

# From the Beginning

John I John

Part III

Jews and the Proffered Kingdom  
His Own Things, His Own People

(Part I of this four-part article dealt mainly with the proper use of three words — *aion*, *aionios*, and *kosmos* — in John's gospel, his first epistle, and Revelation.

Then Part II dealt with foundational material, along with introducing the material developed in this part [John 1, 3] and in Part IV [I John 1, 5].)

## Comparing Genesis and John

*EXACTLY the SAME sequence of events beginning Genesis is seen beginning John.*

There is *a creation, a ruin of the creation, a restoration of the ruined creation over six days, and a culminating seventh day in which the reason for the whole of the matter is to be realized.*

Genesis has to do with the creation, ruin, and restoration *of the material creation, culminating in a seventh day*; John has to do with the creation, ruin, and restoration *of man, culminating in the SAME seventh day.*

And the latter *MUST* follow the former *in EXACT detail*, for the pattern concerning how God restores a ruined creation *was SET in a perfect, unchangeable fashion in the beginning, in Genesis.*

## 1) *Death, Shed Blood, the Spirit Moved, God Spoke*

Whether dealing with the restoration of the material creation in Genesis or the restoration of ruined man in John, *death, shed blood, the movement of the Spirit, and God speaking MUST be seen.*

Then, beyond that, *God was/is very particular and specific about the identity of the One dying and shedding His blood.*

That can be seen in Rev. 5:1-10, where the future redemption of the present ruined earth is in view.

And, from this scene in Rev. 5:1-10, *an individual can KNOW that the SAME scene could ONLY have previously occurred 6,000 years earlier in Gen. 1:2b, 3 when the Spirit moved and God spoke ("commanded the light to shine out of darkness" [II Cor. 4:6]), for, again, the latter MUST follow the former in EXACT detail.*

Or, in the words of John 1:5, with the movement of the Spirit and God's command, "the light shineth in darkness" and was seen *as something completely alien to the darkness.*

Note John 1:4, 5 together in the preceding respect:

*"In him was life; and the life was the light of men.*

*And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not."*

The "light" which God had commanded to shine forth out of the darkness (v. 5) was *NOT* just any "light." Rather, it was a *PARTICULAR* "light" (v. 4). This was the "light" through Whom *ALL things had been brought into existence* (vv. 1-3), the same "light" that John the Baptist had been called to proclaim (vv. 6-9).

God though didn't do away with the darkness; *rather, viewing both Genesis and John together, God established a division between the newly existing light and the remaining darkness.*

And, as previously stated and shown, a *PARTICULAR* individual, Who had died and shed His blood, *HAD to be present*

in the restoration account beginning Genesis and *HAS* to be present in the future restoration account in Revelation chapter five as well.

And, since man is being foreshadowed in the Genesis account and being dealt with in John's account, *again the death and shed blood of a PARTICULAR individual, Who WAS/IS the "light" shining out of the darkness, HAD/HAS to be seen.*

*God will recognize NONE OTHER — past, present, or future!*

And that, of course, is the *WHY* of the event referenced in the latter part of Rev. 13:8:

*"And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."*

"From the foundation of the world" takes matters back to pre-Adamic days, to a time when the earth lay in a ruined state.

*And, as previously stated, apart from the death and shed blood of a PARTICULAR individual at this point in Genesis, relative to the ruined earth, there could have been NO movement of the Spirit and NO command from God for light to exist.*

*THEN, EXACTLY the SAME thing is seen in John.*

*Apart from the death and shed blood of a PARTICULAR individual, relative to ruined man, there could have been NO movement of the Spirit and NO command from God for light to exist.*

## 2) Light, Darkness, Life, Death

Now, note something about the movement of the Spirit and God commanding light to exist in the Genesis account, *which can ONLY be EQUALLY true in John's account.*

*THIS sets forth NOT ONLY God's BEGINNING work BUT ALSO His ENDING work. This sets forth the COMPLETE Divine work relative to man passing from death unto life.*

The continued statements concerning God dividing between the newly-existing light and the remaining darkness *can ONLY* refer to subsequent works relative to that which had just occurred *in a COMPLETE respect* (a division quite similar to and in complete keeping with that subsequently occurring on day two — a division of the waters, part placed above and part left below the atmosphere).

And as John's gospel provides commentary for Gen. 1:1 in the first three verses, John's gospel, following the light shining out of darkness, as well, provides commentary for God's division of the light from the darkness (vv. 6ff).

Man passing "from death unto life," salvation by grace through faith, *can be seen in its clearest, pristine form two corresponding places in Scripture — Gen. 1:2b-3 and John 1:4, 5 — the Spirit of God moving and God commanding the "light," "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," to shine out of darkness.*

*THIS (two verses in Genesis, two corresponding verses in John) is the BASE, beginning both Testaments.*

*And, to avoid ALL error in Biblical interpretation regarding salvation by grace, simply make SURE that ALL teaching is in COMPLETE accord with and rests on the BASE.*

And among the gospels in the N.T., John's gospel is the *ONLY one of the four* that begins with material relative to the *BASE, relative to salvation by grace.*

*ALL three synoptics begin beyond this point.*

Thus, *APART from John's gospel introducing the three synoptics and the N.T. as a whole, the N.T. could ONLY be seen beginning in a manner out of line with Genesis beginning the O.T.* The N.T., beginning with one of the synoptics, *could ONLY be seen beginning at a point OTHER than the beginning.*

*And things BEYOND the beginning, BEYOND the Spirit moving and light shining out of darkness — both Testaments — have to do with just THAT. They have to do with things BEYOND passing from death unto life, things BEYOND salvation by grace.*

This is *FIRST* seen in the septenary structure beginning each Testament. There is *ONE* brief statement relative to *this beginning Divine work*, with the remainder of continuing Scripture in the structure dealing with things beyond.

*THEN, this SAME thing* is seen in all subsequent Scripture, which is in complete accord with and rests on the septenary foundation beginning each Testament. There are, at times, brief statements concerning *this beginning Divine work* (e.g., Ex. 12; Eph. 2:8, 9), with the remainder of continuing Scripture dealing with things beyond.

*Scripture has VERY LITTLE to say about salvation by grace. The WHOLE of Scripture is about things beyond this point, things having to do with present aspects of salvation, with a view to the future, to the seventh day.*

It is man who has turned this around. It is man who has placed the emphasis where Scripture *DOESN'T* place the emphasis and has placed little to no emphasis where Scripture *DOES* place the emphasis.

Then, emanating out of the preceding, it is man who has taken entire passages, sometimes entire books (invariably, John's gospel), and *interpreted (misinterpreted) Scripture in accordance with the way things have been turned around.*

And, with that in mind, we're ready to begin dealing with parts of John chapters one and three.

These two chapters form two corresponding parts of Scripture which man, for the most part has misinterpreted and, correspondingly, turned completely around.

## John Chapter One

With parts of the opening few verses in John's gospel having already been dealt with, we'll begin with verse ten:

"He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.

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 ['children of God'], even to them that believe on his name:

Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (vv. 10-13).

*The FIRST thing* to note and understand has to do with the spiritual state of the Jewish people at the time Christ came to the nation 2,000 years ago.

Christ *DIDN'T* come to an unsaved generation of Jews, waiting for the movement of the Spirit and God calling light into existence.

*NO*, Christ came to a saved generation of Jews, dealing with things beyond the movement of the Spirit and God calling light into existence.

He dealt with the nation relative to repentance and a proffered kingdom, *something which He COULDN'T have possibly done apart from the nation existing in a state beyond Gen. 1:2b, 3 and John 1:4, 5.*

(For information on the spiritual state of the Jewish people at the time of Christ's first coming, refer to pp. 3-23 in Part II of the author's article, "Seven Thousand Years.")

In John 1:10, the word *kosmos*, translated "world," appears three times (*ref.* Part I in this article).

The reference is to the material world in the first two appearances, with the third appearance referring to individuals in the world.

The third appearance though, textually, *does NOT* refer to individuals worldwide. Rather it refers to those to whom Christ came, *those in a position to know and receive Him or NOT know and receive Him, those whom the continuing text goes on to identify and deal with — the Jewish people* (vv. 11ff).

Then, beginning with verse twelve, *those who DID know and receive Him* were given authority, power [Gk., *exousia*, ‘power to act’] to become “the children of God.”

This may sound strange, taking an individual who was already a “son” and making him a “child.” *But, NOT so!*

Relative to the message pertaining to the proffered kingdom — whether to the Jews 2,000 years ago, or to Christians today — God takes an individual who is already a “son” (cf. Ex. 4:22, 23; Isa. 43:1-6; II Cor. 5:17) and “child-trains” that individual, with a view to *SONSHIP in relation to REGALITY* (cf. Matt. 18:1-6; Rom. 8:13-23; Heb. 12:5-8).

(The different forms of the word “chasten” in Heb. 12:5-8 should be translated “child-training.”)

For material on these verses in Heb. 12, refer to Ch. III, pp. 38, 39, in the author’s book, *God’s Firstborn Sons.*)

And those receiving Him are said to have been “born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God” (v. 13).

### 1) *His Own Things, People*

Now, go back to verse eleven and let’s look at this:

“He came unto his own, and his own received him not.”

Note the two appearances of “own” in the verse. In the Greek text, the first is a neuter plural word, and the second a masculine plural word.

The thought, not shown in the English text, would be:

“He came unto ‘His Own things,’ and ‘His Own people’ received him not.”

“His Own things” had to do with the totality of that seen at His coming — the reason *WHY* He came to the Jewish

people, the *WAY* that He came to them, *WHAT* He did before beginning His ministry to them, *HOW* He dealt with them throughout His ministry, and the *WAY* that He left them at the end of this time.

And, His being received or rejected by the Jewish people had to do with the whole of the preceding, having to do with the whole of "His Own things," to which He came.

Christ was born "King of the Jews"; He spent forty days and nights being tempted of Satan relative to the matter, as the second Man, the last Adam; and He, in this capacity, offered to Israel "*the kingdom of the heavens,*" *the kingdom of this world, ruled and controlled by the incumbent Messiah, Satan.*

He, in this capacity, was rejected by Israel (John 18:37-40; 19:14-16); and He was crucified as "the Son of man" (a Messianic title, clearly identifying Him as the Messiah to replace the incumbent Messiah, along with the caption placed above His head, "This is Jesus [of Nazareth], the King of the Jews" [Matt. 2:1, 2; 4:17ff; 27:37 John 3:13, 14; 8:28]).

And, following His resurrection, preceding His ascension, He spent forty days instructing His disciples in things pertaining to "the kingdom of God" (Acts 1:1-11).

The Jewish people to whom He came and offered the kingdom either received or rejected Him *relative to His regal position and regal message*, which had to do with "his own things," the things to which He had come (Matt. 21:33-43; John 18:33-19:22).

Thus, note two things about those receiving Him, those who became *children of God*, those who were *born of God*.

*Those receiving Him, as previously stated, were NOT unsaved individuals.* In this respect, *their receiving Him had NOTHING* to do with the movement of the Spirit and God calling light into existence.

The Jewish people receiving Him did so relative to the subject at hand, which had to do with the proffered kingdom



and the signs being manifested in connection with the message. And this had to do with regality during the seventh day, the seventh and last 1,000-year period associated with the present heavens and earth.

Thus, the Jewish people either receiving or rejecting Him *acted in relation to the message being proclaimed*, accompanied by signs, which had to do with "His Own things," the "things" of the One born "King of the Jews."

## 2) *Born of God*

In that respect, "born of God," as seen in this initial usage in the N.T., *can ONLY have to do with something quite different than HOW it is invariably thought of and used in Christian circles today.*

And, that would *NOT ONLY* be the case in this initial usage *BUT ALL* subsequent usages in the N.T. as well (five times in John 3, once in James, twice in I Peter, and ten times in I John).

The expression is *NEVER* used in the N.T. after the manner in which it is invariably used in Christian circles today.

"Born again," drawn from John 1:12, 13, but mainly John 3:3, 7, is usually the wording of choice. And this expression is quite often used as a synonym relative to someone either being saved or unsaved, *i.e.*, a person is either born again or not born again, either saved or not saved.

And this is *NOT* a matter of little import, for *NOT ONLY* is a usage of this nature incorrect *BUT, through this incorrect usage*, the correct usage is done away with. And any incorrect usage of this nature by Bible students *ONLY* serves to compound the problem by continuing to keep an incorrect usage instilled within the minds of Christians.

*THEN*, part and parcel with the preceding is the fact that the vast majority of Christians are completely oblivious to the fact that a problem of the nature described even exists.

In fact, they would deny that it exists, continuing with the misinterpretation and misuse.

*(INCONCEIVABLE in today's supposedly enlightened Christianity! One might think so. BUT, such is NOT the case at all!*

There is a clearly-revealed, Biblical reason concerning WHY conditions in Christendom are as they currently exist, conditions of such a nature that, as previously stated, the vast majority of Christians are completely oblivious to the fact that such conditions even exist.

And the whole of the matter is perfectly in line with the way Christ stated that it would exist at the end of the dispensation, *which can ONLY be EXACTLY where the Church finds itself today.*

In short, *WHY be surprised about the existence of conditions that have turned out EXACTLY like Scripture stated that they would?*

For information on this matter, refer to the author's book, *Till the Whole Was Leavened.*)

Now, *HOW* can a saved person be "born of God," i.e., "born from above" (the preferred translation in John 3:3, 7)?

Understand "born" as *brought forth* — another way of saying the same thing — and look at a couple of examples of individuals being *brought forth*, BOTH "from above" and "from below."

And, being "brought forth from above" or being "brought forth from below" *are the ONLY two things which can occur in a saved person's life. There is NO middle ground* (Matt. 12:30; Mark 9:40; Luke 11:23)! *It is EITHER one OR the other!*

In Matt. 16:13-17, there is a classic example of an individual being "brought forth from above."

Then, a few verses later (vv. 21-23), there is a classic example of the same individual being "brought forth from

below," the *ONLY* thing which can occur *IF* he is *NOT* being "brought forth from above."

First, note this individual, Peter, being "brought forth from above" in verses thirteen through seventeen:

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Caesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?

And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am?

And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

Then, note Peter being "brought forth from below" in verses twenty-one through twenty-three:

"From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.

Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee.

But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

Then, note John 8:30-44, where individuals believing on Christ are seen performing *works which were NOT in keeping with their belief*.

These individuals are seen *being associated with Satan from below rather than God from above, i.e., they were being brought forth from below rather than from above*.

This entire matter will become more evident in John 3 and in I John.

(Also, for more information on this subject, refer to the author's book, *Brought Forth from Above*.)

## 2) *The Lamb of God, Sin, the World*

Before moving on to John chapter three, another part of John chapter one needs to be dealt with. Both the part just dealt with in verses ten through thirteen and the part about to be dealt with are also found together in the parallel section in chapter three.

Note this second part in chapter one, in John 1:29, 35, 36:

"The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world...

Again the next day after John stood, and two of his disciples;

And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God!"

There are two references by John to Jesus as "the Lamb of God" in these verses. The first occurs on the second day and the second occurs on the third day in the septenary arrangement of events opening John's gospel (1:4-2:11).

The first reference to "the Lamb of God" (v. 29) includes the words, "which taketh away the sin of the world"; but, not so on the second reference (v. 36).

However, the second reference has something not seen in the first.

Note the word "looking" in this verse. The word in the Greek text is *emblepo*, an intensified form of *blepo*, the regular word for "look" in the Greek text.

John, in this second reference, didn't just "look" (*blepo*) at Christ before stating, "Behold the Lamb of God." Rather, as we might say today, "John really looked Him over" (*emblepo*) prior to making this statement.

Relative to these statements pertaining to Jesus as "the Lamb of God," a saved people (the Jewish people) were being dealt with at that time; and, though John's statements would have to include Jesus as the Paschal Lamb in Exodus chapter twelve (where death and shed blood *MUST initially occur*), the statements, as previously seen, were made on the second and third days in the septenary structure beginning John's gospel, *NOT back on the first day in association with events seen in Exodus chapter twelve, which had to do with the movement of the Spirit and God calling light into existence.*

Then, beyond that, as previously seen, John referred to *THIS Lamb* as One "which taketh away the sin of the world."

To correctly understand these verses, *FIRST and FOREMOST Israel's place in God's economy needs to be understood* (ref. Part II of this article).

Then, in connection with the preceding, *different things about the Paschal Lamb need to be understood as well* (Ex. 12:1ff).

Viewing John 1:29 (and v. 36) in the light of Israel's place in God's economy, the paschal lamb was given *TO* Israel, *ONLY* Israel could slay this lamb, and *EFFICACY* through the slain lamb and proper application of the blood had to do with Israel *ALONE*.

*ALL* of this is seen in Exodus chapter twelve (note distinctions between Israel and the Egyptians [actually, the conquering Assyrians controlling the Egyptian government] in this respect).

As well, *ALL* of this is seen in the complete 1,500-year history of Israel from Moses to Christ. The slaying of the paschal lamb year after year by Israel, *EXACTLY* as seen in Egypt during Moses' day, had *NOTHING* to do with the nations.

Now, go to the antitype, *which MUST follow the type in EXACT detail.*

Christ, the Paschal Lamb, came to Israel *ALONE* (Matt. 15:24); Israel *ALONE* slew this Lamb, for the Jewish people were the *ONLY* ones who could slay this Lamb (Acts 2:23, 36; 3:13-15); and *EFFICACY* through Christ's death and shed blood, *EXACTLY* as in the introductory, foundational type in Exodus chapter twelve, and the history of the nation since that time, would have had to do with Israel *ALONE*.

*ALL of the preceding has to do with the PLACE which Israel occupies in God's economy and the MANNER in which God works THROUGH Israel within His economy.*

Now, note four verses from Isaiah chapter forty-three, showing *HOW the nations, within God's economy, are THEN brought into the matter:*

"Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled: who among them can declare this, and shew us former things? Let them bring forth their witnesses, that they may be justified: or let them hear, and say, It is truth.

Ye [the Jewish people] are my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me.

I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no Saviour.

I have declared, and have saved, and I have shewed, when there was no strange god among you: therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, that I am God" (vv. 9-12).

The simple truth of the matter is that *Israel, the ONLY nation with a God*, is to occupy a redeemed position, possess a message, and obey their calling as God's witness to the nations, who are "without God in the world" (Eph. 2:11, 12).

Or, turning this around, note the whole of the matter in a negative respect.

Do away with Israel and you would do away with the Church, which can exist *ONLY* because of a Jewish Saviour, Jewish because He came through Israel.

Then, carrying this a step behind the preceding, doing away with Israel would have prevented the Church's Jewish Saviour from even appearing.

And, within the unchangeable way that God does things, this would have prevented salvation/restoration from ever being effected, beginning with the restoration of the ruined earth in Gen. 1:2b ff.

*ALL* facets of the preceding *can ONLY* be true because of *HOW* God works *WITH* and *THROUGH* Israel *within His economy*. *ALL MUST* possess a *CONNECTION* with Israel.

The whole of the matter is what Christ referenced when He said to the Samaritan woman in John 4:22, "Salvation is of the Jews."

Then there is the matter of the Church being grafted into a Jewish trunk in Romans chapter eleven, which has to do with the reason for the Church's existence — to be the recipient of that which Israel rejected, which was taken from Israel (Matt. 21:33-43; I Peter 2:9-11).

Note how this reads in Rom. 11:17-21:

"And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear:

For if God spared not the natural branches [Jews, relative to the proffered kingdom], take heed lest he also spare not thee [Christians, relative to the proffered kingdom]."

*EVERYTHING relative to salvation/restoration is INSEPARABLY connected to Israel. This is simply the WAY God works out His plans and purposes regarding man and the earth (cf. Gen. 10:1-11:9; Deut. 32:7, 8; Isa. 43:9-12; Acts 17:26, 27).*

Now, with that in mind, go back to John's statement in verse twenty-nine:

*"...Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."*

Israel had slain paschal lambs year after year, for some 1,500 years. *NOW*, with the slaying of *THE PASCHAL LAMB*, all of that would change, for Christ's death and shed blood at Calvary fulfilled the type in Exodus chapter twelve.

The death and shed blood of *THIS* Paschal Lamb though, along with a continued work following His resurrection (placing His blood on the mercy seat in the heavenly Tabernacle, then occupying the office of High Priest), fulfilled *ALL* of the O.T. types regarding sacrifices.

And, John the Baptist's statements regarding Christ as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world," occurring on the second day, with an added reference to this Lamb on the third day, *could ONLY* have had to do with Christ's work beyond both Calvary and His resurrection.

They *could ONLY* have had to do with that seen occurring on the Day of Atonement in Leviticus chapter sixteen, where, among other things, *blood from a slain goat was sprinkled on and before the mercy seat.*

The high priest then took a second goat, a live goat, and placed his hands on the head of the goat, confessing the sins of the people. This goat was then taken into and left in the wilderness, *symbolically seen taking away these sins.*

Christ, fulfilling this in the antitype, would be seen *taking away the sins of the Jewish people on the basis of His Own blood on the mercy seat in the heavenly Tabernacle.*



The words “taketh away” in John 1:29 are a translation of the Greek word *airo*, which means “to take up,” “to take away,” or “to bear.” And the thought of Christ doing this as “the Lamb of God” could refer *NOT ONLY* to His work at Calvary *BUT* to His work as High Priest following His resurrection as well.

That is, –the Lamb of God” would “take up” and “bear” sin in His Own body on the Cross (I Peter 2:24), and, in this respect, through His death and shed blood, He would “take away” sin.

Then, “the Lamb of God,” following His resurrection, through His work as High Priest, on the basis of His blood on the mercy seat, would “take away” sin as well.

The first “taking away” of sin would be the antitype of His work as the Paschal Lamb from Exodus chapter twelve.

The second “taking away” of sin would be the antitype of His work seen in the actions of the high priest relative to the two goats on the Day of Atonement in Leviticus chapter sixteen.

*The latter, NOT the former, could ONLY be at the forefront of John the Baptist’s statements in John 1:29, 36.*

Note how this is seen in Isa. 53:5, 6, 8, at a time when the Jewish people were being dealt with as a saved people, with the Jewish people understanding Isaiah chapter fifty-three *within this type frame of reference*:

“But he was wounded for our [the Jewish people’s] transgressions, he was bruised for our [the Jewish people’s] iniquities: the chastisement of our [the Jewish people’s] peace was upon him; and with his stripes we [the Jewish people] are healed.

All we [the Jewish people] like sheep have gone astray; we [the Jewish people] have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all [the Jewish people]...

He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? For he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people [the Jewish people] was he stricken."

Then, the matter of *bearing, taking away* "sin" in relation to the "world" in John 1:29, should be self-explanatory.

The word "world" (Gk., *kosmos*; *ref.* Part I of this article), in the light of the place which Israel occupies in God's economy and how God deals with the nations within this economy, *CANNOT* possibly be thought of as including more than Israel *ALONE*.

*SOLELY* from a Biblical standpoint, such would be *IMPOSSIBLE*. God simply *does NOT* deal with the nations after a manner which this would imply, after a manner apart from dealing with them through Israel.

The nations, "without God in the world," are to be reached by *the ONE nation with a God, by the nation in possession of the Word, a message, and a calling*.

However, we are living during a day when Israel has been set aside because of covenantal disobedience, including harlotry; and, during this time, a new nation has been called into existence for particular purposes, one neither Jewish nor Gentile, *one with a Jewish Saviour*.

And this new nation, in possession of the Word, has a *God, a calling, and a message ONLY because of their connection with Israel through this Jewish Saviour*.

*BUT*, this new nation, over time, has gone *the SAME unbelieving and disobedient way that Israel went in history*. And God is going to shortly remove and judge this new nation, then turn back to Israel, and deal with Israel after a fashion which will result in repentance, conversion, and restoration.

*And, THEN, in THAT day, God's COMPLETE purpose for calling Israel into existence during Moses' day will be realized.*

The Jewish people, in *THAT* day, will take the message of a Jewish Saviour and a doing away with sin to the nations — *FIRST*, a doing away with sin as seen in Exodus chapter twelve; *THEN*, a doing away with sin as seen in Leviticus chapter sixteen.

### **John Chapter Three**

As previously seen, the *ONLY* place in chapter one which really deals with salvation by grace is seen in verses four and five, having to do with light shining in the darkness. And, as previously shown, when connected with other corresponding verses, particularly from Genesis, the complete word picture in these two verses has to do with the Spirit moving and God commanding the light to shine out of the darkness.

*BUT, that's IT!* There is *NOTHING ELSE* about salvation by grace in the remainder of the chapter, *UNLESS* derived from secondary interpretation.

*THEN*, the parallel section in chapter three, unlike chapter one with its septenary structure, *DOESN'T* even have anything about salvation by grace in the primary interpretation. As the material following verse five in chapter one, *THIS* will have to be derived from secondary interpretation.

Note how chapter three begins:

"There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews:

The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles [Gk. *semeia*, 'signs'] that thou doest, except God be with him.

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" (vv. 1-3).

In the normal way that these opening verses are looked upon and interpreted — invariably pertaining to salvation by grace — Nicodemus is seen dealing with a subject completely alien to the one that he does deal with; and Christ's response, kept within this type introductory line of thinking, is seen the same erroneous way.

And this type erroneous interpretation, as in chapter one, does away with the true subject at hand.

But, rather than deal with the error (for it takes a number of different forms here, as it invariably always does), we'll simply deal with what the verses have to say and let Scripture itself expose the error (again, *ref. Isa. 8:20*).

As previously stated, the accounts in chapters one and three parallel one another. Each begins with statements having to do with a bringing forth from above (the only two places where this expression appears in John's gospel [nor does the expression appear in the other three gospels, Acts, the Pauline epistles, or Hebrews]); and, beyond that, further down in both accounts, "the Lamb of God" is dealt with, in relation to events surrounding both Calvary and Christ's blood subsequently being placed on the mercy seat.

But, let's stay with verses one through three for the present. Then we'll look at "the Lamb of God," seen more in the sense of the Paschal Lamb, in the latter verses. And, since much of what could be said here has already been dealt with in the data covering chapter one, this part of the article need only deal with what might be peculiar to chapter three.

Note Nicodemus' statement beginning the chapter (v. 2). Nicodemus simply began by stating that those in his party, the Pharisees, knew that Christ was "a teacher come from God," evidenced by the supernatural "signs" which accompanied His ministry.

And Christ's response was in complete keeping with Nicodemus' statement.

The signs were being manifested in connection with the message concerning the kingdom, showing the Jewish people what they could have in the proffered kingdom. They were being manifested to effect belief that Jesus was *EXACTLY* Who He claimed to be — “the Christ, the Son of God” — *with the whole of the matter having to do with REGALITY*.

Jesus’ response to Nicodemus regarding these “signs” was something all-inclusive. Jesus’ response had to do with the absolute necessity of being “brought forth from above” in order to “see the kingdom of God” (v. 3), or “enter the kingdom of God” (v. 5).

And, from what is stated in the last verse of the chapter (v. 36), *entering the kingdom* in verse five would be synonymous with *seeing the kingdom* in verse three.

(Verse five presents additional, explanatory data relative to *seeing/entering the kingdom*. And this section on *being brought forth from above* in chapter three [vv. 1-8] would, as well, provide additional, explanatory data for the same subject previously introduced in chapter one [vv. 10-13].

For more information in this realm — particularly on the words, “born out of water and Spirit” [literal rendering] in v. 5 — refer to the author’s book, *Brought Forth from Above*.)

The subject in the text has to do with “*signs*” and the proffered “*kingdom*,” NOT with salvation by grace; and a saved individual capable of responding to the message pertaining to the kingdom, is being dealt with, NOT an unsaved individual.

Then the subject of being “born again,” or “born from above,” has already been dealt with in material covering chapter one, earlier in this part of the article.

Thus, let’s move on to the latter part of the account in chapter three and deal with the parallel pertaining to Christ as the Paschal Lamb, seen in the latter part of chapter one.

Note verses fourteen through eighteen in this third chapter:

“And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up:

That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.

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.

He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.”

Christ, beginning the parallel from chapter one, draws from an O.T. type. And, interestingly enough, the O.T. type, *EXACTLY* as the N.T. antitype, has to do with *a saved Jewish nation and a kingdom*.

In both instances *there is sin in the camp*, in both instances *something is raised up* (a brazen serpent in the type, a Man in the antitype), and in both instances *it is look to that/the One raised up and live*.

With these things in mind, note in the antitype that it is “the Son of man” (vv. 13, 14) Who is to be raised up, lifted up, crucified, *NOT the paschal Lamb*.

“Son of man” is a Messianic title, taken from Ps. 8:4-6 and Dan. 7:13, 14. Christ used this title referring to Himself numerous times throughout the gospel accounts. And, beyond the gospels, it is found only four places in the N.T. (Acts 7:58; Heb. 2:6 [a quotation from Ps. 8:4], and Rev. 1:13; 14:14).

The paschal lamb was given to Israel, and it was given to Israel *to be slain* (Ex. 12:1ff). Had the Jewish people slain

Jesus as the paschal Lamb rather than as “the Son of man,” *NO words of condemnation could possibly have been leveled against them* (Acts 2:22, 23, 35, 36; 7:51, 52), *for they would have done that which they were supposed to do.*

And the Old Testament had made it quite clear that *the nation’s paschal Lamb was to be a Man* (Gen. 4, 22; Isa. 53).

*BUT, they crucified their “King,” “the Son of man,” though, in the process, they ALSO slew “the Lamb”* (cf. John 11:47-52).

Stephen’s use of the expression “the Son of man” in Acts chapter seven, referencing Christ — which *could ONLY* have been understood by the Jews as *Messianic* — appeared to infuriate the Jews to no end, which evidently was their central reason for killing him (vv. 54-60).

In John 3:14, 15, “the Son of man” was to be lifted up:

“That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.”

The better Greek manuscripts do not include the words “should not perish,” making the verse to read:

“That whosoever believeth in him might have eternal life.”

But, that is immaterial, for “perish” (Gk. *apollumi*) is in verse sixteen. And since verse sixteen repeats the statement from verse fifteen, using the words in question, we’ll simply deal with this verse, which will cover both verses:

“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.”

Now, to place John 3:16 within context, note several things:

- 1) This verse is the counterpart to verses twenty-nine and thirty-six in chapter one.

2) This verse is part of Jesus' complete discourse to Nicodemus and *MUST* be so understood. John 3:16 *MUST* be understood as a *CONTINUATION* of the same subject previously introduced in verses two through eight.

3) And, as well, John 3:16 *MUST* be understood in line with the *SAME* thing previously seen in the parallel counterpart in chapter one (i.e., material in vv. 29, 36 having to do with the *SAME* subject previously seen in vv. 10-13).

Then, keeping in mind that *SAVED* individuals and the kingdom are being dealt with, *NOT UNSAVED* individuals and salvation by grace, note the word "world" ("For God so loved the world...").

This *CAN'T* possibly be an all-inclusive statement, referring to both Israel and the nations. That would *NOT ONLY* be out of line with the way God deals with Israel and the nations *BUT* out of line with the saved or unsaved status of Israel and the nations — Israel, saved; the nations, unsaved.

In this respect, the word "world" in this verse can refer *ONLY* to Israel, *NOT* also to the Gentile nations. The nations were to be reached by Israel, as the Jewish people realized their calling to be God's witnesses to the nations.

Then note the words:

"...that He gave His only begotten Son."

This portends three things:

1) God gave His Son to be lifted up, providing redemption.

2) This Son was His "only begotten."

That is to say, relative to the provided redemption, this Son came through Israel, providing His qualification/ability to redeem.



3) Then, there is the reference to “Son” itself. It was “the Son of man” (a Messianic title) Who was to be lifted up.

And it is “Sons” *ALONE* Who rule in God’s kingdom. The entire verse, in line with Jesus’ message to Nicodemus, beginning with Nicodemus’ question concerning “signs,” is *REGAL*.

Then note how the verse ends:

“...that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.”

Simple “belief,” as seen in the type from Num. 20:6-9, to which Christ had called attention (v. 14), was *ALL* that had been asked of the Jewish people. Where a Divine work is involved, as seen here — whether Christ’s finished work at Calvary, or that which His death and shed blood at Calvary makes possible, His continuing work as High Priest — man can do *NO more* than simply believe.

And the continuing words, “should not perish but have everlasting life,” present two conditions, with “perish” (Gk. *apollumi*) pointing to an opposite condition. “Perish,” in this respect, would be realizing the opposite of “everlasting life,” *NOT having “everlasting life.”*

But, that’s in the English text. Let’s correct the text first and then deal with the matter.

The word “perish” is fine for translating *apollumi*, but not so with *aionios*, translated “everlasting.”

*Aionios*, as seen in Part I of this article, has to do with “time,” *NOT* with “eternity.” Further it is consistently used relative to “time” during the last 7,000 years of the present heavens and earth; and, with only several exceptions, that “time” has to do with the last 1,000 years of the 7,000 years, with an AGE. It has to do with the *LAST AGE* of ages associated with the present

*heavens and earth before God destroys this present heavens and earth and brings into existence a new heavens and a new earth.*

And to translate this part of John 3:16 correctly, *aionios*, presently translated “everlasting,” should be translated “age-lasting.”

And *apollumi*, translated “perish,” would be understood in an opposite respect, *i.e.*, *NOT having age-lasting life*.

Note two examples of how *apollumi* is used in this opposite, negative respect in the N.T.

“For whosoever will save his life shall lose [*apollumi*] it: and whosoever will lose [*apollumi*] his life for my sake shall find it” (Matt. 16:25).

“For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish [‘are perishing’ (*apollumi*)] foolishness; but unto us which are saved [‘are being saved’] it is the power of God” (I Cor. 1:18).

(Also note “Additional Thoughts on John 3:16” concluding this third part on p. 28.)

Then, going on to verse seventeen, the second and third usages of the word “world” in verse seventeen, as in verse sixteen, *could ONLY* have reference to the Jewish people.

And the word “condemn” in verses seventeen and eighteen is a translation of the Greek word *krino*, which means “to judge.” That would be to say that the one believing will *NOT* come under judgment; but *NOT SO* with the unbeliever.

Then, Jesus’ conversation with Nicodemus concludes with references to Jesus as “the light” (vv. 19-21), the same way that the first chapter had opened (vv. 4-9).

(The preceding comments on parallel parts of John chapters one and three are out of line with what is invariably taught on this material, *BUT*, they are in line with the text, context, and what should be taught on *NOT ONLY* parts of these two chapters *BUT* the remainder of John’s gospel as well.

John's gospel is the Genesis of the N.T., *NOT ONLY* providing a proper transition from "Moses, the Psalms, and the Prophets" to the N.T. *BUT* properly introducing the three synoptic gospels, Acts, and the N.T. as a whole.

And John's gospel continues and deals with *EXACTLY* the same subject seen beginning and being dealt with in Genesis — the restoration of a ruined earth, and man [created in Genesis, redeemed in John] ruling that restored earth.

And this rule occurs within the confines of "time" and has to do with the present heavens and earth preceding their destruction.

Genesis deals with this through the use of numerous types, John through the use of eight signs. And both books *MUST* be understood accordingly, one book beginning and introducing the O.T., the other beginning and introducing the N.T.

Thus, an individual *SHOULD* want to think long and hard before following interpretation, particularly on John's gospel, which is more in line with *eisegesis* [reading into a text that which is not there] rather than *exegesis* [reading out of a text that which is there].

The former is rampant in the leavened, lukewarm Laodicean Church of today, with the latter usually fought against far more than accepted.

Other clarifying information regarding interpretation in John chapters one and three, particularly pertaining to the latter part of both [1:29, 35, 36; 3:14-17], can be found in the next part of this article [Part IV].

This information can be seen different places throughout a large section of this part [pp. 16-32], dealing with the overall typology of the Tabernacle.

The Tabernacle is another foundational *BASE* which Scripture provides [for Israel, past; Christians, present], governing interpretation, allowing correct understanding regarding salvation, forgiveness of sins, fellowship...)

## Additional Thoughts on John 3:16

John 3:16 is a mainstay for individuals dealing with the unsaved. And, viewing the subject and resulting resonance of the verse, that is all good and well.

The salvation message, whether dealing with the saved or the unsaved, is *actually the SAME*.

It is *look and live*. It is *looking to the ONLY ONE Who can save*, exercising faith in *THIS individual* relative to the subject matter at hand. It is as stated in Rom. 1:17, "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith..."

There though *is a problem, a MAJOR problem*, in the way that John 3:16 is invariably used when dealing with the unsaved (seeing the principle or main interpretation of the verse having to do with the unsaved worldwide, referencing Heaven, Hell, and eternal verities).

*BUT*, the verse (or the whole of Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus [vv. 1-21]), as previously seen in this chapter, has *NOTHING* to do with the unsaved. And removing this verse (or any part of this discourse) from its context and misusing it in this manner does away with the correct interpretation, resulting in what often happens — the whole of John's gospel removed from its contextual setting (in relation to both the O.T. and N.T.) and made to be something that it isn't, resulting in mayhem in a major facet of Biblical interpretation.

Note again the type in Num. 21:5-9, given to help explain and shed light upon the antitype in John 3:16.

The type has to do with *the Jewish people (saved, NOT unsaved), covenantal disobedience (being brought forth from below rather than from above), and a kingdom set before them*.

And the antitype has to do with *EXACTLY the SAME thing 1,500 years later (vv. 3-8, 14-16)*.

*Then, the type in Num. 21:5-9 and the antitype in John 3:16, in turn, help explain Jesus' statement to Nicodemus in John 3:3, 5-8, something which he should have known (vv. 9, 10).*