaism.

That Judaism and Hebraism are the same thing and originate from the same source suggesting that "Judeo-Christian" is a valid term.

If all these things are generally believed, then they must be cultish beliefs!

IS THIS THE MASTER DECEPTION OF SATAN?

Rev 2:9 *… I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.*

Just as Satan wanted Jesus to bow down and worship him, and as Lucifer (Satan) wanted to be like God and be worshipped, so Satan still wants to be worshipped today. Jesus refers to people calling themselves "Jews" (*Ioudaios* or Judean) who "are not" as being of the synagogue of Satan. So Jesus says Satan has a synagogue among peoples calling themselves "Jews" today. As Jesus said in John 8:44 their father was, and still is, the Devil. Would there be a better place to start a deception, than to begin with the seed of Abraham? The denominations still refuse to agree with Jesus that the synagogue of Satan exists and is active right through the latter days against God's people.

The word, "Jews", cannot always be taken in the way that is commonly accepted. Modern international Jewry is primarily of Edomic or Japheth/Ashkenazim or Sephardim origin, and the Jewish Encyclopaedia states that *Edom is modern Jewry*. Edomites are not Israelites; it was Esau who sold his birthright. The descendants of Japheth cannot be Israelites. Neither are "Jews" of other races Israelites by race.
Modern Jewry relates to Edom, Zionism, World Government and the Israeli state, but not to Biblical Israel. At the end of the age it will be the Edomite-Jewish association with their Babylonic enmity that will be burned by fire [Obadiah 1:16-18; Rev 18:6-8].
But there is a final twist declared in Encyclopedia Judaica 1971, 10, column 23:

> ***"JEWS BEGAN IN THE 19TH CENTURY TO CALL THEMSELVES HEBREWS AND ISRAELITES IN 1860.***

This coincides with the cry, "anti-Semitism".. If Zionists began so late in history to pretend that they were Israelites or Hebrews, this confirms the hoax that claims "The Jews" are the Israel of the Bible.

CHAPTER 8: GALATIANS AND ISRAEL EXCLUSIVE

The righteousness which is by faith in Jesus and the gospel of free grace is not questioned. The identity of the two parties involved is the vital issue. To whom is the righteousness of faith given? Is it available to everyone on Earth? That there are two parties involved is not questioned and cannot be questioned. In the majority of our translations the two parties are called "Jews" and "Gentiles"; supposedly meaning Israelites and non-Israelites. The contention is that the two parties are the Israelites in Judea and the Israelites of the Dispersion among the nations, both being of Israelite racial stock and totalling all the tribes of Israel.
It is also contended that these are the ones from whom "The Church" [not in the common concept] is drawn, and from whence the Sons of God are to be manifest.
So far this book has tried to establish the following major facts which are not generally accepted:

1. The Law and the Word was given as a covenant to Israel only.
2. That Israel in the New Testament is still the same people they were in the Old Testament.
3. That the so-called Gentiles could only be Israelites.
4. That "the Jews" are not Israelites.

The foundations of these facts are summarised below.

1. THE LAW AND THE WORD GIVEN AS A COVENANT TO ISRAEL ONLY

Many simple, direct Scriptures have been quoted detailing how the Law and the Word were given to Israel alone. These also show the peculiar place of Israel among the other races. There are no direct statements in Scripture to the contrary. There are no indirect Scriptures to the contrary either, other than manufactured 'types' and the misuse of words. That this exclusiveness holds true in the New Testament is shown clearly by the New Testament passages quoted earlier.
The overall position of the whole Bible might be summed up by:

> *Ps 147:19,20* *He showeth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgments unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation: and as for his judgements, they* [the other nations] *have not known them.*

This verse relates exclusively to Israel as a race. The "word" here is *dabar*, the spoken word in the sense of a specific direction, charge, instruction or covenant. "Statutes" here is *choq* which relates to commands that are engraved upon something. This does not say that other nations are not judged by God, but that the basis is different.

2. ISRAEL IN THE NEW TESTAMENT IS THE SAME AS THE OLD TESTAMENT

This has been shown to be the case from several aspects:

[a] That the parties concerned could not have had a new covenant given without first having had an old covenant. So, in the New Covenant could only be made with Israel.

[b] That there is no direct Scripture in either Testament to state that the new covenant is made, or would be made, with any other but the House of Israel and the House of Judah [Heb 8:8]. Together these sum up to the original party which is Jacob - Israel.

[c] That the promises made to *The Fathers* are always shown as being fulfilled in *us their children*.. This indicates the genetic nature of the fulfilment.

[d] That the *middle wall of partition* that is broken down is the wall that was between The House of Judah and the House of Israel, not between Israel and non-Israelites [see the nature of this partition in Isaiah 11].

[e] That the people addressed in the Epistles were all Israelites by race.

[f] That Jesus came to redeem *His people*. There is no record of redemption being spoken of, or being needed, by those who did not have the broken Law Covenant from which to be redeemed.

3. THE GENTILES ARE ISRAELITES

This has been shown from the following aspects:

[a] From the translations of *goi* and *goyim* [Hebrew] and *ethnos* [Greek] being also used of Israel racially. These words do not apply only to non-Israelites.

[b] The direct statements of the Apostles, as already quoted in the chapter entitled *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*.

[c] A good look at *all, whosoever, every* etc., "all" being all of that part being addressed and not "all" of everything.

[d] There is no prophetical stream about the non-Israelites being redeemed or otherwise being included within Israel.

[e] The conventional, religious view is not supported by the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. The traditional view can only be supported by spiritualising away national Israel as being types and shadows.

[f] Typical reactions to this teaching, as presented in the chapter entitled *Reactions to an Exclusive Israel.*.

[g] Specific stumbling blocks, as presented in the chapter entitled, *Stumbling Blocks to an Exclusive Israel.*.

4. "THE JEWS" ARE NOT ISRAELITES

There are several obvious differences to be found:

[a] The words for Jews [Judeans] and Judah are not the same.

[b] There are those of the *Synagogue of Satan* calling themselves "Jews", but who are not [Rev 2:9 and Rev 3:9]. They must exist today in this age.

[c] The non-Semitic Jewry (that is, by religion) could not be Abraham's seed. (The Israelites who adopted the Jewish religion could be classed as Semite Jews, but that is not relevant to the discussion about Jewry versus Israel.)

WHAT IS BEING DISCUSSED

Having reviewed the four major points through this book, we can now have a look into the book of Galatians and examine it on the foundation of the Law and the Prophets.
This chapter will examine some of the commonly misunderstood terms, such as *christ* and *Greeks* to further our understanding of who was talking to whom throughout the reminder of the New Testament Scriptures, following the resurrection of Jesus.

CHRISTOS WITHOUT IESOU [OR CHRIST WITHOUT JESUS]

Sometimes one of these words is used in isolation from the other and at times they are combined. To say that the words are always interchangeable is a presumption. But we are taught the presumption, even if it is an error, as we will see.
A reading of Bible translations does not make clear the differences between:

Christ	and	*Jesus*
Jesus Christ	and	*The Lord Jesus Christ*
Christ Jesus		

In Galatians 3:26 and Gal 3:29, the same word, *christos,* is used. The word simply means "anointed". The concordances erroneously present things like, C*hrist*, *The Messiah, an epithet of Jesus*. This is saying that "christ" is a surname of Jesus. This stays in peoples' minds as if it were a truth, because we have been taught to think that way from usage. This is far from right. When we see the expression "Jesus Christ" it is hard to imagine why the Apostle Paul chose to leave *Iesou* [Jesus] out in some passages whereas he chose to put it in others, without having some reason for doing so. In both Gal 3:16 and Gal 3:29 the word *Iesou* (Jesus) is not there:

Gal. 3:16	*….and to thy seed which is Christ.*
Gal 3:26	*For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.*

Gal 3:29 *And if ye* be *Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*

In these two critical verses we have something else which is anointed! What can it be? What is the subject? Is it not the seed of Abraham, in their generations, according to the original promise? Hence Gal 3:16 reads *and to thy seed which is anointed* and Gal 3:29 reads *and if ye be an anointed* (people) *then ye are Abraham's seed.*

CAN THE PROMISES MADE TO ABRAHAM'S SEED BE SPIRITUALISED?

This is a major issue! That is, are people of every race who are "converted" now the seed of Abraham? Is Jesus the epitome of the whole group? They say this as if Jesus had a seed in fact!

Answers in the affirmative are the foundation of the traditional teachings. They have become the standard teachings since the Reformation. In essence they teach a generalisation that God does not [and did not] exhibit His Sovereign Nature and make any choices on a national or racial basis. That this is clear in the Old Testament is partially accepted by them, but any suggestion that God has not changed in the New Testament is rejected absolutely.

Historically, Rome brought in the teaching that she was the one true church and that anyone of any race could be converted into the Church by acceptance of that Church's dogmas, sacraments and traditions. The Roman church taught that she was Israel. Anyone who was not of the *Holy Apostolic Roman Catholic Church* was stated to be a Gentile. [remember, "Gentile" is a transliterated Latin word, not a Greek word]. This concept has carried into Protestantism from Bible translations based on the Latin Vulgate. Instead of meaning a non-Roman, "Gentile" has come to mean a non-Israelite. This was the concept that Martin Luther had, as did some of the reformers. The word "Gentile" has been a problem ever since. The present view held by the Churches has its origin with the Roman Mother of Harlots and is not in Scripture.

Translators render *ethnos* (nations) in different ways. They do likewise with the word *hellen* (Greek). Both *hellen* and *ethnos* are translated as "Gentile" when it suits the translators, in order to perpetuate the Roman doctrine. Presumably it was considered that, because the Greeks were not of the Jewish nation, they were not considered to be Israelites.

In the Old Testament, we find promises that are made to Abraham which carry through to Abraham's seed, through Isaac. That is, they are made to the people of Israel. The question that arises is, ***If the promises were made to Jesus, as being that promised 'seed' of Galatians 3:16, does this mean that Jesus is Israel?*** As a matter of fact, as He had no earthly father, He could not be the actual 'seed' (s*perma*) of Abraham, or of any other man. However, He was of Israel [and hence an Israelite] by virtue of the fact that He was born of Mary, who was a princess of Judah. The teaching that Jesus was the promised seed of Gal 3:16 is seen to be false, when the verse is carefully translated, directly from the Greek:

> *Now to the Abraham and to the seed of him, the promises were spoken. He says not, And to the seeds as of many, but as of one, and to the seed of thee which is anointed.*

Galatians 3:29 supports this translation and a careful translation gives:

> *But if you are belonging to an anointed* [people]*, then you are of the seed belonging to Abraham, and heirs according to promise.*

Note well that it is "you", not Jesus who is Abraham's seed. "You" here is emphatic **and plural**

In the AV verses we find interesting words like*, Abraham and his seed, promises, as of one, Christ* and *heirs according to the promise*.. Each of these phrases in the Greek presents a different picture from what is presented by the churches.

In Scripture, Jesus is, amongst other things:

[a] The Redeemer of Israel

[b] The Saviour of Israel

[c] The King of Israel

Through Him were all things created, but He is not his own creation [~~other than by bringing about His incarnation by His Own Will~~]! Jesus is the ~~Eternal~~ Son of God, ~~not a created being.~~ If the seed of Jesus is now spiritual Israel, then Jesus would have to be His own redeemer. But in fact, Jesus has no "seed". Unforunately the writer of this book believed in the in carnation

WHO ARE THESE "HEIRS ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE"?

This latter part of verse 29 tells us a lot more, and it helps us to understand more about the *but as of one* in verse 16. The word *kleronomos* (heir) means *a sharer by lot or getting by apportionment* [Strong G2818] and Thayer confirms, *one who receives by lot*. The promise is *epaggelia* [Strong G1860] and means *a divine assurance or pledge*. What was the pledge God made? To whom was it made? To whom was it later confirmed? To find out and to be certain, we must consider the original covenant.

WHO IS THE SEED TO WHOM THE ORIGINAL COVENANTS WERE MADE?

Addressing Abraham, God says,

> *Gen 17:7* *And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.*

Here we have to note some important things.
If Jesus is the *one seed*, then all generations between Abraham and Jesus have been dis-inherited from the covenant! If we say that this promise was made only to Abraham and to "Christ", then it could not have been also confirmed to Isaac and Jacob and their descendants. But it was in fact confirmed to Isaac and Jacob; thus it includes those living between Abraham and Jesus and to Jacob's descendants after the time of Jesus.

> *Romans 15:8* *Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made* ***to the fathers****: …*

Scripture says the promises were made to *The Fathers* and not "Jesus Christ". We are not told that Jesus came to confirm the promises made to Himself, are we? So, the fulfilment must be taken the way it is stated in Scripture. It is fulfilled in the seed of the Fathers. Looking again at the AV version of Galatians 3:16, *now unto Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds as of many, but as of one, and to thy seed which is Christ,* we can see by this statement that there is a limitation of the promise to just one party, namely "the fathers". Being of Israel, Jesus would be of that party. Here we have to ask a very simple question, and that is, if "christ" (an anointed) means "Jesus Christ" would this not mean, ~~that as Jesus is God manifested in the flesh~~, He would be making a covenant with Himself? What purpose would there be for God to make a covenant with Himself? Sincere seekers are misled by this translation which puts in a capital 'C' in christ, because it tries to say that the seed of Abraham is now the seed of Jesus. There is no *in their generations* when taken this way. The divine pledge of Genesis 17:7 was made to Abraham and would not be valid if it was not for all generations, or *in their generations*.. *In their generations* is plural! Yes? Jesus is singular! Yes? Therefore the interpretation of *and thy seed which is Christ*, must be wrong. That the usual interpretation is quite unacceptable can be concluded without great depth of Greek study. God did not make it that complicated. But, the verses can be translated rather than transliterated.
R.K. Phillips in his *What saith the Scriptures* reads the Greek text of Galatians 3 this way:

> *Verse 26. For ye are all Sons of God through faith, in an anointed* [people] *of* [belonging to] *Jesus* [christo is representing a noun in this phrase].
>
> *Verse 29. And, if ye belong to an anointed* [people] *then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to the promise.*

> *Now before anybody rises up in wrath and indignation, let me agree at once that* 'Iesou' *is the same for the Dative form as for the Genitive form, so* 'en christo Iesou' *has two possible translations:*
>
> 1. *In an anointed* [one] *Jesus* … [which simply means Jesus Christ].
> 2. *In an anointed* [people] *of* [belonging to] *Jesus.*

Then Mr. Phillips asks what excuse there might be for not translating the word *Christo/s/ou*, pointing out that a transliterated word means nothing in another language. He also points out that checking this with a concordance will only repeat the errors of the translators.

> Note: When we consider Gal 3:26 and 29, *christos* is used as the dative and genitive cases respectively. The dative must be used after the preposition *en* in verse 26 (in an anointed). In verse 29 it occurs as the genitive, *of*, or *belonging to* an anointed.

If we want to keep on choosing a translation which is not in context to prove a point then we must be making a mistake. This is trying to make the verse fit the theory! One of the reasons why the latter translation is not acceptable was given by a Greek "expert" as being, *because the Gentiles are not Israelites*. But, as the so-called Gentiles that the Apostle Paul addressed in Scripture were outcast Israelites, then the latter translation must be right in this context. It is understandable why the first translation is accepted almost universally. Firstly, it is because of the misuse of "gentile", and secondly because the word *christos* has been transliterated to always mean "Jesus Christ", by translators from early times and this is the problem.

"AS OF ONE" AND "THE ANOINTED SEED"

> *Gal 3:16* *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.*

The expression, *as of one* in Galatians 3:16 is taken as *as of ONE*, inferring Jesus is the ONE. This is the historical interpretation and most commentaries and lexicons comment from this basis. Many will make comments like, *a unique use of the singular* [Vine] or will admit that this *tends to be at variance with the genius of the original languages.*

> Vine — The children of the promise are counted for the 'seed' points firstly to Isaac's birth … The 'children of the promise' indicates that the seed are indeed plural.

From the many meanings of *heis* (one), it is possible to regard either Jesus or Isaac as being the "one" seed of Gal 3:16. Abraham had seven sons apart from Isaac and these are who Gal 3:16 refers to as *the many*. But the seed *as of one* refers to Abraham's seed which is IN Isaac [Gen 21:12], that is, Jacob and his descendants. Romans 9:7 confirms that Isaac is the 'one seed' - *But in Isaac shall they seed be called.* This shows the fulfilment of Genesis 21:12 as being in Isaac's seed. Then the Scripture continues on to say that Isaac is the *one* or the "one seed".

> *Rom 9:10* *And not only this, but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac;*

So the *one* here is Isaac, and not Jesus. If we accept the meaning that it is the seed of Abraham through Isaac which is anointed, does Scripture make better sense? Do not both Testaments then agree? Do they not then witness together?
If we want to confirm this as being the right meaning, we have to determine if there is such a thing as an anointed seed from conception. That there is will be shown in a chapter titled, *Seeds, Natural and Spiritual*

"IN CHRIST" OR "IN JESUS"

The Churches today use the expression *in Jesus* when at times they should use *in christ* or vice-versa. This is not just splitting hairs. The Bible expression *in christ* may be a far cry from *in Jesus*. The expression *in Jesus* comes from the doctrine that is in question here. *In Jesus*, covers up the meaning of *in christ* (in an anointed), the latter sometimes having to do with a certain anointed people. These people can be found through both Testaments. They are that way from conception. But being born that way [i*n christ* (in an anointed people)] does not make them *in Jesus* under the New Testament.
When we consider that *Iesou* (Jesus) occurs 683 times and the word *christos* (christ) only 300 times, why should we treat them as being interchangeable? The text joins them together when they should be joined together. The Apostle Paul sometimes joined them together and sometimes he did not. He must have had a reason. God must have had a reason. But the churches think of both of the words as always having the same meaning, despite the variety of combinations and grammar in which the words are used.
Let us consider an example to show the point.

2 Cor 6:15 *What concord hath Christ with Belial? …*

Young's concordance points out that *'Belial' should not be regarded as a proper name* and *Belial simply means a worthless person*.. In the Old Testament, Belial categorises a particular type of person. In this context we can either assert Jesus has some association with Belial-type people or we can translate it properly as *what concord hath an anointed* (person) *with Belial.* This is in keeping with the context of the chapter, which contrasts several other classes of things with each other. Notice that each class is of the same type:

[a] righteous with unrighteousness (two classes of behaviour)

[b] light with darkness (two components of the visible spectrum)

[c] believer with an infidel (two types of spiritual attitude)

[d] Temple of God with idols (two types of attitude)

Therefore we can go contrary to the other instances and compare "christ" (taken as a specific person) with Belial (a category of person) or we can compare an anointed person (a type of person) with Belial (a type of person).

Heb 11:26 (Moses) *esteeming the reproach of christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt …*

Jesus was not born yet

What did Moses know at that time about Jesus if Jesus was *Christ* in this context? Jesus had not then been ~~incarnated!~~ His name *shall be called Jesus*, ~~but He was not so named at the time of Moses.~~ What Moses did know about in his day was the anointed people! To deny this is to show an impossible bias and to believe a lie. Strong words? They need to be! Moses esteemed the reproach of an anointed people greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. The account of Moses' life bears this out - Moses left the palace to join his people rather than live on in the palace and become Pharaoh in due course.
To become absolutely clear about the use of the word *christos [or christos],* it is necessary to determine if this was the name God gave to His Son, or if it was a title given Him by men. It can be demonstrated that the word is sometimes a common noun in the New Testament and that it is sometimes a proper noun or title.

THE MEDIATOR

Gal 3:19,20 *Wherefore serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels, in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one.*

God had made a covenant with Abraham and his seed, *in their generations*, which was not displaced through the Law. The law was added because of transgressions, until the seed

arrived to whom the promise had been made in the will [Gal 3:19,29]. This seed still has to be Abraham's seed, *in their generations* for the promise made to Abraham to remain valid. Now, this mediator must be in the middle of two other parties. He cannot be one of the parties, can He? 1 Timothy 2:5 tells us that there is one mediator between God and man. Jesus gave Himself a ransom for all, "all" being all of those who were being *bought back*. This is Israel alone. If *God is one* as we are told, could the Law be directly opposed to the promises? The mediator of the New Testament God made with Israel was the man Jesus Anointed. The mediation was with the same people who broke the Old Testament. The heirs are still the same people. The next chapter of Galatians confirms them as being those who were under the Law. This is Israel alone. The Law was the schoolmaster to bring *us* to Jesus who fulfilled the added law (of sacrifice) by making the ultimate sacrifice and thereby doing away with the added law. There is no scope at all to include any other peoples.
What one believes about this matter is mostly influenced by what is taken to be the meaning of the word "gentile".. The wording of the translations are in line with the beliefs of the translators and it is this that creates the difficulties in understanding. Some scholars even say that they translate the way they do because they say the word "gentile" must apply to all non-Israelites. Why ever must it so apply? This is the preconception most Christians have. We have shown that this is not so in the chapter, *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*. The word essentially refers to Israelites who were then scattered throughout the nations of the known world and especially the nations of the former Greek empire. When we accept who the Gentiles are, then it is no longer necessary to bend *it is written* to fit the popular belief. Then we find harmony between the promises and their New Testament fulfilment.

"NEITHER JEW NOR GREEK"

> *Gal 3:28* *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male and female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.*

If we apply what we have learnt about *christos* to this passage, we find it reads: *for ye are all one in an anointed* (people).
This is a parallel with:

> *1 Cor 12:13* *For by one spirit are we all baptised into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles* [*Hellene* - Greeks], *whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one spirit.*

In saying that there is no difference between Jews and Greeks, it must be noted that the terms are national rather than racial. Both are of the one descent from Israel, as Abraham's seed [Gal 3:29]. All Israelites, whether Judean or Greek speaking, whether male or female, or whether slaves or masters, are accepted.
These two verses say the same thing and the interesting thing here is again in the translations. In both verses "Greeks" and "Gentiles" are the same word *Hellen* in the Greek text of these verses. Even the NIV translates *Hellen* as "Gentiles" in the book of Romans more than once because this suits the doctrine of the translators, but they are willing to translate the same word as "Greeks" in Corinthians. How dare they do this? *Hellen* is not even remotely like *ethnos*.
In Galatians 3:28 there is something in common between the "Jews" and the "Greeks" that links them together. In Gal 3:16 and Gal 3:29 we found it is the anointing [*christos*] and in 1 Cor 12:13 it is *one spirit*.. The common linking factor is "anointing" and "spirit". Please do not dismiss this subject of the anointed race. Tradition has avoided it to accommodate their form of "Jews and Gentiles" doctrine.
Now, when we go back, it can be seen how this all ties up. As we have seen before, the two parties are:

1. Israelites in Judea – The Circumcision.
2. Israelites of the Dispersion – The Uncircumcision – or the dispersed amongst the Greeks.

The New Testament re-unites the Judean Israelites and the Dispersion into *One Body* by Calvary. The whole of Israel is the one body. The expression "dispersion" is what we find in John 7:35 where the Pharisees said, *Will He go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles* [more correctly translated, *the dispersion among the Greeks*].
In Ephesians 2:11-22 it is no different. The Dispersion *had become* [were] as strangers but through the same Spirit, with which they were anointed they were able to be reconciled unto God in one body by "the cross", or stake. In one body there is no difference between the Israelite Judeans and the Dispersion.

Eph 2:18 *For through him we both have access by one Spirit, unto the Father.*

The "both" are the two groups (Judean and Dispersed Israelites), or two parts of the one body, having access by the one Spirit.
Then there is also the presentation in Ephesians where we find, *The Commonwealth of Israel*.

Eph 2:12 *That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope* (because of your caste off state)*, and without God in the world* (order) …

This commonwealth, [according to reference 4174 in Thayer's Lexicon], is spoken of as the theocratic or divine commonwealth. The people being addressed by Paul were not currently subject under this divine administration. When they submitted to this administration, they became one with those who were already subject, so then there was no difference. Paul confirms this in Romans 10:12 where he declares, *For there is no difference between the Jew* (Judean) *and the Greek* (Dispersion), *for the Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* [In context, "all" is all of the "Jews" and "Greeks" meaning all of the Israelite Judeans and the Dispersion]. The word *difference* is used as of musical instruments being in tune [Thayer 1293].
Before someone jumps up and down to say that Ephesians 2:12 says these "gentiles" were *without Christ* and therefore could not have been anointed from physical birth, it must be pointed out that there are two different *without*s in the verse.

Eph 2:12 *That at that time ye were* ***without*** *Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and* ***without*** *God in the world.*

The first is *choris* [Strong G5565] which means "separately" or "by itself". These "Gentile Israelites" were on their own apart and separate from the Israelites in Judea but they still had the anointing that came with their birth.
The second "without" is *athoes* and means "God-less" [Strong G112], but they were still Israelites, although they were God-less, in this sense. With this understanding, the whole Bible does not conflict any more in this area. The promises made to the Fathers are fulfilled *in us their children* and *in their generations* and not in some mythical non-Israelite Gentiles or Church that has no 'children' or 'generations'. So we can see that in no way could non-Israelites be genetic children of the Fathers.

WHO ARE THE GREEKS?

The dispersed among the Greeks [John 7:35] - is a telling expression.

John 7:35 *Whither shall he go that we shall not find him? will he go to the dispersed among the Gentiles* [Hellen: Greeks], *and teach the Gentiles* [Hellen: Greeks]*?*

Who would they be talking about as being *the dispersed*? Historically and Biblically, it cannot be any but the House of Israel and the bulk of the House of Judah. That this is so accords with prophecy. Hence as we shall see, "Greeks" is used as a synonym throughout the New Testament for the Dispersion located amongst the nations of the former Greek empire.
To talk about non-Jews being scattered among non-Jews would be silly and meaningless.
In this verse we have another instance of *Hellen* as "gentile" instead of "Greek". If we were to take the meaning of "gentiles" as *belonging to other nations* referring to Israelites scattered

among other nations, this would be acceptable. This mistranslation is also found in the following places where it is rendered as "gentiles". [Note: By 'Judean' we mean 'Israelites of Judea' exclusive of other races from Judea].

Romans 2:10 *To the Jew [Judean] first, and also to the Gentile* [Hellen: Greeks].

Romans 3:9 *… for we have proved both Jews and Gentiles* [Judeans and Hellen: Greeks], *that they are all under sin.*

1 Cor 10:32 *Give no offence, neither to the Jews* [Judeans], *nor to the Gentiles* [Hellen: Greeks], *nor to the church* (assembly of called out ones) *of God.*

1 Cor 12:13 *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles* [Judeans or Hellen: Greeks], …

Now what do these mis-translations do to all that is commonly taught? The mis-translations disguise who is being addressed each time *Hellen* is used as opposed to *ethnos*.. They disguise that they are Israelites of the Dispersion. We are told a Syrophenician woman was a *Greek* by nationality [Mark 7:26]. But she was an Israelite by race if these "Greeks" were Israelites. That she was born in one place does not require that she was of that place by race. *Genos* has to do with kin, family, stock, or a particular people. Mark is telling us of two things, her birth place and her racial origin as being a *Greek*.. That Jesus did not at that time immediately speak to her was because He had not yet been rejected by the Judean side of Israel. This does not say that this woman was not an Israelite. This only shows again that there were the two parts of Israel. This woman called Jesus *Son of David* and she came to ask Jesus for something. The word used for "asked" is *aiteo* which is used indicating familiarity or of being on an equal footing with the person of whom the request is being made. That the Judeans thought of the Dispersion as "dogs" is well known. She is described as *kunarion*, or a little dog, but these ate from the table of their masters! Jesus told her that her faith was great. She knew from the Word of God that THE Nations of Israel would be blessed and she came for her blessing. Jesus said that He did this *for this saying* which she said. There was a reason for Him to say this. Yet, today we are taught that she is an example of a non-Israelite "Gentile" obtaining a healing from Jesus!

IN THE BOOK OF ROMANS we find that the corrected translation of *Hellen* as "Greeks" rather than "Gentiles" gives a whole new direction. Both "Judeans and the Dispersion" are parts of the one body. There is a common connection with the Law which was only given to Israel as a whole. Paul tells *of the work of the Law written on their hearts*.. This is a fulfilment of prophecy given only to and about Israel [Jer 31:31], under the new covenant. At that time only one part [the Judean side] of the whole race of Israel was acknowledging the Law. The other side of Israel was called the Uncircumcision because they were not acknowledging the Law. But both parts are under sin. Throughout this Book of Romans there is much reference to the Law. The Book is written to those who were under the Law [Rom 3:19], that is, to Israel. The book is not addressed to other races.

IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12:13, above, is another place where *Hellen* is translated as "Gentile" instead of "Greeks". The section begins with a definition in the first verse as to who these "Greeks" were.

1 Cor 10:1 *… how that our fathers … all passed through the sea … were all baptized unto Moses …*

This could not be said of any non-Israelite race. This whole passage tells that they were Israelites. It tells of their early history!

1 Cor 12:13 *For by one spirit are we baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles* [Hellen: Greeks], …

That is, whether from Judea or from the Dispersion. This is what has been shown earlier where the common factor connecting these two peoples was the One Spirit and the Anointing. But, why does the Apostle Paul not use the word *ethnos* which is often also translated as "gentile"? Why does Paul specify *hellen* (or Greek) when it comes to important doctrine? Could this be in order that there might be no mistake about his meaning? Is it that

there might be no mistake about who he is isolating? Paul was writing to his 'brethren' – fellow Israelites scattered in Asia and nearby areas, as opposed to the former *nations of Israel* as they were known in the Old Testament. (We do not pay sufficient attention to the use of such titles – each one is used in accordance with the subject matter and authority behind the situation.)

IN ALL THE NEW TESTAMENT we must register that the word *Hellen* (Greek) and its variations are used thirty five times. This is a lot of times! There is never one proposition that the word might mean someone who is not an Israelite. The translators seem to have thought that this should have been so because they at times switch the translation to "gentiles", which they thought might suggest non-Israelites. There is no explanation ever presented to support the view that "Greeks" means all the "non-Jewish" races.

FROM HISTORY we find just where the body of the Dispersion was at that time following the captivities in Assyria and Babylon. They were about parts of the old Greek empire – in Northern Greece and Asia Minor. It is not unreasonable then that they should be called "Greeks", because this is where they were found. We can also see this from where the Apostle Paul travelled; this is the area where they were. It does not say that they were Greeks by race or that they were non-Israelites. The concordances suggest that they were "Greek speaking".

COMMENT: The Apostle Paul came from the city of Tarsus in Cilicia; this made him one of the "Greeks".. He was a Hebrew by birth, a Benjamite by tribe, and a Roman by citizenship. And he was a "Jew" (Judean) because he was brought up in Judea and a Pharisee, trained in Judaism. [Never forget these dual meanings of "Jew"!]. A national term does not determine racial origin in itself. Can anyone be justified in continuing to say that race and birthplace are always the same to prove a doctrine? Yet, this is what we hear as a common teaching!

CHILDREN OF PROMISE

Gal 4:28 *Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.*

This passage is an allegory [v24] and a comparison of relationships between those who are under the Law and those of them who have become partakers of the promise under the New Testament. The Law is the issue all the way through. The issue is not Israelites and non-Israelites, because the non-Israelites never had the Law-covenant in the first place. In verse 5 we are told Jesus came *to redeem them who were under the Law* that *WE might receive the adoption* (placing) *of* (as) *sons*.. There is never a suggestion about any who were not "brethren" being redeemed or of receiving the adoption. They all have to be brothers or "brethren" of the same race. They are all *adelphos* or *kinsmen from the same womb*. Some will not like this definition so, let us consider some lexicon and dictionary sources.

THE WORD 'BRETHREN'

Thayer:	From the same womb … a brother … any blood relation or kinsman … having the same ancestor … belonging to the same people … a fellow-man … one having descended from the same father.
Vine:	Adelphos denotes a brother or near kinsman. In the plural, a community based on identity of origin of life.
Davidson:	Adelphos [*A* plus *delphus* … the womb] a brother, a near kinsman or relative; one of the same nation or nature.
Bullinger:	Adelphos = brother, or gen, near kinsman, then in the plural, a vital community based on identity of origin.

This word is translated over 100 times as *brother*, for example, Peter and James *his brother* [Matt 4:18]; James and John, *his brother* [Matt 17:1]. When we read this word, *brethren,* as used in all the epistles, we can now see exactly what the word means. They are not spiritual brethren! They are kinsmen. They are all Israelites! In no way can they be *fellow-believers*

from all non-kinsman races. We will be looking at this again (in the chapter *Seeds, Natural and Spiritual*). These are the ones who are told to *look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged, look unto Abraham your father, and Sarah that bare you …* [Isaiah 51:1,2]. This limits the scope to those who came from Abraham and Sarah.

ISAAC … HEARING FAITH … AND FREEBORN SONS

All that will be said here is that again we have, in Galatians 4:29, what was mentioned earlier about *born of the Spirit*. This is the allegorical equivalent of the anointed people being conceived containing that spirit. Those people could remain under the Law, or come under Grace. They are the same people who began under the Law [Gal 3:3]. They were able to subject themselves either to the works of the Law or to *the hearing of faith* [Gal 3:5] and to become righteous through hearing, believing and doing what God asked, as Abraham did. They were never justified just because they were born Israelites. The term "freeborn sons" that some use is used to suggest that somehow this can refer to other than Israelites.

Acts 13:39 *And by him* [that is, Jesus] *all that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses.*

The Apostle Paul was talking again about the fulfilment of the promises that had been made to the **fathers OF ISRAEL**, as those people who had been given the Law of Moses. Law and grace are an issue to Israel only. The Edomite leaders of the Judean nation thought that physical birth gave them the right status with God when they protested that Abraham was their father, but Jesus made it clear to them they were not Abraham's children. [In John 8:37 we can see that there is a difference between Abraham's seed and Abraham's children.] Jesus said to them, *ye cannot hear my words*. Likewise Ishmael who was born after the flesh could not [and cannot] "hear".. He is cast out. The linear descendants through Isaac could still be fools and be slow of heart to believe. They could be deceived or be bewitched. The truth is to be obeyed. Jesus had been *evidently set forth crucified among you*. Paul was specific as to whom he was addressing. It is these Israelites who have to choose, not other races.

James 2:21,22 *Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect?*

Note: In this section in the Book of James about faith and works, the *our* in *Abraham OUR father* is written unto Twelve Tribes [James 1:1]. Be fair here. Where is it declared that this is written to anyone else? *He begat US with the word of Truth* [James 1:18]. Where is it written that He begets any other than Israelites by the Word of Truth?

IN THEE SHALL ALL NATIONS BE BLESSED

Gal 3:7-9 *Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached* (proclaimed) *before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*

This verse together with and the verses below, are favoured by universalists because they seem to present a universal gospel for all races. "Nations" is sometimes translated emotively as "Heathen" to try to add weight to the universal argument. To understand any passage of Scripture it is necessary to look at it as a whole by going back to the prophecy behind it to see what it is fulfilling.

To Abraham:

Gen 12:2,3 *And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and will curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall* ***all families of the earth*** *be blessed.*

Gen 18:18 *Seeing that Abraham shall surely become a great and a mighty nation, and all* ***the nations of the earth*** *shall be blessed in him?*

Gen 22:18 *And in thy seed shall all* ***the nations of the earth*** *be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.*

To Isaac:

Gen 26:3 *Sojourn in this land, and I will be with three, and will bless thee; for unto thee, and unto thy seed,* ***I will give all these countries****, and I will perform the oath that I sware unto Abraham thy father.*

To Jacob:

Gen 28:14 *And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the* ***families of the earth*** *be blessed.*

To Israel:

Psalm 22:27 *All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all* ***the kindreds of the nations*** *shall worship before thee.*

Here are six important verses which are used to support the doctrine of universal racial salvation. Indeed, they do appear to give valid support on the surface. But do they actually say what the religious translators make them say? Is this the problem here?

THE "FAMILIES OF THE EARTH" BEING BLESSED IN ABRAHAM

The major source of error in these *blessing* passages is what we mean by certain words. We have different words translated as *earth* and the *ground*, *countries* and the *land*, as also occurs with the words translated *nations*, *families* and *kindreds.* Although an extensive technical Hebrew language exposition is beyond the scope of this book, there are things that need to be pointed out.

Originally Abraham was told to go from his father's house unto an *eretz* that God would show him. If *eretz* here is the whole Earth, then Abraham must have gone to another planet! Abraham was told *all The 'Earth' which thou seeth, I will give thee*. He was told to arise and walk through the earth. Did he walk across the whole globe? So we have to ask if this 'earth' is the whole earth or the promised land. It is not all the '*eretz*s of all the races on earth. Abraham was told to get himself out of his present *earth* and to go to *THE earth*. There are many references which give confirmation of the meaning. *THE earth* does not mean the whole globe, but rather that portion belonging to the particular area or person under consideration.

Contrary to popular presentation, we must note that in Genesis 12:3, the 'them' *in I will bless them* is plural, whereas the 'him' in *I will curse him* is singular. The Hebrew allows for two possible translations of *be blessed*, namely:

may be blessed in, or by, association with thee, and

*may bless themselve*s [as the RV footnote says].

Some awkward questions could be posed here if it was to be taken that *all nations* had the meaning of "every race on earth":

1. If those who curse Abraham are cursed, how could those so cursed be part of *all nations* which were to be blessed?
2. Were the Egyptians blessed or cursed through Israel's presence during their captivity and also in the Exodus?
3. When the Children of Israel went into the Promised Land, they were told to exterminate all the Canaanite nations. Was not that an unusual way of blessing the Canaanites? After all, they were supposed to be part of *all nations*. Likewise Amalek was to be exterminated.
4. In Deut 23:6, God commanded Israel that they should not seek the peace or the prosperity of the Ammonites and the Moabites right up to the end of the age. Ezra 9:12 indicates similar treatment of the non-Israelites in the land. This is hardly a blessing on those nations, is it?
5. When The House of Judah was in captivity in Babylon, is there any evidence of Israel being a blessing to Babylon?

6. When the House of Israel was in captivity in Assyria, did this make the Assyrians blossom?
7. In prophecy why are all the forecasts concerning non-Israel nations always detailing them as being servants to Israel and for them to perish if they refuse this destiny? This is so right up to the end of the age.
8. The promise to Abraham was to "ALL" nations without any exceptions. "All" cannot include those who are cursed and those God says that He hates. Hence "all" means *all the nations of Israel*.

Throughout Scripture, Israel was *to dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations* [Num 23:9]. Prophecy sustains this to the end.

Daniel 7:27 — *And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve him.*

Isaiah 60:12 — *For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.*

Zech 14:16,17 — *And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. And it shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.*

Israel and Judah were scattered among *all nations*, but are these other nations to be blessed? Jeremiah does not agree.

Jer 30:11 — *… though I make **a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee**, yet I will not make a full end of thee …*

Jeremiah repeats this in Jer 46:28, addressing this to Jacob.
In all these Scriptures we can see the unique place of Israel among the other nations. This continues after Jesus returns and Israel reigns with ~~God~~ JESUS over the other nations. Finally there will be no more death. What a blessing! The blessing is either given by this seed, or by the Act of God.

THE PROMISE AND "THY SEED" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Acts 3:25 — *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 the kindreds of the earth be blessed.*

Only Isrealites are being addressed here! We can find references in Scripture to the families [plural] of Israel. "Kindreds" is *patriai* which all lexicons give as kindreds from one ancestor. The Hebrew *mishpachah*' supports 'family' 288 times and it is used of the subdivisions of Israel. The Tribes became national identities but were of one racial group from one ancestor. Israel is still an exclusive race existing as families or nations. It is unto these Jesus was sent.

Acts 3:26 — *Unto **you** first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless **you**, in turning every one of **you** from his iniquities.*

In context, *you* still is the Israelites being addressed.
As we said, without continual recourse to the Old Testament origins, it is impossible to rightly interpret passages in the New Testament. Only by going back can we know what *all nations* means and only then find a doctrine that is 100% consistent. Galatians 3:8 can no longer be allowed as an "out" for those preaching universal racial salvation. When we take Scripture as originally written in the Hebrew and Greek, we find that conflicts disappear. We can understand that an exclusive Israel in the Old Testament remains an exclusive Israel in the New Testament. The promises are ever fulfilled *in us their children* and never in others. They are fulfilled in *brethren* of the same *kin*. The blessings of the Patriarchs [as given by Jacob in Genesis 48 and by Moses in Deut 33] for *the last days* still apply separately to each of that same group of peoples, who are being specified. These are the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh. In Genesis 49 Jacob gives his prophecy about what will befall each individual Tribe of Israel, in the last days. These are limited, specific and definite. We

cannot find prophecy for the application of the blessings given by the patriarchs as being applicable to all other races. This is why *all nations* is commonly taken wrongly today as meaning every race on earth. The statement of Romans 4:11, *a father of all them that believe* is only in the context of Israel.

For the *last days*, Jacob gave his blessings to his children one by one [Genesis 49]. The blessings were to his seed only. They were not to other seeds. The New Testament is still made only with the House of Israel and the House of Judah [Heb 8:8]. The word *children* in Galatians 3:7 [the Children of Abraham] is *huios* which denotes kinship or physical offspring. [Note: This word is also used of animals, so it cannot refer to spiritual offspring in the way commonly taken!]

How can the Patriarchal blessings apply to all races? If they were all the same, what would be the point of separation? And, if they are for the "last days", why not accept this as a reality, rather than saying that some singular multi-racial church that has nothing to do with these Twelve Tribes is the recipient of these blessings?

As it has been pointed out, translators show what they believe in their translations. For instance, in Galatians 3:8 the words translated *heathen* and *nations* are identical. The translation as *heathen* gives an entirely different connotation to the verse. The nations whom God would justify by belief were not heathen, but were of Israel. The proof of this is that this is the fulfilment of the prophecy made by the Patriarchs. This is confirmed – *by him are ye justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses* … These justified people must have first been under the Law of Moses, so they could only be Israelites. Most of this book of Galatians is written relating Law and Grace to the one people. The whole argument might be summed up by questioning whether or not they were going to remain under the schoolmaster or whether they were going to believe God as Abraham did. What they were to believe was that Jesus had redeemed Israel and that Jesus was the Son of God.

Ultimately, that which is reserved for Israel, namely redemption, salvation, resurrection to eternal life, belongs only to Israel. It is their inheritance from Abraham, according to the promise made by God *to the fathers* of Israel.

CHAPTER 9: ADOPTION

The commonly accepted doctrine about *Jews and Gentiles* provides a basis for the thought that non-Israelites can be *adopted* into Israel. In the Old Testament it is claimed that *strangers* who became circumcised, kept the Passover and Law of Moses and became *as Israel*. On the surface this looks to be a reasonable case and appears to fit together in a unified view.
However, these views are contested in this chapter. The intention is to show:

[a] That *adoption* refers to the *adoption of Sons* out of the Children of Israel, 'sons' being *huios* and 'children' being *teknon*.

[b] That *strangers* in the Old Testament may often refer to Israelites who were resident among other nations, living apart from the main body of Israel.

The word *strangers*, and others like it, are also be found in the New Testament. When we base our examination on the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, we find in the New Testament the context is identical with the Old Testament. The next chapter shows there are several different words translated as *strangers* in both Testaments. Both this and the next chapter complement each other to conclude that a*doption* can never mean that non-Israelites somehow become Israelites or become *as Israel*.

THE WORD "ADOPTION"

The word translated poorly as "adoption" is *huiothesia* and it occurs only five times in the New Testament. It is not found in the gospels although the proper meaning or principle is there. Before we examine the five Scriptures, and the context in which they are used, it is better to first look at the word *huiothesia* itself. Lexicons do not agree precisely on the meaning of the word. Typically, they give meanings such as, *adoption as a son,* but this is a vague compromise.
Vine states *huiothesia* is a composite word consisting of:

Huios	[a] son. He is already a son
Thesis	a placing, or setting. The son is now restored

Hence, *the placing of a son* or *the placing of sons*.
From Bullinger's comments::

> *Adoption = sonship. An adopted child may partake of all the privileges of the family, yet is not begotten and born in the family. But the subjects of this verse* ***are begotten of the Spirit*** *[John 3:6] and are, therefore,* ***sons of God by spiritual generation****. It is therefore a real sonship-spirit that enables then to cry 'Abba Father'.*

Once we can penetrate the religious explanation, we find Bullinger is close to the Bible's truth. The Israelites, who were the subject of John 3:6, contain spirit from their conception. They are born with the potential to be sons of God. However, in their dispersed or caste-off state, due to their disobedience and disbelief, they are not acceptable as sons of God. They are still to be "placed" as sons of God and this happens when they prove themselves to be worthy – just as Abraham did – be demonstrating their belief. Until that time they are known merely as children of God.

Jesus made it crystal clear to Nicodemus that anyone not born of this "spiritual generation" cannot acquire it later in life:

> *John 3:5* *Except a man be born* [begotten] *again* [from above], *he cannot* [is not able] *to see* [perceive] *the Kingdom of God ….*

Jesus used *anothen* [from above] not *deuteros* [a second time], as Nicodemus did.
This is why Jesus said that which is begotten of spirit is spirit and that which is begotten of flesh is flesh. Jesus is telling us there are two orders of human beings – those that are of the spirit and those that are of the flesh – spirit beings and natural beings. The spirit carrying

being contains the spirit from conception. The natural or non-carrying being does not contain the spirit at conception and can never acquire it.
The word *huiothesia* is never used to mean *make anyone a son*. It is to *place a son*. Each son who is placed already exists as a son. The Greek does not suggest making anyone a son and some lexicons point this out. Strong G5206 also gives *the placing of a son*.
Following this up in Thayer we find:

> *That relationship which God was pleased to establish between himself and the Israelites, in preference to all other nations … that blessed state looked for in the future life after the visible return of Christ from heaven …*

The word appears in five verses where we should read *placing of a son* rather than "adoption" and so let us look at the five verses where the word is used.

THE FIRST ADOPTION VERSE

Rom 8:15 **For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption** (placing of a son)**, whereby we cry, Abba, father.**

It is this indwelling spirit which enables those who are begotten from above to cry [*krazo*] "Abba Father". Dr. Bullinger's comments:

> *Abba that is, father. Is said that slaves were never allowed to use the word Abba. Strictly therefore, it can be employed only by those who have received the gift of the Divine nature.*

Paul continues:

v16 *The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.*

We must clearly recognise to whom this book of Romans is written. This is why it was necessary in earlier chapters to establish that Paul was writing to Israelites only. Only then can we understand what Paul goes on to say in the next verse.

v17 *And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ …*

There is no "Jesus" in this verse. This has been covered in an earlier chapter. It is further pointed out:

> *As xristos* [christos] *is in the genitive case, it means 'of' or 'belonging to' an anointed. There is no sound reason why the AV should alter this to 'with Christ'. ~~Surely He cannot be regarded as a joint-heir to these promises.~~*

We are joint-heirs with Jesus

Consequently, verse 17 is better translated:

> *If we are children then we are heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs belonging to an anointed people.*

The "joint" heirs refers to all of Israel, that is, the circumcised and the uncircumcised who constitute the two parts of the one anointed people.

THE SECOND ADOPTION VERSE

Rom 8:22,23 **For we know that the whole creation** (ktisis) **groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption** (placing as sons)**, to wit, the redemption of our body.**

In this verse we can see an explanation of what *adoption* is, namely the redemption of our body. It only remains to establish if this redemption is available to all and sundry. There is no way *huiothesia* refers to the popular concept of presently bringing non-Israelites into Israel.
Ktisis refers to the whole Israel nation or *the whole creation* that is groaning waiting for the placing as sons. This is confirmed in Isaiah 43:1 where we read, *But now saith the Lord* [that is, Jehovah] *that created thee, O Jacob, and He that formed thee, O Israel*. *Ktisis* (creation) in the *whole creation* does not mean all races, but means those of the two sections of God's race who are waiting [together] for *the placing of Sons* – "and not only they" refers to the

Uncircumcision or Dispersion and "but ourselves also" refers to the Israelites of the Circumcision in Judea.

THE THIRD ADOPTION VERSE

Rom 9:3,4 **For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh; who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption** (placing as sons)**, and the glory, and the covenants, the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises.**

If they are Israelites, then they do not include others than Israelites. This must be a difficult passage for those who want to insist on maintaining the traditional teaching that anyone of any seed can become an Israelite. The *kinsmen according to the flesh* and *brethren* [from the womb] are straight statements. So is, "**Who ARE Israelites**".

To whom was this covenant made? The giving of the Law that pertained to Israel was given by the disposition of angels [Acts 7:53]. The new covenant was made with the same Israel that had the old covenant. Under "disposition" (*diatheke*), Thayer gives:

> *As the new and far more excellent bond of friendship which God, in Messiah's time would enter into with* ***the people of Israel****.*

Many lexicons also limit this to Israel, as does the context:

To whom was the giving of the Law?	This law-giving was made to Israel alone.
To whom are the promises?	These were the promises to Israel alone, as the children of the Fathers.
To whom is the service?	Again, this Levitical law was exclusive to Israel.

In connection with the last point, see Rom 9:3 and Thayer's comment about *service*:

Thayer	*latreia*	The service, or worship of God according to the requirements of Levitical law.

The verse itself states *who* **ARE** *Israelites*. So, if they are Israelites only who are *placed as sons*, where is the scope for saying such placement could possibly refer to non-Israelites? To find any statement, anywhere in Scripture, saying that these things pertain to non-Israelites, is impossible.

So, the *placing as sons* is not for everyone of every race and God sets the limits.

Exodus 33:19	*… and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.*
Romans 9:18	*Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*

God is always sovereign! God is gracious to those that He chooses!

Hence this third adoption verse should read, "**WHO ARE ISRAELITES, TO WHOM BELONGS THE PLACING OF SONS**". This can never refer to a church made up from all races. The subject refers always to the redemption and restoration of Israel [Jacob]. There are no references to other than the regathering of Israel. The remnant is always the remnant of Israel, *who ARE Israelites*.. There is no record of any remnant of others outside of Israel.

THE FOURTH ADOPTION VERSE

Galatians 4:5 **To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption** (placing) **of sons.**

The annoying thing with the AV handling of this verse is that it adds "of sons" in this instance but not in the others.

This is a very straightforward statement as to whom the Son of God came to redeem. It was those who were under the law [Israel only]. These also are the only ones who can receive the

adoption [or placing] *of sons*. These are the *we* in the verse. Never is there a proposition in Scripture that others should be redeemed, or needed to be redeemed.

Strong G1805	*exagorazo* (redeem)	To buy up, that is, ransom; fig to rescue from loss [improve opportunity] … redeem … [to buy out *ek* as of purchasing a slave to free him].
Thayer	*exagorazo* (redeem)	By payment of a price to recover from the power of another … metaphoric of Christ freeing the elect from the dominion of the Mosaic law at the price of his vicarious death … to buy up for one's self, for one's own use.

It was Israel who was to be bought back by the Redeemer of Israel.
The "receive" in this verse contains the prefix *apo* which makes "receive" mean *to receive back again what is due*.. Therefore these are Israelites who are being re-instated to their former position with God. *To receive back again* therefore cannot include any who did not originally have this position; it cannot mean non-Israel.
Galatians 3:24 tells us that the child is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father. *But when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the Law, to redeem them that were under the Law*. There is a progression from childhood to sonship in this chapter. This sonship is fully realised at the time of the manifestation of the sons of God. *'Children of God'* is not a title, but *'Sons of God'* is a title. Rom 8:18-23 gives the connection with "adoption":

v18	*… the glory which shall be revealed in us*
v19	*… the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God*
v20	*… hope …*
v21	*… shall be …*
v23	*… waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body*

The time of the manifestation of the sons of God is an important subject.

1 John 3:2	*Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.*

It is pointed out that one does not become a man without first having been a child. The child is under the schoolmaster. The child is the man earlier in time**. He is still the same person. HE IS STILL OF THE SAME RACE AND BLOODLINE**! Today we are taught that anyone of any race can become a son. This is based on the presumption that every person of every race was given the Law of Moses and that all races are the same because, "they all came from Adam".. This is manifestly not true! This is why the first chapter of this book quoted so many verses to authenticate the exclusive position of Israel nationally in regard to the giving of the Law.

THE FIFTH ADOPTION VERSE

Eph 1:5	**Having predestinated us unto The adoption** (placing as sons) **of children ~~by~~ in Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.**

Strong G4309	*proorizo* (predestinate) -	to limit in advance or to determine before.
Thayer	*proorizo* (predestinate) -	To predetermine, decide beforehand, to foreordain, to appoint beforehand.

That there might be any limit in advance on who can become sons might find sentimental objections among sentimental Christians who think that *whosoever* has no limits. *According to the good pleasure of His will* might also find sentimental objections, but God is still sovereign and selective, and He is as unchanging as ever. The "good pleasure" (*eudokia*) is given as:

Strong G2107	Satisfaction, delight, purpose etc.
Thayer	Delight, pleasure, satisfaction

We have looked at the limitations in this connection in regard to the exclusiveness of Israel in the New Testament. God does choose according to His purpose! For *thelema* (His will), we find:

Strong G2307	is a determination … desire … will … pleasure.
Thayer	What one wishes or has determined shall be done … of what God wishes to be done by us.

The "us" in the verse is selective and not everyone of every race. Talking of God's selection, the Apostle Paul also asks this question, *How is anyone able to argue with God*?

HOW CAN ANY ARGUE WITH GOD?

Rom 9:20-22 *Nay but, O man, who art thou who repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?*

Arguing with God is impossible. The *we* in this book of Romans is those to whom it is written. The relationship of this peculiar people, in particular, to the Law, is an issue in the books of Romans and Galatians. For this reason the argument Paul makes does not apply to all peoples but is limited to the two sections of God's people, Israel.
Can any really argue with God about His selection and limiting in advance? Paul goes on to tell of the *vessels afore prepared unto glory*. This is referring to Israelites only in the Book of Life. God determined long ago that it would not be everyone of every race. No, in context, it is to *Jews and Greeks* [The Israelites in Judea and the Dispersion]. Paul again goes on to associate the "Greeks" with those to whom Hosea prophesied, namely the House of Israel.

WHAT IS THE TEACHING ABOUT ADOPTION?

In all five occurrences of the word adoption in the New Testament, each is associated with Israel. At this point some might say, *So what?, Israel is spiritualised in the New Testament*.. If Israel was not spiritualised when the Apostle Paul wrote his epistles, when was this change made? Again, this is one of the reasons why this point had to be covered in an earlier chapter to show that the common view is not valid. The thrust of Scripture is that the change is within the Israel people who now may receive sonship - that is, be reinstated and placed as Sons of God. It is not a change of non-Israelites into Israelites, but of those sons of Jacob who become worthy to have such a title. 1 John 3:2 tells us that we are now the Sons of God and that when Jesus returns we shall be like Him.

WHO ARE THESE SONS?

In the New Testament there are two Greek words translated as "son" or "sons".. These words are not interchangeable. The Lexicons give enlarged coverage to these two words, so that the main points only can be presented here.

1. **TEKNON** [Strong G5043].

This is translated as child 77 times, daughter 1 time and son 21 times and means *a child*.

Vine states	In contrast to *huios*, son, [see below] it gives prominence to the fact of birth, whereas huios stresses the dignity and character of the relationship.
Acts 13:33	… *Thou art My son* [huios], …

All Israelites are *teknon* [children] of God but not all Israelites will be called *huios* [sons] of God. The word *huios* is used in a way that involves the character, orderliness and discipline of a particular group.
From Thayer's compilation we find:

offspring, children, a male child, a son … the name transferred to that intimate and reciprocal relationship formed between men by the bonds of love, friendship, trust, just as between parents and children … in affectionate address, such as patrons, helpers, teachers and the like employ: my child … in the NT, pupils or disciples are called children of their teachers, because the latter by their instruction nourish the minds of their pupils and mould their characters … ***children of God: in the OT of "the people of Israel" as especially dear to God, in the NT, in Paul's writings, all who are led by the Spirit of God and thus closely related to God*** *…* like only Isreal

The religious tone of the comment almost buries the truth! When were the Children of Israel ever downgraded to the status of being mere "dear" to God! But despite this bias, it seems they still cannot get away from the basic fact the Children of Israel were in a different relationship with God in comparison with all other races.

2. HUIOS [Strong 5207]

This word occurs 380 times, and is translated mainly as "son", or "child".. It does denote kinship. [Note this well!]

Thayer	*A son; rarely used for the young of animals; generally used of the offspring of men … in a wider sense, a descendant, one of the posterity of any one … used to describe those who are born again … and hereafter in the blessedness and glory of the life eternal will openly wear this dignity of the sons of God.*
Vine	*Primarily signifies the relation of offspring to parent. [John 9:18-20 and Gal 4:30]*

Although Thayer's comment reflects those of the church, the special nature of those who are *begotten from above* (not *born again*) is nevertheless present. This goes to show how vigilant we have to be when we read the lexicons and other such references - they all have their in-built religious beliefs that colour their discussions.
Let us look at some of the verses where *huios* is found:

Rom 8:14	*For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.*
Rom 8:19	*For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.*
Gal 4:5	*… that we might receive the adoption of sons.*
Gal 4:7	*Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son: and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.*
2 Cor 6:18	*… ye shall be my sons and daughters, …*
Heb 2:10	*… in bringing many sons unto glory …*

The important thing to establish is the origin of these *sons of God.* What is clear is that they come from a state of servanthood under the Law. From there they come to a state where they can be placed in sonship. That they do not originate from those who were never under the Law is clear. There is no possible way *adoption* can relate to the adoption of non-Israelites into Israel.
There is another point in Greek which might help understanding of this subject. If we consider Galatians 4:5 again, *That we might receive the adoption of Sons*, the word *apo-lambano* (receive) is a compound word. The prefix *apo* has the force of *back again*.. These particular people must be receiving something back which they had possessed at some previous time. Hosea, prophesying to Israel, nails this:

Hosea 1:10 *… and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them* **[that is, Israel]** *ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God.*

In this verse *My people* and *sons* are different terms.

HE CAME UNTO HIS OWN

John 1:11,12 *He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, …*

Once again, we need to determine the origin of the Sons of God. They are from among *His own*. Jesus came to His own ~~possessions~~ people but those in control of these ~~possessions~~ people did not receive Him ~~as the owner~~. On the other hand, the common people there heard Him gladly and recognised His authority. Their belief enabled them to become the Sons of God once again. The rulers who questioned His authority are to be cast out. *As many* [that is, of Israel] *as are led by the Spirit, they are the Sons of God* [Rom 8:14]. This is the qualification. It is from this verse that the verses containing the word "adoption" follow on.
In the next chapter we will see whether or not *strangers* could join themselves to Israel and become *as Israel,* in the Old Testament.

Note:
. This verse is a reference to the Father, not to Christ. A study of the context reveals that this section opens in verse 6 by telling us, "There came a man who was sent by God…." We are told, "God is light," and that God's light shown through Jesus Christ and made him the light of the world. Though God was in the world in many ways, including through His Son, the world did not recognize Him

CHAPTER 10: PILGRIMS, STRANGERS AND ISRAEL

In the Old Testament there are Scriptures that certainly look as if they are saying that non-Israelite strangers could become circumcised, keep the Passover, the Laws of Moses and thus become as *one born in the land*. This is the matter which is being questioned.

The immediate necessity is to look at the word *stranger* and similar words like *foreigner, sojourner* and *alien*.. In both the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament there are many different words loosely translated as *strangers, foreigners* and *servants*, etc and this is the problem. Our translators [this includes the NIV] have had no system of consistent rendering of any of these words. That there are *strangers* who are Israelites and *strangers* who are not Israelites, is very obvious.

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT there are eight words which are translated *as stranger, strangers, foreigner, sojourners or aliens* and some clarification is necessary. Without this clarification we have translations which make the Bible appear contradictory and inconsistent.

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT there are ten words which are variously translated, so that it is clear that each word in the original has a different meaning. Some of the New Testament quotations are from Old Testament origins and therefore they show a close alliance between the two languages.

WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENT KINDS OF STRANGERS?

The most commonly mis-understood word is *ger*, which is translated as "stranger(s)" 86 times out of the 92 times it occurs in the Old Testament. The meaning of this word might be summarised as being an Israelite who lives apart from the main body of Israel. That is, living among, or in the land, of other races. The important fact is that this stranger is an Israelite by race.

It is not hard to find instances where the translators have translated the same Hebrew word, in the same context, into two different English words. This makes immediate nonsense of those verses when taken as translated.

Following are the main Hebrew words translated *stranger, foreigner, sojourner,* etc. The comments include a summation of the meaning of the key terms and the status of the people covered by those terms in the eyes of the Law. The summations are based on usage of the word in Scripture, as shown throughout this chapter. The words are:

H4033	*maguwr*	(noun) from 1481 in the sense of lodging; a temporary abode; by extens. a permanent residence: - dwelling, pilgrimage, where sojourn, be a stranger. For example: Gen 17:8, *the land wherein thou art a stranger.* It is used of the places where Abraham, Isaac and Jacob dwelled in their travels or pilgrimage. We will use the term *dweller.*
H1616	*ger*	(noun) a guest; by impl. a foreigner: alien, sojourner. For example, Gen 15:13, *Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs.* A person of one's own blood or race who is visiting in the district and is not known to the residents of the area. Israelites who were not present at the covenant sanctification ceremony in Mount Sinai (such as the descendants of Judah's son, Zerah). Moses named his son, Gershom, because he was visiting from Egypt and Canaan (as opposed to being an exile). The *gerim* have equal rights before the law and can accumulate wealth in Israel. We will use the term *kinsman-visitor* (to show the genetic connection).

H2114 *zuwr*

(verb - used as a participle with the force of a noun) to turn aside (espec for lodging); hence to be a foreigner, strange, profane; spec. to commit adultery: (come from) another (man, place), fanner, go away, strange (-r, thing, woman).

For example, Num 16:40, … *no stranger which is not of the seed of Israel.* The basic thought is of non-acquaintance and non-relatedness. A complete alien; no racial connection.. In our context, one who is not an Israelite, Shemite or Hebrew. This person has no rights or protection under the Law and will be killed on sight if found near the Temple.

We will use the term *alien.*

H5236 *nekar*

(noun) from 5234. Foreign, or (concr) a foreigner, or (abstr.) heathendom: - alien, strange, stranger.

For example, Gen 17:12, *And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house,* **or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed** (not of your own immediate family).

Refers to what is foreign to a family, tribe, nation. Hence the son of a stranger refers to the son of a foreigner and these are half-caste Israelite (see Isa 56:3, *Neither let the* ***son of the stranger****, that* ***hath joined himself to the LORD****, speak, saying, The LORD hath utterly* ***separated me from his people****: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree*).

In our context, we will use the term *foreigner.* (Compare Gen 35:2 which reads *… put away gods, the foreigners which are in the midst of you …*)

H5237 *nokriy*

(adjective) from 5235. Strange, in a variety of degrees and applications (foreign, non-relative, adulterous, different, wonderful): alien, foreigner, outlandish, stranger.

For example, Judges 19:12, *And his master said unto him, We will not turn aside hither into the city of a stranger, that is not of the children of Israel; we will pass over to Gibeah.* Compare with Ruth 2:10*, Then she fell on her face, and bowed herself to the ground, and said unto him, Why have I found grace in thine eyes, that thou shouldest take knowledge of me, seeing I am a stranger?* - a foreign person with respect to Boaz and his people because Ruth had come from a different Israelite tribe.

Similarly, a strange woman as opposed to one's wife is referred to an adulteress. In our context it describes one who is not of Israel but is a Shemite or Hebrew versus an alien (*zuwr*). Harlots, in Israelite times, were typically not Israelite women, but were quite similar in appearance because they were in a broadly related genetic line. Thus it refers to Hebrew people with whom marriage is forbidden - Canaanites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc and with whom Israelites were always led away to other gods. These people had no rights or privileges in Israel.

In our context, we will use the term *foreign (one, person, land).*

H8453 *towshab*

(noun) from 3427. A dweller, (but not outlandish); espec. (as distinguished from a native citizen and a temporary inmate or mere lodger) resident alien, foreigner, inhabitant, sojourner, stranger.

For example, Lev 25:6, *And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger that sojourneth with thee.* Compare 1 Ki 17:1 *And Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the inhabitants* (towshab) *of Gilead, …* The majority of the references are to a temporary, landless, wage earner, hence, not naturalised. In our context, the lowest order and, basically, had no rights other than access to the cities of

refuge. The children of the towshab could be bought as perpetual servants, without prospect of redemption, and could not hold any position of authority.

In our context we will use the expression *temporary resident.*

Each of these terms apply their meanings according to their context and hence can be used of Israelites as well as other people. For example, Abraham described himself as a sojourner to the sons of Heth [Gen 23:4]. However, our interest is the use of these terms with reference to the status of non-Israelites within Israel. By way of example, let us look at one of the standard Scriptures used by universalists:

Exodus 12:19 *Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses: for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off from the congregation of Israel, whether he be a* ***stranger*** [kinsman-visitor]*, or born in the land.*

This verse makes perfect sense when we realise the stranger in this case is, in fact, an Israelite but not one who was present in Mount Sinai at the time of the formal covenant ceremonies. Compare this with:

Ex 12:43-49.. *And the Lord said to Moses and Aaron, This is the order of the passover. There shall be no* ***stranger*** [the AV text is deficient here; the Hebrew reads: *no son of a stranger* - ben nekar - son of a foreigner; a half-caste] *eat thereof: But* ***every man's servant*** [bondservant] *that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then he shall eat thereof. A* ***foreigner*** [a foreign person] *or a* ***hired servant*** [H7916: a man at wages by the day or the year. Not the same as the bond servant, above] *shall not eat thereof. In one house shall it be eaten; thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house, neither shall ye break a bone thereof. All the congregation of Israel shall keep it. And when a* ***stranger*** [kinsman-visitor] shall *sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one born in the land: for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is homeborn, and unto the* ***stranger*** [kinsman-visitor] *that sojourneth among you.*

In the AV version of this quotation there are four categories of people mentioned in regard to the ordinance of the Passover and it looks as if the stranger mentioned as forbidden at the beginning of the verses is suddenly allowed to partake at the end of the verses. However, the translations do not reveal that there is a fifth category, the kinsman-visitor, who is the one allowed to partake if the males of his family are circumcised.
Let us look at some of the variations in the English translations of these verses:

[a] The NIV calls the first stranger an alien, and the second one a temporary resident which is not correct – the half-caste is not an alien and the kinsman-visitor is not the same as an alien who is temporarily living in the country.

[b] The RSV calls the first a foreigner and the second a stranger – the first one is wrong and the second one is only partly right; the kinsman-visitor is a stranger, but it does not reveal the racial connection that is present in the Hebrew word.

[c] The Living Bible actually calls the second pair of strangers "foreigners" which is so far off the mark that it is completely mis-leading.

The sincerity of the translators is not the issue here, but there are important implications for how we view the New Testament verses on similar subjects. In the New Testament we still have *pilgrims and strangers*, *aliens* and *foreigners*. We have been taught or have presumed certain things about these words, but the right teachings are, in fact, the same as are presented in the Old Testament. The New Testament is based on the Old Testament and *it is written* [in the Old Testament].
If certain of the "strangers" in the Old Testament were Israelites **by race**, might not certain of these strangers still be Israelites **by race** in the New Testament?

NEW TESTAMENT STRANGERS

In the New Testament we also find a variety of words translated as "strangers", "foreigners" "aliens" and "pilgrims". As the translators did not understand the differences between the

different terms for strangers in the Old Testament, it should not surprise us to find the same confusion in the New Testament. The Greek words translated stranger, pilgrim or sojourner are *allogenes, allotrios, apallotrioo, epidemeo, xenodocheo, xenos, parepidemos, paroikeo, paroikia, paroikos* and *philonexia*.. With reference to Strong, Thayer and Vine, the words that are relevant to this chapter are:

G245	*allotrios*	(adjective) from G243; another's, that is, not one's own: by extens. foreign, not akin, hostile - alien, (an-) other (man's men's) strange(-r). Belonging to another (opposite of *idios* - one's own); foreign, strange; hence not of one's own group, family, nation, kingdom; an alien, an enemy. Matt 17:25, Heb 11:34. This is the equivalent of the Hebrew *nekar*. We will use the term *foreigner*.
G526	*apallotrioo*	(verb) *apo* (from) plus *allotrios*. to estrange away, that is (pass. and fig.) to be non-participant: alienate, be alien. To alienate, estrange; to be shut out from one's fellowship and intimacy. To be rendered alien, to be alienated; the condition of unbelievers is presented in a threefold state of alienation (a) from the commonwealth of Israel (b) from the love of God (c) from God Himself. Hence, to be shut out from one's group. Eph 2:12.. There is no equivalent for this word in the Hebrew terms above. We will use the term *estranged*..
G1927	*epidemeo*	(verb - used only twice; participle) to make oneself at home, that is, (by extens.) to reside (in a foreign country): - [be] dwelling (which were) there, stranger. To be present among one's people, in one's city or one's native land; to be a sojourner; of a foreign resident, among any people, in any country. Acts 2:10. This is the participle equivalent of the Hebrew *ger*. We will use the term *visiting*.
G3581	*xenos*	(adjective) foreign (lit. alien, or fig. novel); by impl. a guest or (vice-versa) entertainer: - host, strange(r). A foreigner, a stranger; alien (from a person or a thing); without the knowledge of, without a share in; new, unheard of; one who receives and entertains another hospitably; with whom he stays or lodges, a host. Strange; denotes a stranger in the sense of an unknown person of the same group (such as people of the same race). Matt 27:7, Acts 2:10, 17:21, Eph 2:19, Heb 11:13. The is no equivalent for this word in the Hebrew terms above. We will use the term *stranger*.
G3927	*parepidemos*	(adjective used as noun - *para*: from; expressing a contrary condition; *epidemeo*: to sojourn and *demos*: a people) from 8344 and the base of 1927. An alien alongside, that is, a resident foreigner: - pilgrim, stranger. One who comes from a foreign country into a city or land to reside there by the side of the natives; a stranger; sojourning in a strange place, a foreigner; in the NT metaph. in reference to heaven as the native country, one who sojourns on earth. Sojourning in a strange place away from one's own people. Used of those to whom Heaven is their own country and who are sojourners on Earth. Denotes a sojourner, an exile; used of OT saints. 1 Peter 1:1.. As this term is related to *epidemeo* above, it is the equivalent of the Hebrew *ger*. We will use the term *visitor*.
G3940	*paroikia*	(noun) See *paroikos*. Foreign residence: -- sojourning, as strangers. A dwelling near or with one; a sojourning, dwelling in a strange land; metaph. the life of a man here on earth is likened to a sojourning.

		This is the equivalent of the Hebrew *towshab*. We will use the term *temporary resident*.
G3941	*paroikos*	(adjective) having a home near, that is, (as noun) a by-dweller (alien resident): foreigner, sojourn, stranger. Dwelling near, neighbouring; in the NT, a stranger, a foreigner, one who lives in a place without the right of citizenship; metaph. without citizenship in God's kingdom; one who lives on earth as a stranger, a sojourner on the earth; of Christians whose home is in heaven. One who dwells in a place. 1 Peter 2:11 - as sojourners (*paroikous)* and aliens (*parepidemous*). This is the equivalent of the Hebrew *towshab*. We will use the term *temporary resident*.

The New Testament, therefore, has a similar variety of words as has the Old Testament in this area, so we can no longer presume that all strangers and foreigners [as translated] are non-Israelites. Comparisons must be made from the Old Testament foundation in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.

There is a certain relationship conveyed by one pair of words used in the Old Testament which always compares with the same sentiment conveyed by a similar pairing of words in the New Testament. These New Testament phrases are derived from the Old Testament, so there is a link between them.

Ps 39:12	*Hear my prayer, O Lord, and give ear to my cry, hold not Thy peace at my tears, for I am a STRANGER* [ger: kinsman-visitor] *with thee, and a SOJOURNER* [towshab: temporary resident]*, as all my fathers were.*
Gen 23:4	*I am a STRANGER* [ger: kinsman-visitor] *and a SOJOURNER* [towshab: temporary resident] *with you.*
Lev 25:23	*For ye [are] STRANGERS* [ger: kinsman-visitor] *and SOJOURNERS* [towshab: temporary resident] *with me.*
1 Chron 29:15	*We are STRANGERS* [ger: kinsman-visitor] *before thee and SOJOURNERS* [towshab: temporary resident]
1 Peter 2:11	*Dearly beloved, I beseech, as STRANGERS* [paroikos: temporary resident] *and PILGRIMS* [parepidemos: visitors].
Heb 11:13	*These all died in faith … and confessed that they were PILGRIMS* [xenos: stranger] *and STRANGERS* [parepidemos: visitors] *on the earth.*
Eph 2:12	*Being ALIENS* [apallotrioo: estranged] *from the Commonwealth of Israel, and STRANGERS* [xenos: stranger] *from the covenants of promises.*
Eph 2:19	*Now therefore, ye are no more STRANGERS* [xenos: strangers] *and FOREIGNERS* [paroikas: temporary residents] *but fellow citizens with the saints and of the household of God.*

Here we have a selection of Scriptures from both Testaments in which there are parallel words. In the Old Testament references, the paired words are *ger* and *towshab* in each case. While both terms are used to define race, it is essential to determine the context in which they are used to verify which race is under discussion.

In Hebrews 11:13 the pilgrims and strangers are Israelites because the book is written to the Hebrews; those whose Fathers had been given the Law of Moses. In the other New Testament verses, it is not clear, at first glance, that they are Israelites. But, when we examine the Greek, we find similar terms - ones that identify Israelites in each context. And it is easy to verify that each reference is, indeed, to Israelites. These paired words do not teach that there are two groups of peoples, but rather that they all are Israelites in two different situations. When David said that he was *a stranger and a sojourner* [Ps 39:12], he was one person who was two things. *Strangers* and *aliens* are not necessarily two completely dissimilar groups of people in Ephesians 2:12 and Ephesians 2:19. In this case they are one group of people who are two things. This follows exactly the same pattern as presented in the Old Testament.

When we compare what David is saying in Psalm 39:12 with what Peter is saying in 1 Peter 2:11, we find a common distinction. David refers to *all my Fathers* who were, of course, Israelites. Peter is addressing *the Elect* and not others. This book of Peter is written to *strangers* [parepidemos: visitors] *scattered*. Note this well; there is no way around it! This cannot be spiritualised to make it refer to some non-Israelite multi-racial church! Both David and Peter are saying they have no kinship with the races among whom they (Israel) are temporarily living (that is, for the duration of their lives). We find a remarkable affinity and agreement between both Testaments. In both, Israel is totally exclusive. It is now even more difficult to insist that these so-called "gentiles" are non-Israelites!
Before we leave this subject of strangers, let us consider another very significant Scripture.

> *John 7:35* … *will he go unto the dispersed among the Gentiles* [Hellenes: Greeks] *and teach the Gentiles* [Hellenes: Greeks].

As we saw in the chapter, *Galatians and Israel Exclusive,* the *dispersed among the Greeks* relates to the *Lost sheep of the House of Israel* whom Jesus says He came for only [Matt 10:6 and 15:24]. Those *lost sheep* were the only ones the disciples were instructed to visit. Come now and let us reason together. Could the disciples go to proclaim the Gospel of the Kingdom to a race they could not find because they were *lost*? They were not so lost that they could not be found, were they? [*Lost,* in this context, has to do with being put aside for punishment].
To read the parables of Jesus in the light that these *lost sheep* are the House of Israel is enlightening! The lost sheep are never non-Israelites! When we come to the regathering of those "strangers" who are scattered, how could it ever be a regathering of any other than that exclusive race of Israel who were scattered in the first place?
When we look again at the 1 Peter 2:9 we find these particular strangers [of 1 Peter 1:1] were:

[a] Chosen … [Isaiah 41:8 … *Jacob whom I have chosen*]

[b] A Royal Priesthood … [Isaiah 61:1 , Hosea 4:6 etc.]

[c] An Holy Nation … [Deut 14:2]

Please note that "nation" is singular in this context Some may still wish to deny these "holy" (set-apart) people still exist as being different from all other nations. But Peter knew they still existed when he wrote to them.

[d] A peculiar people [Exodus 19:5 , Deut 26:18 , Psalm 135:4]

Israel and Judah were taken into their respective captivities because of their continued disobedience under the Law. Following the captivities these people moved away from Palestine because God had caste them out of that land. On top of being scattered, they also lost all knowledge of their law, which means they lost the rituals for reconciliation with God. They were lost as members of the eternal Kingdom of God. However, as a nation of people they did not cease to exist (Jer 31:36,37 and Jer 33:17). Jesus came for these people because, by making the ultimate sacrifice, they no longer needed the Levitical Law as the means of reconciliation with God. They could "go direct" by prayer in Jesus's name, because He is now the Mediator for the individual Israelite. It was still limited to Israelites because:

[a] Only they had broken the Law Covenant.

[b] Only they had the indwelling spirit that needed to be saved from eternal death.

The physical location of the Dispersed Tribes was well known up to the time of the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD. After that, with no Temple in Jerusalem as a focus for ceremony for those who wished to make the journey, the whereabouts of these people was forgotten over time. Nevertheless, the existence of the sun, the moon and the stars says the nation of people still exists today. The words of Jeremiah's prophecy are quite definite and cannot possibly apply to a "church" in the popular concept.
As a separate matter of prophecy, the nation of Israel would always have a monarchy ruling over them, from the site of the official throne. This is sometimes confused with 1 Peter 2:13 which refers to the people respecting the authority of the King. This is a

different matter – the teaching throughout the New Testament, even for the Judeans, is to obey the civilian authorities of the day, (render unto Caesar, etc), and not to foment social upheaval. This directs us to stand up for what is right when formal opportunities and mechanisms are available, but not to incite social unrest by going outside the formal system. When we go to the book of Hebrews and consider these *pilgrims and strangers*, the *Fathers* and the "Patriarchs" are prominent. God who spoke to these Fathers by the Prophets, *hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son*. We can pretend all we like that the children are now spiritual children, but the Bible still insists that the New Testament is only made with the House of Israel and the House of Judah [Heb 8:8]. How would these Houses be spiritualised? The quoted prophecies are those made to Israel! Israel is still just as exclusive, today!!

CHAPTER 11: SEEDS, NATURAL AND SPIRITUAL

To many people, the subject of Abraham's seed is somewhat of an enigma. In the chapter, *Galatians And Israel Exclusive*, we looked into this major issue to see whether or not the seed of Abraham is now the seed of Jesus, as is commonly taught. Some reasons why this could not be so were given. The purpose of this chapter is to further clarify thinking about:

1. What is *the seed of Abraham* - is it genetic only?
2. What is "offspring" - what is the meaning of the expression *offspring of David*?
3. What is the difference between "seed", "offspring", "children", "fruit", etc.?
4. Why it is necessary to divide between these things that are different?

THE DIFFERENT WORDS FOR SEED

In most common translations the Hebrew and Greek words pertaining to this subject are often badly translated, and the various translations are inconsistent. So, for a start let us look at all the words in Strong's concordance and Thayer's Lexicon for "seed", "offspring", "fruit", "generation", etc.

OLD TESTAMENT:

Strong H2233	*zera* or *zerah*	Seed; fig. fruit, plant, sowing time, posterity - carnally, child, fruitful, seed - time, sowing time.
Strong H6631	t*se'etsa*	Offspring, issue, that is, produce, children, - that which cometh forth [out].

NEW TESTAMENT:

Strong G1074	g*enea*	From a presumed der. of 1085. A generation, by impl. an age [the period or the persons]: age generation, nation, time. Fathered, birth, nativity; that which has been begotten, men of the same stock, a family. The several ranks of natural descent, the successive members of a genealogy. Metaph. a race of men very like each other in endowments, pursuits, character - esp. in a bad sense, a perverse race. The whole multitude of men living at the same time. An age (that is, the time ordinarily occupied be each successive generation), a space of 30 - 33 years.
Strong G1078	g*enesis*	From the same as G1074; nativity, fig. nature, generation, nature[- ral]. Source, origin - a book of one's lineage, that is, in which his ancestry or progeny are enumerated. Used of birth, nativity. Of that which follows origin, viz.- the wheel of life (Jas 3:6), the wheel of human origin which as soon as men are born begins to run, that is, its course of life/nature.
Strong G1081	g*ennema*	From 1080: offspring, by anal. produce [lit or fig.] fruit, generation. That which has been born or begotten - the offspring or progeny of men or animals; the fruits of the earth, the produce of agriculture
Strong G1085	g*enos*	From G1096; kin [abstr. or con., lit. or fig., indiv. or coll.]: born, country[man], diversity, generation, kin, kindred, nation, offspring, stock. Race - offspring; family; stock, race; nation that is, nationality or descent from a particular people. The aggregate of many individuals of the same nature, kind, sort
Strong G4687	s*peiro*	to sow, scatter, seed.
Strong G4690	s*perma*	Seed; that from which a plant germinates, the seed that is, the grain or kernel which contains within itself the germ of the future plants. metaph. a seed that is, residue, or a few

		survivors reserved as the germ of a new race (just as seed is kept from the harvest for the sowing). The semen virile; the product of this semen, seed, children, offspring, progeny; family, race, posterity. Whatever possesses vital force or life giving power; of divine energy of the Holy Spirit operating within the soul by which we are regenerated
Strong G4703	*sporas*	From G4687; a sowing; a scattering [of seed], that is, [concr.] seed [as sown].

It can be seen that there are a number of words in the original languages which need to be rightly divided.

SEED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The word *zera* is used of the genetic seed of both men and plants. In Genesis 1, these seeds always produce after their own *miyn* (kind or species). In Genesis 1:11 in the expression *whose seed is in itself*, we see a principle. There is a later principle established that mixed seeds should not be sown together. Sentimental Christians might like to think that all seeds of men are the same as far as God is concerned, but separation is shown very early in the Bible pages. It is God who separates the seeds of mankind. It is for us to believe God. In the early part of the Old Testament, we have a story about the one special seed of Israel that was commanded by God to utterly destroy certain other seeds [races]. This shows that there was a difference between the two groups. According to the common teaching, this separation is not supposed to continue into the New Testament, so we will have a look and see if it does. Within the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets there is no pattern of prophecy forecasting any change by God to this position; therefore any change in teaching must be questioned from the full foundation of the Law and the Prophets.

THE TWO SEEDS IN GENESIS 3:15

Gen 3:15 *And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between thy seed [zera] and her seed [zera]; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.*

Both seeds are the same word *zera* so we must accept the genetic context. Notice there is no enmity between the seeds at the time of speaking, because the seeds to be affected did not exist at that point in time. We have been taught that God is not like that; that He does not put enmity between differing seeds, but, in fact, God is still sovereign. If God wants to separate seeds, that is His business. If God wants to put enmity between seeds, that too is His business. Yet, the hypothesis of the World Church is that God made all races and seeds of men to be one, and that they should be mixed together. To use the expression *that they might be one* of John 17:21 as justification is to take the expression out of the context of *those that thou hast given me* of verse 9. God made no such extension - so where does that leave the World Church?

In the passage from Genesis above, there are stated to be two seeds. The *seed of the woman* and the *seed of the serpent* need to be identified before we can have any understanding of the issues. The *seed of the woman* refers to the Adamic line, and the remainder of the Bible deals only with the history of the Adamic line and its refinement to the seed of Jacob only. Somewhere along the line we have to come to a conclusion as to whether the difference between the *seed of the woman* and *the seed of the serpent* is a matter of:

[a] Belief

[b] A genetic difference

[c] A combination of these

What happened in Eden? Satan beguiled Eve by clearly misusing and misapplying God's words. Eve was remiss by failing to quote God's words precisely - she altered God's words and hence was led into a trap. Adam, on the other hand, simply disobeyed. He saw Eve eating and without fancy discussion, went ahead and disobeyed God's commandment. The

capacity or facility to disregard God was now manifest in the physical make-up of Adam's line. The Bible account of what happened to these people, down to Noah, shows us how they generally followed the ways of natural man (those of Genesis 1).

In Abram and Sarai, God wrought a major change in the Adamic line. The spirit that had been breathed into Adam was dissipated to such a low level, that something needed to change if this human line of spirit-carrying people were to continue into the future. When Isaac was conceived, God changed Abram's name to Abraham and Sarai's name to Sarah. This commemorated the fixing of the spirit in Abraham and Sarah so that everyone conceived of their line received the same amount of spirit as Isaac.

Esau also received the same amount of spirit as Isaac and Jacob. But whereas Isaac and Jacob chose to believe God, Esau rejected God by rejecting his birthright. He compounded the matter by marrying into the families that God had rejected and declared as not suitable for marriage with Israel. This was no mere prohibition but enshrined in the Law - much to the astonishment of modern Christians. To act contrary to this Law is the wilful pursuit of those who live like the natural man of Genesis 1. It was the giving over of himself to Satan's ways that made him and his progeny the seed of Satan as surely as if Satan had been their physical father. The whole of Esau's line is devoted to the destruction of Israel - as is Satan. This is the enmity foretold by God in Gen 3:15. Hence Esau's line is the seed of the serpent through acts of disbelief and it is a genetic line because it applies to all who are descended from that line.

ABRAHAM'S SEED IS GENETIC

Let us look closer at the promises made to Abraham. These promises are also made to Abraham's *zera* through Isaac. It is here suggested that the readers go to the trouble to pick up a Strong's concordance, page 896-7 and look through the multitude of references which use *zera* [Strong's ref 2233]. **Every Old Testament reference to the seed of men, as a line, is to genetic seeds**. There are no exceptions! Therefore it cannot refer to any spiritual seed in this context.

Lev 15:17 *And every garment, and every skin, whereon is the* ***Seed of copulation*** *…*

Now, how would one get some spiritual seed on his skin and garments? This seed is *zera*! "Copulation" is just copulation. So, could *zera* here be spiritualised to be a *spiritual* seed? Remember that *zera* is also used for animals. Abraham's seed is always a genetic seed. Please do not pass on reading until you have satisfied yourself that this is so. To go through Young's or Strong's concordance references is better than extracting verses for you! Then you will be able to see the total area covered.

If God chooses to make promises to those of one particular seed or race, that is His prerogative. That God does do this is found to be so from the beginning to the end of the Bible. Dare we question the purposes of God any longer*? For the Lord of Hosts hath purposed, who shall dis-annul it* [Is 14:27]. When it comes to the race of Israel, God says, *That the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth* [Romans 9:11].

SEED AND OFFSPRING

In the prophetical Scriptures in particular, the words shown above as "seed" and "offspring" are often linked together. For example, speaking of Israel, God says:

Isaiah 61:9 *And* ***their seed*** *shall be known among the Gentiles* [nations], *and* ***their offspring*** *among the people: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are* ***the seed*** *which the Lord has blessed.*

This seed which the Lord has blessed is spoken of as being the planting of the Lord [v3]. In this section of Scripture, strangers [*zar*] and aliens [*nekar*] are to serve as servants, vine-dressers, and plough-men to God's seed. The relationship is that of servant-hood to those with the garments of salvation.

Isaiah 44:3 *For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my spirit upon* ***thy seed****, and my blessing upon* ***thine offspring****.*

In verse one of this chapter *my people, my chosen* are expressed as being Israel and/or Jacob. Their King is described in verse six as *the king* **of Israel**. This prophecy cannot be extended to all races. There are no Scriptures like this for other than Israel. The offspring of Israel are different and separate from that of all other races or people.

Isaiah 65:23 *… for they are* ***the seed*** *of the blessed of the Lord, and* ***their offspring*** *with them.*

This chapter is about an "elect" [v22], and a singular "nation" [v1]. Their situation is Jerusalem which is reserved for a "seed". The time is the time of the *new heavens and a new earth* [v17]. Anyone will look in vain for a prophetical stream which regathers all the seeds of men to either the Jerusalem that now is, or to the New Jerusalem.

Gen 17:7 *And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and* ***thy seed*** [zera] *after thee in their generations* [posterity] *for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to* ***thy seed*** [zera]*after thee.*

Throughout the Old Testament the seed of Abraham is through the seed of copulation, through the son of promise, Isaac. Isaac's birth was a physical event, not a mystical, spiritual church-conceived experience. The birth of Isaac was supernatural, but God had told Abraham that Sarah would bear him the child - *unto thee* [v21]. The covenant was made to him and his *zera*. Israel came from Abraham's loins [Heb 7:5].
Try as we like, we cannot stretch the promise to include any other seed, or even to encompass any other of Abraham's seed. We cannot honestly say that all of mankind came through Abraham's loins! If any want to say God's people now are a spiritual seed from every race, where would *Abraham's loins* come into it?

SEED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In the New Testament we find the same picture as is presented in the Old Testament.

Luke 1:54,55 *He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to* ***our fathers****, to Abraham,* ***and to his seed*** *for ever.*

Some might like to suggest from what they teach that the subject is not Israel and the seed of Abraham. They teach that all the New Testament is now about "The Church". This is not true, because what they mean by "The Church" is what the Greek text says! The passage above says nothing about a multi-racial church. The people who are the subject of the passage are Israel as the seed [*zera*] of Abraham [Note the *our Fathers*].

Luke 1:68 *Blessed be the Lord God* ***of Israel****; for he hath visited and redeemed* ***his people****.*

There is no mention of other peoples. There never is!

Luke 1:73 *To perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, the oath which he sware to* ***our father Abraham****, that we … to give the knowledge of salvation unto* ***His people****.*

"*Our fathers"* is another way of expressing the line by descent of *His people*. Now we are back to the covenant in Genesis 17:7. This is a generation of Abraham's physical seed to whom fulfilment is made. The promise was made to Abraham's *zera* [in Hebrew] and it is being fulfilled in Abraham's *sperma* [in Greek].

"SPERMA" (AV: seed)

This word is used 37 times in the New Testament in a familial sense - referring to things that are homogenous in a genetic sense. The word used in Luke 1:44-55 is discussing Abraham's seed (*sperma*). So, let us look at some more verses in which *sperma* occurs so we can have certainty about this matter.

Mark 12:22 *The seven had her, and left no seed..*

Luke 20:28 *And raise up seed unto his brother.*

"Sperma" does not sound like a spiritual seed, does it? It is physical! And it is physical seed in the following verses:

Acts 3:25,26 — *Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in **thy seed*** [sperma] *shall all the kindreds* [the same kin] *of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of **you** from his iniquities.*

Acts 7:5 — *And he gave him none inheritance in it, no not so much as to set his foot on: yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and **to his seed*** [sperma] *after him, when as yet he had no child.*

Rom 4:13 — *For the promise, that he should be heir to the world, was not to Abraham, or **to his seed*** [sperma], *through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.*

Rom 4:16 — *Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be to all **the seed*** [sperma]*; not only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all* [separated ones (Israelites) as identified in Rom 1:7].

The pronoun *us* is the children of Abraham to whom the original covenant was made. The promise is not made at any stage to other than *all the seed*, namely to those of whom Abraham is the father. This could not be clearer.

Rom 4:18 — *Who against hope believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, So shall **thy seed** be.*

The context here is the original covenant to Abraham and his seed.

Rom 9:8 — *That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for **the seed**.*

Not all of Abraham's offspring are counted for the seed, but only those through the son of promise, Isaac and Jacob - *I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*. Because the seed is *sperm*a, it cannot be a spiritual seed made up from *converted* people from all other races, as commonly taught!

Rom 11:1 — *I say then, **Hath God cast away his people? God forbid.** For I am an Israelite, of **the seed** of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin.*

Israel and the Seed of Abraham are always linked in the New Testament, not as a spiritual seed, but as a physical seed.

2 Cor 11:22 — *Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the **seed of Abraham**? so am I.*

In this passage alone, there is an association between three factors [Hebrews, Israelites and the Seed of Abraham] which is impossible to break apart. Israel can never be any thing other than of the *sperma* of Abraham. It cannot be a spiritual seed as is commonly taught.

Heb 11:11 — *Through faith also, Sara herself received strength to conceive seed* [sperma, that is, *zera* of Abraham].

Before we pass on from *sperma*, it might be noted that the *sperma* verses in Galatians have been omitted. This is because they have been covered in the chapter, *Galatians and Israel Exclusive*. They tell the same story.

THE TWO SOWINGS IN HIS FIELD

Only Matthew mentions and explains about the tares as being sown in *His field* along with the wheat. Mark and Luke do not mention either the field or the wheat. The good seed [*sperma*] in Matthew are defined as *the children of the Kingdom* [Matt 13:38]. In this field there are sown two kinds of plants, the children of the Kingdom and the children of the wicked one. The sowings are both at the seed stage. Both grow together until the harvest; there is no suggestion given that one can convert into the other.

"SPOROS" (AV: seed)

This word occurs only five times in the New Testament. The *sporo*s verses relate to the Word of God as seed, or to the sowing of seed where *physical offspring* alone is not the issue. Luke 8:11 says that the seed [*sporos*] is the Word of God. Not Jesus as some teach

THE WORDS "SPIRITUAL" AND "NATURAL"

The idea commonly presented is that the Seed of Abraham, or Abraham's children, are a spiritual rather than a genetic seed. This is a physical impossibility! We hear the expression used, *First the natural, then the spiritual* to attempt to say that Israel nationally was the *natural* and that the Church is the *spiritual* that came later. What the Bible says words mean may be different to what we mean. So let us look at *natural* and *spiritual* as they connect to our present subject.

NATURAL

The word, of course, has a connection with "nature" which is most commonly a translation of *phusis*. This word is also translated as *natural*.

Strong G5449	Growth [by germination or expansion that is, [by impl.] natural production [lineal descent]; by extens. a genus or sort, fig. native disposition, constitution or usage … [man] kind.
Thayer	The nature of things, the force, laws, order of nature, as opposed to what is monstrous, abnormal, perverse. The operation of nature. The sum of innate properties and powers by which one differs from others.

However, when we come to the verses where the "natural" body and the "spiritual" body are compared, we find the word *psuchikos* [Strong G5591].

Thayer	This is having the nature and characteristics of the breath. The principle of animal life; which men have in common with brutes. The sensuous nature with its subjection to appetite and passion.

Hence:

1 Cor 15:44	*It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.*
1 Cor 15:46	*Howbeit, that was not first that was spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterwards that which is spiritual.*

The context of these verses has reference to the resurrection. This is when the change from the natural body to the spiritual body takes place.

SPIRITUAL

The word "spiritual" is *pneumatikos* [Strong 4152].

Thayer	Relating to the human spirit, or rational soul, and the part of man which is akin to God, and serves as his instrument or organ. Belonging to a spirit, or being higher than man, but inferior to God. Belonging to the Divine Spirit. Produced by the sole power of God himself, without natural instrumentality or parent.

It is used of this present age for many things other than of the body.

Rom 1:11	*… spiritual gift* … also 1 Cor 12:1 and 14:1.
Rom 15:27	*spiritual things*
1 Cor 3:1	*As unto spiritual*
1 Cor 10:3	*And did all eat the same spiritual meat*
1 Cor 2:13	*Comparing spiritual things with spiritual*
1 Cor 2:14	*Spiritually discerned*

Gal 6:1	*Ye which are spiritual*
Eph 1:3	*Spiritual blessings*
Eph 5:19	*Spiritual songs*
Eph 6:12	*Spiritual wickedness*
Col 1:9	*Spiritual understanding*
1 Peter 2:5	*Spiritual house … spiritual sacrifices*
Rev 11:8	*Spiritually called Sodom and Egypt*

But the present bodies we have are never called *spiritual* in this present age. These bodies may be *anointed*, *filled* etc. but they do not become *spirit bodies* until they are raised from the dead in their spirit form.

1 Cor 15:36 *Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die.*

Thus, the seed of Abraham is still a *natural* body. The common teaching today is that the *seed of Abraham* is now a spiritual seed consisting of *born again* believers of every race. This *born again* expression is as incorrect as when Nicodemus thought it! Jesus never said *born again*; He said *begotten from above*].
The words "spiritual", "anointed" and "holy" do not mean the same things.

ISRAEL – THE HOLY SEED

Ezra 9:2 *For they have taken of their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: and so that* ***the holy seed*** [zera] *have mingled themselves with the people of those lands: …*

Here we find the seed in question is *zera* and that they are "holy" (set apart; Hebrew: *qodesh*). This is another Scripture which clearly shows that all seeds are not the same. It also shows that the seeds of mankind are not to be mixed together! That our multi-culturists ["Christian" or otherwise] disagree, only declares their ignorance.

Isaiah 6:13 *… so* ***the holy seed*** [zera] *shall be the substance thereof.*

In context, this verse concerns only the remnant of Israel, but it still shows that God's people are a holy seed [*zera*], thus being different from other seeds.

ISRAEL – AN HOLY PEOPLE

There are many Scriptures that present God's chosen nation as being a *Holy People*. The word for "people" is quite different from "seed", but these Scriptures quickly give the same picture.

Deut 7:6 *For thou art an* ***holy 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 upon the face of the earth.*

This verse shows the separation of *special people* [Israel as being addressed] from all others. Deut 14:2 and Deut 26:19 are similar verses.

"Holy" is *qadosh* [H6918]: used of people [and God, God's name and holy places], rather than of objects.

"People" [H5971] is *am*: or *a people as a congregated unit, a tribe, to associate.* This is used to delineate *a people* as being separate from other people. It is used of Israel, and also of other races, to show racial separation.

Isaiah 62:12 *and they shall call them,* ***The holy people****, …*

Dan 12:7 *… and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of* ***the holy people*** *…*

ISRAEL – A SEPARATED PEOPLE

Then we come to a people who are *separated* from other races. That this carries on into the New Testament might not find favour with many teachers, but it is hard to avoid. The doctrine of separation, as taught, might have to be re-considered in this aspect!

Exodus 33:16	*For wherein shall it be known here that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? is it not that thou goeth with us? so shall we be* ***separated****, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth.*
Lev 20:24	*… I am the Lord your God, which have* ***separated you*** *from other people.*
Neh 9:2	*And the seed of Israel* ***separated themselves*** *from all strangers* [the Hebrew text states ***sons of*** - nekar - ***foreigners*** (which clearly identifies these children as half-castes)] …

The word *badal* for separation is shown by Strong H914 to denote an utter separation and a selection.

ISRAEL – A PECULIAR PEOPLE

This also continues on into the New Testament, like it or not! The word in the Old Testament is *segullah* which signifies *an enclosure or peculiar treasure*. In the New Testament the noun is *peripoiesis* and the adjective is *periousios* showing that there is a people who are an acquisition, or purchased possession.

Thayer	That which is one's own, belongs to one's own possessions. A people selected by God from the other nations for His own possession.

Hence:

Ex 19:5	*… ye shall be* ***a peculiar treasure*** *unto me above all people.*
Deut 14:2	*For thou are an holy* [separated] people unto the Lord thy God, and *the Lord hath chosen you to be* ***a peculiar treasure*** *above all nations that are upon the earth.*
Deut 26:18,19	*And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be* ***his peculiar people*** *… high above all nations … that thou mayest be* ***an holy people*** *unto the Lord thy God, …*
Ps 135:4	*For the Lord hath chosen Jacob for himself and Israel for* ***his peculiar treasure****.*
Titus 2:14	*… to purify unto himself* ***a peculiar people****, …*
1 Peter 2:9	*But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an* [singular] *holy* [separated] *nation,* ***a peculiar people****; …*

The race of Israel is spoken of as a collective treasure and a singular people. A treasure is a depository or *a thing laid up*. It is also translated as *special, proper* and *jewels*. In the New Testament, *peculiar treasure* is variously translated as *obtain* salvation [1 Thess 5:9], *obtaining of the glory* [2 Thes 2:14], and *purchased possession* [Eph 1:14], or as expressed in Hebrews, as *the saving*.

Heb 10:39	*But we are not of them who draw back into perdition; but of them that believe unto the saving of the soul.*

In this book of Hebrews some might not like the pronouns, but *we* and *them* both refer to Israelites only. The first *them* refers to those who reject God and refuse to believe and who did not *follow after holiness* [or set-apartness], thus failing the grace of God [Heb 12:15,16]. Most would not like to think that there is a birthright [a right from birth] racially that could be sold, but there is. Remember how Esau sold his birthright, and how he could not regain it? But, for now, let us return to the "seed". Esau did not *follow after holiness* by breaching racial set-apartness.

ISRAEL – THE ANOINTED SEED

This might well *get some people going*! For those who have been brought up to think that all seeds are the same this might be just too much; this might be the last straw. Let it be so! That there is *an Anointed Seed* as well as *a Holy Seed, an Holy People, a Separated People* and *a Peculiar People*, gives a lot of confirmation. It all compounds perfectly, does it not? Does it not show different aspects of God's chosen Israel race? Our sovereign God gives us enough detail so that we can ignore Him no longer! To not believe Him is to *kick against the pricks*.. The seed of Abraham to whom the covenants were made still exists. **The spiritual "body" comes after the resurrection, so the seed of Abraham does not yet have a spiritual body**. We are still *waiting the redemption of the body*, whether individual or corporate.

Rom 8:23 *… which have the first-fruits of the Spirit even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*

We have looked into "adoption" as a subject already. We are looking for the placing of the Sons of God. But what about this particular and singular anointed seed? Is there such a thing in both Testaments?

Anointed in Hebrew is *mashiach*. [This is translated as Messiah in Daniel!!]

To anoint in Hebrew is *mashach*.

Anointing in Hebrew is *mishchah*.

They have universal application to persons, people and things. There are also other words in Hebrew so translated, such as *suk* and *badal*.

Hab 3:13 *Thou wentest forth for the salvation of thy people, even for the salvation of Thine* ***anointed***..

This places *Thine anointed* and *Thy people* as being one and the same. This says that they were anointed before they were saved - anointed by the presence of the indwelling spirit. Speaking of the Seed of Abraham, [His servant] and the Children of Jacob [His chosen], and the covenant God made **to Israel**, we read:

Ps 105:15 *Touch not* ***mine anointed****, and do my prophets no harm.*

Rev 11:15,16 *The Kingdoms* (singular in the Greek) *of this world* [kosmos] *are become the kingdoms* (singular) *of our Lord, and of* ***his Christ*** [anointed (people)] *and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders, which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God.*

Here we need, as usual, to go back and see what prophecy this is fulfilling. It is found in Daniel 7:13-18 and concerns Jesus and the Holy People. In Revelation, the worship is directed to the Lord, but it is not directed to the "anointed". If Jesus was "His anointed", then Jesus was being ignored! True Jesus is not to be worshipped but God all Mighty

ISRAEL – A CHOSEN PEOPLE

It has been pointed out before that most people have some thought about the existence of a chosen race of people. For Christians and others brought up in the Western World, the thought is towards Israel as being that chosen race. [Some may choose incorrectly to call Israel "The Jews"]. Then, of course, if one race is chosen, then every other race not chosen! Christians are somehow able to think about an *exclusive Israel* and yet include everybody at the same time.

Throughout the Old Testament the exclusivity of Israel is a consistent theme, as has been shown in this book. Israel may have been put aside, brought low, dis-allowed by God, but God says the promises that were made to the fathers of Israel will yet be fulfilled in *us their children*.

Isaiah 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* [kinsman-visitor] *shall be joined to them.*

Ezek 20:5 *… In the day when I **chose Israel**, and lifted up mine hand unto the **seed of the house of Jacob**, …*

Here we see the connection between the "chosen" and the "seed" in question. This chapter of Ezekiel goes on to express God's final determination upon Israel at the end of this age. Trying to move this determination on to other than the seed of Jacob, will not succeed. It is not in prophecy anywhere!
When we follow through to the New Testament, we find the word *eklektos* which is variously translated as the *chosen* or the *elect*. Jesus spoke of the days being shortened for the Elect's sake, and of the rising up of false christs and prophets who would try to deceive the Elect. The word *eklektos* appears 23 times in the New Testament. It is derived from the root word *eklego* which refers to selection in the primary sense. This is usually translated as *chosen* or *chose*.

Acts 13:17 *The God of **this people of Israel chose our fathers**, …*

Read this verse several times. Who is God the God of? Who did He choose? This word for "elect" is used throughout the New Testament in places where it might not be obvious that a racial/national entity is involved. In context the word may be associated with, *called, inheritance,* and *predestined*. These are all words that have exact parallels in the Old Testament where they are used racially of the Nations of Israel. There is no question or suggestion in either Testament that the seed [of our fathers] might be any spiritual seed from all races.

Matt 24:31 *And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together **his elect** from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.*

This gathering cannot be other than the gathering from among those who are the subject of the prophecy. The Elect are the ones resurrected. This has been shown in the chapter titled *Adoption* as the process for the placing of sons out of Israel.

2 Tim 2:10 *Therefore I endure all things for **the elect's** sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.*

For whose sake? Is it any but the Elect?
These New Testament expressions, *called, chosen,* and *elect*, are all used in the Old Testament where they are addressed exclusively to the race and nations **of Israel**.. Even through to Revelation, those with the Lamb are the faithful among the *called* and *chosen*. They are not from among others.

ISRAEL – A STONE PEOPLE [OR NATION]

In the Book of Daniel we find prophecy concerning nations. In this book there is a "stone" cut out of a "mountain" which "brake" the other kingdoms in pieces. The stone that smote the image became a great mountain [a symbol of nations] and filled the whole earth. In the New Testament there are references to the Kingdom of God being a nation.

Matt 21:43,44 *Therefore I say unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from* [among] *you* [the Judean leaders], *and given to **a nation** bringing forth the fruits thereof. And whosoever shall fall on **this stone** shall be broken: but on whosoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.*

WHAT IS BEING SAID?

In the matter of "seed", both Testaments say exactly the same thing. In no way has the *zera* of Abraham changed. God has not changed! The seed of Abraham is genetic only.
Yes, we still have the questions about the other non-Israel seeds/nations/races to answer. There is no justification for insisting that God must mean something different to what is presented in the Word because the non-Israel nations do not appear to be accommodated. Translators have always sought to expand the scope and even the NIV translation does this, justifying interpretation on the grounds of scholarship! We can presume all we like about the

other races. We can pretend that God makes no selections among races and that all races must be the same. To say this is to say that God was wrong to choose Israel for a purpose and to sever them from the other races. We can attempt to spiritualise the Seed of Abraham all we like in an attempt to accommodate all the other races, as being in that one particular seed. We can choose to do lots of things other than believing God. But only God's word will endure for ever. At this stage we will say only this, that understanding is impossible if we cannot accept what God says about His *called, chosen, elect, peculiar* and *separate* people who descended from Abraham through Isaac and Jacob.

CHAPTER 12: "BORN AGAIN" OR "BEGOTTEN FROM ABOVE"?

If ever there was a need to put aside pre-conceived ideas and teachings, there is great need to do so in the present use of the expression *born again*.. There is a common conception and presentation throughout the Christian world that is an absolutely false and misleading error. The basis of the expression is found in John.

John 3:3-5 *Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be* ***born again****, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.*

In most translations, the words *born again* have been carried on in a traditional manner, suggesting that a second "birth" is necessary to enter the Kingdom of God. Many Bibles, in their margins, will have "from above" showing this is what the original word means. When we look into the words actually spoken, we find that it was Nicodemus who made the suggestion about entering a second time into his mother's womb. This was the interpretation that Nicodemus put on Jesus' words, but Jesus did not say anything about a second time even if the translations make Him appear to say He did. JESUS DID NOT USE THE WORD "AGAIN"! There is no manuscript at all that says Jesus used the word "again".. The word *deuteros* that Nicodemus spake appears in the New Testament 44 times, and it always means twice, again, etc.
Jesus did not use this word *deuteros*; Jesus used the word *anothen*.

Strong G509	anothen	Includes from above, or from the first.
Thayer	anothen	Used of things that come from heaven [from God], or from a higher [upper] place, or from the very first, or from the origin.

Knowing this one word difference helps understanding and shows up the problems there are with the popular concept. Jesus confirmed to Nicodemus that He was not speaking of a second birth when He told Nicodemus that He was referring to being born of water and of Spirit. Jesus did not use the future tense as did Nicodemus. Jesus was speaking of something which existed at the time of speaking. The Christian Church has picked up the words Nicodemus spoke, rather than the words of Jesus. Jesus chided Nicodemus for not knowing *these things* [v10]. Likewise today, our teachers need chiding for the same reason of not knowing *these things*. Jesus went on to say that not every person is begotten *of the Spirit*, noting that that which is *of flesh* is of the flesh, being begotten that way.

AGAIN

The word anothen that Jesus uses appears 14 times in the New Testament and it does not have a meaning similar to *deuteros* (second time) or *pallin* (again), the latter being the word most commonly translated as "again".. The adverb *anothen* always relates to place and is used of past or former time, but never the future time. In order to discuss the word *anothen*, let us consider examples of how the word has been translated.

Matt 27:51 and Mark 15:38	*…the veil of the temple was rent in twain* ***from the top*** *to the bottom; …*
Luke 1:3	*… having had perfect understanding all things from* ***the very first*** *…*
John 3:31	*He that cometh* ***from above*** *is above all: …*
John 19:11	*… except it were given thee* ***from above****: …*
John 19:23	*… now the coat was without seam, woven* ***from the top*** *throughout.*

Acts 26:5	*Which knew me **from the beginning**, …*
James 1:17	*Every good gift and every perfect gift is **from above**, …*
James 3:17	*But the wisdom that is **from above** …*

None of these indicate "again" in any sense.

BORN

Begetting and birth are two vastly different events. Begetting as used of men is the action and process of conception, for example, *Abraham begat Isaac* [Matt 1:16]. Birth as used of woman, is movement from one environment to another, for example, *Mary of whom Jesus was born* [Matt 1-16]. This word *gennao* varies with the context and it may have an abstract meaning also where it is used of figurative father-child relationships [1 Cor 4:15].
This word "born" in John 3:3-5 is *gennao* and it is found 98 times in the New Testament. The sense usually has connection with procreation; the most prominent meaning being *beget* or *begotten*. We must thus now determine the time when this begetting takes place. All modern teachers insist that people already born can be re-born in the future. But when used of a male, *begotten* is usually about the time of conception; when *born* is used of a female it is usually about physical birth.

Thayer	It is of mankind begetting children. It is often used metaphorically of bringing others over to one's way of life.
Vine	Chiefly used of men begetting children.

If we want to understand its use in John 3:3-5 it is necessary to look at the Greek. They are not future tenses. Modern theology or teaching likes to use the words in the future tense [from tradition], but this is a total error. We have been taught so wrongly to use the words, *except a man be born again* in the future tense that it is hard for many to think otherwise. But *be born* is indefinite with respect to time. Jesus taught exactly what is taught through the Old Testament, namely that God's race is born from an original sowing.

BORN OF WATER AND OF SPIRIT

This is not only an interesting subject; but John 3:5 [*Except a man be born of water and of the spirit*] is a key verse. Because of the "and" we see there are two requirements for perceiving the Kingdom of God: *water* as well as *spirit*. What is believed here determines which gospel is believed. We have the choice to believe that any man of any race can *see the kingdom of God* or we can believe the limitation that Jesus presents:
The word for water is *hudor* and it is used of water of all sorts. On its own it means nothing but water! Some religious so-called experts argue that the expression refers to baptism, but this cannot be so because the thief on the cross [stake] went to paradise without being baptised. So we have to look further.
A person is *begotten of water* as part of the natural process following biological conception, but Jesus added the words*, and of the Spirit*.. This makes it clear that the ability to comprehend the Kingdom of God is included at the time of conception. To determine what this is about, we must of necessity go back to the Old Testament to see who and what was begotten of the Spirit. We can anticipate that the Old Testament will agree with the New Testament.

WHO DID GOD BEGET?

Exodus 4:22 *Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my firstborn.*

Statements like this immediately exclude all the other races and, potentially, those before Jacob. So, there is no need to go further back in the Bible, apart from noting that both Abraham and Sarah were from the Adamic seed. They could not have been from the pre-

Adamic or other later seedlines. When God separated Abram and Sara He regenerated their ability to conceive a child and commemorated the event by changing their names adding the fifth letter of the Hebrew alphabet into their names - Abraham and Sarah. This number is connected with the Spirit of God! The life in Sarah's womb was spirit-endowed. Now, consider these questions:

1. If Israel was God's firstborn son, then who are their offspring?
2. For Israel to be the son, then who is Israel's father? Is it not God?
3. Does not Israel originate from God if Israel is His son?

Nowhere in the Bible can we find any suggestion of the humanist brotherhood of all men. God is expressed as being the Father of Israel only. He is the father of *all men* OF *ISRAEL,* not all men of all races.
Jesus taught His disciples [all Israelites only] to pray saying, *our Father which art in heaven.* This is better translated *our Father, the One in heaven*. Neither God nor man can be called a father until they have begotten offspring. There is no suggestion of a spiritual birth later in life. God states that He is a Father in Exodus 4:22; therefore He begat offspring and is the father of all descendants from Israel. The Apostle Peter declares that we [Israelites to whom he was writing] are begotten from above, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible seed, by the Word of God. (as from the womb)
It must be immediately pointed out that, in this verse, the incorruptible seed of God [the Father] is *sporas* rather than *sperma*. The meaning of this word *sporas* is *the sowing back in the past*, or *sown seed* and refers to the firstborn, Isaac, conceived in Sarah's womb, after God had regenerated Sarah's and Abraham's ability to conceive a child. It is now an appropriate place to look at Sarah and Abraham, who are shown to be the place [or origin], being that originating rock or quarry and the pit.

ABRAHAM AND SARAH – THE ORIGIN

Isaiah 51:1,2 *Hearken unto me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord: look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you: for I called him alone, and blessed him, and increased him.*

It is not necessary here to establish all the reasons as to why God needed to make a new start with Abraham and Sarah. We have to accept that He did call Abraham alone. From this beginning, God made promises to Abraham that were to follow on to Abraham's seed (*zera*). Only those born from this new beginning could comprehend the Kingdom of God. This beginning was from God because God had regenerated Abraham and Sarah enabling them to bear one child. In this way Isaac was born because of God's action.
From Adam to Abraham, Adam's pure line contained the breath of life [see Job], so where did the people come from who did not have the breath of life? These men and women originated from Genesis 1. Through misgenerative activity, Satan had introduced pollution to the bloodstream of the sons of Adam, and we find that God sought to eliminate the products of such activity. Noah was pure in his generations [Gen 6:9], and so he and his unmixed family were preserved. Later, the Children of Israel were to destroy the mixed breed of the Canaanites. These could not receive the things of the Spirit of God. They could not witness in their spirit and say, *the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God* [Rom 8:16], as an Israelite is able to do. This principle is a continuing theme in the Bible.
Through Abraham and Sarah, God established the basis for Abraham's seed to become the Sons of God [John 1:12]. God was making a new beginning with Abraham. None other than the seed of Abraham, through the son of promise, Isaac, has this opportunity or potential. Abraham's seven other sons did not have this potential because they were born before Isaac. The descendants of Isaac were begotten of the Spirit from their conception. This is why those among Isaac's descendants who believe are regarded as being anointed by the Spirit

[Gal 3:16]. Paul is able to declare, *now He which stablishes us with you in Christ, and has anointed us is God who has also sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts* [2 Cor 1:21,22]. In 1 Cor 2:7-16 Paul, confirming this, tells the brethren [kinsmen of the same womb of Sarah] that they have not received the spirit of the world, but the Spirit of God [v12]. He says that through this we might know [or comprehend] the things that are freely given to us, [the brethren], of God. He goes on to further declare that the "natural" man [those not born of Isaac's line] cannot receive the things of the Spirit of God. He affirms Jesus' statement that anyone who is not begotten of the original sowing [in the womb of Sarah] cannot see the Kingdom of God.

1 John 2:27 *But the anointing which you have received abideth in you, …*

1 John 3:9 *Whosoever is born of God doth not commit* [practice] *sin, for his seed remaineth in him: …*

1 John 5:18 *We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; …*

There is this relationship between the "anointing", the right "seed", and being begotten of God.

FORMED FROM THE WOMB

Isaiah 44:2 *Thus saith the Lord* [Jehovah] *that made thee* [*Israel*], *and formed thee from the womb, …*

In what way would Israel be formed in the womb? Whose womb? The word *beten* means what we mean today by *the womb*. Men do not have a womb; Abraham did not have a womb, but Sarah did.
In Isaiah 51:1,2 as quoted above, speaking of Sarah, we find the womb described as *the hole of the pit*. This metaphor is a term that extends to the mountain from which the Stone Kingdom is taken. This is God's mine. James who was writing to the twelve tribes said*, OF HIS OWN WILL BEGAT HE US* [ISRAELITES] *WITH THE WORD OF TRUTH* [James 1:18]. *Begat*, as has been shown, is chiefly about conception, not physical birth.

Isaiah 43:1 *But now thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel, …*

This verse indicates a difference between *Israel* and *Jacob*. Here we have the one being *created*, and the other being *formed*.. So there are differences associated with the use of these words in different contexts.

Isaiah 44:24 *Thus saith the Lord, thy redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb, I am the Lord that maketh all things; …*

Here again, the Lord is speaking to Israel only. Nowhere in Scripture can we find reference to the Lord being the redeemer of any other people apart from those of Israel who are *formed from the womb*.. In the New Testament we still find reference to the womb of Sarah. Therefore it is as important as ever in the New Testament, as well as in the Old Testament.

Rom 4:19 *And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about an hundred years old, neither the deadness of Sara's womb: …*

Contained in the first verse of this chapter, we see, *Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh*. The *father of us all* [that is, Israelites] of verse 16 is Abraham *after the flesh*.. This still is not a spiritual rebirth. Remember that Paul was writing to the House of Israel to whom he was sent.
Nicodemus, as a master or teacher in Israel, should have known these things, Jesus told him so, in no uncertain terms. Teachers today likewise do not know these things. The womb of Sarah and the offspring from that womb have been spiritualised away! The common New Testament word "brethren", as has been shown, is *kinsmen of the womb*. What other womb would this be other than the womb of Sarah?

HE CAME UNTO HIS OWN … BORN OF GOD

John 1:11,12 *He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he the power to become the sons of God, …* This verse is actually speaking of Yahweh not Jesus

Quoting R.K. and R.N. Phillips in *The only begotten ~~God~~*, Son

Verse 11 is almost completely misunderstood by the whole of Christendom today and the AV translation is the main cause of this misunderstanding … The word own *appears twice in the verse – but in the first clause it is neuter gender while in the second it is masculine. Therefore John is referring to two* ***different*** *things.*

The first clause states that Jesus came to His own possessions [neuter gender] – His land, His Kingdom, His city, His temple. In the second clause the term His Own *is the Greek term* oi idios *[masculine gender] which means, literally,* the members of one's own household. *In this case it refers only to those who had authority over His Kingdom, city and Temple. (The vast majority of Israel were scattered abroad in the Dispersion and, at that time, were still classed as* ***not my people****.) Before we can complete the translation of verse 11, we have to look at the beginning of verse 12.*

The Greek text of verse 12 begins but to those who did receive Him. *In this clause and the last clause of verse 11, we have another instance of the AV translating two different Greek words as one English word – in this case,* received. *The last clause of verse 11 states, in effect, that those who were ruling over His possessions neither* ***received nor accepted Him*** *[as the owner]. It points to outright rejection, not through ignorance [which is covered by the phrase* does not recognise Him *in verse 10], but by wilful refusal to accept Him as the rightful owner. However, in the first sentence of verse 12 the word* received *has the meaning of* to welcome *or* to accept willingly. *Hence, while the* ***Judean*** *Nation rejected Him at a national level, there were individuals in that Nation who did both recognise and receive Him gladly. Verses 11 and 12 read in the Greek text:*

v11 *He comes unto his own* [possessions] *but The people* [ruling over His possessions] *refuse to accept Him* [as the rightful owner].

v12 *But to those who welcome Him, to The ones believing in His name, to them He gives authority to* [make themselves] *become* [because *of* their beliefs] *children of God* [again].

They were not everyone on earth who were born of bloods [plural in Greek] or by the will of the flesh [John 1:10-13]. Jesus came to His household who were born by the will of God.

Thayer *Household* is used as *stock, race, descendants of one.*

Phillips and Phillips again points out:

The phrase translated the sons of God *in verse 12 of the AV is quite wrong. The Greek phrase is* tekna theou *which means children of God. Immature children, no doubt, but it does* ***not*** *mean sonship; for sonship points to growth and ultimate maturity. Nor does it have anything to do with the false doctrine of "adoption". On the contrary, the phrase forcefully asserts:*

a. *the natural genetic relationship of a child with its true father and, hence,*

b. *those* children of God *are the biological descendants of God Himself.*

Note that John 1:13 states:

Which were born, not of blood [plural], *nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*

To which Phillips and Phillips point out:

Verse 13 states that those who were given the right to become children of God [again] *were those* [begotten]*:*

a. **not** out of bloods - *which is of ordinary human descent,*

b. **nor** out of *[the]* will of the flesh - *which was Sarah's demand to have children by Hagar and Keturah,*

c. **nor** out of *[the]* will of a man - *which was Abraham's desire for an heir,*

d. ***but out of God are begotten***.

The Greek verb begotten *is plural in this verse and so cannot be limited to the birth of Jesus.*

Isaac was not born of Abraham's will. Abraham was past that. Isaac was begotten by God's will when He regenerated Abraham and Sarah's ability to have a child and to give that child an **individually incorruptible spirit**.. Isaac was thus begotten *from above*, as are Isaac's descendants from the time of their conception. In this portion of John 1 we find the origin of those who can believe in Jesus. Also we find where they did not [and do not] come from!

Jesus came only [alone] to those begotten from above by God. He is shown to be the Redeemer of only His Kinsmen.

A person does not exercise his will in determining where and of what race he should be born. The will factor of the person being born does not function in normal physical conception and birth. God determined what seed a person is. God knows who are begotten of the Spirit from above. 2 Tim 2:19 says *God knows those that are His*. The word "born" *gennao* in the following Scriptures which is used in the genealogies and in all other places, as being begotten or conceived. It does not relate to some spiritual birth.

John 1:13	*Which were born* [begotten], *not of blood* …
John 3:3	*Except a man be born again* … [that is, begotten from above]
John 3:5	*Except a man be born* [begotten] *of water and of Spirit* …
John 3:8	*… so is everyone who is born* [begotten] *of the Spirit* …
John 18:37	*… To this end was I born* … [referring to Jesus' physical birth from Mary]
Matt 2:1	*When Jesus was born in Bethlehem* … [referring to His physical birth from Mary]

Spiritualise these references if you like, but you will be like Nicodemus, *not knowing these things.*

REGENERATION

In Scripture there is an expression that means "born again". This is *paligenesia* or *palin* (again) plus *genesis* (born). There are but two occurrences:

Matt 19:28	*Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. …*
Titus 3:5	*… but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; …*

It is not appropriate to expand this new subject here, other than to again note the Tribes of Israel limitation.

WHAT IS BEING SAID?

Simply this, there is a great difference between "begotten" and "born". *Begettal* refers to conception where as *born* refers to physical birth. The Greek word, *gennao,* means conception or beget (when used of men) and physical birth (when used of women). Unless a person is begotten of the line that arises from the original sowing, the begetting of God, that person does not come to contain the ability to perceive the Kingdom of God. This is what Jesus said to Nicodemus!

CHAPTER 13: THE CHURCH

Early in the Christian life, the convert is told something about "The Church". The word *ekklesia* may be used, and it may be correctly spoken of as *that which is called out*. So far, so good, but then the problem begins. Called out of what? The usual explanation given is *called out of the world*. Fair enough, but what is the meaning of *the world*? The chapter entitled, *Which World Did God "So Love"?*, was written to show that there are different "worlds" in Scripture, not just the one world supposedly consisting of everyone of every race who is not converted.

Then we looked at "adoption" to show who was adopted from where, concluding that the Sons of God were *placed as sons* (not adopted) out of the genetic seed of Abraham, through Isaac.

We also looked at "strangers", considering whether or not genetic stock other than Abraham's seed could join themselves to Israel, and become *as Israel* by keeping the Law, Circumcision and the Passover. We found that there were different words for "strangers" and showed that this proposition was basically invalid. Consideration of the matter of "seeds" showed that there is no such thing as a *spiritual seed*, as is commonly presented, and that the genetic seed of Abraham cannot be spiritualised away. We will now see that "the Church" is called out from amongst Israel.

In this chapter, "The Church" is placed in quotation marks, because it is commonly used in a way that is un-Biblical. The Greek word translated "church" means *a called - out assembly*.. It is sometimes translated as *assembly*.

> Thayer — A gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place, as assembly.

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT "THE CHURCH"

To find out what we are talking about, we have to ask some questions:

1. Can the church really be separated from Israel?
2. Is it called out from every race?
3. Can all men of all races be potential inheritors of the Kingdom of God?
4. Is there prophecy to support the current common theory that *The Church* has replaced Israel?
5. Could the "wife" be other than Israel?
6. What was the *church in the wilderness*?
7. What is the *church of the firstborn*?
8. What about the promises made to David and David's eternal throne?
9. Does *of your brethren* as found in the New Testament suddenly change somehow to be *spiritual* brethren?
10. Why are there so many references to *the fathers* in the New Testament when *the fathers* have no connection with non-Israel races?
11. Why is national Israel still separate in the Book of Revelation?

In looking into these questions, we will find that our normal religious education impedes our understanding and that what is being presented here is at variance with the popular teachings.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WORD "CHURCH"

The word originates from the Greek word *kuriakos* which means *belonging to the Lord*. From this word has developed the German *kirche*, the Dutch *kerke*, the Scottish *kirk* and the English *church*. The word is first found in the Great Bible of 1570. In no way does the word originate from *ekklesia*, even if tradition would like to say that it does.

In *The Book of Revelation* by R.K. and R.N. Phillips, 1992:

> *The term* ekklesia *is the combination of two Greek words,* ek – out of, *or* from, *and* klesis – to call. Ecclesia *simply means an assembly, any assembly of people who are called out from other peoples and from which all aliens and slaves have been excluded [see Ellicott's comments on Matt 16:18]. Hence it is used of the whole nation of Israel, as distinct from other nations. For those who claim that trying to limit* ekklesia *to Israel is a biased view, please read Dr. E.W.. Bullinger [The Apocalypse of the Day of the Lord] from which these notes are summarised.*

The Old Testament equivalent is the Hebrew word *cahal* [or *qahal*] which means to call or to assemble together, but there is not one place where it is rendered "church". *Cahal* is used seventy times and is mostly translated as "congregation", this being the congregation of Israel. An interesting feature is that this word is used for those called out of Israel to assemble before the Tabernacle and Temple, and it denies or excludes the "mixed multitude" (*edah* - which is also translated as *congregation*) which comprised of those from other races who had joined themselves to Israel.
In the New Testament there was a parallel situation of there being a "mixed multitude" in the Judean nation.

THE FOUNDATION OF "THE CHURCH"

The word *church* is usually thought of traditionally as being a New Testament word, because it is supposed to be a multi-racial entity, whereas in the Old Testament, Israel was a single race. Let us look at the foundation of the Church as given by Jesus.

> *Matt 16:18* *And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*

This is after Jesus asked two questions, *Who do men say that I am*? and *Who do you say that I am*? Peter replied, *Thou art the Son of the Living God*. Jesus then said to Peter, *Thou art petros* [masculine] *and upon this petra* [feminine] *I will build my assembly*. Therefore *petra* and *petros* cannot refer to the same thing. The latter word must refer to something within the preceding conversation. However, the two traditional views are:

[a] The Roman Catholic view – that "The Church" is built upon the Apostle Peter.

[b] The Protestant view – that "The Church" is built upon the rock itself. The translators of the KJV did not give the word *rock* a capital "R" as might have been expected. The traditional teaching from this verse is that Jesus is the rock upon which He builds His Church. This sounds quite reasonable until we look into the words used in the verse. [Please note that it is not being said that Jesus is not the cornerstone of the foundation].

The word, *petros*, is simply a small rock or stone that came from a larger rock. The second word for rock is *petra*, the feminine of the very same word but it refers to a huge immovable mass of rock. Now, <u>if Jesus is the rock in question upon which the church is founded, then Jesus would also have to be feminine!</u> So, we had better look further into some *petra* verses to find out in what sense the *rock* is used.

> Vine says: ***Petra*** denotes a mass of rock, as distinct from ***petros*** a detached stone or boulder, or a stone that might easily be thrown.

For example:

> *Matt 7:24* *Therefore whosoever hears these sayings of mine, and does them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock* [petra].
>
> *Rom 9:33* *As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a stumblingstone* [lithos], *and a rock* [petra] *of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.*

Jesus' words are the stumbling stone Israel could trip up on. <u>This never applies to peoples other than Israel</u>. But the stone in Romans 9 is not *petra* or *petros*; it is *lithos*. The *stumbling stone* and the *rock* are not the same words. Jesus said those who build their houses in response to *these sayings of mine* are those who build on the feminine *petra*. Jesus was then

addressing his disciples [Israelites all], and not the Scribes and Pharisees in the mixed multitude.
The people who are the subject of the discussion in both verses, are stated to be Israel [and they are Israel only].
Peter also uses the two quite different words for *stone* or *rock* in the same manner and in the one context.

1 Peter 2:7,8 — *Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone* [lithos] *which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone* [lithos] *of stumbling, and a rock* [petra] *of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.*

Lithos is a stone or rock that has been fashioned or worked over, for example, a corner stone, a tomb stone or a mill stone. So, there can be no mistake. In these verses we see three distinct terms:

petros	a rough, unfinished, unsophisticated stone that is a chip off a large lump of rock - like the rubble at the bottom of a cliff.
lithos	a worked, piece of stone that has been produced for a particular purpose.
petra	a huge, unmovable mass of rock - like Ayer's Rock in Australia. It is more than foundation rock - it is awesome in its immensity.

The great immovable rock of Matt 16:18 was the statement: *Thou art the Son of the living God*. For a human being, like Peter, to reach a point where this statement can be made is a momentous occasion. It is the dawn-breaking realisation that Jesus is ~~no ordinary~~ man. It is the actions taken in response to this discovery that shows what we believe. This is why the called-out ones are the ones who believe this rock solid statement and build on it.
To be wise, we must consider well Jesus' words.

COULD "THE CHURCH" TAKE OVER THE PROMISES MADE TO ISRAEL?

In the last chapter of the Book of Romans, it is sometimes claimed that the dispersed of Israel rejected the salvation of God, and when Paul turned to the "Gentiles" [v28], he was supposed to be turning to non-Israel stock. "The Church" is thus said to contain non-Israelites and to have taken over all the promises that had been made to Israel. We need to consider three issues in connection with those verses:

1. Paul was speaking with Judeans who were then in Rome. He turned to the House of Israel because *they will hear it*. In all of Paul's epistles, he writes to Israelites [see the chapter, *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*].
2. There is only one set of promises in prophecy and these are made to Israel. There is no separate set made for any non-Israelite church. The fulfilment can only be made in the same people, or as Paul puts it, *in us, their children*.
3. The doctrine of the Kinsman-Redeemer would have to be ignored. God is faithful not to break His own laws. Jesus is the Kinsman-Redeemer **of Israel**, not of others who are not kinsmen. The called-out ones are those of Israel who believe Him and change their lives accordingly. They had previously been *under the Law*. These from among Israel are the members of the *ekklesia*, the assembly, (not church!).

WHO IS "THE ASSEMBLY"?

When Stephen was addressing the Judean leaders, he related the history of Israel to them. This is what "got them going". These leaders were a mixture of *men* and *brethren*, both appearing jointly as *elders*. Stephen reminded them of the prophecy that Moses had made about a prophet being raised up unto Israel *like unto me* and that *him shall ye hear*.. Jesus was to be raised up unto the very same [like] racial group of people. Stephen then goes on to say:

Acts 7:38 — *This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sina, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give to us.*

Here we find mention of the church [*ekklesia*] which also existed in the Old Testament. This means that they are the same entity. Stephen isolates *the church* as having *our fathers* in a genetic way. This is not what is taught in our Bible schools and churches, because it does not fit with the multi-racial conception of "The Church". The Israelites were on their own, separate from the other races, in the wilderness. Stephen tells of the lively oracles given to *us*. That these oracles were given to Israel alone has been shown from many Scriptures. Let us go on to look at other places where we find the word *ekklesia.*

Acts 20:28 … *and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church* (ekklesia) *of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.*

We could look at this flock later because it adds to what is being said. Israel as *sheep* in prophecy ties up with sheep in the New Testament. They isolate Israel as being the same people in both Testaments. In this verse Paul is addressing *the church of God*.. The church has been purchased, or bought back, by Jesus' blood. *Bought back* signifies that they were previously a possession of God. Without going into this as a subject, it can be stated that this can apply only to the nation of Israel. As Zacharias prophesied, *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed His people …to remember his holy covenant, and the oath which he sware to our father Abraham* [Luke 1:67,73]. All this identification could not possibly apply to other races. *The assembly* (*ekklesia*) is of Israel, and of Israel only, and these are the ones who *he hath purchased with his own blood* as quoted above.

Yahweh has done it in Jesus - Jesus was not God Incarnated

There are a number of references to the local assemblies *[ekklesia]* in various towns and even in houses, but there is no need to quote these verses. But, there are things about these assemblies that are significant.

1 Cor 1:2 *Unto the church* (ekklesia) *of God which is at Corinth, to them which are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, …*

This qualifies who are the members of the assemblies. The calling is essential. *Both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren* [Heb 2:11-13]. God's name is declared among the brethren … *in the midst of the church* (ekklesia) *will I sing praise unto thee … I and the children which God has given me*.

This assembly can never be stretched beyond this to include everyone on earth.

1 Cor 14:34 *Let your women keep silent in the churches* (ekklesia)*: for it is not permitted for them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law.*

Here we see a connection between the Law given to Israel and the persons being addressed. The assemblies consist of the same people who knew the Law. Therefore they must be the Israel people.

WHAT IS THE ASSEMBLY?

His *body*, is the one word which describes *the assembly* in Scripture.

Eph 1:22,23 … *and gave him to be the head over all things to the church* (ekklesia) *which is* ***His body****, …*

Col 1:18 *And he is the head of* ***the body****, the church* (ekklesia): …

Col 1:24 … *for His* ***body's*** *sake, which is the church* (ekklesia): …

Eph 5:23 *for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church* (ekklesia)*, and he is the saviour of* ***the body***.

The word *soma* (body) has a similar connotation as the human body in many verses where it is used, according to dictionaries and lexicons:

Vine	*soma*	The word is also used for physical nature, as distinct from *pneuma*; the spiritual nature.
Strong G4983	*soma*	From 4982; the body [as a sound whole], used in a very wide application, lit. or fig.: bodily, body, slave.

In Eph 5:23, there are the masculine aspects, the "husband", "head and "christ" with the feminine aspects, the "wife", "church" and the neuter noun "body".. The assembly has a head and a body. The spoken voice comes only from the head, from the husband aspect. The feminine aspect, the body, has no words of its own; it is subject to the head in all things. The head controls the body. Where this is not so, then what is found is not the true assembly. Paul says Israel would remain in that darkness until they were *made nigh in Christ Jesus by His Blood* [Eph 2:13]. But they are not spoken of as being *the body* until they are *made nigh*. These that are made nigh are the assembly. They come out from Israel only, and not from that which was given to Satan. Israel had been dead in their trespasses and sins through the broken Law and had walked according to the course of *this world*, but some were now quickened [or made alive] and saved by Grace. This is no different than what has been written in the chapter entitled *Adoption*. The story is the same.
So far we have the one body which is the *ekklesia*. This is one single body. In the New Testament, the KJV translators translated the singular word *ekklesia* as "churches" 37 times. It would have been better if the translators had used the word "congregation" or "assembly". *Congregation* is not used by the translators as a New Testament word, apart from Acts 13:43.. Here we have the start of a problem with the word *church*. Because of the translations, we wrongly associate the word *church* [as a place] with *congregation* [as people]. This gives problems when reading through the Word. Sometimes our conception of the church as a place where we go to is adequate, although in reality each person there must be a *called-out one*. They must all be of the *ekklesia*; they must all be of Israel. The place of the meeting is the *sunagog*e [used 58 times].
In the Old Testament there are three major words that have to do with the assembly. These words are:

Mowed	Refers to the meeting place or the meeting itself. The translators had "a lot of fun" translating this word, giving it meanings such as *assembly, appointed, seasons, congregation* and *solemn.* There are 24 references. All these translations do not help to make understanding easy. It means an appointed meeting or their coming together. This word is inclusive of everyone within the Israelite camp, both Israelite and non-Israelite.
Cahal	*An assembly called together – invited out of whole congregation.* The word only relates to racial Israelites, and so does not include any of the mixed multitude within the Israelite camp. These are the called-out ones who alone applied the blood of the Passover lamb.
Edah	The whole assembly inclusive of both Israelites and the mixed multitude. Unfortunately, both '*edah* and q*ahal* are translated as "congregation" and this gives rise to the misconception that the mixed multitude had the same total position as the Israelite bloodline. A parallel situation of mixture applied in Judea at the time of Jesus and a similar position is found among our assemblies today.

In both Testaments, the *cahal* and *ekklesia* are used exclusively of the seed of Abraham.

1 Tim 3:15 *But if you tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church* (ekklesia) *of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.*

The ground or *hedraioma* of the truth, means *to make stable, settle firmly, a stay or support* [Thayer].

THE ASSEMBLY OF GOD

1 Cor 10:32 *Give no offence, neither to the Jews* (Judeans), *nor to the Gentiles* (Hellen: Greeks), *nor to the church* [assembly] *of God.*

Three groups are mentioned in this verse:

1. Unconverted "Jews", or the Judeans of Israel.
2. Unconverted "Gentiles" of the Dispersion of Israel.
3. The converted ones from these two who are *the assembly of God.*

The popular reasoning from this verse is that assembly is comprised of converted people from out of the "Jews and Gentiles". This is thus thought to encompass every race on earth. But, as these "Gentiles" are the House of Israel, the assembly must be comprised of those who are from the House of Judah plus the House of Israel, who are redeemed under the terms of the New Testament made to Israel. Scripture says the New Testament is made with these two Houses alone [Heb 8:8]. This confirms what we saw under the chapter *Adoption*. In the above verse, then, no offence is to be given to any of Israel stock from either House, whether converted or unconverted. The context as given in verses 1 and 2 of this chapter in Corinthians is Israel. Those being addressed in the first verse of chapter 10 had "fathers" who were associated with Moses; this means that they were Israelites.

THE CHURCH WHICH IS THE SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN

Today, although we have open, unashamed, so-called "churches" of Satan, these are not our concern here. The Synagogue of Satan is an imitation and a counterfeit of the real thing. Jesus spoke about the synagogue of Satan in Rev 2:9 and 3:9.. This synagogue of Satan co-exists with what is translated as the "churches". If we venture to say that the members of Satan's synagogue are such because they are not of the seed of Abraham, some might object and they might object loudly. Jesus says that these of Satan's synagogue call themselves Judeans *and are not*. They profess to be of God's people but they are not. Jesus says so, and in the Gospels He also points to the *children of the wicked one*. This indicates that they are of a different seed. This distinction must be kept in mind.

Matt 13:38 *The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one.*

Here we see two differing 'children'. Jesus says that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. It is absolutely impossible. Peter tells of two differing seeds, the corruptible and the incorruptible. This compares the natural man of Genesis 1 with the spirit carrying man, of Genesis 2. The *good seed* is the only seed which can be quickened by the Word of God. So, is there a corruptible seed and an incorruptible seed or not? Peter is writing to the "elect" (chosen) nation and he tells about the salvation that should come to this people. The prophets of Israel searched for the grace that was to come to Israel [1 Peter 1:10]. Is God not allowed to make such choices? Is God not allowed to be merciful to those whom He will? Is God not supposed to harden whom He will? Yes, but we are taught this is not so and that every kin is the same and has the same opportunity. The tares, like the trees from corrupt seed, have the destiny of being *cast into the fire*.
Amongst Israel were and still are:

[a] The false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing [Matt 7:15].

[b] Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the truth [2 Tim 3:8].

[c] Those who lay in wait to deceive [Eph 4:14].

[d] Men speaking perverse things to draw away disciples [Acts 20:28-31].

These are the false teachers who can be identified by:

[a] Their *winds of doctrine*.. [Eph 4:14].

[b] Their Christian doctrines from seducing spirits with *doctrines of devils* [1 Tim 4:1].

[c] Their perversion of *the right ways of the Lord* [Acts 13:10].

These all look like the real thing in outward profession! They use God's word in the way Satan does. They say *Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your Name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and done many wonderful works*? This would be enough to convince the average church-goer that these were so-called *spirit-filled* [present tense] and *born again* Christians [perish both expressions]. They are one thing outwardly, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. The outward *wonderful works* claimed are works, and not Grace. Works are not fruit; only the good seed can produce that. Fruit is produced, by God, as the good

seed abides in the Vine. The seed is manifested by actions; it is by their *fruit ye shall know them.*
Wonderful works, in themselves, prove absolutely nothing. Jesus says of them, *I never knew you. Never* is *oudepote.*

Vine	*oudepote*	from *oude*, not even, and *pote*, at anytime and is used in definite negative statements.

He never ever knew them. But who will agree with Jesus today? So let us now see how Satan's synagogue also has wonderful works.
As it has been said, these things, such as the prophesying in the name of Jesus, the casting out of devils and the wonderful works, might deceive even the elect.

Mark 13:22	*For false Christs and false prophets shall arise, and shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.*
John 4:48	*Then said Jesus unto him, except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.*
Matt 12:39	*An evil and adulterous generation seek after a sign; …*

The latter two verses were addressed to the Pharisees. The false christs and false prophets who are not of the elect, seek by signs and wonders to deceive the elect.
What does the average church-goer flock to see today? What do they seek after? How would they know and discern what is deceit and seduction? Are they taught? Or do they and their pastors pray saying, *Lord, give us miracles; Lord, show us your power; Lord, pour out your spirit; Lord, send us out*.. Listen to Church-goers at prayer meetings. What is it that many of the people want most? They want signs and wonders! Their actions and behaviour can be impressive! But, these can be seen as mechanisms of deception.

Rev 13:13	*And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on Earth, in the sight of men.*

How much closer to the truth could he appear to be? Satan is shown as doing wonders in the sight of men! Look at the order of service at many modern Pentecostal-type meetings. There is a similar technique to that found in parts of the entertainment world to raise an atmosphere. The old nature is quickened. First we have the loud music and the clapping to the beat of drums. Choruses are sung proclaiming what we are; how we are a mighty army and all these things. The songs are what they call affirmations; such as, *We are a people of power*. Now, what is the thought that is being instilled in the congregation's mind? What is being whipped up? What is the ambition? Is it not to raise enough fervour to prophesy, then to *cast out devils* [deliverance] and then do mighty works? Then they shout supposedly binding demons but there is no change. They have done this for years. It all sounds so good. It sounds alive, but again, there are no changes. They want a name that they are alive*, but are dead*? The net result of this activity is disillusionment, defeat and apathy. The local assemblies hold a majority of disillusioned and apathetic people.
These three things, the power, the signs and the wonders, are what some people seek above all else. Satan can do it! Satan can make fire come down from heaven, in the sight of men, we are told [Rev 13:13, taking this literally]. So they sing, *I'm calling down fire* to get the meeting all fired up. Their fire has to come from the outside. They do not already have it within. God's people, the elect, can easily be led astray in this area.
One thing more might be said. Consider the worship service on Mt. Carmel [1 Kings 18]. Study the worship order of the prophets of Ba'al. The Word of the Lord did not matter to them. They cried out; they cut themselves, they prophesied, but there was no fire for them. Elijah did what he did, because God's Word had told him to. He just prayed a simple prayer and the fire fell. And the ratio there was one true prophet to 450 false prophets. Could we have a similar ratio today? Although all professed to worship a god, the prophets of Ba'al did not address their god the same way Elijah addressed his God. Elijah knew his God *as the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, not the Ba'al of all races. Is this the same in the

noisy so-called Christian world today? Almost always it is *Christ this, and Christ that*, it is *Lord this, and Lord that*. They are forever saying the *Lord, Lord*, but they are not ever doing the will of God. Their actions do not support their words. Seldom is the precious name of Jesus heard in their worship, apart from trying to use the name of Jesus to cast out demons [see Acts 8:9:24]. That they do wonderful works *in My Name* proves nothing!
The grand old songs of the Church, the songs of Redemption, the songs of Calvary and the songs of the Saviour's Love are not popular. No, power, signs and wonders are paramount, to them. These are what they like to sing about. They have much in common with the New Age!
We read of a "false Jew" in Acts 13:10 who ceased not *to pervert the right ways of the Lord*. He could not help it.

> *Jude 12,13* *These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear, clouds they are without water … to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.*

Does our charity deny the Word of God which says *to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever*. Darkness is reserved for them even as surely as Israel's inheritance is reserved for Israel [1 Peter 1:4]. There is one great thing wrong with these people, even if they profess to be Christians. Yes, they separate themselves, but they *are not having the Spirit* [Jude 19].

SIGNS AND WONDERS IN THE ASSEMBLY

There can be no denying that signs and wonders are part of what is expected to be seen in the assembly. There is no denying that people believed Jesus after seeing and experiencing of miracles. The point being stressed is that this believing had aspects other than just the miracles, namely:

1. The prior proclaiming of the gospel.
2. The proclamation of the Kingdom.
3. The Lord working with them.

Hence:

> *Mark 16:20* *And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following.*

The miracles that are of God follow the teaching of the Word and the call to repentance in Israel. Jesus and John the Baptist taught of repentance and the Kingdom of The Heavens and of God. Jesus performed miracles, but John *did no miracle*. John the Baptist's call to repentance was followed by some hearers repenting. But, where is the call to repentance and the teaching of the Kingdom of Heaven today?
In what is today called the Early Church, they taught of repentance and of the resurrection, from the dead [Acts 4:1]. There was persecution too, but also there was the witness of the resurrection of Jesus, accompanied with great grace and great power.
Before Jesus' death and resurrection, the principle was exactly the same.

> *Luke 16:30,31.* *Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he* [Jesus] *said unto him, if they will hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.*

Someone being raised from the dead might well be classed by many as the greatest miracle, but that alone would persuade nobody to repent. Jesus says so! He also pointed out that if they would not accept the persuasion of Moses and the Prophets they would not accept the persuasion of One from the dead. So today it is necessary to *hear Moses and the Prophets*, and *it is written* as the basis of right teaching. But, the churches today often dismiss this saying instead*, that's Old Testament*.
Back in the days of Ezra, there was the teaching of the Word to Israelites. The understanding was given and there was repentance that was followed by God manifesting His Glory. The

people of Judah wept with joy because they understood the words that were spoken. [But we have to note here that the Israelites were required to divorce their foreign wives together with their mixed - blood children]. There was no attempt to stimulate without any understanding and teaching about repentance.
There are other examples of this order in Scripture and we must also take note:

1. That miracles in themselves do not make people believe.
2. Teaching converted people to inspire them to a new level of faith will not necessarily enable them to move in the supernatural. Repentance, obedience, love and right application are part of the package.
3. Miracles may make the "wrong" people want to assemble themselves with Israel. These foreigners become a major problem to Israel and Peter tells us they will still be among the people of God through this age. They are still a problem that is not dealt with because there is no separation made.

When the Children of Israel came out from Egypt, there was a mixed multitude who came out with them. The reason is not stated, but it may have been because they had seen the miracles. It is likely they contained the descendants of the servants of Abraham's family who went down the Egypt with the Israelites. Universalists like to say that this is a type of "Gentiles" joining themselves to Israel. It was this mixed multitude that *fell to lusting in the wilderness*.. Ezra taught the word to Israel and the people repented by separating from Israel, all the mixed multitude. We will see this in the chapter, *What of Balaam's Doctrine*. It is the mixed multitude in the midst of Israel that makes it so hard to accept the exclusive nature of Israel, compounded by governments making racial separation illegal under Human Rights legislation. Non-separation encourages acceptance of the Doctrine of Balaam.

WHAT ARE WE SAYING?

The assembly is not a multi-racial entity in Scripture, even if it is accepted as if it were a fact of life in the denominational churches today. The only multi-nation aspect is that of *being of the nations* [plural] *of Israel*. They are most definitely not what we commonly know as being "The Jews" today. God's people are the only ones Scripture records as the second parties to both the Old Testament and the New Testament. In due course some of their many marks of identification will be shown. They are *ready to be revealed in the last time* [1 Peter 1:5]. Peter says this Grace is *to be brought unto you* [that is, those being written to] *at the revelation of Jesus Christ*, Peter says. This is the time of the *blessed hope* of the assembly only. This hope cannot be the blessed hope of anyone else.
It is our choice whether or not *to be mindful of the words spoken before by the holy Prophets, and of the commandments of us the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour* [1 Peter 2:3]. We can, of course, ignore the holy prophets of Israel and follow the false prophets that were present then and now.

2 Peter 2:1 *But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you …*

These teachers are now among us, as prophesied. These widen God's gate to include all of every race, following the *way of Balaam*.

CHAPTER 14: WHY NOT PROCLAIM THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN?

In this chapter we will look at the Kingdom that was established in the Old Testament to see how this relates to the Kingdom in the New Testament.

Matt 10:7 *And as you go, preach, saying, 'the KINGDOM OF HEAVEN is at hand'*

This is the commission that is never a central issue or teaching that is carried out today. What we have to decide essentially, is whether or not The Kingdom referred to in the New Testament has any connection with God's Kingdom, as taught, in the Old Testament. Are they the same Kingdom? Is Israel still racially exclusive in this respect? The purpose in this chapter, is to show that in both Testaments they are the same people.

WHY "THE KINGDOM OF GOD" AND "THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN"?

Quoting from Vine under "Kingdom":

> *With regard to the expressions,* The Kingdom of God *and the* Kingdom of the Heavens*, while they are often used interchangeably, it does not follow that, in every case, they mean exactly the same and are identical.*
>
> *The Apostle Paul often speaks of the Kingdom of God, not dispensationally but morally, for example, Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20 but never so with the Kingdom of Heaven.* God *is not the equivalent of* the heavens. *He is everywhere and above all dispensations, whereas* the heavens *are distinguished from the earth, until the Kingdom comes in judgment and power and glory [Rev 11:15], when the rule in heaven and on earth will be one.*
>
> *While then, the sphere of the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Heaven are at times identical, yet one term cannot be used indiscriminately for the other. In the Kingdom of Heaven [32 times in Matthew], heaven is in antithesis to earth, and the phrase is limited to the Kingdom in its earthly aspect for the time being, and is used dispensationally* ***in connection with Israel*** *… The Kingdom of Heaven is always the Kingdom of God, but the Kingdom of God is not limited to the Kingdom of Heaven, until in their final form, they become identical.*

This is a particularly unhelpful description. The difference between Matthew and the others is that Matthew presents Jesus as the King. By referring to the Kingdom of Heaven we are left in no doubt as to the dominion of the King, whose identity and right to rule is given in Matthew's genealogy. It is called the Kingdom of the Heavens because that is the natural abode of its citizens - that which is spirit is spirit. The seven parables in Matthew concern the dominion of the kingdom and its citizens.
The other gospels and the Epistles, use the generic expression, Kingdom of God, because they take the existence of the Kingdom as a fact and are not concerned with the Kingdom itself. They focus on the people who have the potential to enter the Kingdom and try to deliver the messages concerning the Kingdom to them.

JESUS' TEACHING ABOUT THE KINGDOM

Jesus taught about the Kingdom, using the word over 100 times! This is a grand theme throughout the Bible from the time of the establishment of the Kingdom. If we look at the statistics we find something astounding:

Proclaiming the Kingdom	306 verses.
Proclaiming the King	964 verses.
Rejection of the King	901 verses.
Rejection of the Kingdom.	782 verses.

What this means is that 78% of the verses within the gospels concern the "kingdom".. It is recorded that Jesus' first words are about the Kingdom, as are his last words when he was asked*, Lord, will you, at this time, restore the Kingdom to Israel [*Acts 1:6]. JESUS BEGAN AND FINISHED ON THIS SUBJECT! Note that the restoration concerns Israel only..

Paul shows that this subject goes right to the end when he says, *then comes the end, when he shall have delivered up THE KINGDOM to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power* [1 Cor 15:24]. So, the Kingdom continues until the end of the age. The gospel Paul declares in the first verses of this chapter, concerning Jesus' death and resurrection, in context, applies to this Kingdom.
A look at a concordance will reveal that Jesus spoke the word *salvation* only twice. The first is found in Luke 19:9 [Zacchaeus] and the second in John 4:22 [*salvation is of the Jews*]. In neither of these verses does the word have the meaning that is commonly put upon it. When Jesus declared that salvation had come to the house of Zacchaeus, this man had agreed to keep a certain portion of the Law of Moses! In the second instance, Jesus was saying that salvation comes from among the Judeans because He was referring to Himself.
Likewise, the word *church* (ekklesia) was used by Jesus only three times, so something must be wrong with what is normally taught about both "salvation" and "church".. These are the facts that denominational churches refuse to admit, teaching instead what they call the *gospel of salvation* in a different context to the 78% of the gospel verses as shown above.

THE WORD "KINGDOM"

In the Old Testament, as might be expected, the translators have been inconsistent in translating the three main words that are most commonly translated as "Kingdom".
We have:

Strong H4467	*Mamlakah*	Dominion [used of all kingdoms of all races].
Strong H4468	*Mamlakuwth*	The reign of any king of any race.
Strong H4410	*Meluwkah*	The thing ruled, that is, The Kingdom itself.

The latter word is used of two kingdoms in particular, that of God and that of Lucifer. There are 24 references in the Old Testament.
The first mention of *meluwkah* is in:

1 Sam 10:16 … *But of the matter of* ***the kingdom****, whereof Samuel spake, he told him not.*

This first mention tells us exactly what the Kingdom is about and that this concerns the people of Israel only.
It was the *word of the Lord* that Israel should have a king [1 Sam 9:17]. Saul was to be the first in this position, but no unconditional promise was made to King Saul, as the King. Next the Kingdom was given to David.

1 Chron 10:14 *And [Saul] inquired not of the Lord: therefore he [God] slew him, and turned* ***the kingdom*** *unto David Son of Jesse.*

This Kingdom is spoken of as THE LORD'S KINGDOM. This is the same as the New Testament expression, *The Kingdom of Heaven*. The Throne belonged to God, and Solomon sat upon that *Throne of the Lord* [1 Chron 29:23]. Jesus is to inherit **this same Throne** of His father David [Luke 1:32].

Ps 22:28 *For* ***the kingdom*** *is the Lords: and he is the governor among the nations.*

This is yet another statement about this Israel Kingdom ruling with the Lord *among the nations*. *Meluwkah* is expressed as being a crown of glory and a royal diadem in the hand of the Lord [Isaiah 62:3]. In context, this is Israel. It is a very special Kingdom which is among, but separate from, the other kingdoms on Earth. It is a Kingdom which was established to be forever.

IS THE KINGDOM PHYSICAL OR SPIRITUAL?

Denominational churches teach that the Kingdom is now a spiritual kingdom, made up of *born again* believers of all races. Let us look and see why this cannot be so. We will

continue by looking at the Kingdom in the Old Testament. Of David and the covenant God made with the House of David, we read:

> *2 Sam 7:12-16* *And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed* ***out of thy bowels****, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of* ***his kingdom*** *for ever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son. … But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul … And thine house, and* ***thy kingdom****, shall be established for ever before thee:* ***thy throne*** *shall be established for ever.*

Here we find the seed comes from physical copulation – *out of thy bowels* and *thy seed*. So, it is not a spiritual Kingdom; it has flesh and blood monarchs. This is an eternal kingdom which starts on Earth with a human king on a throne, to which Jesus will return to reign. The popular teaching instead is that Jesus has already inherited that Throne and is now ruling from heaven, whereas Jesus says He will return to take His Kingdom on Earth.
2 Sam 7:12-16 shows the establishment of the Kingdom under the House of David, and note, the promises to this kingdom are now unconditional. Later on we can see this expressed as a covenant.

> *2 Chron 13:5* *Ought ye not to know that the Lord God* ***of Israel****, gave* ***the kingdom over Israel*** *to David for ever,* ***even to him and his sons****, by a covenant of salt?*

The *even to his sons* are salty words that the universalist, denominational churches absolutely refuse to believe. As has been said, it is impossible to believe in a multi-racial church and preach the Kingdom of Heaven at the same time. They will not believe that *even to his sons* means just that. [NOTE: *for ever* often signifies *to the end of the age*]. As for national Israel, teachers say that Israel is now a spiritual Kingdom with Jesus as the King. This ignores that Jesus is to return to take up His Kingdom. He does not yet rule with a rod of iron, and so the concept of the Kingdom being spiritual is not valid.
When we come to the New Testament, the parables of Matthew 13 are immediately spiritualised by the churches. They claim the parables deal with moral and spiritual struth and the commentaries are a collection of the most imaginative interpretations you could ever wish to find. However, the hard fact is that if we choose to ignore that the Kingdom is literal, what would we do with the Throne of David that is established for ever? Has the seed out of David's bowels gone some where else or has it evaporated or has the seed been spilled upon the ground? Has the sun and the moon ceased to shine so that God's promise to David might be of non-effect? Are we to say that the resurrection is past, and overthrow the faith of some? Do we say that Jesus has already returned and is now seated upon that same Throne, on Earth?
Many churches, in effect, are saying the Kingdom is not literal, even if they do not realise it. Their platforms stand on isolated Scriptures only. Now, remember, it is the greater part of the Christian churches that teach this wrong concept. The weightier matters of the Law are what is omitted [Matt 23:23], when they omit the origins of the Kingdom in the Old Testament. To them, the Laws of the Kingdom do not exist; the continuing Throne of David does not exist today. If they do not believe this exists, then they cannot proclaim the Kingdom of Heaven and the continuing Throne of David.
The following verses are typical of those used to support the spiritualised view.

> *1 Cor 15:50* *Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the* ***kingdom of God****; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.*

This Scripture is used to try to indicate that the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be material and literal. But, the Kingdom of God, even as this verse shows, is an inheritance. There is a time for gaining of rulership over that which is inherited. The verb *inherit* shows progression from one state to another. We do not yet reign on Earth with our glorified bodies! We have not come into our inheritance.
After Jesus was resurrected, He no longer spoke of being *flesh and blood*, but rather of being *flesh and bone*. Glorified and incorruptible bodies will no longer have corrupted, or

corruptible, blood. The redeemed out of Israel will not just be spirits wandering about without bodies. The redeemed will look as Jesus did after His resurrection, when He said:

Luke 24:39 *Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bone, as you see me have.*

The simple fact is that human beings do not enter the Kingdom of God. They must first die and be raised in their immortal form. For some, that process will occur in the twinkling of an eye. For those already dead and buried it will seem as if was a twinkling of an eye between when they were alive and are now resurrected.

Luke 17:21 *… for behold, the **Kingdom of God** is within you.*

This is a simple translation error – it should read *is among you*. Jesus is the King of the Kingdom. The Pharisees were asking Jesus about the end of the age, and of the Kingdom of God. They did not believe in the Kingdom of Heaven any more than the universalist churches do today. He tells them that He must first suffer and be rejected before the lightning flash of his Second Coming occurs. But at that time, He was the King Eternal who was then present amongst, the population of Judea and Galilee.

John 18:36 *… **my kingdom** is not of this world …*

This is another translation error. Jesus is saying that His Kingdom is not of the *kosmos* (order) of Rome. This aspect of *kosmos* has been covered earlier in the chapter *Reactions to an Exclusive Israel*.. Jesus does not give this some mystical spiritual meaning. The references to the Kingdom of God in the Gospel of John do not say the Kingdom is spiritual and thus is accessible to all races. Jesus says that UNLESS one is begotten *from above*, of water and of spirit, [at the time of conception] that person CANNOT enter the Kingdom of God.
In conclusion on this question of a spiritualised kingdom, the Kingdom is real, as is its throne. However, its citizens are resurrected beings with immortal bodies. Entry to that Kingdom requires, as a minimum:

[a] being begotten from above

[b] believing Jesus is the Son of God.

WHAT DO THE PROPHETS SAY?

Isaiah 9:7,8 *Of the increase of his government, and peace, there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon **his kingdom**, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth, even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. The Lord sent a word into Jacob, and it has lighted upon Israel.*

Isaiah 60:12 *For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.*

Jer 51:19,20 *The portion of Jacob is not like them; for he is the former of all things, and Israel is the rod of his inheritance: for the Lord of hosts is his name. Thou art my battle axe and weapons of war: for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee shall I destroy kingdoms.*

We see that every reference to this Kingdom is associated with Israel [Jacob] as a race. We can see the nature of this Kingdom as being dominant, with all the other nations being required to serve Israel or perish. Israel is to be God's battle axe against other nations.
Is it taught that this Kingdom, having a Throne with a Royal Seed, must exist somewhere on earth today? No, the national message of the Bible is almost totally absent and untaught in the majority of denominational churches. We have to ask, *How could the separated nations ever be spiritualised as 'nations and kingdoms'*? *How could the verses above be spiritualised*? When we come to the New Testament, we find the picture is identical to that in the Old Testament. Our unchanging God still has not changed, as we shall see.

To confirm this from the Psalms and to complete the necessary Law/Psalms/Prophets triad, which is the requirement of this book, we find there is much in the Psalms about the Kingdom and its Throne.

Ps 89:3,4 — *I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up* ***thy throne*** *to all generations.*

Ps 89:20-22 — *I have found David, my servant, with my holy oil have I anointed him: with whom my hand shall be established, mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him; nor the son of wickedness afflict him.*

Ps 89:29,36, 37 — *His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and* ***his throne*** *as the days of heaven … and* ***his throne*** *as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven.*

Until heaven and earth passes away; until the sun and the moon cease to be visible, David's Throne is established for all generations. This is one of the reasons why a monarchy representing David's Throne over Israel must exist today.

THE THRONE OF THE KINGDOM

The Throne of the Kingdom is not the Throne in Heaven. Our present purpose is to consider the Throne of the Kingdom of the Lord, on Earth, firstly through the Old Testament, then through the New Testament:

[a] There are prophecies given in the Old Testament that relate to these two covenant periods.

[b] There are prophecies that refer to Jesus when He takes that throne.

[c] There is reference to this Kingdom being handed over to the Father.

There is only one kingdom with the one Throne! Later on we will see just where this Throne might be today. It must be the Throne of a Kingdom existent today. The Throne is described as being *the throne of the Lord* and as being *His Throne* in the Old Testament. It is still the same Throne in the New Testament.

2 Chron 9:8 — *Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on* ***his throne*** *…*

1 Chron 28:5 — *… to sit upon* ***the throne*** *of the kingdom of the Lord,* ***over Israel****.*

1 Chron 29:23 — *Then Solomon sat on* ***the throne*** *of the Lord …*

So, it is the Lord's Throne over Israel, with flesh and blood human beings sitting upon it, from the time of its formation until Jesus claims it.
Now, it is no use for us to say that the Kingdom of The Lord is over people other than Israel. The clear presentation of all Scripture is that the Throne is *over Israel*. We will find this also in the New Testament, where Jesus, the Son of God, is presented as being the descendant of David.

Luke 1:32,33 — *… and the Lord God shall give unto him* ***the throne*** *of his father David: and he shall rule over the house of Jacob, for ever …*

We cannot force this verse beyond *the House of Jacob*.. Through both Testaments, the Kingship rule is over the *House of Jacob* exclusively.. No other race is ever presented as being included with Israel anywhere. It is always Israel, ruling with ~~God~~ Jesus, over the other nations. The King is never other than the King "**of Israel**"; He is the King of a chosen, called, particular and peculiar people. Israel is, as always, exclusive!

Luke 1:32,33 — *He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him* ***the throne*** *of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of* ***his kingdom*** *there shall be no end.*

Immediately we can see the connection between the Throne of David and the Throne that is given to Jesus. They are one and the same. The reign is specifically given as being over the

"**House of Jacob**", this being "**all Israel**".. This is completely exclusive of other races; it is a racial statement!

Acts 2:29,30 *Men and brethren, let us freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried … that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on* ***his throne****.*

The phrases *fruit of his loins* and *according to the flesh* are as unavoidable as is David's Throne. Jesus never denies His *Son of David* connection.

THE ETERNAL NATURE OF THE THRONE

This presentation might upset many who have been taught otherwise. While many of us will accept that the Kingship and Kingdom existed in the Old Testament, it will be heard, *"That's Old Testament"*, suggesting wrongly that the Kingdom no longer exists, other than in some spiritual sense.
Jesus returns to David's Throne and the Throne is for ever!

2 Sam 7:13 *He shall build an house for my name, and I will stablish* ***the throne of the kingdom****, for ever.*

1 Kings 9:5 *Then will I establish the throne of* ***thy kingdom*** *upon Israel for ever, as I promised to David thy father, saying, There shall not fail thee a man upon* ***the throne of Israel****.*

Jer 33:17 *For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want a man to sit upon* ***the throne of the house of Israel****.*

We see here that the Throne is **upon Israel**.. There will always be a monarch upon that Throne. This promise was conditional upon obedience, and Solomon's line failed to meet the conditions. The kingdom was rent and Solomon's son no longer ruled over all twelve tribes. But Jeremiah 33:17-25 tells that the promise that God made to David would last as long as day follows night. So even if Solomon did fail, offspring of David would be ruling on a throne [or thrones] over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The location is not limited to the Holy Land.

Ps 132:11 *The Lord has sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it, Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon* ***thy throne****.*

The Lord has sworn in truth makes every suggestion that there is no continuing throne of David a complete lie. The *fruit of thy body* shows that the monarch[s] must be descendant[s] from King David. Yet, the traditional teaching is either contrary to *it is written* or it is ignored. We cannot escape or ignore *the fruit of thy body*.
The House of Israel is that part of Israel which will always have a monarch or monarchs, from David's line upon the Throne. The Edomite leaders of the Judean nation, acknowledged, *We have no king, but Caesar*. They said, *Away with this man, we will not have Him to reign over us*. When the House of Israel and the House of Judah re-unite, Jesus will be the monarch from the House of David who will reign over both of them. In the restoration, both Houses will be properly re-united; a representative portion of them will return to the Land *with one King* [Ezek 37:21-25].

Ps 45:6 *THY THRONE, O God, is for ever and ever, the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre.*

The sceptre is the symbol of authority.

Ps 122:4 *Whither the tribes go up, even the* ***tribes of the Lord****, unto the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord.*

The *tribes of the Lord* is not a multi-racial church. The thrones of the House of David are plural here [v5].
At the time of Ezekiel's temple, there is no change in the exclusive position of Israel. God is *in the midst of the Children of Israel*.

Ezek 43:7 *The place of* ***my throne****, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell* ***in the midst of the children of Israel*** *for ever …*

We just cannot change *the children of Israel* here, can we?
Although the time of the restoration of all things is not our present subject, we see that Israel is still as exclusive as ever, at that time. There is no *midst of all nations or races* where God will dwell for ever. As always, it is limited to the "midst of Israel". The New Testament that is made with the House of Israel and the House of Judah is consistent with what God has sworn to David and the House of David [Heb 8:8]

PROCLAIMING THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

In Matthew's gospel we find it is the Kingdom of Heaven that is proclaimed. Let us consider some references:

Matt 3:2 *And saying, Repent ye, for the* ***kingdom of heaven*** *is at hand.*

Matt 4:17 *From that time, Jesus began to preach and to say, Repent, for the* ***kingdom of heaven*** *is at hand.*

Here we find Jesus and John the Baptist both starting their public ministry with exactly the same message. The message is always repentance followed by teaching about the imminence of the Kingdom of Heaven. This Kingdom was then in existence, but it was not manifest. Today we hear the Kingdom is "spiritualised."

Matt 5:10 *Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the* ***kingdom of heaven****.*

Matt 5:20 *For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the* ***kingdom of heaven****.*

These two verses refer to "righteousness".. Without this particular righteousness, no one at all can ever enter the Kingdom of Heaven. To say that there is only a spiritual interpretation of this passage, is to deny that there is a *righteous nation* in Scripture.

Matt 10:5-7 *These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles* [nations]*, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as you go, preach* [proclaim]*, saying, The* ***kingdom of heaven*** *is at hand.*

There are three obvious questions here that the churches do not answer:

1. Why this limitation on whom the disciples were to go to? Why only to Israel?
2. Why does the Kingdom of Heaven always relate in some way to Israel?
3. Why does Jesus not bring other races into the picture?

Jesus had already stated that some of the Scribes and Pharisees were not part of the righteous nation. Their measure of Law-keeping and other observances could never change their characteristics as being both *born from beneath* and *of their father the Devil* [John 8]. True righteousness is not based upon right living alone. Jesus told the Edomite leadership of the Jews:

Matt 8:11 *And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the* ***kingdom of heaven****.*

Here, again, we see the Kingdom of Heaven is associated with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Many of Israel will come, but the others are shut out of it. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are spoken of often as being *The Fathers*, that is, the fathers of Israel. This is racial. If this is not understood, then it is impossible to *proclaim the Kingdom of Heaven* in a meaningful sense. Where did Jesus go proclaiming the gospel of the Kingdom? Among whom did He go about healing every sickness and disease among the people? It was only to those to whom is was given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven. Today it is popular to deny Jesus and to say that everyone of every race is given the ability to know these mysteries. Jesus also limited those to whom the keys of the Kingdom were given.
The means of entering in is given only to those appointed. They only have opportunity; they only can have an inheritance. The inheritance is not by physical birth alone. Speaking to His disciples again, Jesus said:

Matt 18:3 *Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted,* [strengthened and turned towards it] *and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the* ***kingdom of heaven****.*

Again, Jesus is not speaking to the Scribes and Pharisees here, or to anyone outside of Israel. Jesus pointed out that the Edomite Jewish leaders were active in trying to prevent Israelites from knowing and entering their place in the Kingdom of Heaven, or their inheritance in the Kingdom.

Matt 23:13 *… for you shut up the* ***kingdom of heaven*** *against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.*

"The Jews" are still the major opponents of the Gospel of the Kingdom. The churches can pretend all they like that "The Jews" are not whom Jesus says they are, but that will not change what Jesus has declared! Each of this section of Jewry is still *the child of Hell* [v15]. To pray for "The Jews" is not the same as praying that, *all Israel might be saved.*

THE PARABLES

Matt 13:11-13 *He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of* ***the kingdom of heaven****, but to them it is not given. For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.*

It is Jesus who says understanding of the Kingdom is not given to everyone. We have immediately to agree, or to disagree, with the Sovereign God who does make selections among men.
According to Vine *mystery* means:

> *In the N.T. it denotes, not the mysterious (as with the Eng. word) but that which, being outside the range of unassisted natural apprehension, can be made known only by Divine revelation, and is made known in a manner and at a time appointed by God, and to those only who are illumined by His Spirit. In the ordinary sense a mystery implies knowledge withheld; its Scriptural significance is truth revealed. Hence the terms especially associated with the subject are* made known, manifested, revealed, preached, understand, *and* dispensation.

Anyone else to whom it is not given, will hear the word of the Kingdom [v19] and will not understand it. The subject of Matt 13:11 is the secrets hidden in the Word of God about the Kingdom of the Heavens. These secrets are presented as the parables in verse 13.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

Right at the commencement of this book of Acts, we find immediate reference to the Kingdom of God. Through this Book of Acts, the people addressed are always Israelites. This confirms what has been said in the chapter titled *Adoption*, where it has been shown that the Sons of God are placed *out of* national Israel. These so placed have their inheritance in the Kingdom of God.

Acts 1:3 *To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of things pertaining to the* ***kingdom of God****..*

Acts 1:6 *… they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again* ***the kingdom to Israel?***

Take careful note, Jesus does not say the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel will not take place, but that there is a God - appointed time to restore the Kingdom to Israel.. Nor does He say the promise made to King David and to the seed *from his bowels*, on that Throne, is taken away. Denominational churches may say this and say that the disciples misunderstood, but God does not say it. When the prophets say that the power of the Holy People would be scattered and that Israel would lose the knowledge of their identity until *the time of restoration* of the Kingdom to Israel, this does not say that the Davidic Covenant ceases to exist. It cannot cease because of God's oath.

The restoration of the *all things*, [Acts 3:21], includes the Kingdom. It is the God of OUR FATHERS [v13] who brings this to pass. *Our fathers* isolates Israel only as being the recipients.. Through repentance and belief, the iniquities of the fathers can be set aside under the New Testament to Israel. Those who *hear* Jesus as *that prophet* [v22] will not be destroyed from among the same people of Israel. Those left have an inheritance among the saints. This inheritance is the Kingdom of God.

Acts 8:12 *But when they believed Philip preaching* [proclaiming] *the things concerning the* ***kingdom of God****, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptised, both men and women.*

So, Phillip taught the things concerning the Kingdom of God, also, even after Pentecost. The disciples were exhorted to continue in the faith, to secure their inheritance.

Acts 14:22 *Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we through much tribulation, enter into the* ***kingdom of God****.*

The Apostle Paul consistently proclaimed the Kingdom of God to Israelites only. His expounding was from the Law and the Prophets. If we do not go back to this foundation, then we will "get it wrong".. Even from a natural point of view, it cannot be reasonable to insist that Paul would teach about the Law and the Prophets to those who had no knowledge of the Law and the Prophets.

Acts 19:8 *And he went into the synagogue … disputing and persuading the things concerning the* ***kingdom of God****.*

Likewise, we must dispute and persuade the things concerning the Kingdom of God. This was important to the Apostle Paul and so it must be important to us too.

Acts 20:25 *And now, behold, I know that you all, among whom I have gone preaching* [proclaiming] *the* ***kingdom of God*** *shall see my face no more.*

In the previous verse, Paul says that his ministry as received from the Lord Jesus, was *to testify of the grace of God*, relating this to the Kingdom of God.

Acts 28:23 *… to whom he expounded and testified the* ***kingdom of God****, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening.*

Once again we see the expounding is from Moses and the prophets. At the end of the Book of Acts, Paul speaks of the hardness of heart of those in Judea who would not hear the Gospel and thus he turned to proclaim to the dispersed nations of Israel outside of Judea. These nations are described as being "Gentiles" by the translators [see the chapter *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*]. That these were the nations of Israel is fully in accord with the prophets. It cannot be denied that this last chapter of Acts speaks of *The hope OF ISRAEL* [v20], and that the Holy Ghost spoke to OUR Fathers [v25]. The particular people being addressed among those at Rome *were Israelites* just as much as those from among the general population of Judea.
Paul proclaimed in Rome for two years. This was the same gospel that he received in the beginning. He declared, *The gospel which was preached* [proclaimed] *of me, is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ* [Gal 1:11,12]. If what is commonly taught today is *after man*, then it is time to reconsider what "gospel" is being proclaimed. At the end of this age it is to be still the same gospel according to Jesus:

Matt 24:14 *And this gospel of* ***the kingdom*** *shall be preached* [proclaimed] *in all the world* [kosmos: order] *for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come.*

The question must come to mind, *Why do ministers not expound the Kingdom from the Law and the Prophets, as well as from the New Testament, in the same way as the Apostles*?
Could it be because the Kingdom has a racial flavour in the Old Testament, and that this does not fit in with the Doctrine of Balaam or popular concepts about racism? They refuse to see the racial flavour in the New Testament because of this doctrine.

THE KINGDOM IN THE EPISTLES

There are references to the Kingdom of God in the epistles, but as shown, the people are still Israelites who are being addressed. The New Testament excludes *fornicators, idolaters, adulterers, the effeminate, homosexuals, thieves, the covetous, drunkards, revilers,* and *extortioners* from inheriting the Kingdom of God [1 Cor 6:9,10; Gal 5:21; Eph 5:5]. The Kingdom of God is always spoken of as being an inheritance. The majority of Bible teachers teach that all Christians are already in the Kingdom, instead of Christians being in the process of receiving, or qualifying for the kingdom, as heirs.
This is the Kingdom that Jesus will deliver up to the Father when He shall have put down all rule and authority and power [1 Cor 15:24]. This inheritance of the *brethren* cannot be inherited by flesh and blood [1 Cor 15:50], but only those who are changed at the Trump of God [v52]. Until this time, the Gospel of the Kingdom is to be proclaimed as a witness, and then *shall the end come* [Matt 24:14]. Jesus here, is speaking of the Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven and this is to be proclaimed to the *cities* **OF ISRAEL** [Matt 10:23], *till the Son of Man be come*. The entrance of Israelites into the Kingdom of God is by inheritance and walking in the Light, so that the Blood of Jesus is able to cover sin [1 John 1:7]. The *'cities of Israel'* exist wherever Israel was scattered and where they exist today.
There are many conditional Scriptures to this end that include the word "Kingdom".

Heb 12:28	*Wherefore we receiving* ***a kingdom*** *which cannot be moved, let us have grace, whereby we may serve God acceptably, with reverence and godly fear.*
James 2:5	*Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and* ***heirs of the kingdom****, which he has promised to those who love Him?*
2 Peter 1:10,11	*Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if you do these things, you will never fall. For so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*

Again, what is the time given for entrance to be ministered? What is the time of the promise? In Revelation we find the time when comes *salvation, strength, and the Kingdom of our God.* Then reward is given unto *thy servants, the Prophets and the Saints*. This reward is given to no others. This is the receiving of the inheritance! As yet, we have only an *earnest* of this inheritance.
Paul also talks of:

Being *translated into* ***the kingdom*** of His dear Son	[Col 1:13].
Being *fellow-workers unto* ***the kingdom of God***	[Col 4:11]
Being called ***unto his kingdom*** and glory	[1 Thess 2:12].
Being counted worthy of *the* ***kingdom of God***	[2 Thess 1:5].
The appearing of ***his kingdom***.	[[2 Tim 4:1].
Being preserved unto ***his heavenly kingdom***.	[2 Tim 4:18]

WHAT IS BEING SAID?

The intention of this chapter is to show why the commission to proclaim *the Gospel* of the Kingdom of Heaven is not observed today. Accordingly, we have looked at the original formation of what is described as *the Throne of The Lord* and its Kingdom in the Old Testament. Then we have considered the promises made to King David about the *seed from your bowels*; namely, that this seed would be on the Throne for all generations. We saw that there is no room for spiritualising that Throne or the seed upon it. The Throne of David is the Throne Jesus takes as the lawful descendant of David's seed.
Through the Acts and the Epistles, we see the Kingdom is always connected with Israel only, both before and after the New Testament was made **with Israel**.. If these things are not believed, or if they are spiritualised away totally, then the Kingdom of Heaven and the

restoration of the Kingdom to Israel cannot be proclaimed. Any other gospel that is being taught cannot be the gospel of God's grace to His Kingdom people. "The Church" in its popular concept has nothing to do with the Bible; it has nothing to do with the *Kingdom of Heaven* over Israel!

CHAPTER 15: THE REGATHERING OF ISRAEL - OLD TESTAMENT

Today we find much written and spoken in religious circles insisting that the establishment of the modern Israeli state is the fulfilment of end-of-age prophecy concerning the regathering of Israel.

The contention in this chapter is that this is a false insistence and that the bulk of the peoples being gathered to the Israeli state could not possibly be Israelites as a race of people. Since the *seed* of Abraham is genetic, and since those going to Palestine are multi-racial, the only common "Jewish" connection can be by religion, sympathy, upbringing or some false pseudo-racial association. Rather than being Israelites, these people are more likely to be descendants of Esau. Prophecy declares Esau's descendants will be brought together for destruction centred on Jerusalem. Many of the prophecies concerning the fate of Esau [also known as Edom, Idumea, Mt. Seir, Teman, etc] have been presented in the chapter entitled, *Could the Modern Jews Be Israel*?

Furthermore, the timing of the Israeli build-up is incorrect if it is to be portrayed as the re-gathering of Israel. When we consider other events associated with the return of the nation of Israel to "The Land", we find the sequence does not fit the Israeli state. In this chapter we will examine the timing factors.

When writings from Evangelical, Zionist and Messianic Jewish sources are examined, a limited number of Scriptures quoted by these groups are repeated over and over again to support their views claiming that the Israeli state is a fulfilment of prophecy.

WHO ARE REGATHERED?

The very titles that we find in the margins of our popular Bibles, such as *regathering* and *Jews Return*, suggest correctly that this all pertains to Israel only. However, the popular acceptance is that all converted people are *true Jews;* [meaning true Israelites because they think that "Jews" and "Israel" mean the same thing]. This is a consideration that has been disproved in earlier chapters, mainly on the basis that the Bible is a book about Israel and is addressed to Israel only (including the so-called Gentiles of the dispersed Houses of Israel and Judah).

WHAT SAITH THE LAW, THE PSALMS AND THE PROPHETS?

In considering this subject, we cannot ever move away from the foundation given by Scripture. This is, that New Testament fulfils the Old Testament prophecy, as given in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. All through the Old Testament we find references to this promise of national gathering being made to the people of Israel only.. This selective aspect of the gathering is a fact of Scripture even though this may be difficult to accept because of the sentimental objections that arise from our pre-conditioning and religious upbringing or education.

There are Scriptures used to suggest that *all the families of the earth* are to be blessed in Abraham, but it has been demonstrated that *all the families* does not mean all people of all races. Without going over all this again, it might be well to ask how Israel could have been a blessing to all those nations God told Israel to destroy? There are many similar contradictions. For example:

> *Amos 3:1,2* *Hear this word that the Lord has spoken against you, O Children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up out of the land* [earth] *of Egypt, saying* ***you only have I known*** *of all the families of the earth …*

Something is obviously wrong with the traditional teachings!

THE REGATHERING AS FOUND IN THE LAW

Addressed specifically to Israel as a people [and not to any other race], we read:

Deut 30:1-6.. *… and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, … That then will the Lord thy God turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God has scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee … And the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed … and the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of they seed …*

This is the original promise made to Israel; this has not changed, and there are things that must be noted:

1. The PEOPLE in this passage are Israel – not any others.
2. GOD is repeatedly presented as the Lord God of Israel – not of others.
3. GOD does the gathering – they do not come back unconverted under their own steam.
4. It is FROM THENCE not OF all nations. *Whither* also speaks of place.
5. The TIME is given as *when thou* [Israel] *shalt call to mind* all the things presented at Mt. Sinai and set their mind to return to the Lord and to obey His voice. These is no evidence of this in the Israeli state.
6. The PLACE is given as the *land which your fathers possessed* … [Note all the New Testament references to "The Fathers"]. It is a specific geographical place on Earth. It is the land where *the fathers* [of Israel] lived.
7. The FULFILMENT is isolated to the children of "The Fathers". It is not the mythical, spiritual children of Abraham in the sense that Galatians 3:7 is commonly taught, because "The Fathers" includes Isaac and Jacob.

This passage in Deut 30:1-6 gives us the time of this event and goes on to tell us that Israel's enemies will be cursed and not be blessed. This racial separation is always present. Provision is also made for those of Israel who deny the Lord, to be cursed instead of being blessed. Being born an Israelite is no guarantee of eternal life. Each must come through The Door. Jesus says *I am The Door of the sheep* [John 10:7]. Jesus does not say that He is the door for races other than the sheep. Jesus gave His Life for the sheep! But, it is NOT recorded that He gave His Life for goats or anyone else. Israel is often spoken of as being the *sheep of His pasture*.

From here we go on to find the very same message that the Apostle Paul teaches in Romans 10:5-13 that is so often quoted in religious gospel preaching. Paul is addressing Israelites only who are stated to be "brethren" (*kinsmen of the womb*). These were of the same kin and of the House of Israel who Paul said also knew the Law [Rom 3:19 and 7:1-4]. The Law was given to Israel only.

1 Chron 16:35,36 *And say ye, Save us, O God of our* [Israel's] *salvation, and* ***gather us together****, and deliver us from the heathen, that we may give thanks to thy holy name … Blessed be the Lord God* ***of Israel*** *for ever and ever …*

In all these verses, kindly take note of the separation or identification that is made by the pronouns. See just who the *gather us* refers to and understand how this cannot ever be extended to include others. Note God is always stated to be *The Lord God of Israel*.

In this song of David, we find the prayer for Israel's gathering together, prayed by David on behalf of Israel. This regathering has not yet happened. In the New Testament, Jesus taught Israelites to pray, *Thy Kingdom come*. This is the hope of Israel, under both covenants. It is never presented as being the hope of all races, even in the New Testament.

Neh 1:8-10 *Remember, I beseech you, the word that thou commandedst thy servant Moses, saying, If ye transgress, I will scatter you abroad among the nations: But if ye turn unto me, and keep my commandments, and do them; though there were of you cast out unto the uttermost part of the heaven, yet will I* ***gather them from thence****, and will bring them unto the place that I have chosen to set my name there. Now these are thy servants and thy people, whom thou hast redeemed by thy great power, and by thy strong hand.*

Some might like to argue that this refers only to those of the House of Judah who returned to Jerusalem from Babylon. But, the original promise was made to the whole nation, and in this verse, the gathering is from "nations" in the plural. Again, the action relates to the redemption of Israel. It is through the Redeemer OF ISRAEL, Jesus, who came *to save His people from their sins*.. The PLACE is always a specified place; it is not a condition as many New Testament teachers suggest, but a physical place that God has chosen on Earth. It is the *land which* **your fathers** *possessed*.

THE REGATHERING IN THE PSALMS

Ps 102:21,22 *To declare the name of the Lord in Zion, and his praise in Jerusalem; when the people are* ***gathered together****, and the kingdoms* [of Israel] *to serve the Lord.*

Ps 106:47 *Save us, O Lord our God, and* ***gather us****, from among the heathen, to give thanks unto thy holy name, …*

Ps 105:42,43 *For he remembered his holy promise, and Abraham his servant. And he* ***brought forth*** *his people with joy, and His chosen with gladness.*

This psalm is addressed to *O ye seed of Abraham his servant, ye children of Jacob, his chosen*: [verse 6]. It speaks of the everlasting covenant made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob [Verses 8,9 - 19] and refers to the land of Canaan.

Ps 107:2,3 *Let the redeemed of the Lord say so, whom he hath redeemed from the hand of the enemy; and* ***gathered them*** *out of the lands, from the east, and from the west, from the north and the south.*

In verse 7 of this Psalm, it is God who leads Israel unto a *city of habitation.* This Psalm is about the gathering of the redeemed of the Lord from the East, West, North and South. It is always to a place. It is centred upon Jerusalem. This Psalm ends with:

Ps 107:43 *Whoso is wise, and will observe these things, even they shall understand the loving kindness of the Lord.*

What are *these things*? Are they not to do with Israel and her gathering? Would it be improper to suggest that if we do not *observe these things* we must therefore be lacking in understanding? Jesus pointed out the same thing in John 3:12 *If I have told you earthly things and you believe not, how shall you believe if I tell you heavenly things*? Jesus was talking to Nicodemus, a *Master in Israel* about knowing these things. It is absolutely necessary to understand the earthly things about Israel as a racial entity before we can ever understand heavenly things. The facts concerning the gathering of Israel are most important!

THE REGATHERING IN THE PROPHETS

Isaiah 11:9-13 *They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. And* ***in that day*** *there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall be for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles* [nations] *seek and his rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass,* ***in that day****, the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and* ***gather together*** *the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.*

Twice in this section there is the phrase *in that day*. So it does not apply to other than the time specified. This is the day when the wolf will dwell with the lamb and the leopard will lie down with the kid, etc, and when *the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea* [v9].

Isaiah is telling us a basic fact about the House of Israel who are at enmity against the House of Judah until the time of the regathering of all Israel [Isaiah 11]. These two Houses [or parts of Israel] must exist today as specific entities. The gathering is clearly spoken of as being of two parts that come from among [not of] all nations in *the four corners of the earth*.. If Israel

has now been "taken over" by the Church, how ever could this prophecy be fulfilled? We will see a lot more about this separation between Israel and Judah as we go along. What do the end-of-age teachers say about this matter? Nothing! If we take this literally, we see the route Israel is to take back to the promised land, as well as the timing. So far men do not go dry-shod over the Egyptian sea [verse 15]. A highway expressed in verse 16 as being from Assyria is not presently manifest either. The time of *in that day* is the time of the latter days when Jesus comes to smite the earth with *the rod of his mouth* … [Isaiah 11:4].
Reading on we find that the time is when the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose [Is 35:1] The fact that the Israeli state has organised the watering of desert areas does not prove anything in itself Do the same in the interior of Australia and that desert will also blossom as the rose. This chapter ends with, *and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads.* Those going to Palestine today are not returning this way! They do not make any claim of being ransomed.

Isaiah 40:5 *And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord has spoken it.*

Isaiah 40:11 *He shall feed his flock* [Israel] *like a shepherd: he shall* ***gather the lambs*** *with his arms, and carry them in his bosom, and gently lead those with young.*

Could this possibly refer to the first advent? All flesh has not yet seen the glory of the Lord, but when He returns, *every eye shall behold Him*.. In the Word of the Lord we do not see a multi-racial mix going back to Palestine. The glory of the Lord is revealed to all the flesh of Israel, and then He gathers His lambs. Although there is no *in that day* in these passages, the times are the same. The expression, *in those days* or *in that day* refers to the time approaching the close of this age.

THE REGATHERING IN JEREMIAH

There is so much in the book on this subject, that it is difficult to select quotations. In chapter three there is the same separation of Israel and Judah, with the same time feature as given by Isaiah. These two factors are so important yet they are what the popular ministers have to omit to support their traditional teachings. The present Israeli state is a mis-fit in terms of the timing given.

Jer 3:18 *And in those days* [the timing], *the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall* ***come together*** *out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance* ***unto your fathers***.

Once again we find the gathering is to the same specific land area and a repeat statement about the time of the gathering of Israel as being i*n those days*. This is a time when Israel will no longer be walking after the imagination of their evil hearts. In this verse and in this chapter of Jeremiah we again find the same reference to the differentiation between Israel and Judah. They are separate parts of Israel [for example, see
Jer 3:11; 3:18; 5:11; 11:17; 30:3,31; 31:31; 33:14; 36:2; 50:4]. Again, it has to be pointed out very clearly that something is very wrong with the popular doctrines that do not allow for this. There are many Scriptures in this book of Jeremiah alone about this matter. Let us look further into Jeremiah for the gathering of these two Houses.

Jer 23:3 *And I will* ***gather*** *the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again unto their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase.*

v5 *Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgement and justice in the earth.*

Some like to say that this applies to Jesus' time, but Jesus did not reign and prosper as a King at the first advent.

v6 *In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.*

Note the usual Israel and Judah separation, and again that it is in the day when Jesus reigns.

v7,8 *Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and there they shall dwell in their own land.*

It must be noted that the gathering is only of the seed of Israel, that is, the Children [descendants] of Israel. Also, the return is from the North Country [singular] where Israel is to be found.

DO OUR MODERN PROPHETS AGREE WITH JEREMIAH?

Jeremiah goes on to say something sad and searching, yet most significant.

Jer 23:9 *Mine heart within me is broken because of the prophets; all my bones shake; I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine hath overcome, because of the Lord, and because of the words of his holiness.*

v11 *For both prophet and priest are profane, yea, in my house have I found wickedness, saith the Lord.*

We can now examine the full passage above to see if today's prophets are equally profane in not believing what God says about the gathering of His people Israel. This is the context in which Jeremiah is speaking. Should we feel as bad about it as Jeremiah did? These Pastors and Teachers with the universalist all-races doctrines are the pastors who are said to be destroying the sheep of God's pasture [verse 1]. These are hard words and God pronounces woe on all and every one of these pastors who will not teach what Jeremiah is saying about the gathering of Israel and Judah. It is time for a personal check up on what we believe about this, to avoid this woe!

[a] Those regathered are a very small remnant of the two Houses [all Israel] only. [Zeph 2:9; Micah 2:2; Ezek 14:22; Jer 6:9, 23:3, 31:7; Is 1:9, 4:3, 11:16, 37:4; Rom 11:5, 9:27]

[b] They are only from God's flock [Israel].

[c] Israel as a whole are gathered from out of all countries where God had driven them. But Israel is not of the racial content of the races of those countries.

[d] The timing is in the days of the Righteous Branch. This is not the First Advent time, because Jesus does not yet sit on David's present throne on earth. He is yet to return to David's throne [over Israel].

[e] Judah and Israel are separate entities until this time. Their present enmity has been stated clearly [Isaiah 11:11-13]. Do we believe this?

[f] It is i*n his days* that the two entities oficially re-unite. The *middle wall of partition* that the Apostle Paul talks of is then broken down under the New Testament that is made with Israel and Judah alone [Heb 8:8]. And then, Paul says*, All Israel shall be saved.* In prophecy, the two parties are never other than Israel and Judah, they are never "Jews and Gentiles" in the way that is commonly presented. There is no line of Old Testament prophecy that the popular teachings could be shown to fulfil.

[g] The people concerned are always the *seed* [genetic] of the House of Israel [v8].

[h] The "Land" is that which was given to their Fathers [genetic]. There are not two promised lands, nor is this promised land a place to which "saints" are raptured to before the Millennium. Israel is to *dwell* in their own land; the same one that was given unto their fathers. They are gathered from out of nations on Earth, and not from some place outside of earth from where they supposedly might have been raptured.

Let us look at this passage from Jeremiah again, and examine our hearts:

1. Are we those upon whom God says He will bring evil [v12]?
2. Are we those who cause *my people Israel* to err [v13]?
3. Do we s*peak a vision out of our own heart* and not out of the mouth of the Lord [v16]?
4. Do we say to our people, or think, *no evil shall come upon you* [v17]?
5. Have we yet *marked his word and heard it* [v18]? Indeed, look at the rest of this chapter of Jeremiah about teachers and pastors who carry on stealing *my words every one from his neighbour.*
6. Is what we teach or believe just what we learned at Bible College or at church?
7. Will we yet continue not to accept what God is saying through His prophets about the gathering of Israel?

8. Will we continue to ignore the separation of Israel and Judah?
9. Will we continue to ignore the time when Israel is gathered and confess that this is NOT what is happening in the Israeli state? If we do not yet do so, we still have the rest of the prophetical books to contend with and be convinced, for all tell the same story.

Let us probe this subject further in Jeremiah.

Jeremiah 31:8-11 *Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child and her that travaileth with child, together: a great company shall return thither. And they shall come with weeping, and with supplications I will lead them: … He that scattered Israel will* ***gather him****, and keep him, as a shepherd does his flock. For the Lord has redeemed Jacob.. …*

We find a place that they come from, [this is another subject, as is the *North country*]. Woman still are getting pregnant at that time and life on Earth continues. They were not raptured away anywhere, nor do they come from a place where they *neither marry or are given in marriage*. It is the returned Lord who leads them back; this Scripture again shows the timing of this gathering! The flock is made up of two parts; remember how Jesus said He had other sheep than the Judean fold? One is Judah and the other is the House of Israel. The two add together to make up the *Jacob* we see in the verse above.
It is only Jacob-Israel [both Israel and Judah] that is spoken of in Scripture as being redeemed. It is never a multi-racial church. [Note again, only Israel was given the Law, and therefore only Israel needs redeeming from that broken Law]. In Jer 31:2, it is Israel who finds grace in the wilderness; it does not include anyone else. Could all the factors in this chapter be spiritualised away?

Jer 31:1 *At the same time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people.*

God is never spoken of as the God of all races, and Israel is *my people*. As God says *of old* [v3], *I have loved thee* [Israel] *with an everlasting love*. Jeremiah 31:31 is the very chapter Paul repeats in the Book of Hebrews [Heb 8:8] telling of the New Testament that is made with the House of Israel and the House of Judah. The New Testament is made with none others, even in the New Testament pages!

Jer 32:41 *Yea, I will rejoice over them to do them good, I will plant them in this land assuredly with my whole heart and with my whole soul*

Who, and who only, are planted in *this land*? Israel can never be spiritualised away as a *church* in the modern concept. Jeremiah 31:35-37 and 33:17 tells us that Israel will always be A PEOPLE in the same way Peter does in the New Testament. This is to be so as long as the stars are shining and the moon can be seen. So Israel is still an individual two-part racial entity today, consisting of the House of Israel and the House of Judah! Jeremiah also tells us about the House of Israel always having a monarch over them [Jer 33:17], and so this part of Israel must contain a monarch today. [Note again the separation of Israel and Judah in this chapter].
NB There are no separate prophecies concerning any non-Israelite church.

Jer 50:4,5,19 *In those days, and in that time, saith the Lord, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together, going and weeping: and they shall go, and seek the Lord their God. They shall ask the way to Zion with their faces thitherwood, … And I will bring Israel again to his habitation, …*

It is always Israel and Judah only! Again they are mentioned separately as seeking God together. There is not one drop of a stream of prophecy to the contrary! This verse is certainly not being fulfilled in the Israeli state today. Some would say that "Zion" is a figure of speech, or that the prophecy concerns the return of Judah to the Land under Ezra and Nehemiah. But here it is both houses, not just Judah, who are mentioned as separate entities making up *all Israel* as being brought to his habitation.

Israel will be sanctified in the eyes of all the other races when God gathers His people … *then shall they dwell in THEIR LAND* <u>*that I have given unto My servant JACOB*</u> … [Jer 28:24-26]. The word "Jacob" can never include other races.

THE REGATHERING IN EZEKIEL

This book tells the same story. In chapters 37 and 38 in particular we find some verses are commonly extracted to support popular views. But these chapters also give a repeat of the timing factors which immediately put this subject in the right perspective. Ezekiel was told, *Behold I send you TO THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL* [Eze 2:3 and 3:1]. To extend this limitation beyond the Children of Israel is to deceive! We are told by the Apostle James who wrote to THE TWELVE TRIBES, that many deceivers are entered into the world. <u>Our modern deceivers extend these twelve tribes to include every race on earth.</u> They claim other races are joined to Israel by *adoption*.. If this was so then other races and churches would have to come to belong to one of the Twelve Tribes! They would have to be in either one or the other of the Houses of Israel or Judah [see the chapter entitled *Adoption*].

Ezek 11:17 … *Thus saith the Lord God, I will even gather you* [Israel] *from the people, and assemble you out of the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give* ***you*** *the land of Israel.*

Ezekiel tells the same story as Jeremiah! He makes the same complaint about the pastors and prophets who ignore the national message of the Bible and who have not *made up the hedge for the House of Israel*.. He says that their teaching is *prophecy out of their own hearts* [Ezek 13:1-16]. The rest of this chapter tells how their teaching seduces Israel. <u>Today the modern teachers *see visions of peace* for Jerusalem [v16] and they think that the Israeli state is the start of the fulfilment. But, there will be no peace in Jerusalem until Edom is destroyed there and the Prince of Peace brings the righteous remnant back to enjoy the abundance of peace they alone are promised. This gathering is after Esau's descendants have been destroyed in 'The Land' by a complete and utter destruction.</u>
God says that these false prophets will have God's hand against them, *and they shall bear their iniquity* [Ezek 14:9-11]. They will be taken out from among Israel! It is God who is saying these things, like it or not! We can see the severity of God in this and just how seriously we must take heed to this message.
Although Israel is punished much for their abominations, God says:

Ezek 6:60 *Nevertheless, I will remember my covenant with thee* [Israel]: … *and I will establish unto thee an everlasting covenant.*

But, the gathering of Israel, from among the countries *wherein you are scattered*, is with fury, purging and judgement [Ezek 20:34-38]. All flesh shall know that *I the Lord have drawn my sword* [Ezek 21:5]. Can we perceive the sword sharpened as Ezekiel did [Ezek 21:8-17]? Or do we prophesy lies saying God's people shall be raptured away out of it? God's principle is always, *the unrighteous shall be severed from among the just* [Matt 13:49]. How dare our teachers reverse what Jesus says. They teach that the righteous are raptured away from wicked. These teachers must face their judgement! In the parable of the Tares and the Wheat, is it not the Tares who are FIRST burned? We must have a good think about this! Ezekiel 34 is too long to quote, but it is a mine of treasure on the subject of the gathering of Israel. It ends by saying:

Paul do teach that there is a rapture or "caught away"

Ezek 34:30,31,33 *Thus shall they know that I the Lord their God am with them, and that they,* ***even the House of Israel are My people****, saith the Lord God. And you my flock, the flock of my pasture, are men and I am your God, …*

"Sheep" and "flock" are the people who personally belong to God. Israel is bought back for a price and "found". The *bring* [v13] and *seeketh out* [v12] parallel the *bought* and *found* through the New Testament parables. <u>The *new heart* is a promise made to the House of Israel. You will look in vain for the *new heart* to be put in anyone else but Israel …</u> [Ezek 36:21-38].

What is the timing? We must look at this timing and see if this is what we have been taught. And with this, note the desolation that is yet to come upon the land before Israel returns. Other prophets write about this too, but you will not find our modern teachers ever mentioning it. They are too busy prophesying smooth things about the Israeli state! These are the false prophets. These are the ones with the dangerous doctrines, every one of them.

THE PROPHECIES OF THE DRY BONES AND THE TWO STICKS

Our end-time teachers and book writers use extracts from these chapters, but again they ignore the timing factors of the regathering as well as exactly who this prophet is addressing.

THE DRY BONES

In the parable of the dry bones, we find:

> *Ezek 37:11* *Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole House* ***OF ISRAEL****.*

They are expressly stated to be Israelites, so how could they be anyone else?

> *Ezek 37:14* *… and I shall place you in your own land …*

Just who, and who only are to be placed in their own land? It is Israel as a people who alone are being addressed. So we must again ask if this gives support for the present Israeli state. To support the Israeli state is to say, in effect, that the resurrection is past. The current teaching about the Israeli state is pure deception!

THE TWO STICKS.

Even the Jehovah Witnesses have a play on this one. However, the Bible states the one stick represents Judah and the other represents Israel. They are *companions* … [v16] … or *fellows* … [v19]. The sticks become joined together. This is a picture of the gathering together of all Israel. It includes no one else! It is not "Jews and Gentiles" in the popular context. The prophet goes on to say:

> *Ezek 37:21-23* *… Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land. And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king unto them all; and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms anymore at all.*

Anyone who denies that Israel is made up of just these two peoples has a serious problem. If they are not prepared to believe this *earthly* thing, Jesus says they cannot ever believe *heavenly* things [John 3:12]. At present Israel could not possibly be a singular "church" as some teach. The two parties could not possibly be "Jews and Gentiles" as is commonly taught. All the *kosmos* [or order] of Israel that Jesus is talking about is changed by our teachers to be *all the races on the Earth*.

> *Ezek 37:24* *And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one Shepherd …*

Religious denominations teach that Jesus is the King of Christians of all races, but they fail to observe that Jesus says He is gone away to a far country, AND WILL RETURN to take His kingdom and be one shepherd to Israel. Those falsely occupying the vineyard part, at present, will be destroyed *with the brightness of His coming*. The vineyard is not the whole earth; it is a specific area of the earth.

> *Ezek 37:25* *And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant … and my servant David shall be their Prince, for ever.*

This "land" is a defined area on earth, being that given to Jacob. There is both racial separation and place separation.

> *Ezek 37:28* *And the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore.*

In these verses we see two groups, *the heathen* and *Israel*; they are two completely separated identities.

Ezek 39:21	*And I will set my glory among the heathen, and all the heathen shall see my judgement that I have executed, and my hand that I have laid upon them.*
v22,23	*So the* ***house of Israel*** *shall know that I am the Lord their God from that day and forward … and the heathen shall know that the* ***house of Israel*** *went into captivity for their iniquity …*
v25	*Thus saith the Lord God; Now I will bring again the captivity of Jacob, and have mercy upon the* ***whole house of Israel****, and will be jealous for my holy name.*
v27	*… and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations;*
v28	*Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen, but I have gathered them* [Israel] *unto their own land …*
v29	*Neither will I hide my face any more from them: for I have poured out my spirit* ***unto the house of Israel****.*

Note here the segregation of Israel from the other nations. The mercy upon Israel is *in the sight of many nations*, so Israel and these many nations coexist, but are separate. On whom do the prophets say the Spirit is poured out? Do the prophets say it is poured out upon all races? From Joel 2:28 [and from the New Testament] we have been taught that *all flesh* is not limited to Israel's sons and daughters, even if Israel are the people being addressed. But *all flesh* is almost always the *all flesh* of Israel.

The important thing to note in connection with the gathering of Israel, is that Israel is still a separate racial entity from the other nations, not only at this late stage of this present age, but into the next age. It is impossible that Israel has become a multi-racial "church". There is no prophecy at all about any portion for anyone of any race other than the Twelve Tribes. God's sanctuary is stated to be *in the midst of Israel* and NOT in the midst of the heathen nations or races.

At the end of Ezekiel, we find listed the apportioning of the land which is divided *according to the Tribes of Israel*. All those who want to continue to call the Tribes of Israel "The Church" will continue to blur what is on the pages of the Bible in black and white. The more this subject is examined, the more impossible the popular evangelical teachings become.

THE REGATHERING IN DANIEL

The "stone" kingdom of Daniel 3 is touched upon earlier in the chapter *Why Not Proclaim the Kingdom of Heaven?* and a summary of the position is given in Daniel 7.

Daniel 7:13,14	*… one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations and languages, should serve him: … and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.*

Yet again, this kingdom is separate from other peoples and nations. The other peoples are servants to Israel. The Lord of Hosts, the Lord of the armies of Israel, has the whole Earth and all the other peoples in subjection. At the end of this book of Daniel, the archangel Michael *standeth for the children of thy [Daniel's] people* [Dan 12:1]. Daniel's people were Israel. The limitation is specific! Again, there is no suggestion of a "church" in the way it is presented today.

THE REGATHERING IN HOSEA

Hosea says the Children of Israel will be known as *The sons of the living God.*

Hos 1:10	*Yet the number of the* ***children of Israel*** *shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God. Then shall* ***the children of Judah and the children of Israel*** *be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head, …*

Here again we find the separation of the two Houses. Peter, in the New Testament quotes Hosea, and does not say anything about anyone other than *a* [singular] *nation*. He is writing to Israel.

Hos 8:10 *Yea, though they* [Israel] *have hired among the nations, now I will gather them …*

God says He will then be as the dew to Israel [Hos 14:5]. <u>But note, none of these things are said to anyone of any other race.</u> Israel is scattered "among" the other nations.

THE REGATHERING IN JOEL

In *those days* of the pouring out, the blood and fire, the pillars of smoke and the sun being turned into darkness with the moon into blood, Mount Zion and Jerusalem shall be delivered. This is the time when God says He *will be jealous for His land and pity His people*. God's people, expressed as being Israel, are still that entity. The land is still the same area. The other races are still separate.

Joel 3:1,2 *In those days … and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and parted my land.*

God says that His heritage is still the unchanged nation of Israel who are *My people*. It is not *The Church* in the common concept. "My land" is still parted today.
The remnant left of God's people are NOT raptured away from this time of trouble. They are very much present. Joel points out that at that time, the Lord will be the hope *of His people* and the strength of *The Children of Israel* [Joel 3:16,17]. *The Children of Israel* are not multi-racial non-Israelites. No strangers will pass through Jerusalem any more [v17]. Note this well. This means that such must be *passing through Jerusalem* up to this time! We can see that this passing through of strangers is not God's intention and the effect of the mixed multitude within Israel is always to Israel's detriment.

THE REGATHERING IN AMOS

This prophet speaks about the grievous judgements upon Israel. He reminds us of the terror of these days and of the sun going down at noon and of the destruction in "The Land". But of those of Israel who are left, He says:

Amos 9:11-15 *In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof, and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: That they may possess the remnant of Edom … And I will bring again the captivity of* ***my people of Israel****, and they shall rebuild the waste cities … And I will plant them upon their own land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God.*

Amos did not prophesy about any rapture! **Paul is teaching it - it is for those in Jesus**
Our modern teachers like to take an expression like *rebuild the waste cities* and then say this is what is happening in the Israeli state today. Cities are being rebuilt, but the tabernacle of David is not raised up; neither has *the sun gone down at noon-day*.. The cities of the Land have never been devastated so much that there is not a person, a blade of grass or even a fish [Zeph 1:2,3]. This must came to pass before the notable day of the Lord, and before Israel returns to the Land. This level of destruction has never happened yet to what is commonly called the "Holy Land". The wasted cities will then be rebuilt by Israel, but not before this time. That which is being built now in Palestine, must be something other than what the prophets are talking about concerning Israel.
We will see that the reference to the remnant of Edom in verse 12 is confirmed when we quote from Obadiah. These peoples falsely calling themselves "Jews" will be exterminated and:

Obad 1:17 *… and the house of Jacob shall possess their possessions.*

This is the time when Israel displaces Edom [see the chapter entitled *Could the Modern Jews by Israel?*]. The "House of Jacob" never means all races. Neither was Obadiah a believer in a multi-racial church!

THE REGATHERING IN MICAH

By now the consistency of the message about the gathering together of Israel has to be apparent to anyone with half a mind to evaluate the evidence objectively. Not one of the prophets of Israel is an universalist! This continues through the minor prophets.

> *Micah 2:12* *I will surely assemble, **O Jacob**, all of thee, I will surely gather the remnant **of Israel**; I will put them together …*

Micah agrees with all the other prophets that the gathering only involves Israelites.
When Israel is gathered, Micah tells the position of the other nations.

> *Micah 4:2* *And many nations shall come, and say, Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the house of the God of Jacob, and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.*

This is the time when Jesus rules, with Israel, over the nations with a *rod of iron*. *The nations shall see and be confounded at thy might* [Micah 7:16]. Metaphorically, the other nations are *to lick the dust* [Micah 7:17].
For the duration of the millennium, there is no more war among the nations, all of whom are still separate from Israel. Israel is described as a "nation", as are the others. Other nations and Israel are always separate peoples in Scripture. All the prophets agree.

> *Micah 5:7,8* *And the remnant **of Jacob** shall be in the midst of many people as a dew from the Lord … And the remnant **of Jacob** shall be among the Gentiles* [nations] *in the midst of many peoples as a lion among the beasts of the forest, …*

Micah goes on to remind us of the Doctrine of Balaam and that to walk humbly with her God, Israel must avoid the idolatry that comes through racial intermarriage. Idolatry always is a reason, through Scripture, for judgement upon Israel. Balaam prophesied blessing upon Israel when Israel dwelt as a separate people. Moabite intermarriage with Israel destroyed this separation leading to idol worship. As with the other prophets, Micah concludes with the usual message:

> *Micah 7:20* *Thou wilt perform the truth **to Jacob**, and the mercy **to Abraham**, which thou hast sworn **unto our fathers** from the days of old.*

Despite what all the prophets have to say about this subject, it is ignored, or spiritualised, by almost all of today's teachers.

THE REGATHERING IN NAHUM

This prophet's message on this subject is missed because the word for "gather" is translated as "turned away" [KJV] or "restore" [NIV].

> *Nahum 2:2* *For the Lord hath turned away* [gathered] *the excellency **of Jacob**, as the excellency **of Israel**: …*

But Nahum is just as exclusive about Israel as are all the other prophets. This prophet mentions other peoples only as they relate to Israel.

THE REGATHERING IN HABAKKUK

Habakkuk is the prophet who declares that the vision is for an appointed time and that it will surely come [Hab 2:3 and Hab 3:13 – *You went forth for the salvation of Thy people, the salvation of Thy anointed.*]
To call Israel *God's anointed* is never taught today. It could not possibly be taught together with popular concepts. This was covered in the chapter entitled *Seeds, Natural and Spiritual.* When we consider the time factor of chapter three when the Lord goes forth for the salvation of His people, this is at the time of the Second Advent [Hab 3:3-6]. It is at a time of judgement [v9-12].

> *Hab 3:18* *Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.*

This is the message Habakkuk gave to the Chief Singer about the salvation of the anointed people Israel. It must be a very important message!

THE REGATHERING IN ZEPHANIAH

This prophet speaks about the terrible judgements upon Israel and then he speaks of the remnant of Israel with the Lord in the midst of them.

Zeph 3:17,18,20 *The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty; he will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy; … I will gather them that are sorrowful … At that time I will gather you again … for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, …*

In this passage the word *gather* is found twice. Although Zephaniah was a prophet to Judah, the last chapter speaks of the remnant of Israel [v13] and of a fulfilment beyond the return of Judah from Babylon.
Israel is still found to be separate among *all the peoples of the earth* [v20]. We do not find reference to such captivity of any other nation but Israel. Israel is the only people exclusively gathered together from among the other nations!

THE REGATHERING IN HAGGAI

Haggai also speaks about the anointed people, the Children of Israel.

Hag 2:5 *According to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my spirit remaineth among you: …*

This latter phrase definitely is not taught in our churches. Israel are the people of the covenant that are mentioned above. They are children of the ones God brought out of Egypt. This identifies them as Israelites. These are whom God's Spirit remains upon, so the prophet says. Haggai goes on to speak of the heaven and the earth shaking and then of the glory of the new temple. This speaks of the time surrounding the end of this age.

THE REGATHERING IN ZECHARIAH

This prophet tells of the scattering of both Israel and Judah, but he goes on to say:

Zech 2:5 *For I, saith the Lord, I will be unto her a wall of fire round about* [Jerusalem], *and will be the glory in the midst of her.*

Israel is *the apple of Mine eye* and the other nations are a spoil. No one can say these are the same things. The Lord will *yet choose Jerusalem again* [Zech 2:12]. This will be marvellous in the eyes of the remnant of Israel [Zech 8:6].

Zech 8:7,8 *… Behold I will save* ***my people*** *… and I will bring them, and they shall dwell in the midst of Jerusalem: and they shall be* ***My people*** *…*

Never do we find any other race than Israel being termed God's People. These alone are brought [gathered] to Jerusalem.
Once again, it is the House of Israel together with the House of Judah that are gathered … [Zech 8:13 and 9:1], as is also shown in the verse below. The word "Joseph" indicates the leadership of the House of Israel.

Zech 10:6 *And I will strengthen the* ***house of Judah*** *and will save the* ***house of Joseph****, and will bring them again to place them; for I have mercy upon them: and they shall be as though I had not cast them off …*

The following chapters of this book tell of the continuing separation of all Israel from other races and also the separation within Israel. Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives feature in a geographical way. Once again, the non-Israel nations come up to Jerusalem, from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of Hosts. This is optional because there is punishment for those nations who will not come [Zech 14:12-21]. And again, the non-Israel nations cannot reside inside Jerusalem.

The very last verse of this book says, *and there shall be no more the Canaanite in the House of the Lord of Hosts*.. This means that the Canaanite must presently be in the House of the Lord. It is the doctrine of those with Canaanite blood that this book is opposing. Jesus says, *beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees*.

THE REGATHERING IN MALACHI

Malachi's burden of the Word of the Lord was to Israel [not to others]. Here we find the expression*, Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau*. This our universalists cannot accept with their interpretation of *go into all the world*, making this phrase mean the inhabited Earth [*oikoumene*] whereas it is *kosmos* which means the *kosmos* of Israel, in that context.
Racial admixture is expressed as *hath married the daughter of a strange god* and we see that, *The Lord will cut off the man that does this … both the master and the scholar out of the tabernacles of Jacob*. It seems that most of our masters and scholars will be cut off because of what they are teaching. We have seen how other prophets say the same thing about the false teachers. *Who will be able to abide the day of His coming*? [Mal 3:2]. The *great and dreadful day of the Lord* is at hand.
There will be a message before that day that few will accept.

Mal 4:4-6 *Remember the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgements. Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord: And He shall turn the heart of the fathers unto the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse.*

This last book of the Old Testament tells of the gathering and who will be entered in the Book of Remembrance. Again it is a remnant of **the sons of Jacob** [Mal 3:6].

Mal 3:17 *And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him.*

Those who are serving the Lord, as sons, *shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that serveth not* [Mal 3:18]. This day *will burn like an oven; and all the proud, yea, all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it leave them neither root nor branch. But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings* – [Mal 4:1,2]

TO CONCLUDE

Let us not be too proud to admit what the Lord of Hosts says about the regathering of the remnant of the exclusive SONS OF JACOB. This subject of the regathering of Israel and the *gospel of the Kingdom* have much in common. The people involved have the same racial identity. It is essential that we believe the right gospel, applying it to the same people that Scripture does. We will now go to the New Testament where we find no change from what we find in the Old Testament.

CHAPTER 16: THE REGATHERING OF ISRAEL - NEW TESTAMENT

In the last chapter, the consistent prophetical stream was presented to show that the regathering of Israel is:

1. To be fulfilled in only one people, Israel, as all the prophets specify.
2. To involve a specific place, that is, the *land which I gave to your fathers.*
3. Brought about by God who does the gathering.
4. For a people, Israel, who are gathered *out of* all nations, NOT *of* all nations. [Not one of the prophets is a racial universalist].
5. For a nation, Israel, who remain racially separate from the other races, even after the Second Advent. [Jewry, commonly called "Jews" are not Israel].
6. For two houses, the House of Israel and the House of Judah, who remained two separate parts of Israel, until the enmity between them was broken under the New Covenant.
7. Not completed in this present age. The gathering is either concurrent with Jesus' return, or post-Second Advent. [This is directly contrary to most of the current popular teachings].

At the end of this chapter we will briefly look at the common conception that Jesus is the epitome of the Seed of Abraham and if the Abrahamic Covenant has thus been fulfilled. Now we will go through the New Testament and show that the presentation about the regathering of Israel is exactly the same as it is in the Old Testament. The sequence of events and the time factors have a great bearing on whether or not the present Israeli state could be the fulfilment of prophecy about the regathering of Israel.

THE REGATHERING IN MATTHEW

It is well to remind ourselves how the gospel writers tell us the purpose for which Jesus came. The gospels make it clear that Jesus came to save and rule His people. These are whom God selected as *His People* before they were saved.

Matt 1:21 … *Thou shall call his name JESUS: for he shall save* ***his people*** *from their sins.*

Matt 2:6 … *That shall rule* ***my people Israel****.*

The expression, *His people* is specific. Throughout the Old Testament, *His People* describes Israel only. John the Baptist declares that *this is He that was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah* and John the Baptist goes on to the first New Testament mention of a *gathering* of the Lord's people. In many verses below, look for the word *gather* and verify for yourself who is being gathered.

Matt 3:12 … *he will thoroughly purge his floor, and* ***gather*** *his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.*

That some thing is gathered and something is burnt shows that there are differences between people in the eyes of God. All men are not created equal. Later Jesus takes up the theme of the wheat in the parable of the tares and the wheat. If one thing bears repeating, it is the statement that the tares are gathered and burned before the wheat is gathered. The chaff are burned after the harvest. What we are looking at in particular is the time frame, or the order of events, of these two gatherings together. Jesus gives the time as being *in the time of harvest* and this is given as being *at the end of the age*. It is at that time when the Son of Man sends forth His angels to remove from out of His kingdom, all things that offend and them which do iniquity. [Note: the resurrection occurs before Jesus sets foot on the Mount of Olives.]

As was seen to be the case through the Old Testament, the bad are removed from out of the kingdom. It is never the good who are raptured away leaving the bad behind. The wicked are ever separated from among the just.

Matt 13:49.. *So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just..*

It is this principle that our popular teachers deny.

Matt 23:37 *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have **gathered** thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.*

The people gathered are *your children.* They are still the descendants of the same people to whom the prophets were sent. No other peoples are ever indicated.

MATTHEW 24

When it comes to the word *gather*, Matt 24:29 refers to happenings that we saw forecast through the Old Testament. We have the tribulation before the gathering, so the elect have not been raptured away. There is again the sun being darkened and the moon not giving her light. If these things are literal, then these things have not yet happened.

Matt 24:29-31 *Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels, and they shall **gather together** his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.*

The language is similar to that seen in the Old Testament where the prophets say Israel will be gathered out of the other nations where they had been scattered. Once again, we see that the gathering of *His elect* nation is before Jesus descends upon the Mount of Olives, thus confirming what all the prophets say. We can again see the consistency of the message through both Testaments that contradicts the popular teaching that says the Israeli state represents the fulfilment of prophecy. Some of the above things that have to happen before the gathering of Israel simply just have not yet happened. So much for the Israeli state!

MATTHEW 25

Here again we find the matter of the gathering and the separating of the good and from the bad. In this case it is the sheep and the goats.

Matt 25:34 *Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.*

It is the King who does the separating, so the King must have returned at this time to take up the Kingdom and this separation concerns only the potential occupants of the Kingdom. [The separation of the Tares from the Wheat is before this time.]
In this verse we have mention of the inheritance. Through the Old Testament, the inheritance is shown to be an area of land [on this earth] which was promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and their descendants.

THE REGATHERING IN THE OTHER GOSPELS

In John's gospel there is an interesting prophecy made by Caiaphas in his capacity as High Priest. It is recorded that he spoke not of himself:

John 11:50-52 *Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not … and not for that nation only, but that also he should **gather together** in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.*

The traditionalists would like to say that this *gathering in one* refers to *Jews and Gentiles* [supposedly meaning Israelites and non-Israelites] being gathered together. But Caiaphas isolated *the whole nation* and their position *as children of God*. In this passage we see that Jesus would not die for the House of Judah only, but for *the children of God*, inclusive of the House of Israel, who were then scattered abroad. This confirms what the prophets say about the gathering together of Israel and Judah.

THE REGATHERING IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

In the first chapter of Acts the question about the kingdom being restored to Israel was asked. The Greek word used means, *to make it like it was before, or to heal it*. Therefore it cannot refer to the Church in the popular concept.

> *Acts 1:6,7* *When they*, [the apostles] *were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, will thou at this time restore again the Kingdom* ***to Israel****? And he said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power.*

Jesus did not deny the restoration; He told them it was not for them to know the timing. The key point is that the subject is the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel. No other peoples are included.

The witness *unto Me* is to be taken to *the uttermost* part of the earth where Israel had been scattered among the nations. The racial universalists say the uttermost part of the earth means the inclusion of every race upon earth. But Jesus says, *You shall not have gone over 'THE CITIES OF ISRAEL' before the Son of Man be come* [Matt 10:23]. They were to go only to the *lost sheep of the House of Israel* [Matt 10:6]. It was demonstrated earlier in the chapter entitled, *Stumbling Blocks To An Exclusive Israel*, that the instruction to *go into all the world* and *preach the gospel to every creature* was to go unto all the k*osmos* of Israel and proclaim it in every *ktizo* or place where Israelites dwelt.

The question was asked, *Wilt thou, at this time, restore the Kingdom* **to Israel**? In this restoration time the apostles were told that they would sit on twelve thrones *judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel* [Matt 19:28]. No mention is ever made of other peoples. There is no suggestion of a multi-racial church ever taking the place of Israel as a people. This message of the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel is a message that is not proclaimed any more. If there was a multi-racial "church", it would not be a case of restoration to something that was manifest previously, but something altogether new. This we do not find.

WHAT IS THE NEW TESTAMENT GATHERING TIME?

Through the New Testament, the gathering time is connected with the Second Advent of Jesus. It can be studied from this aspect.

Going back to Matthew 24 we find:

> *Matt 24:31* *And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall* ***gather together*** *his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.*

Paul in 1Cor 15:52 and 1Thess4:16 is talking about what is going to happen before the tribulation

At this trump of God, the dead in "christ" [an anointed people] are raised [1 Cor 15:52 and 1 Thess 4:16]. This refers to the elect as opposed to the final steps in the re-gathering of Israel, but both events occur in the era of the Second Advent. Therefore, it is a bit hard to imagine that this trumpet's reverberation has already happened – especially if any want to continue to say that the Israeli state today represents this gathering together of Israel. Matthew says that this is *immediately after the tribulation of those days* [Matt 24:29], so it cannot be pre-tribulation.

> *2 Thess 2:1-17* *Now we beseech you brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our* ***gathering together*** *unto him.*

The subject people are *brethren* (kinsmen of the womb). These are the *kin* of the ones who are gathered together. Again, no others are mentioned. The time is at the Second Advent of Jesus [the *coming of our Lord Jesus Christ*], as this verse says.

The "falling" means actually the rapture

What we find today is a great ~~falling away~~ from this fact about the gathering together of Israel. This is the context of this chapter in which Paul speaks of *the mystery of iniquity* [v7]. The source of this iniquity is Rome and the doctrines that originate from that source.
In the context of Israel, Paul says,

Heb 9:28 … *unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.*

The present Israeli state was formed through Zionist political determination together with political alliances, military might and violence. Because this is contrary to the weight of prophecy showing repentance, trust in God alone, and a totally different manner and attitude at the time of the regathering, the Israeli state has no "Divine right" as claimed to the inheritance land. Yet, this is the common assumption of most denominational churches. They have been fooled by those calling themselves Jews, but who are not Jews through their use of the name "Israel".. It is this Israeli state who *call themselves Jews*. These are abiding in unbelief and in hatred towards the Redeemer of Israel. Jesus says that these wicked husbandmen will be destroyed when He returns to take His Kingdom.

HAS THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT BEEN FULFILLED?

There are those who teach that the Abrahamic Covenant has been fulfilled, declaring:

1. That the promise to Abraham concerning territory was fulfilled when David established his dominion from the Euphrates to the Nile [1 Chron 18:3, 2 Sam 8:3] and confirmed with Solomon [1 Kings 8:65, 2 Chronicles 7:8].
2. That statements like, *and hast given them this land which thou didst swear to their fathers to give them* [Jer 32:21-23], show that the seed of Abraham was fulfilled in Jesus, *the true seed of Abraham* and *the covenant's objective reality.*

Both statements completely ignore what God said concerning the amount of land Israel would inhabit during that period [Ex 23:20-33] and the statement to David concerning the fact that Israel was not going to remain in the promised land (1 Sam 7:10). They also ignore what is said by the post-Solomon prophets together with what is said in the New Testament about the regathering to the land that was given to the fathers of Israel. Neither David nor Solomon possessed the land *forever* as provided for in the original covenant statement. The House of Israel and the House of Judah will re-unite and return to the land under Jesus as King, when He returns to take up His Kingdom.
The second statement generally ignores the fact that Jeremiah observes that the disobedience of the people [verse 23] was the fulfilment of Deut 4:25-27, Deut 28:64 and others.
If the statement was true, then the present separate identities of Israel and Judah could not also be true. This argument about the *seed of Abraham* has raged for centuries, but the conclusion presented in this book is the straight forward answer to what has been made into a complex matter. Israel remains exclusive; we have discussed what *all the nations being blessed in Abraham* means. The King will return and He will take His Kingdom with its territory [the covenant land] and the *forever* of the Abrahamic Covenant will be fulfilled in Jesus. Those elect overcomers, the Sons of God, resurrected at the Second Advent, will reign with Him on Earth.

Rev 11:15 … *The Kingdoms* (singular in the original) *of this world* [kosmos: order] *are become the kingdoms* (singular) *of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.*

annointed

CHAPTER 17: THE HEIRS OF JACOB - ISRAEL

Throughout this book words like *inheritance, elect* and *chosen* have come up many times and these show that there is a difference between Israel and the balance of peoples. Now we come to some differences within Israel itself. Among these sons of Jacob, there are differing end-of-age blessings for each tribe. These things are for *the last days*.

Following the line from Abraham and Isaac, we come next to Jacob. These three are described as *the fathers* in the New Testament. Jacob, whose name God changed to Israel, had twelve sons, each of which was the head of a tribe, the tribes becoming known as the twelve tribes of Israel. Normally the eldest son Reuben would have inherited the birthright, but he *defiled his father's bed* and it is recorded that Jacob gave the birthright to the sons of Joseph. This does not mean that Reuben was totally disinherited; we find Reuben sealed in Rev 7:5.

> *1 Chron 5:1,2* *Now the sons of Reuben the firstborn of Israel, [for he was the firstborn; but, forasmuch as he defiled his father's bed, his birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph the son of Israel and the genealogy is not to be reckoned after the birthright. For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler,* ***But the birthright was Joseph's****].*

This introduces two factors that are often overlooked, namely that, although the chief ruler comes from Judah, the birthright is not given to Judah. Accordingly, Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, thus have this birthright, even today. Right at this point, we must note that each individual tribe was not treated the same by God and the birthright given to Joseph carried a double blessing [Gen 48:22]. Jacob blessed Ephraim and Manasseh, the sons of Joseph.

When the patriarch Jacob was giving his sons their individual blessings, we are told four things:

1. Genesis 37:3 *Israel loved Joseph more than all his children ….*
2. Genesis 48:5 *And now thy two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh which who were born unto thee in the land of Egypt, before I came unto thee in Egypt, as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine.*
3. Genesis 48:16 … *let my name be named upon them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.*
4. Genesis 48:6 *And thy issue* [Joseph's] *which thou begettest after them, shall be thine* [Joseph's], *and shall be called after the name of their brethren in their inheritance.*

This means that Ephraim and Manasseh would be included in the sons of Jacob. This perpetuates the name of Jacob in Ephraim and Manasseh. In listings of Israel through the Bible, in differing contexts and circumstances, two sons are deliberately left off each time to make the total twelve only each time. One of the extra names often replaces Levi who had no inheritance among the other twelve, and the other sometimes replaces Dan, for example, because of the golden calves.

Let my name be named upon them indicates, *to proclaim – to nominate – to cry or call out*. So this is important. In Isaiah 43:7 and 48:1 this naming is a proclamation of racial identity, so that Ephraim and Manasseh are henceforth part of Israel and are sons of Jacob.

In addition to their birthright blessing, the name "Israel" was passed on to Ephraim and Manasseh as part of all the other twelve tribes. This includes the names of Abraham and Isaac, according to verse sixteen; this shows that all were part of the same racial line through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. What is believed here conditions what is believed prophetically in the remainder of the Bible.

THE BLESSING ON EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH

This is found in Genesis 48:15-22 and should be read and re-read until it is understood. The traditional blessing [*mitzvos*] is imparted by placing the right hand on the person's head, but here the patriarch crossed his hands and placed the hand of blessing upon Ephraim thus

giving primacy to Ephraim over Manasseh. In various places through the Old Testament where we are told, *Ephraim is My firstborn* [Jer 31:9]; he is also spoken of as being God's firstborn, the one with the blessing.

Ezek 37:19 *… the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim …*

With the birthright being Joseph's, Ephraim has the stick or is *ates* (fastened in place) in relationship to the other sons of Jacob. This stick must not be confused with the sceptre [*shebet*] *that shall not depart from Judah* [Gen 49:10]. Psalm 108:8 says, *Ephraim is the strength of my head; Judah is my lawgiver.* This establishes the relationship between Ephraim and Judah. That Judah has the sceptre does not remove the birthright from Joseph.

1 Chron 5:2 *For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; but the birthright was Joseph's.*

Judah was praised by his brethren because of his strength and from Judea came Jesus, *that shall rule my people Israel* [Micah 5:2 and Matt 2:6]. But, in no way did this take away the birthright from Joseph, who in turn gave primacy to his son Ephraim.
In this, as in many places in Scripture, we see the principle of birthright, where the natural firstborn may be passed over. We see Ishmael being the natural firstborn to Abraham being out of favour to Isaac. Isaac's natural firstborn was passed over in favour of Jacob. Jacob, in turn, blessed his eleventh son and then we see how Ephraim, the last born, received the birthright. The birthright was always given to a kinsman, who is a blood descendant. That is why Jesus can only be the Kinsman-Redeemer of Israel. We are told that He came, *To save His people from their sins. His people* is a specific limitation; they were His people before they were saved. To most in the denominational churches, and even amongst the Messianic Jews, the ideas held are either:

[a] Judah is still prevailing.

[b] Judah or "Jews" are Israel.

[c] The multi-racial "church" is now Israel.

[d] Through the redemption of Israel that is in Christ Jesus, nothing of the prophecies of Moses have meaning any more.

This is nothing less than unbelief in what Jesus said about the necessity of believing what Moses wrote, in order that His Words might be understood.

THE PEOPLE AND THE MULTITUDE OF NATIONS

In giving his blessing to the lads, Ephraim and Manasseh, the patriarch Jacob immediately stated what each would become [Gen 48:19]:

[a] Of Ephraim (the younger brother): he shall become a multitude of nations.

[b] Of Manasseh: He shall become a people.

The promise to Abraham and the promise to Ephraim are not the same. Abraham was to become a *qahal* of *am*, or a *congregation of people*, whereas Ephraim was to become a *melo* of *goi* or a *full hand of nations.* Manasseh was to become an '*am*, a people.
In the last days neither Ephraim nor Manasseh have disappeared in favour of any multi-racial church. Moses likewise pronounced blessings on all the tribes and he said the sons of Joseph would *push the people* [*am*] together to the ends of the earth saying, *These are the ten thousands of Ephraim and the thousands of Manasseh* [Deut 33:17].
If we are now in the last days, there must be somewhere on Earth, peoples representing Ephraim and Manasseh. They would have a common tongue, being brothers. One must be a grouping of nations and the other must be a people. Scripture shows how each tribe has symbols, banners and other pointers giving individual identification. Present identification from this aspect is not within the scope of this book.
What is vital to understanding of prophecy, is the division of the twelve tribes into the two Houses. They have enmity between them. Ephraim and Manasseh both come from the one House, but Judah represents the other House. This division is not generally recognised today,

with the consequence that prophetical interpretation is totally confused. What we have commonly presented is a *church* that is completely foreign to prophecy. In the chapter, *The Church*, it has been shown how the *assembly* is drawn out from among Israel who are of the physical blood descendants of Abraham through Isaac. They become manifested as "sons" through resurrection in the New Testament.

It is common to hear that the House of Israel has disappeared, leaving only "The Jews" who can be identified. It has come to the point where it is commonly said that the Jews are Israel. However, the House of Judah is only part of "all Israel" and modern Jewry is a multi-racial conglomeration that adheres to a common religion.

But, since the House of Judah are Israelites, there is nothing wrong in referring to them as Israelites. This can be found in Scripture. The two houses went into separate captivities and it is common to hear false teaching how Israel [suggesting the whole nation] returned from captivity under Ezra and Nehemiah. This is entirely wrong as it was the House of Judah that went into captivity in Babylon. The House of Israel [ten tribes] has never returned "to the Land" as a nation or nations after their captivity in Assyria. The timing of this event is shown in the chapter, *The Regathering Of Israel*.

Throughout Scripture we find parts or the whole of the twelve tribes, spoken of as *all Israel, Jacob, Judah, Ephraim* and the two Houses, in a way that is not generally understood. Each rightly is entitled to be called Israel as part of all Israel. This is wrongly used to try to support the popular teachings that there is now no separation between the Houses or the Tribes. Sometimes prophecy is directed at one part and not another, so careful reading is essential to determine just who is being addressed. It is commonly thought that all the ten tribes of the House of Israel have disappeared into a foreign milieu and that no identification of any part is possible. This is far from the truth.

The 10 tribed House of Israel are never described in Scripture as "Jews". That they became like the foreign nations in many ways is not disputed. They were called Greeks in New Testament Scripture and the *uncircumcision* by the Judeans, but the disciples still knew exactly where to find them and to tell them the gospel story. It is evident that they got results. Remember how Jesus sent the disciples only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel? [Matt 10:6 and 15:24]. Jesus made this limitation which the churches today refuse to allow or believe. They subsequently became lost in history and blind to their own identity and, collectively, (that is, in the common knowledge of the general population), nobody knows where they are today.

SOME POPULAR INTERPRETATIONS AND COMMENTS

Jacob prophesied that Ephraim's descendants would become a *m'loh* [or *melo*] of *goyim* or *a fullness or a full hand of nations*. With the popular, but wrong translation, this has become "the fullness of the Gentiles"! This terminology, together with the other examples listed below, is used to try to prove that these expressions mean something other than what the Hebrew or Greek means.

1. EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH ARE SAID TO BE 'TYPES'

Some people will go so far as to recognise the position of Ephraim and Manasseh, but then they will say that Manasseh is a "type" of the Old Testament with Ephraim being a "type" of the New Testament. They have to say that to keep believing the traditional teachings about "Jews and Gentiles". When God said that He would make Abraham's descendants as numerous as the stars in the sky, they say this myriad represents the Gentiles' conversion to become the Church. But, as we have seen, Abraham's descendants could not be both Israel and a multi-racial Church.

2. "GALILEE OF THE GENTILES"

In Isaiah 9:1 we find the expression, *Galilee of the Nations* or *Galilee of the Gentiles* according to version. This is quoted in Matthew 4:15 where the word "Gentiles" is picked up

and used to say these were non-Israelites. But, Jesus' ministry was mainly in Galilee, rather than in Judea, and all the people ministered unto were Israelites. Isaiah, who is being quoted, does not even remotely suggest non-Israelites – the context in these passages relates to Jacob/Israel. The section starting in Isa 9:8 confirms the exclusiveness of Israel outside of the so-called Gentile non-Israel nations.

Isaiah 9:8 *The Lord sent a word into Jacob, and it hath lighted upon Israel.*

"Jacob" and "Israel" cannot mean every race. One of the marks of Ephraim/Israel today, as the heirs of Jacob, is the place of the Word of God found among this people. This does not mean that all this people believe in Jesus, but that the Word of God has a place in the affairs and laws of these people. Ultimately, the one blessing given in the original covenant is fulfilled in both the Houses when:

Isaiah 9:7 *Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the Throne of David …*

Jesus is yet to return to take that Throne. This throne exists today in the people upon whom the, *word has lighted*. The *over all Israel* means all of the tribes of Israel, and there is no suggestion that this could be everyone of every race.

3. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND CHURCH OF THE FIRSTBORN

The general assembly [paneguris: general public assembly] *and church* [ekklesia: called-out assembly] *of the firstborn* [Heb 12:23] is used to support the belief that the *firstborn* are believers from all races on Earth who believe in Jesus. Jesus is the *firstborn from among the dead,* but *ekklesia* does not have the meaning they place upon it.
It is often wrongly said, *as creator He is father to all men, but he is the 'spiritual' Father only to believers*. However, Moses was to tell Pharaoh**, "ISRAEL IS MY SON, EVEN MY FIRSTBORN***"* [Ex 4:22]. Under God's law *all* **the firstborn** *of thy sons shalt thou redeem* [Ex 34:20]. God says, *all* **the firstborn** *are mine* [Num 3:13]. *All* **the firstborn** *of my children I will redeem* [Ex 13:15]. God does not break His own law of redemption to include everyone else, as is commonly taught today.

4. THE ISRAEL OF GOD … AND… CIRCUMCISION OF THE HEART

This is yet another way of trying to get around the exclusive nature of Israel in order to incorporate all races within a New Testament Israel which some like to call *The Israel of God*.. It is said that the Old Testament Israel has passed away and that believers in Jesus are all now the New Testament Israel. The mechanism is based upon the *circumcision of the heart* doctrine. The basis is Jer 31:31 where God says:

Jer 31:31-33 *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: 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; … I will put my law in their inward parts, and write in their hearts …*

As usual, there are the two parts, namely the House of Judah and the House of Israel as has been pointed out many times before. When the prophet goes on to describe how the law would be put in their inward parts, and be written on their hearts, this is said to be what happens when a non-Israelite joins Israel. They are supposed to have become *circumcised in heart* and somehow then become "Israel".
The problem is this: that the *circumcision of the heart* is an expression that is not confined to the New Testament.. It is found in the books of the Law where this expression is applied to Israel. In the New Testament, likewise, outward circumcision in the flesh is useless without the circumcision of the heart. Paul does not say the covenant of circumcision no longer exists. How could anyone be given a new covenant who first never had an old covenant? Both Testaments address this promise expressly to only the House of Israel and the House of Judah, as demonstrated in the above verse. These Houses both still exist in the New Testament [Heb 8:8].

So, if Bible Colleges like to say that the *Israel of God* is a multi-racial term this does not make it so in fact. In all of these things, the blessing Jacob placed upon his sons, and the birthright blessing upon Joseph, have not passed away.

5. THE SO-CALLED NEW TESTAMENT PASSOVER

Another aspect sometimes presented is what some like to call the New Testament Passover, which somehow is supposed to allow for the multi-racial concept. When Jesus said, *With desire I have desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer* [Luke 22:15], He was confirming that He was to fulfil the Law of Sacrifices with His own Blood. Jesus became the Passover Lamb for Israel. In no way does this say that somehow this was now to be extended to all races beyond Israel and Judah. The moment we understand that every book of the New Testament is written to Israelites alone, and that the New Testament fulfils what is written in the Old Testament, understanding will come. The institution of the Passover was made for Israel alone and was to be commemorated by Israel for all generations.

WHEN EPHRAIM REPENTS

In Scripture, "Ephraim" is used of the single tribe, as well as the leader of the ten - tribed House of Israel. One of the very sad stories through prophecy is the story of Ephraim. They are *cut off*, *become not a people*, and are described as drunkards. Ephraim becomes like *a silly dove* and as *a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke*.. They become much punished by God. But through it all, through prophetical Scriptures we can sense the yearnings of God for Ephraim.

> *Jer 31:20* *Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still: therefore my bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him; …*

Isa 7:8 foretold that Ephraim would become *not a people*. They came to the place where they no longer recognised who they were; nationally they lost knowledge of their identity, as being God's people. They lost all knowledge that they carried the patriarch's as well as God's blessing. God says:

> *Hosea 11:3* *I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms, but they knew not that I healed them.*

But we are told that one day Ephraim will repent. He will first have sorrows like a travailing woman [Hos 13:13] and God will hear Ephraim *bemoaning himself* [Jer 31:18] and Ephraim will call upon God, as a nation.

> *Zech 10:7* *And they of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man, and their heart shall rejoice as through wine: yea, their children shall see it, and be glad; their heart shall rejoice in the Lord.*

From this point, the story is that of the regathering of Israel. It is a thrilling story in prophecy, <u>but the sad side of all this is that the churches refuse to teach it, or even ever mention the name of Ephraim.</u> The repentance of Ephraim and the regaining of the knowledge of their identity are connected.

WHAT ARE WE SAYING?

The Christian denominations will not accept the blessings that Jacob prophesied in Genesis 49 or what the prophet Moses said at the end of the book of Numbers. Jesus said that it was necessary to hear Moses in order to comprehend His words. Although Ephraim, as the leader of the ten-tribed Northern House, is not even mentioned in the New Testament by that name, once, we see and believe what Moses wrote is seen and believed, the blessings of the patriarchs and the words of the prophets can be seen through the New Testament books. For example, the language of Peter is that of Hosea. Hosea wrote primarily to the ten tribes and likewise Peter writes to the same people. The parables of Jesus come alive in this context and suddenly these parables can be seen to be dealing with the two separate Houses and the Kingdom.

Traditionally, the churches spiritualise the prophetic messages. Whenever nations and races are considered, this is made a matter of personal belief or disbelief. This is because the foundation in Moses's writings are destroyed.

Ps 11:3 *If the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?*

These Psalms differentiate between righteous people and wicked people, in terms of nations and races, as well as good and bad people within Israel. To most churchgoers there is only some kind of spiritual message. Once again, the problem doctrine is the *all the world* doctrine. It does not exist through the Old Testament. Moses did not write one word about this *all the world* doctrine. Moses prophesied about the sons of Jacob and what would happen to them in the last days. They have not somehow disappeared. The sons of Jacob have not somehow become all races. All races have not become the sons of Jacob. These sons of Jacob cannot therefore be modern Jewry that comes from almost every race and colour on Earth. The New Testament teaching about the regathering of Israel is exactly the same as that in the Old Testament and the heirs of Jacob/Israel remain the same.

CHAPTER 18: THE SONS OF JOSEPH

In the last chapter, it was shown how the name "Israel" was named upon the two sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh and how they were given the birthright as sons, alongside the other sons of Jacob. Although they were actually grandchildren, they are spoken of as being sons, tribes, or half tribes of Israel, many times in Scripture. The birthright double-blessing was given to Joseph, to be passed on to his sons (Ex 48:22, 1 Chron 5:2), with Ephraim having the leadership position. In prophecy, the name Ephraim may also be found in association with the ten tribes of the House of Israel, because of this leadership. Neither Judah nor the House of Judah, have this place of honour as a right because Reuben's *birthright was given unto the sons of Joseph* [1 Chron 5:1].

Once again, it is necessary to understand and note that our sovereign Lord does not treat all people the same.. He even makes differences between each Tribe of the Children of Israel and then between the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Today the churches make *election* a matter of a person's choice entirely in their push for universalism. The Apostle Paul makes the differences clear when he records:

> *Rom 9:6-11* *… For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed … (For the children being not yet born, neither having done good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.)*

Although the context of this verse is Jacob and Esau, it is quoted to establish that God does select [or elect] to establish His purposes. Christians are not taught about the election in this way. As has been pointed out before, we cannot have universalism and election at the same time for all races. Why should we any more *reply against God* [Rom 9:20].

When we come down to the 24th and 25th verses of Romans 9 we read:

> *Rom 9:24,25* *Even us, hath he called, not of the Jews* [Judeans] *only, but also of the Gentiles* [Greeks]? *As he saith also in Hosea, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved.*

This perhaps, is a "crunch" verse in popular doctrinal teachings. The question is, *Who are the Gentiles in this verse*? Hosea wrote about Ephraim; he mentions the name "Ephraim" 37 times! This must be recorded deeply into the mind.

[Some find a difficulty with Hosea 5:5 where there is mention of Israel, Ephraim and Judah all within this one verse. In verse 3, Ephraim's whoredom defiles the rest of the House of Israel and this is the context of verse 5].

Peter quotes from Hosea; to whom did Peter address his epistles? [see the chapter entitled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel*]. Peter wrote to the dispersed [scattered] of Israel. In Rom 9:24,25, Paul is referring to the House of Israel and their relationship with Judah. Paul is saying that God has called both the House of Israel as well as the House of Judah. Thus Hosea says not one word about non-Israel races being included within Israel and nor do the other prophets. The ten tribes may have the appearance of being non-Israel, but what God says is, *I will sift the House of Israel among all nations, like corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth* [Amos 9:9]. Among these sifted people somewhere are the sons of Joseph.

Romans 9 must be read with election in mind. Part of Israel, namely the House of Judah, was following *after the law of righteousness* but the House of Israel *followed not after the law of righteousness*. Then Paul goes on to say, *brethren, my heart's desire, and my prayer to God FOR ISRAEL*, [that is, all of Israel] *is that they might be saved*. He never suggests any other races being saved. He says, *has God cast away his people, God forbid. God has not cast away his people who he foreknew* [all Israel, whom He 'knew' in the Old Testament] and then Paul tells about Elisha making intercession to God FOR ISRAEL. Next Paul goes on to

show that not all of Israel itself obtains salvation, but only the election of Grace. This is the remnant out OF ISRAEL, the ones God *has reserved unto himself*.

TURNING AWAY UNGODLINESS FROM JACOB

Rom 11:26 *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.*

There can be no mistaking what is the meaning of *Jacob* because he is mentioned by that name 358 times in the Bible, 24 of which are in the New Testament. Despite this, Jacob seldom rates a mention today.
In all these things, we can see why "election" is an unpopular thought and doctrine. It is easy to see why this is changed by churches to make election into a matter of anyone of any race *receiving Jesus*. It is then made man's choice. But, it is those amongst ISRAEL who accept the Deliverer out of Zion who will *turn away ungodliness FROM JACOB* [Rom 11:26]. The words *Jacob* and *Zion* have nothing to do with non-Israel races.
Jacob has an heir; his birthright was given to Joseph who then blessed Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh. This subject is ignored by most denominations today who decline to believe the Bible because they will not believe what Moses wrote. Any suggestion that God would turn away ungodliness from Jacob only is violently opposed. The whole subject is spiritualised, with the result that our churches are filled with a *mixed multitude*. The portion of those who can 'hear' are discouraged from believing any verses like this in the Bible.
Does Jacob have an heir, or not? Who is this heir *in the last days* that Moses prophesied about? Are we to believe this prophet Moses or not? Why does Jesus say we must believe Moses before we could believe what Jesus was saying? We have to choose, even if popular teachings do not want to allow this choice. The reason why the churches deny the teaching of Moses is primarily because of their false and conflicting teaching about *God so loved the world* and *go into all the world*.

WHO ARE EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH TODAY?

Let us go back to Jacob's prophecy in Genesis concerning Ephraim and Manasseh:

Gen 48:19-22. *… he* [Manasseh] *also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations. And he blessed them that day, saying, In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh: and he set Ephraim before Manasseh. And Israel said to Joseph … I have given to you one portion above thy brethren …*

For those brought up to think that "The Jews" are Israel or that Israel is one uniform entity with no differences between the Tribes or Houses, or that Israel is now "The Church", these Scriptures might come as a shock. God is still sovereign here, even if we have been led to believe and to think otherwise.
In the last days Ephraim was to become a multitude of nations and Manasseh was to become "a people".. Some would liken these as being a Commonwealth of Nations with the other being a Republic. It is certain that the tribes, or Children OF ISRAEL, were not to become some obscure religious "church" made up of all races, in the last days.
When we can see that the two parties Paul discusses are the Dispersion and the Judeans, the two Testaments no longer conflict. Paul's conclusion in discussing the two groups is: *and so ALL ISRAEL shall be saved*. Few will agree with the Apostle Paul's conclusion.
Although The House of Israel had become *strangers and aliens* [Ephesians 2:12] from the commonwealth OF ISRAEL they were never non-Israelite "strangers" [see the chapter entitled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel*]. They had been living outside of God's fullness, but, *now in Christ Jesus … are made nigh by the blood of Christ*.. Then Paul goes on to describe the enmity that had been between Judah and Israel, saying that He [God] *might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby* [Eph 2:16]. Both Judah and Israel could now build together for an *habitation of God through the Spirit*.

WHAT OF EPHRAIM AND MANASSEH TODAY?

In asking this question, it will very quickly be seen that there are not a lot of options available. It becomes like what is believed or not believed, about evolution. People will to not believe in creation because that belief brings responsibility and accountability, so they prefer to believe in evolution. Likewise, there is a similar situation when we consider the identity of Ephraim and Manasseh. The religious "churches" prefer to believe in universalism because they do not want to believe that God sovereignly chooses and uses races. Our teachers do not want to believe that God treats one race or tribe differently from another. This fact is decidedly graphic in the Old Testament! They are quite happy to delete all of this from the Bible and from their teachings and quite willing to disbelieve the prophets just as much as those who stoned Stephen! So, let us look at indicators that will lead us to identify Ephraim and Manasseh.

THE MONARCHY OVER THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL

The leading tribe over the House of Israel is Ephraim. One of the marks of identification is a monarch [or monarchs] of the House of David ruling on the throne of Israel. Although the matter has been examined in earlier chapters, let us again confirm this matter. This is a covenant made between God and King David:

2 Sam 7:12-16 *And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom, … but my mercy shall not depart away from him … and thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever.*

The seed is, *out of your bowels*; it is not some spiritual seed. It is one Kingdom. Each successive monarch is a descendent of King David. Never forget that this throne is called, *the throne of the Kingdom of the Lord, OVER ISRAEL* [1 Chron 28:5]. This is not a minor Biblical theme.

Jer 33:17 *For thus saith the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel.*

THE NEW PLACE APPOINTED FOR ISRAEL

This is a prophetical subject that is usually avoided because it can have no place in the *all the world* doctrine of the modern churches. Going back to 2 Sam 7, we find a situation where King David is sitting in his palace, in the city of David [Jerusalem] and the prophet Nathan brings a message to David, saying:

2 Sam 7:10 *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: neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.*

What is being said is that a new "place" was going to be appointed for God's people Israel, which was away from the Jerusalem in Palestine where David was then sitting. There was to be a new location for David's Throne. Nevertheless, a blood descendent of King David was always to be enthroned. But, with this promise, warnings were issued of punishment, correction and even the loss of the knowledge of identity. The Children of Israel were to *abide many days without a king*, [Hos 3:4] – that is, outside of the king's dominion.

Hosea 5:1 *… ye house of Israel, … O house of the King …*

The monarch exists today, according to God's promise. Vine [under Kingdom] says,

> *The fundamental principle of the Kingdom is declared in the words of the Lord spoken in the midst of a company of Pharisees, the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you [Luke 17:21], that is, where the King is, there is the Kingdom.*

Jerusalem is the *city of the great King* [Psalm 48:2]; in the Kingdom of Heaven, where the King is, there is the Kingdom. If a new place was appointed for *my people Israel*, then there would be a new place for the King. This helps to explain why the prophet ZECHARIAH can

say, *and the Lord shall choose Jerusalem again* [Zech 2:12] and *Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place* [Zech 12:6]. This "again" relates to the time of the regathering OF ISRAEL when Jerusalem resumes its former role. Until this time, the Throne of David must be somewhere else other than in Palestine.

When this verse, 2 Samuel 7:10, speaks of the appointment of a "place", the word *maqowm* is used over three hundred times to denote a specific location. It is a place, not a condition, as some would like to say. Israel is to be *planted* there in that location. When we come to the second time "place" is used in this verse, the word used is *tachath* which means something quite different. This latter "place" is used about the same number of times but it denotes being "under" some protection. The rest of the verse bears this out. What this means is that the re-located Israel is under some Divine protection. Israel's throne may be threatened and Israel may be punished, but the Throne will always remain secure. Its location may be the safest place on Earth!

The *as beforetime* is pointed out and this is confirmed in other places in Scripture. In Isaiah 29:1-6 there is the first prophecy of the chapter that pronounces woe to Ariel [Jerusalem] where David dwelt. This *dwelt* is translated as being past-tense, and if so, then David [or one of David's successors] must now dwell some place else, other than in the Old Jerusalem.

WHERE IS THIS NEW LOCATION?

This is presented as in islands to the North and West of Palestine.

Isaiah 24:15	*Wherefore glorify ye the Lord in the fires, even the name of the Lord God of Israel in the isles of the sea.*
Ezek 39:6,7	*And I will send a fire upon Magog, and upon them that dwell carelessly in the isles: and they shall know that I am the Lord. So will I make my holy name known in the midst of my people Israel; and I will not let them pollute my holy name any more: and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord the Holy One* ***in Israel****.*

Again, Israel is the one people in the midst of whom God dwells. The expression, *my people Israel* shows that in the latter days, Israel is still separate from the other races. Although all Israel is scattered in all points of the globe, they are gathered back from the North and West.

Hosea 11:10	*They shall walk after the Lord: he shall roar like a lion: when he shall roar, then the children shall tremble* ***from the west****.*
Isaiah 49:12	*Behold, these shall come from far: and, lo, these* ***from the north and west****.*
Jer 3:18	*In those days, the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the* ***land of the north*** *to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers.*
Jer 23:8	*But, the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel* ***out of the north country****, and from all countries whither I had driven them: and they shall dwell in their own land.*
Jer 31:8	*Behold, I will bring them from* ***The north country*** *…*

Although part of Israel is also shown as being gathered from the North, South, East and the West, there is this particular emphasis to the North and the West. "The Isles" must be somewhere North and West of Palestine. There is no other option than the British Isles. The timing of the gathering from these Islands is when *I will break the bow, and the sword, and battle out of the earth* [Hos 2:18].

Much could be written about the marks of identification given in Scripture, but that is a separate study, and so the comments here must be brief. The purpose of this book is to present what the Bible says without being strong on identity. There must be two brother peoples speaking a commonly based language some place on Earth. Between them, there must be but one Monarch from a continuing monarchy that can be traced back to the Royal House of King David. The separation of Dominion and Sanctuary that God established over Israel must feature in law. The monarchy must have connection with a Commonwealth of peoples.

WHERE MIGHT EPHRAIM BE NOW?

We have mentioned the Isles North and West of Palestine and now consider the matter of the continuing Throne. There is only one Throne on earth that approaches all the requirements, and this is the Throne of England. There are charts available, whereby some seek to establish that Queen Elizabeth II is the 144th descendant from King David. It is certain that the English coronation service is based upon that found in Scripture for the Kings of Israel. Even today, the Sovereign, by virtue of his/her position, undertakes in the coronation oath*, to the utmost of his power to maintain the Laws of God, and the true profession of the Gospel …* This relationship to the Gospel in Britain can be traced back to first century.

Tertullian: AD 155-232:	The extremities of Spain, the various parts of Gaul, the regions of Britain … have received the religion of Christ. [Tertullian Def. Fidel, P179].
Eusebius: AD 260-340:	The Apostles passed beyond the ocean to the Iles called the Britannic Iles. [De Demonstratione Evangelli Lib].
Gildas [Albanicus], The Wise: AD 425-512:	Christ, the true Sun, afforded His light, the knowledge of His precepts to our Island, in the last year, as we know, of Tiberias Caesar [De Excidio Bratanniae, Sect 8, page 25].
Theodoret, The Blessed, Bishop Of Cyrus:	AD 435 Paul, liberated from his captivity in Rome, preached the gospel to the Britons, and others in the West … and also the Cymry [Welsh] [De Brit. Ecc. Primord, Chap. v111].

There is no shortage of such confirmation. While this Throne was in transit from Ireland to Scotland to England, there is a great abundance of recorded statements from those monarchs on that Throne who spoke of their Kingdom as being that of Israel. In British heraldry, the harp of David is never far away, nor is the lion of the Tribe of Judah, from which that monarchy springs.

WHERE MIGHT MANASSEH BE NOW?

In seeking the identity of Manasseh in these last days, there are various beliefs:

1. The USA – This is the option favoured by the British-Israelites whose belief is primarily based upon the "13th tribe".
2. A people within Britain and now not separated from Ephraim – this does not allow for the scriptural separation of Ephraim and Manasseh as identities.
3. Scotland – Manasseh was to become a people, distinctive from Ephraim, but not separate. In the division of Israel, half of the tribe of Manasseh remained with Ephraim and the other half remained east of Jordan, with Reuben and Gad. The inheritance of Manasseh was to be on the northern border of Ephraim. Biblically, Ephraim and Manasseh usually fought side by side with both acknowledging the same King. In the blessing of Moses upon Joseph [Deut 33:13-17], Ephraim and Manasseh are likened to two horns, *pushing the people together to the ends of the earth*.. This shows their togetherness.. The ratio of ten thousand of Ephraim to one thousand of Manasseh as given, approximates the proportion each provided as armed forces in the last world war by England and Scotland.

CONCLUSION

One thing we can never afford to deny are the prophecies, starting with Moses, concerning the Children of Israel, *in the last days*.. Jesus makes it clear that we must understand these things in the Book of Beginnings to understand what will be in the latter days. You must weigh the evidence from Scripture, yourself and draw your own conclusions as to who Israel is today and whether or not the Israel of the Old Testament is the same Israel in the New Testament. This book will assist you to research into things that are about to be revealed. Ephraim will repent as prophecy records, but first they have to know their identity and place in destiny. Then they will be God's battle - axe to bring peace upon earth. The deception

which says, *the Jews are Israel* has been described in this book as the master deception of Satan that deceives the whole world.
From this vantage point we can reconsider various doctrines, although only two of them are discussed in this book. We can now find out what the Apostle Peter means by *one sure word of prophecy* in a so-called Christian world that has many different "sure" words of prophecy. Jesus will yet sit upon the Throne of David, over Israel, on Earth, when He returns to take His Kingdom.
"AND SO SHALL ALL ISRAEL BE SAVED".

CHAPTER 19: THE NON-ISRAEL RACES

People brought up with a religious belief may have conflict between *it is written* and what they have been taught. Many were brought up singing in Sunday School the song*, red and yellow, black and white; all are precious in His sight*.. This has given us the thought that our God treats everyone of every race exactly the same. The Bible does not support *the brotherhood of man* in the sense that all men are blood-brothers. In this book it has been pointed out that there are certain ways where God does not treat everyone the same – even amongst the tribes of Israel themselves there are differences, so we will re-consider some of these treatments.

THE BASIS OF GOD'S JUDGEMENT OF NON-ISRAEL NATIONS

When we read in John 1:17 *for the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*, we have a problem because the law is spoken in connection with Abraham, long before Moses was born. It is also clear that God judged other non-Israel nations – so what was the basis of judgement? Some nations were judged before what some call *the giving of the law*, [for example, Sodom] and some were judged afterwards [for example, Damascus, Gaza, Tyre, Ammon, Moab and Edom]. We find Jonah being sent to proclaim repentance to Nineveh. We find law and judgement in respect to Adam and Eve and the sacrifices made by Cain and Abel. To almost all Christians there is a conflict about what *The Law* means.
In connection with Abraham we are told:

> *Gen 26:5* *Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws.*

In the beginning of this book many of the Scriptures were listed to show that the total law, namely the Commandments, Statutes and Judgements, were given exclusively to Israel as part of a covenant. There were promises made and responsibilities given to Israel that were not made to other races. Before the addition of the Law to Israel [Gal 3:19], there were the promises made to the seed of Abraham through Isaac, the inheritance being made on the basis of promise, and not the keeping of "The Law".

> *Ps 147:19,20* *He showeth his word unto Jacob, his statutes and his judgements unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation: and for his judgements, they* [that is, the other nations] *have not known them.*

This verse is both limiting and specific and relates exclusively to Israel as a race.

[a] The "word" is *dabar*, or the spoken word.

[b] "Statutes" is *choq* which relates to commands in the sense of a specific direction, charge, instruction, boundary or limitation.

[c] "Judgements" is *mishpat* which relates to a judicial verdict pronounced by God. It is strongly connected to justice.

The Ten Commandments that were given to Israel as part of a covenant are *dabar*, or spoken by God to the subject addressed.

> *Deut 4:13* *And he declared unto you* [that is, Israel] *his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them on two tables of stones.*

In verse 14, Moses was commanded to teach statutes and judgements *that ye might do them in the land whither ye go over to possess it*. We are told that keeping these is why other nations would think and know that Israel was a great and a wise race. Here racial separation is demonstrated!
It is a common perception that none of the Law existed before it was given through Moses on Mount Horeb, but we have seen that God knew Abram would obey the Law. Reference to the requirement to obey the spoken words of God starts right back in Genesis. The Scripture records that God did judge other races, and that obedience was required of them.. When their

iniquity was full God destroyed them. *Avon*, iniquity/punishment, is first found in regard to Cain in Genesis 4:13 and it has 236 occurrences in the Old Testament, most of which refer to Israel.
One of the cities God destroyed for wickedness was Sodom. We read in Genesis 13:13 that *the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly*.. To be wicked, a Law must have existed for them to obey. The law of God was flouted in a way that was open, deliberate and public. Isaiah 3:9 puts it this way, *they declare their sin … they hide it not*. Jeremiah 23:14 confirms this attitude in reference to those in Israel who were openly prophesying in Baal. This is the national attitude we find in Israel today, leading to a judgement that will be greater than that against Sodom [Lam 4:6 and Matt 10:15].
Ezekiel 16:49 describes the sin of Sodom as being, *pride, fullness of bread, and abundance of idleness … neither did she strengthen the hand of the poor and needy, and were haughty and committed abomination before Me*.. This is another picture of our society where open abominations include breaking *thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination*.. Today this act is publicly accepted, legal and open as it was in Sodom.
2 Peter 2:6 and Jude 1:7 picture this and say that similar open abominations are being worthy of eternal fire. On top of this, Anglo-Saxon Israel is openly flouting the word God spoke to them, namely the Ten Commandments.
So, Sodom was required to be in subjection to God's laws and it becomes clear that law existed before the time of Moses. Concerning judgements against sundry non-Israel nations, when we look at the language of Amos, his expression, *for three transgression … and for four, I will not revoke the punishment* is identical in wording and is the same for Israel as for non-Israel.
The difference between Israel and the other races is the everlasting covenant God made with His elect. For Israel God says:

> *Eze 16:60-63* *Nevertheless I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish with thee an everlasting covenant. Then, thou shalt remember thy ways, and be ashamed … and I will establish My covenant with thee; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord: that thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more because of thy shame, when I am pacified towards thee for all thou hast done, saith the Lord God.*

There are no such words addressed to any but Israel.

RACIAL DIFFERENCES

Because of scientific discovery in genetics, no one can pretend there are no racial differences between races. In fact *The Sydney Morning Herald* for 12 July 1997 reports that the latest issue of the journal *Cell* carries a major breakthrough discovery showing that analysis of DNA from the Neanderthal skeletal remains establish there is no genetic connection between Neanderthal man and modern man. Where to now for the evolutionists and the blood-brotherhood crowd?
Quoting from Time Magazine of February 7th, 1994 page 49 on genetics and T*he Human Genome Diversity Project*:

> *What we are doing is to make it possible for Saddam Hussein to collect blood samples from ethnic groups in Iraq who oppose him, so later they can be targeted with biological weapons.*
>
> *Subtle variations between races in white blood - cell types mediate specific immune responses to disease.*

RACISM

One of the things peculiar to Western Society (as opposed to any others) is the teaching that racism is totally wrong. Yet, those who seek to enforce anti-discrimination laws [which include race, racial and national or ethnic origins, and religion] will immediately jump to the support of modern Jewry, as a special religious-racial group, even if modern Jewry is made up of people from many different races. In New Zealand people are actively discouraged from even questioning events of history that might undermine the enforcers' determination of

history in regard to "The Jews".. Their determination is very important to them, and, as such, is in itself racist. What is it that they are trying so hard to either protect or to promote? Might it be their false presentation that the Jews are Israel? Might not this be a mechanism by which the *prince of this world* seeks to eliminate the right message of the Bible? In an earlier chapter this was described as *The Master Deception Of Satan*.. Would it not be Satan who is saying that the Potter does not make one vessel unto honour and another to dishonour, as Scripture says? Anti-racism is saying that every person of every race is the same in the eyes of man, and in Satan's religious doctrines, this is the same as saying in the eyes of God. The issue is multi-culturism and this does not feature favourably through the Bible pages. Mixture of cultures is a source of conflict, both in religion and custom. Israel was separated from the other races, for a purpose. For Israel the Biblical message is still, *come ye out from amongst them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord* in the New Testament. The people being addressed in Corinthians had the "fathers" and were *baptised unto Moses* [1 Cor 4:1]. They were Israelites!

Jer 10:2,3 *Thus saith the Lord, Learn not the way of the heathen, …*

The *way* is *derek* which Strong gives as *course of life, or mode of action*. We should not be teaching indigenous culture in our schools.

IS GOD RACIST?

Not one person can read the Old Testament without agreeing that God is shown to be totally racist. God discriminated on the grounds of race and God clearly treated races differently and even made differences between the tribes of Israel themselves.
The Children of Israel had a mission to eliminate the Canaanite races right down to women, children and even their animals. There are those whom God says He will eliminate when Jesus returns *at the brightness of His coming*. The matter has to be faced; God was totally racist in the Old Testament and we understand that He is unchanging for all time.
Jesus tells us about those who are occupying the "vineyard" and who will be destroyed when He comes to take up His Kingdom. We read of the armies of Heaven:

Rev 19:15,19 *And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: … I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army.*

We are reading of national armies and basically racist matters, right here towards the end of the New Testament pages.

Joel 3:2-17 *I will gather all nations, and will bring them down to the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and for my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations, and have parted my land.*

At this late stage in history, Israel is a separate race among the other nations. God is still racist here and at this time. The context supplies the time and so at the end, Israel is still the individual race it always has been.

RACIAL ORIGINS

Right from Genesis we have this fact of the differing seeds of mankind (see the chapter entitled *Seeds, Natural and Spiritual*) and it is a subject in both Testaments. There is no simple scriptural mechanism for determining which seed is which today. However, Jesus says, *by their fruit ye shall know them*.. It is the fruit that bears the seed. Jesus taught that a bad tree cannot ever bring forth good fruit. It is impossible for those of the bad seed to hear and to respond to the Word of God, Jesus taught us. The Apostle John speaks of those *whose seed remaineth in him … because he is born of God* [1 John 3:9]. As Scripture uses trees as symbols of races, trees might be thought of as being family trees or genetic streams.
The response to the Word of the Lord is an indicator as to seed – the good seed has the choice to obey or not to obey. It is only in maturity that the type of fruit becomes obvious. An example is seen in the parable of the Tares and the Wheat.

Throughout the Old Testament we find references to certain peoples, like Canaanites whom Israel was to destroy. We find differences between the people *created* in Genesis 1 and those who were *formed* in Genesis 2. There are differing prophecies as destinies for differing peoples. As has been pointed out earlier in this book, even each individual tribe of Israel has different prophecies for the latter days.

It is fashionable to say *that the ~~Creator~~ Christ came as Saviour to all Mankind; because all races are descended from the first created man*, and that *races began at the time of the tower of Babel*. But, after Babel we find a different picture, for example:

Gen 19:37 … *the same is the father of the Moabites* …

Gen 19:38 … *the same is the father of the children of Ammon* …

Gen 36:9 … *and these are the generations of the Esau the father of the Edomites* …

From this point on, through Scripture, each group with such a 'father' is treated as being a different race with different destinies. Each then are treated as being from differing 'stock'.

IS THERE A THIRD GROUP?

We have to ask, *What about those non-Israel people who are neither Canaanite, Moabite or Edomite, etc? What does Scripture say about these*? It is safe to say that the Bible says nothing. But, one thing is certain and that is that they were not given the Commandments, Statutes and Judgements that were given to Israel. Because they did not have the Law of Moses to break, why should they need redeeming from the curse of that broken Law? Through Scripture, redemption is spoken of only in regard to Israel. *All have sinned and come short of the glory of God* refers only to the *all* within those to whom the Law was given [Rom 3:19].

SHOULD THE WORD OF GOD BE TAUGHT TO THESE OTHERS?

Although Jesus was talking with Israelites when He said that the rain falls upon the good and the bad, it is obvious that the laws of science apply equally to all races, regardless of racial origins or racial mixtures. These laws of science are "laws of God" and therefore anyone of any race has the physical and mental benefit of obeying them. We are told clearly in Romans 3:19 *now we know that whatsoever things the law saith is said to them that are under the Law*; that is they are said only to Israel as those who were given the Law. This was established in the opening chapter of this book.

But there is more to this than meets the eye. The words of God can be mis-applied and mis-directed when they are known. Would teaching the Word of God assist in providing a right direction? But, to what degree could the Word be heard? We are told that the Edomites cannot "hear" and that the Canaanite races are to be exterminated or separated completely. If we are told nothing specific about the non-Israelite races as a total group, how then can anyone presume anything? One thing we are told is that the good seed can "hear" His Word. We do hear stories of missionary activity where there are great *deliverences* among non-Israel races after telling them about the miracles Jesus did. On appeal to emotions alone, we are told about persons being healed and delivered from oppression, but who have no change in conscience and who have no shame for their past mis-deeds. It seems that something is not written on their hearts. They seem to continue on as long as the missionary or the helper is with them; but if they are no longer assisted, then they either revert to paganism or go into a Catholic type of belief which is compromised with paganism or superstition.

The missionary activity of the churches is based upon their need to "witness" their religion. But there is no such requirement in the Bible. For example, God said that Israel will always be a nation before Him. The people of the nation are not required to do anything to "witness" what God said - the very fact that they continue to live and die is witness enough. The revelation of Israel at the end of this age will be witness to the veracity of God's word. To spend time, money and effort in religious "witnessing" missionary activity to other races suits

man's religious views, but is contrary to the Bible's view because it is contrary to the threme of the exclusiveness of Israel.

We know there are some people whom the Bible says will never be resurrected:

Jer 51:57 *And I will make drunk her princes, and her wise men, her captains, and her rulers, and her mighty men: and* ***they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not wake****, saith the King, whose name is the LORD of Hosts.*

Heb 4:3 *For we which have believed do enter into rest, as he said,* ***As I have sworn in my wrath, if they shall enter into my rest****: although the works were finished from the foundation of the world.*

The first reference covers all who are under the heading of Babylon, which in connection with Revelation, we see is all who are opposed to Israel. The second reference covers all those Israelites that God sent into the wilderness to perish forever because of their refusal to believe Him

We also know from Biblical statement that no one can enter the Kingdom of God unless they are of Israel. Therefore, it means that people of other races have no eternal life in the Kingdom and if there is no eternal life in the Kingdom, there is no eternal life of any kind available to them. It is not a case of them being "condemned"; it is simply a matter of them having no eternal life. Unworthy Israelites will die, be resurrected, condemned and have their spirit taken from them (this is the message of the parable of the Ten Talents). Their lifeless bodies will be destroyed in the Lake of Fire.. This should be a matter of concern to every individual Israelite. But if someone of another race is to die and never to be resurrected, what does it matter to them once they are dead? There is no awareness in the grave, only corruption of the body. If you go to sleep and do not wake up until lunchtime tomorrow, you will not know what time the sun rose. If you die in your sleep, you will not know you are dead.

Life after death is a mystical vision for most races and involves speculation about a fabulous harem for Arabs on the one hand, through to re-incarnation for the Hindus, on the other. The Bible tells us nothing about the resurrected life other than that we cannot even begin to imagine it. If we care about it, as Israelites, we will strive to attain it and will receive it. If we care not, we will see it momentarily and know absolute remorse, panic and terror as we face oblivion in the Lake of Fire. But once that occurs, we will know nothing and will be the same as any non-Israelite who dies. There is no such thing as Hell and eternal punishment - only life and oblivion (see the paper by Phillips and Phillips entitled *What Leaves the Body at Death?*).

These things are not spelt out in black and white in the Bible but they are the corollaries of what is spelt out for Israel and Israel only.

HOW DO WE ASSESS OUR BELIEFS?

This might be summed up by saying that we must be objectively critical and that we must appreciate just what the Bible says on any subject. Likewise we must appreciate what the Bible does not say and we must not presume anything, or accept anything, especially if this is based upon religious tradition. Scripture says we can be *led away, fall away* or *slip away* from the Truth of the Word of God. Most people are the clones of their teachers in their beliefs and this can only be bad. We must do our own research on what is said and be like those in Berea [Acts 17:11] who *searched the Scriptures daily whether those things were so*. If we were to say those at Berea were *noble* because they checked what the Apostle said to them against the Old Testament Scriptures, most would agree. It is safe to say that very few people are objective. It is also safe to say that few religious church-goers thoroughly check what is taught to them and that most of them do not do this daily.

From history we must agree that people are capable of believing anything and it is more common for people to believe just what they want to believe. Sometimes they believe and act out of fear or emotionalism; there are many motives for belief. There is culture, indoctrination, peer pressure and such things, but as far as the Bible is concerned, possibly

the worst thing is tradition, because of its pre-conditioning. The Scribes and Pharisees made the Word of God of none effect because of their tradition [traditional interpretations - Matt 15:6]. We have traditional teachings today and as well we have such things as charismatic leaders; they go about trying to persuade people just as Jim Jones or Hitler did. So, we can see just why we are told to judge all things. By what standard do we make these judgements? We are to examine the Word to see *if these things be so* and to believe them accordingly. We are to *dig deep*, to seek and to search. This indicates the necessity of doing research, of comparing Scripture with Scripture and checking translations if necessary. Every growing Israelite will be taught about God during these activities. He will be refining his beliefs continually and sometimes he will freely admit that at times he has been wrong, mainly because of what he has been led to believe. As Solomon said, *And I gave my heart to seek and to search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under the heavens* [Eccl 1:13]. This shows the attitude that is needed.

The problem with many teachers is that they become too proud to ever back-track. Back-tracking is very rare indeed and through pride they are brought to a place where they can never be taught themselves. So, they keep on plugging the same old line and say, *We cannot see it any other way*. The Truth of God has always been, but none of us know it all. Today, some teachers could be likened to surgeons who were still blood letting in the same way it was done in earlier years and who would not hear of any increase in knowledge, even when there was evidence contrary to their medical training.

ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY

We need to look at something that might sound heretical to many at first. Could orthodox Christianity be cultish?

[a] Could orthodox Christianity be something that refuses to accept all the Word of God? [Primarily from the pre-conditioning of tradition, not necessarily from insincerity.] Is the *go into all the world* doctrine as generally taught really based on the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets or on valid interpretation of the New Testament?

[b] Has orthodox Christianity a wrong slant because it will not believe the prophetic words of Jacob and Moses for Israel in the "last days"?

[c] Is the popular symbol of Christianity, namely the "Cross", actually the symbol of the anti-Christ?

According to lexicons, the word translated as "Cross" is *stauros* (an upright pale or stake). There is no "Cross" in the Greek. The shape of the two beamed cross was the symbol of the god Tammuz of Chaldea. The Chi, or X as allegedly seen by Constantine had nothing to do with *xulon* used for the *stauros* and is another invention and heresy of Rome, the mother of universalism. (Think about it - if Jesus was not crucified on a cross, then what did Constantine see? Whatever it was, or was said to be, if indeed he saw anything, it could not have been a divine vision!)

If the *all the world* doctrine [which is one fundamental doctrine that is believed almost universally] is wrong, then that belief is cultish. This is so even if Martin Luther confirmed what he was brought up to believe and introduced it into Protestantism and most have followed it since. This one belief is the source of a conflict which undermines faith, but it is said to be *what every Christian must believe or he is not a Christian.*

The wrong doctrine is summed up in the generalised belief, *Jesus died to save the world*, and it arises from, *go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature*, and *God so loved the world* [see the chapter entitled *Which World Did God So Love*]. These are said to be the best known and the best loved verses in Christendom, but if the *all* and *world* are taken wrongly, then Rome has originated the greatest fraud of all time.

In some areas we have departed from Rome's doctrines, but in others the Protestants still tag along. Just stop for a moment to think back and see how St. Francis used these Scriptures to preach to the birds and the animals. He considered the birds to be part of *every creature*. In this book we have learned what *every creature* really means, having refined our

understanding to confine our teaching to people only. In this book we have gone a stage further and have refined our understanding to confine the teaching to all the *kosmos* (order) of Israel in the *ktizo* (cities) or habitations of the Israelites. We also found that *kosmos* referred to the orderly arrangement of the object under discussion not the inhabited earth [for which *oikomene* would be used].

It has been necessary for us to go into all the problem verses carefully to show the meanings of the words and we will not repeat anything here apart from two verses which summarise the Biblical position. The popular conception is that any person becomes one of God's people when that person becomes "saved". This is not the way Scripture puts it. It is "His People" [Israel] whom Jesus came to save who were originally His people, but who were in a state of condemnation.

Matt 1:21 *And you shall call his name JESUS, for he shall save* ***his people*** *from their sins.*

Luke 1:68 *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for he hath visited and redeemed* ***his people***

These verses sum up something that is not believed by orthodox Christianity.

Another thing that is not believed is the difference between "all" and "many".

Matt 20:28 *Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.*

This *for many* is changed to mean *for all*, "all" being taken as every race, outside of the *Israel*. There is no basis in the grammar of the Greek text for such a belief that makes *many* mean *all and sundry.* Neither is there any basis found through the foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. In the well known Isaiah 53:11,12 we find, *by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify* many *… and he bare the sin of* many. These verses are not accepted any more than verse 8 where we read*, for the transgression of MY PEOPLE was he stricken.* Why not accept this limitation of *My people*?

There are just so many things that are taught in churches that simply are not true. Much of what most people believe is based on half-truths and sentimentality that have been passed down over the years. Yet, the origin of much doctrinal problem can be traced back to Rome. Babylon is described in Scripture as *the mother of harlots* who seeks to deceive the whole earth. Belief must be right belief. Satan tempted Jesus to bow down and worship Him through misapplying or misquoting the Word of God. Rome believes she has the right to rule not only "The Church" in like manner, but also to rule over all temporal authority. It is Israel, as the seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob, that is to rule with God, not the Church of Rome.

With the current thought of what *all the world* means ingrained in the mind, people can read Scripture without seeing what is written to the contrary. Think back upon some of the things that have been pointed out throughout this book. All the pretence in the world that they are not there as themes through Scripture, will not eliminate them from the Holy Writ. While no one person or group has the whole scope of Scripture at their command, all Christians would benefit by obedience to meditate in the Word of God, day and night. Few do and because of this they are so easily led astray.

Because the Bible does not say exactly what happens to the races outside of Israel, we have no right to speculate about them. Neither can we say that every race is the same as Israel because differences are continually presented through Scripture. Even the individual tribes have differences between themselves right up to and including *in the last days* . It can be safely said that these things are almost never taught anywhere by orthodox Christianity. Instead of truth, universalism is the common teaching.

One thing we can say with certainty is what the Bible says about the race of Israel. This is what the Bible is about. God made covenants with Israel; He gave Laws to Israel; He loves Israel and is the Kinsman who has redeemed both houses of Israel.

Luke 1:16,33 *And many of* ***the children of Israel*** *shall he turn to the Lord their God … and he shall reign over* ***the house of Jacob*** *for ever.*

These many from the House of Jacob that Jesus reigns over in His *for ever* Kingdom are totally restrictive and are impossible to generalise. How ever could *the House of Jacob* refer to all races of the world? The statements of Scripture that have been shown about the Kingdom of God being reserved for those who qualify from among those *begotten from above* at conception are definite and precise.

GOD WILL BE GRACIOUS TO WHOM HE WILL BE GRACIOUS

Romans 9:18.. *Therefore hath he mercy upon whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*

We are then told about the Potter who makes one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour and about vessels *fitted for destruction*. It is the Potter who fashions the vessels from the raw materials before they have done either good or evil.
To those who say, *all is now of grace to everyone of every race*, listen to the much-loved writings of the well known author Selwyn Hughes in *Every Day With Jesus*, in the daily reading for 17th February 1994:

> *The word 'grace' is unquestionably the most significant single word in the Bible, I agree. But it must be understood right away that grace is a characteristic of God which is exercised only towards those who are seen as having a special relationship with Him. Nowhere in the Bible is the grace of God ever mentioned in connection with, mankind generally, though some theologians frequently use the term 'common grace'* [a term not mentioned in the Bible] – *the idea that God gives a special form of grace to the whole of mankind which restrains them from being as bad as they could be.*
>
> *The other day I came across a writer who said, The creation of the universe was an exercise of grace. I understand that he might have been using the word 'grace' as a synonym for love,* [a mistake often made by Christian writers]*, but strictly speaking the exhibition of grace is reserved for the elect .*

Selwyn Hughes then quotes Arthur W Pink as saying:

> *Grace is the sole source from which flows the goodwill, love and salvation of God unto His chosen people.*

TO CONCLUDE

This book has tried merely to present what is recorded throughout the Bible. Any problems or conflicts that have been precipitated by this book should be settled by researching the matter in Scripture, building upon the Cornerstone, together with the foundation of the prophets and the apostles. Israel, as a racial seed, is a major theme through Scripture.
What has originated from Rome and Jewry, with the false teaching about *the Jews are Israel*, together with the doctrine of Balaam must be rejected. Jesus, in the messages to the so-called churches in the Book of Revelation, says He holds these and some other doctrines "against" the assemblies and demands repentance. It is Jesus who is issuing the warning!
Throughout this book the exclusive nature of Israel has been presented from Scripture, with some examination of the contrary views. The divergence really begins in Genesis 1 and 2. If any says he believes the Bible to be true and to be the Word of God, then he must start there. To accommodate the popular view, the second chapter is said to be a re-run of first chapter. The differences are very great indeed and so this cannot be true. Men and women are created by *Elohim* [a plural word] in Genesis 1 before Adam was formed from what existed by *Jahveh Elohim* [singular] in Genesis 2. So Adam had contemporaries, but these contemporaries did not *receive the breath of life* and did not become *a living soul* like Adam. Without going into the many differences in these two chapters we can say that two streams of men existed from this time. When God breathed the breath of life into Adam's nostrils, God formed a dynasty and from out of this race the Hebrew people came. Scripture shows these peculiar people to be different from all other races and to be *His people*, the people whom the gospels and prophets say Jesus came to save.
Jesus said that the time would come when His followers would be put out of the synagogues [assemblies], and may be killed for believing what He is saying. We are told we must hold fast to the end, waiting for *that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself FOR US, that he might redeem US from all*

iniquity, and purify unto himself A PECULIAR PEOPLE, zealous of good works. THESE THINGS SPEAK, AND EXHORT, AND REBUKE WITH ALL AUTHORITY [Titus 2:13,14]. These "peculiar people" are the connection and something that is to be definitely spoken about with all authority.

CHAPTER 20: WHAT OF BALAAM'S DOCTRINE?

Rev 2:14 *But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them which hold the doctrine of Balaam …*

Why is there a doctrine in the New Testament that is not ever taught as a subject? Why is it so carefully avoided? Why is it dismissed by the *all are now one in Christ Jesus* false argument?

It is stated by Jesus as being the *Doctrine of Balaam*. This is found among references to the Nicolaitanes and reference to Jezebel. We have mentioned Elijah and the 450 prophets of Ba'al, but there were also 400 prophets who sat at Jezebel's table. That makes it 850 to one true prophet! In His messages to the assemblies, Jesus makes scathing remarks about the Nicolaitanes and Jezebel, but in this chapter we are concerned only with the Doctrine of Balaam.

Jesus immediately refers this matter back to the Old Testament and He goes on to tell us simply just what Balaam taught:

Rev 2:14 *Who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the Children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication.*

Well we might say *we do not have any problem with that, we do not do, believe, or teach any of those things*. Do we not? Let us have a look and see if we hold the Doctrine of Balaam in fact, either directly or indirectly. We will use the correct word "assemblies" in place of "churches".

The Doctrine of Balaam deals with *fornication* or whoring after false gods. Israel is described as being a whore when worshipping strange gods. The event that pre-disposes *fornication* and leads to the worship of false gods is sexual relationships with people of different races.

Jesus described the actions in the verse above as a stumbling-block [a stumbling-stone] to the children of Israel and Israel only. Jesus is writing to the assemblies, [that is, those who are "called out" of Israel under the New Testament] and He says that some among these hold a doctrine that is false. These are *children*, that is, they are descendants of Jacob.

Eating things offered to idols may not be an issue today in the literal sense, but fornication which is the worship of false gods and the mixed marriage aspect are major issues. Immediately racial intermarriage is mentioned, there is instant opposition. Those who hold the error of the doctrine of Balaam always oppose anything against it. But what is being quoted above is New Testament doctrine! It is Jesus who is speaking, so please tread carefully. The cherished multi-racial concepts and the multi-cultural ideas might have to go down the drain; we might just have to pull the plug on them. The Book of the Revelation is not the only New Testament reference to the doctrine of Balaam. Jude calls it an *error* and Peter describes it as a teaching of false prophets, being *damnable heresies*. Now if this is a heresy that leads to damnation, we had better take heed! If you do not want certain damnation, then no longer hold to this doctrine!

That perhaps ninety odd percent of the so-called Christian Church follow this pernicious doctrine of Balaam, will not alter the fact that Jesus says, *I have this against you*.. Are we to believe Jesus or are we to believe our false teachers? Jude claims that these teachers *speak evil of things which they know not … after the error of Balaam*. They do not know they are teaching error. This is no minor doctrine because Balaam appears by name 60 times through the Bible. To be damned for holding the doctrine of Balaam is no minor matter!

WHAT IS BALAAM'S DOCTRINE?

The story of the hiring of the prophet Balaam by King Balak to curse the Children of Israel is found in the Book of Numbers 22. However, it is not until Num 31:16 that we discover the doctrine:

Num 31:16 *Behold, these* [the captured Moabite women] *caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, …*

In the first instance, Balaam was hired to curse Israel and God prevented him from doing so. In the end, Balaam counselled Moab to use their women to seduce Israel so that Israel would come to worship the gods of Moab and thus God would punish Israel for the latter act of *fornication*.
The consequence of Balaam's advice was seen in very short time:

Num 25:1 *And, Israel abode in Shittim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab. And they called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods: and the people did eat, and bowed down to their gods.*

That it was the work of the women is confirmed in verse 18. God's judgement on the offenders was swift - everyone who had joined to Baal-Peor was executed. Subsequently, when Joshua was rehearsing the history of Israel [Joshua 24], he raised the matter of Balaam. Joshua was speaking on behalf of God, who said:

Josh 24:10 *But I would not hearken unto Balaam.*

This is followed by a warning to serve God and to put aside the Gods of the Amorites. The whoredom with foreign gods followed on from sexual association with the women of foreign races.
In Ezra 10:10,11 and Nehemiah 9:2 we see the required divorce of the seed of Israel from the seed of others. This *except for fornication* was carried out and even the mixed blood children were included in the separation and divorce of foreign wives. *Shall we then hearken unto you to do this great evil, to transgress against our God in marrying strange wives*? [Neh 13:27]. The "strange" in "strange wives" is *nokriy* meaning foreign, as in not Israelite. It was the strange foreign wives that led to the sin of idolatry. Those wives were foreign to Israel.

Neh 13:2,3 *… but hired Balaam against them, that he should curse them: howbeit, our God turned the curse into a blessing. Now it came to pass, when they heard the words of the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.*

There is a lesson in this!
The prophet Micah also reminds Israel about this matter of Balaam. Through Micah, God asks tenderly, *Oh My people, what have I done unto you, and wherein have I wearied you? Testify against Me*. God warns Israel, *they have dealt treacherously against the Lord for they have begotten* **strange children***: now shall a month devour them*-[Hosea 5:7]. Then He goes on to tell how He brought Israel out from Egypt, and then asks Israel to remember about Balaam.

Micah 6:5 *Oh my people, remember now what Balak king of Moab consulted, and what Balaam the son of Beor answered … that ye might know the righteousness of the Lord.*

He says that the consequence of inter-racial sexual activity is a controversy which the Lord has with His people. God will yet plead with Israel [verse 2]. This controversy is over pursuit of the wrong object, contrary to the beliefs in Israel's spirit.

Micah 6:16 *For the statues of Omri are kept, and all the works of the house of Ahab* [who took Jezebel to wife 1 Ki 16:30], ***and ye walk in their counsels*** *…*

The *righteousness of the Lord* has a connection with this matter of racial intermarriage, although this is never taught. This matter of righteousness is mentioned in most places where Balaam's doctrine or whoredom by Israel is found. Peter says it is forsaking the *right* (immediate/straight/narrow) *way and are gone astray following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness* [2 Peter 2:15].
The prophecies of Micah concern the Children of Israel, and he shows the elect remnant that is to be regathered from Israel only at the end of this age. It is still the Children of Israel only and not any multi-racial church. The other nations go up t*o the mountain of the Lord* after it

is established and the other nations learn God's ways and thus there will be peace on earth. Micah makes this clear.
Balaam knew that no man could curse the Nation of Israel because *there is no enchantment against Israel*.. But he also knew that God would judge Israel for fornication with the gods of other races. Balaam answered Balak's consultation and advised that Israel could be seduced to worship other gods through sex with Moabite women. Micah says this is to be remembered. It is to be remembered for all time. If the seduction by foreign women is prohibited for Israelites, then it is entirely consistent that racial intermarriage is equally unacceptable - for the latter is only a ceremonial version of the former. Racial equality, racial integration and anti-discrimination laws are the modern day equivalent of Balaam's doctrine. The mixed multitude in our midst can intermarry as much as they like, for there are no constraints placed upon them. The sad part of is that their life styles are held up as examples to the rest of the community. This is when the damage is done. These examples cause ignorant Israelites to be seduced into accepting and even promoting such "tolerant" behaviour. Every vote for such tolerance is a vote for Balaam's doctrine. When we see it condoned or even put into practice by senior politicians, we know that the counsels of Ahab are still active today. And therefore, we know the Doctrine of Balaam is still taught today. Under various racial vilification laws of one form or another, it is illegal to espouse anything to the contrary in most of the Anglo-Saxon world. Notice that it is not illegal anywhere else - not in Asia, not in India, not in the Middle East, not in Russia, not in Europe. Only in the United Kingdom, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Challenge any of Ahab's councillors with this information and you will be told that once the basic human rights issues are resolved in these other countries, loftier issues, such as racial tolerance will be next on the agenda. It is a plausible answer, is it not?
Jesus says, *I have this against you – repent, or else I will come against you quickly*.. As it always is through the Bible, Israelites who marry out of Israel are cut off, or those foreigners whom they marry are destroyed or removed. When reading this, please do not suppose that "Israel" refers to "Jews" because "The Jews" are most certainly not Israel. Israel refers to the Anglo-Saxon people.

NEW TESTAMENT FORNICATION

We do find teaching about fornication today, it is true, but there are various interpretations. The matter of concern is, with whom is the fornication committed? It has been shown that Jesus referred the matter back to Balaam and the Old Testament. The Apostles Peter and Jude did the same. The Apostle Paul is bold in his connecting of fornication in the New Testament with fornication in the Old Testament.

> *1 Cor 10:8* *Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand.*

This is about the worship of Baal-Peor. This refers us once again to Balaam's advice, although Paul does not use Balaam's name. The judgement against Israel for false worship with the gods of other races is given as an example confirming God's judgement against this.

> *1 Cor 10:11* *Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition …*

Are we to accept admonishment and this example or not? Paul shows that this is a common temptation for all the Israelites to whom he is writing. At this point it is necessary to remind readers of the foundation that was laid in the chapter entitled *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*. The import of 1 Cor 10:1 cannot be escaped. The people being addressed could only be Israelites! Look at it; they were Israelites! What happened to Israel was that they were led into idolatry through foreign women. This is New Testament doctrine! The realisation of the import of this aspect of fornication will add to the appreciation of a number of other Scriptures. Let us consider some of these.
In response to a question about whether it was appropriate for a man to divorce his wife, Jesus answered:

Matt 19:9 *And I say unto you, who-so-ever shall put away his wife,* ***except it be for fornication****, and shall marry another, committeth adultery, and whosoever marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.*

This *except for fornication* should be taught in its right connection with divorce and re-marriage. Jesus made it clear that all men could not receive this saying, save they to whom it is given [verse 11]. It is not given to everyone of every race; Jesus says so. Much has been written about what *porneia* [fornication] applies to and it is now usually generalised to include all illicit sexual intercourse. This generalisation is not valid since adultery, for instance, is a different word completely.
It has also become inclusive of all pornography as this is known today. This is appropriate because pornography is lust of the mind and it is, in the words of Jesus, equivalent to the physical act. Hence pornography is simply the application of modern technology to implement Balaam's doctrine. Perhaps if we called it *Moabiteography* fewer Isrealites would be seduced by it – but Ahab's councillors would never accept such a move. It would be discrimination against Moabites and hence illegal!

Vine	*porneia*	Illicit sexual intercourse … metaphorically, of the association of pagan idolatry with doctrines of, and professed adherence to, the Christian faith.
Thayer	*porneia*	Illicit sexual intercourse … metaph. the worship of idols, of the defilement of idolatry, as incurred by eating the sacrifices offered to idols.

Paul shows that the pagan practise of mixed racial marriage is not to be indulged in by Israelites [1 Cor 6:12-18].
We will quote Jude, who mentions Cain.

Jude v 11 *Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward …*

Jude links the New Testament with Genesis. Jude links false teachers with Cain and with Balaam. They had the same error. There was an anticipated reward through the error of Balaam. This reward was monetary gain. This is nothing new.
However, throughout all the Bible, we have a consistent theme; we find God always keeping a portion of His Order pure, separate and undefiled. No fornicator will inherit the Kingdom of God [1 Cor 6:9].
This again presents the racial separation of Israel from other nations. In the New Testament the call is still to *come out from among them, and be ye separate …* [2 Cor 6:17]. In this verse, "touch", *haptomai*, is a word used of carnal intercourse with a woman, like it or not [confirm this in 1 Cor 7:1-3]. The "them" in this verse are "unclean" people that are not to be "touched". "Unclean", *akathartou* [which is used as a noun], shows that there is a difference between 'clean' and 'unclean' people, with the clean not to 'touch' the unclean. The "yoke" in 2 Cor 6:14 is with *heterozugeo* which means *a different sort* [Vine], or *one who is not an equal* [Thayer]. God also made clean and unclean animals and fish; each were born that way. There is frequent reference to show that God's judgement is upon those of Israel who transgress by having this common carnal intercourse with other races and going after *strange flesh*. This shows up also throughout the New Testament. Jesus says in Revelation He holds it against the churches which hold the Doctrine of Balaam [Rev 2:14]. From the 60 mentions of Balaam, it is possible to determine the nature of this doctrine. Because almost all denominations hold the doctrine of Balaam without knowing it, we can understand just why it is never taught. Probably few know what this doctrine is, but all should if Jesus holds it against them! 2 Peter 2:15 indicates that people with this doctrine have gone astray. Jude v11 calls holding it an error.
New Testament "fornication" has not changed from what Old Testament fornication was, even if we like to try to say that *porneuo* has no racial connection today. In 1 Cor 10:8 we are told that all that is mentioned in this passage are for examples to us. When we read what one example is, we find, *neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and*

fell in one day three and twenty thousand. Look back to the Old Testament and find that what caused three and twenty thousand to die was Israelites having sex with non-Israelites [Numbers 25:1]. Moses even demanded that all Israelites who did this should be slain because of the idolatry that would follow. King Solomon got caught this way and it led to idolatry. We read of plagues in Israel because of this [Numbers 25:6-8]. These things are written for our admonition we are told in 1 Cor 10:11, but because of the popular, but wrong, doctrine to the contrary, this necessity for admonition is not accepted today. Jezebel [the foreign wife of Ahab] is permitted in the churches today even if Jesus says He holds it against the churches [Rev 2:20]. What this means is that the New Testament doctrine about racial intermarriage is the same as that in the Old Testament. So, when did the doctrine change to the belief that God no longer requires Israel to dwell alone, to intermarry with other races, and not be separate from the other races?
When Paul says,

2 Cor 6:17 *Wherefore come out from among* ***them****, and be ye separate … and touch not the unclean thing …*

He is talking about people coming out from amongst people, not things. The *them* are people. Can any deny this? ["Thing" in the KJV and other translations is not in the Greek text.]
When we look further at fornication, we find the Jewish leaders raised the matter of fornication, saying:

John 8:41 *… We be not born of fornication; we have one father, even God.*

Jesus laid it on the line to them replying that they were not Abraham's children through Isaac, although they were Abraham's seed. These Edomites knew that Israelites were the children of God, and hence tried to claim descent from Abraham as entitlement to be included with Israel as children of God. They also knew that the pursuit of other gods was classed as fornication and it is by their actions that they show from which side of the line they came. Jesus said to them, *I know that you are Abraham's seed, but you seek to kill me … because my word has no place in you*. They could not *hear* it. Then Jesus goes on to speak about observing deeds done as a means of determining who are begotten of God and who are not. *If God were your Father, you would love me*. Their actions showed they did not love Jesus. *The lusts of your father you will do*. This indicates the 100% orientation of the minds of the Pharisees against Jesus, even if they do say *we have one Father, even God*.. Although they were Abraham's seed, their seed had *gone astray* when Esau polluted the line by marriage outside of his race. Esau despised his birthright. This is what led to his idolatry. Esau tried to find repentance with tears, but could not find it. This is true of Esau's mixed race descendants for all generations [Mal 1:3-5]. The whole subject of divorce on grounds of *except for fornication* should be taught if the churches were prepared to give a balanced account of the Bible's teachings.
The early church were given the same warning as we are today:

Acts 15:29 *That ye abstain … from fornication …*

1 Cor 6:13 *The body is not for fornication …*

1 Cor 6:18 *Flee fornication …*

Eph 5:3 *But fornication … let it not be once named among you …*

Col 3:5 *Mortify therefore … fornication …*

1 Thes 4:3 *For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication.*

The essence and consequence of fornication is corruption of the truth; a leaven that has to be purged. In the book of Revelation, there is much reference to fornication in connection with Babylon and the Harlot of Rome. Rome is described as *The Great Whore*.. This is the whore above all whores [Rev 19:2] *which corrupts the earth with her fornication*.
Ask these questions about the Roman Catholic Church:

Who is the great advocate of racial intermarriage? Who always has been?

Who does not believe that God set boundaries for the races [Deut 32:8 and Acts 17:26]?

Who advocates one world church of all races?

Whom can we blame for the problems relating to multiculturalism, particularly in the Western world?

Whose religion blends in with any culture?

Who originated much of what is taught today in Protestant churches on the subject of the Universal Church from all races?

Corruption in doctrine has led to the many denominations that ignore what *fornication* really is. *Never-the-less, when the Son of Man comes, shall he find THE faith* (belief) *on the earth* [Luke 17:8]? The doctrine of Balaam is accepted almost universally and it is one of the objectives of the United Nations. World Government is working to promote the fusion of all races by inter-racial marriage. Other fronts are promoting "breaking down the barriers". The object is the corruption of the Anglo - Saxon / Israel bloodline through inter-racial marriage. Evangelist Billy Graham is reported in the Charlotte Observer as saying, *I don't see anything wrong with inter-racial marriage – there is nothing in the Bible to forbid it. It all comes down to a practical matter in today's culture* and, *integration is the only solution. We've got to be totally integrated - in our homes, in out worship services, even in marriage*. Perhaps he reads a different Bible!
Jezebel is alive and well!

Rev 2:20 *Notwithstanding, I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication …*

What is the effect of Jezebel's teaching? It is to teach and seduce my servants to commit fornication and to eat things sacrificed to idols. Here we see idolatry again. Who does Jezebel seduce? It is *my servants*, Jesus says. It is God's servant race that is seduced. The seduction is to commit fornication with other races, as Balaam advised Balak. Note well, Jezebel herself was not an Israelite by race. She wrought havoc within the nation. But, Jezebel is teaching within the assemblies! Can we afford to continue to suffer her teachings any longer?

GOING ASTRAY

We might have our own ideas about what going astray means. There may well be many applications, but the Apostle Peter identifies one way of going astray in particular. We can be certain about this way! Please take note that this is a New Testament statement:

2 Peter 2:15 *Which have forsaken the right way, and are gone astray, following the way of Balaam the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness.*

Here we find another mention of un-righteousness which is connected with Balaam's teaching. We cannot avoid the connection, in context, with sex and *eyes full of adultery* [verse 14] and *cursed children* [verse 14]. These teachers' *promise of liberty* [verse 19] is to be avoided at all costs. To indulge is to have an *end that is worse than the beginning*, says Peter.
The Apostle Jude brings up the theme also, saying:

Jude v 11 *Woe unto them! for they have gone the way of Cain, and run greedily after the error of Balaam, for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.*

Here we see an attempt to profiteer outside of God's purposes. In Jude, we find again the warning is one of woe over Balaam's doctrine through which they hoped for reward to satisfy their greed.

WHOREDOM

Throughout the Old Testament, there is much reference to whoredom. When God complains about this whoredom, it is because of Jerusalem's whoredom with other races [Ezekiel 16]. The results of mis-using God's gifts were lewdness and abominations through breaking their covenant with God [v59]. There are two main words, *zanah* and *taznuwth*, which are translated as "whoredom".. Both have a lot in common but the latter word is exclusive to Ezekiel who associates whoredom with non-Israel races twenty one times. *Zanah* comes from a prime root meaning *highly fed, and therefore wanton*. It is used 105 times. There is mention of *strange women* (non-Israel stock), that is, *nokriy* and *nekar* as explained in the chapter entitled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel*.
Solomon knew the dangers, and he fell into the trap nevertheless. It was foreign wives that caused his downfall and descent into idolatry.

Prov 23:27 *For a whore is a deep ditch; the strange woman is a narrow pit.*

Ditch and *the pit* are not the same thing. Only the ditch can be got out of! *Narrow* connects *with the adversary*, in Hebrew. There is a difference between a whore who is an Israelite and a strange woman who is a foreigner!

Prov 23:33 *Thine eyes shall behold* ***strange women****, and thine heart shall utter perverse things.*

Prov 5:20 *And why wilt thou, my son, be ravished with a* ***strange woman****, and embrace the bosom of a stranger?*

These three verses tell about "strange" women of a foreign race.
Speaking about whoredom Hosea says:

Hos 4:14 *… therefore, the people that doth not understand, shall fall.*

It must happen! Let there be understanding!
All through Scripture, we can find such warnings presented in different ways. They all add up to the same answer from both Testaments. Racial intermarriage leads to idolatry. It always has been so; God's judgement is upon it. While there may appear to be examples in Scripture where Israelite men married non-Israelite women, it can be shown that this is not so. Let us take Ruth as an example. Her mother-in-law's kinsman, Boaz, together with all the elders of the city, had no hesitation in helping Ruth in accordance with Israelite law. Furthermore, Ruth married Boaz and this is the line that gave rise to Jesse and David and it is the line from which Jesus claims His human ancestry. This is sufficient to establish that Ruth was an Israelite who, along with many, many others, were living in the Plains of Moab. The Israelites had taken it from Moab as part of Israel's advance into the Promised Land.

IS BALAAM'S DOCTRINE THE NORMAL TEACHING?

It is painfully obvious that Balaam's doctrine is the standard teaching in our Churches, Bible schools and Seminaries. It has been advocated on Christian radio, television and the press. The false prophet Balaam is heard advocating racial mixture, multi-culturism and a one world multi-racial church. We have Promise Keepers and other well-funded organisations advocating breaking down the barriers between races in the sense that there is no differences between the races.
As in Balaam's time, so in our time; Moabites and Ammonites are still attacking Israel with their false doctrine. The Canaanite is still in the house of God too, but when Jesus returns there will no longer be found the Canaanite in the House of the Lord (Zech 14:21). The word from those days still applies:

2 Chron 20:20 *… believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe his prophets, so shall ye prosper.*

But, who will believe today?

HARD SAYINGS?

The whole subject of race is a problem to most Christians. Most get over the problem using one of the following methods:

[a] Teaching the doctrine, and actively promoting it.

[b] Just going along with it.

[c] Spiritualising it away, saying that all believers of all races are the nation of Israel.

[d] Believing/teaching that Israel no longer exists.

[e] Saying there is both a natural and a spiritual Israel - a nation and a church respectively.

Many will admit to not feeling at ease over any mixed race marriage, but they are afraid to express the disquiet even if they do see that racially mixed marriages do not work out well. Today, in this Biblical time of Man's Day, *racism* is classed as a sin of major proportions. To be labelled *racist* is supposed to be a bad label; everything racist is supposed to be wrong. The racist person himself is considered to be evil. The very fact that this is the teaching of the anti-Christ world government indicates that this teaching must be anti-God. This attitude is being brought into the churches. It is a platform of the World Council of Churches and those who preach a social humanistic universalised gospel.
In the Old Testament, God is presented as being absolutely racist and racially selective. God told Israel to destroy whole nations, exterminating men, women, children and their animals. That Israel as a nation did not do so is the reason that many of these problems still exist today. The question has been asked, *Has the unchanging God changed*? He cannot change, can He? God is shown as being totally racist in the Old Testament. What He has said will surely come to pass, even if some church-goers think He has changed and that His Word will not come to pass. We can no longer hold the doctrine of Balaam and be blessed by God. Jesus holds this against the Churches.

CAN BALAAM'S DOCTRINE APPLY TODAY?

The vogue today, as ever, is to question God. The subject under examination is what Romans 9 is about. We also might like to say that there is unrighteousness with God [verse 14-18] when God says that *He will have mercy on whom He will have mercy, and … and that whom He will He hardeneth*.. Why then should we resist God's will? Why should the churches reply against God?

> *Rom 9:20,21* *Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God. Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?*

Paul goes on to show that there actually are vessels *fitted for destruction* and that there are also vessels of mercy, which He had *afore prepared unto glory*.. This chapter of Romans confirms the Old Testament sense of being of race, not of individuals. The whole context still isolates Israel from other races. We have to settle whether or not there are racial differences today. If not, then Balaam's Doctrine could not apply today. The rising tide of racial strife through the world shows that there are these differences. The attempts by world leaders to mix the races are not working and cannot work. We are seeing anti-discrimination legislation attempting to enforce multi-cultural concepts. With this, we are seeing growing anti-Christian sentiment.
So, what about the other races? Can we still declare that all races are treated the same way by God?
In Roman 9 we find mention of Pharaoh, a non-Israelite, who was raised up by God for a purpose, that through God's power, God's name might be known throughout the Earth. God then has different purposes for the different races. Who are we to argue still with God? Paul's sayings are hard sayings. When Jesus spoke some hard sayings [John 6:60], many of His disciples walked no more with him. Will you also go away?

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

We can believe that God will hold the doctrine of Balaam against us, or we can continue to follow Balaam's doctrine. The current multi-cultural doctrine has no basis in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. It is based upon:

1. The popular interpretation of Galatians 3:26-29 which ignores that this book is written to Israelites who had been under the Law. This was covered in the chapter *Galatians And Israel Exclusive*
2. The popular meaning of the word "Gentile" [see the chapter entitled *That Unfortunate Word "Gentile"*].
3. The popular application of *God so loved the world* and *go ye into all the world.*

So, what is to be done from a practical point of view? What are we to do if we agree with Jesus and continue in the Apostles doctrine? [Acts 2:42]. Mixed-race marriages are increasingly common in our churches. Many have the racial mixtures in their immediate families. This is not easy to deal with in the light of applying the Doctrine of Balaam. The answers come from knowing who we are.

The message of the New Testament is to believe Jesus and obey God. These are actions to be taken by individuals and hence it is as individuals we must respond. Everyone in Israel is given the opportunity, at some time or other, to hear and respond to things of the spirit. If, like Esau, the decision is to turn away - so be it for that individual. If, like Abraham, the decision is to believe and to prove it through the deeds of one's life - so be it for that individual. One thing is certain: for everyone who chooses to believe, stumbling blocks and difficulties will appear in the course of life. Understanding our roles as individuals, understanding our society and the forces that afflict it, together with successfully holding fast to the truth is the challenge for those whom Revelation identifies as overcomers. To them go the rewards. Those who reject God will be forgotten from the mind (Rev 21:4-7).

The disbelievers try to hide behind every type of argument. The majority spiritualise the subject away by saying the promises were not to the genetic seed of Abraham, but to the spiritual seed of Abraham. The great error in this is that there is no prophetic foundation for this view. It does not have foundation in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets; therefore it is not valid. The popular thought is to spiritualise the whole matter and to make it a matter of conversion and non-conversion.

TO CONCLUDE

Tolerance is sometimes called a Christian virtue, but truth is totally intolerant of untruth.

This chapter has endeavoured to make the doctrine of Balaam clear, a doctrine that Christians should not tolerate. When Balaam spoke prophetically, it is recorded that he spoke the words that God put into his mouth; this was not the same thing as the counsel he offered Balak. In his prophecy he entrenched the blessing that was established upon Israel who had no enchantment against them. This blessing was for *the last days*, that is, following the First Advent. In blessing Israel, Balaam said:

> *Numbers 23:9* … *lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned amongst the nations.*

Alone means *only* in the sense of being in a class of its own. Israel is still very much unlike all the other nations. Israel is *peculiar* and Israel remains exclusive from the other races in the Word of the Lord. It is God's decree that Israel will always be this way. But how many Israelites will believe Jesus and obey God so that they attain the eternal life to see it?

INDEX

NOTES