

was merely a repetition of what has gone before, or whether it added any new thought. But when we have in Romans the figure of the olive tree given which this parallels so closely, and that ending with the statement that if they're lopping off meant all this blessing, what will the grafting in again of the ~~two~~ true branches mean, but life from the dead? We have that statement given. And so all Israel shall be saved. We have the promise in the New Testament ~~that~~ Israel is a nation born in a day, comes as a whole to the knowledge of the Lord, ~~at~~ a later stage in this development, and here we have it said, they, too, that erred in spirit--well, now they're not the blind, they're the people who have erred, that seems to go back more to vv.10-12. They erred, they will come to understanding, and they that murmur will learn doctrine, so that you have just very lightly given, and yet it seems to me it is a very reasonable interpretation of it, that in this verse, then you have the grafting back into the olive tree of the natural branch, fitting in with Romans. Yes? (stu.7) It seems to me that Paul very clearly in Rom.11, I believe it is, gives the figure of the olive tree, <sup>of</sup> ~~as~~ the continuity of the olive tree, out of which certain branches, the natural branches were grafted out, Well, now the olive tree doesn't begin at pentecost, if it does, how were they the natural branches grafted out, they weren't even in it at pentecost. It is very clear, I mean, some of them were, but the bulk weren't, it is very clear ~~that~~ what Paul was talking about, is the continuity of the people of God through the ages, the witness to God, and he speaks of the natural branches being grafted out, the wild branches being grafted in, and then of the natural branches being grafted back in again, there is a continuity there, I don't see how you can get away from that continuity. You have of course, in the church, you have a new organization, you have certain new elements ~~but~~ <sup>but</sup> that you have a continuity of the people of God, you don't have a sharp sudden break. ~~It~~ doesn't seem to me. I see no warrant for that. When you speak of the church as a new thing, I would rather ~~say that there is to be~~ <sup>say that there is to be</sup> ~~speaking of the church as~~ a new element  $\phi$  in the people of God in that there will be a change in the ordinances, a cessation of so much stress