

This Is Elias, Which Was For To Come

Matt 11v10: *For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.*

Matt 11v14: *And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which was for to come.*

Luke 1v17: *And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.*

Matt 17v11-13: *And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.*

Mark 9v12-13: *And he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at naught. But I say unto you, That Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.*

~~~~~

**Is it true that Malachi 4:4-6, Matthew 17:11 and Revelation 16:15 prophesy that there shall be a second Elijah who shall be a harbinger of Christ's Second Coming?**

1. 'Elijah truly shall first come' is not a prophecy of the future. The Westminster Tradition's teaching about a second Elijah is based largely upon the word 'shall'. They divide the text in Matt 17:11 into Messianic and Eschatological parts, as though it said, '[the second] *Elias truly shall first come* [before Christ's return], *and restore all things. But I say unto you, that Elias* [the first] *is come already...*' This is unsound exegesis. The Geneva Bible says, '*Certainly Elias must first come, and restore all things.*' Do the scribes say Elijah must first come? Certainly he must first come! But I say unto you, that he is come already! This was the problem with the scribes: they were still waiting for Elijah's coming. The three disciples had just seen the prophets Moses and Elijah on the mount, whom they perhaps thought were the Moses and Elijah of Mal 4:4-5 come indeed. But Jesus did not speak of the Elijah whom the

disciples saw on the mount, nor of a future Elijah: he spoke of John the Baptist. *'Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist.'* Why then did Jesus say, *'Elijah SHALL truly first come?'* The King James translators did not use the word 'shall' to imply a future event. The common usage of the English word 'shall' has changed since the KJV translation of 1611. The greatest and one of the earliest dictionaries in the English language (Noah Webster 1828) states that 'shall' is roughly equivalent to 'ought'. He writes, 'In the second and third persons, *shall* implies a promise, command or determination. "You *shall* receive your wages," "he *shall* receive his wages," imply that you or he *ought* to receive them...'<sup>1</sup> That the Geneva Bible has Matt 17:11 as *'Certainly Elias must first come'* entirely supports this. A teaching constantly emphasised within The Westminster Tradition is that Scripture must interpret Scripture. Mark 9:12-13 is therefore very important, being the only other record of this conversation between Jesus and His disciples. It gives no indication of a future Elias. Jesus was affirming the teaching of the scribes, that *'Elias must first come'* (Mark 9:11b). *'Elias verily cometh first, and restoreth all things.'* If Jesus had been teaching an eschatological fulfilment of Mal 4:5 then He would not have followed with *'and how it is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought.'* The context is clearly Christ's first coming and suffering. [1. Modern English dictionaries validate Noah Webster's explanation and add that the word 'shall' is now used to form a future tense. For example, Chambers English Dictionary on 'shall': 1. Originally expressing debt or moral obligation, now used with the infinitive of a verb (without to) to form (in sense) a future tense...]

2. **John the Baptist completely fulfilled the prophecies of both Malachi 3 & 4.** John the Baptist was the messenger who should prepare the way (Mal 3:1 = Matt 11:10). John the Baptist was Elijah the prophet (Mal 4:5 = Matt 11:14). This passage in Matthew 11:7-15 is important because it proves that Malachi 3 and Malachi 4 speak of the same event. The Westminster Tradition's treatment of these chapters is similar to their treatment of Matt 17:11 - that is, to divide the text into a Messianic and Eschatological fulfilment. Thus they make Mal 3 primarily Messianic and Mal 4 primarily Eschatological. But in Matt 11, Jesus does not expound these chapters this way. He says of John the Baptist from Malachi 3, that *'this is he, of whom it is written.'* And He says of John the Baptist from Malachi 4, that *'if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.'* Amen. Both chapters are fulfilled by John the Baptist. John the Baptist also fulfilled the final verse of Malachi. This was confirmed by the angel Gabriel himself in Luke 1:17. The angel not only quoted Mal 4:5-6, but also appended his quotation with a reference to Isaiah 40:3 - that John the Baptist should make ready a people prepared for the Lord. When a prophecy is only partially fulfilled there is room to look for another fulfilment. For example, it is clear that Solomon could not completely fulfil God's promise to David in 2 Sam 7:12-16 and therefore David's true 'seed' was a greater than Solomon. But this is not the case with Malachi 3 & 4. Every New Testament Scripture dealing with these passages declares John the Baptist to be the fulfilment. There is no cause to look for another. The great and dreadful day of the LORD spoken of by Malachi must have

been Christ's first coming. This agrees with Mal 3:2 - *'But who may abide the day of his [Christ's] coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness.'* This is the great and terrible day of the LORD spoken of in the following chapter. It is true that there is another great and notable day of the Lord (Acts 2:20b), but the Scriptures which deal with Christ's Second Coming do not speak of a coming Elijah.

3. **John the Baptist never exalted himself, but directed people to Christ.** Though John the Baptist's calling and anointing were absolutely beyond dispute (being confirmed by prophecy, angelic announcement, miraculous conception, ministry and Jesus' own testimony), and though *'among them born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist'* yet he never exalted himself beyond the simple assertion that he was *'the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias (John 1:23).'* His motto was that *'He must increase, but I must decrease (John 3:30).'* John knew his identity and his importance. Though he doubted Christ, he did not doubt himself (Luke 7:19). Yet we find no evidence of pride or desire to elevate himself. His ministry was entirely spent in directing people to Christ, the Lamb of God, the Bridegroom, the Mightier than he, the latchet of Whose shoes he was not worthy to stoop down and unloose. He took no title. His disciples knew him simply as John. As his Master was servant of all, even so was he (Matt 23:8-12).
4. **A harbinger would not come as a thief.** It is a teaching within The Westminster Tradition that the thief in Rev 16:15a is not Christ, but another. This thief is understood to be the second Elijah. But other eschatological passages disagree with this interpretation. They are clear that the day that *'will come as a thief in the night... (2 Pet 3:10)'* is the day of the Lord (of His final return). A second witness is to be found in 2 Thess 5v2: *'For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night.'* Elijah of old did not come as a thief. In fact, there was no nation or kingdom which did not know of him (1 Kings 18:10). John the Baptist did not come as a thief. *'Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan (Matt 4:5).'* Jesus' first coming to this world was expected: the prophet Daniel made the timing clear, as is taught within The Westminster Tradition. But we have no such prophecy of His return. *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither even the Son.* So we are to take heed, watch and pray: for we know not when the time is (Mark 13:32-37). That we know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh is the chief application of the parable of the ten virgins (Matt 25:13). There were not five foolish virgins who knew not the hour and five wise virgins who had received the thief of Rev 16:15. Rather, none of them knew. If the timing of His return will not be known, then it is clear there will not be a harbinger sent to announce it. The prophecies of Revelation are to

be understood by God's people (Rev 1:3). But while we understand that Christ's coming is near, we cannot know how near: we cannot tell the hour, nor the day, nor even the season. *But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night* (2 Thess 5:1-2). Jesus' warning that He comes as a thief immediately precedes the pouring out of the seventh and last vial into the air (Rev 16:17). Is it not again a warning that His coming, though imminent, will be unexpected? To say the text in Rev 16:15 speaks of a harbinger is to contradict the very warning that we don't know when He will return. If the Son Himself does not know the day nor the hour, how can He send a forerunner?

### **Afterword**

My motive will doubtless be questioned in sending this brief refutation. So I will be clear. This is not a separation letter. The author is not seeking to be anonymous but is prepared to stand by his doctrine. I am not representing the Westminster Tradition UK, nor the brethren in England, nor sadly my own family. *Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.* My source of e-mail addresses was The Jerusalem Times. I have not e-mailed selectively. I do not expect to be well received by any, for I stand on ground that few wish to occupy and many will deny is legitimate. I am not 'building my own kingdom'. It would be a kingdom of one! I joined The Westminster Tradition about 10 years ago. I have never embraced every teaching, but have sought to exercise patience and like Mary to keep those things which troubled me, and ponder them in my heart. Should God grant me mercy on that day, I will be eternally grateful to Him for sending to me the beautiful feet of those from The Westminster Tradition who delivered me from my bondage to a false and demonic gospel which could not save. If I were on my deathbed today, I would wish for none other to minister to me. For I believe Elijah Thomas Chacko's Gospel. I find his Gospel aligns (in general, though not always in pastoral application) with that of a number of important historic forebears and most importantly with God's Word. But I believe he is mistaken in his identity and therefore his mandate. I can no longer forebear and watch the schismatic fruits ripen, of what are in my judgment, scripturally unsubstantiable claims. However, I do not believe this precludes Elijah Thomas Chacko from experiencing God's blessing upon his preaching insofar as he is faithful to the true Gospel. Martin Luther, the man who ignited the Protestant Reformation preached the heresy of consubstantiation. Howell Harris was an indefatigable preacher who turned many to repentance, yet he believed the heresy of patripassianism. There are other historical examples. The book of Judges showcases a bewildering array of flawed men who were mightily used of God. Luther's violent refusal to listen to Zwingli, even his denunciation of Zwingli as having another spirit split the Swiss and German churches irreparably. A grievous schism arose among the Welsh Methodists when Howell Harris fought Daniel Rowland's correction. History is indeed cyclical. The teachings I have sought to refute in this letter are those upon which many other false doctrines and practices hang. I may write further on these.

Though I do not like the spirit in which some from the churches of Judah, Zebulun and Shandong (so far) have composed their letters, yet the ferocity with which their opponents such as Haziell and Kadmiel have responded reminds me of James and John, who said: *'Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them (Luke 9:54-56).'* I believe many of the doctrinal objections raised by the churches of Judah, Zebulun and Shandong are valid and have not been satisfactorily answered. I request Elijah Thomas Chacko to personally write a refutation to the doctrinal accusations that have been made. If he instructs third parties to draw up refutations, then he should make it clear whether or not he endorses everything in them! I also request that he publish fairly and without bias or selection letters written in response to the open letters and special reports. I request that everybody who has already written a response be given the opportunity to opt out of inclusion in such a publication.

I have tried to consider the implications and consequences of sending this letter. Will I cause some to stumble? But the cart must not go before the horse. The pastoral expediencies and consequences should never be used to suppress the truth or the eventual damage will be worse. The fallacies dealt with in this letter act as leaven, and *know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump (1 Cor 5:6b)?*

Therefore I say to those who read this: let the truth trouble you, but look patiently to Christ Jesus. Do not fear man, *for the fear of man bringeth a snare: but whoso putteth his trust in the LORD shall be safe (Prov 29:25)*. As befits those that trust in the LORD, *let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice...* (Eph 4:31). Do not carelessly reject Elijah Thomas Chacko, but *search the scriptures daily, whether those things [he teaches] are so (Acts 17:11)*. He may not be a second Elijah, but I do not believe he is consequentially of the devil. *In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth...* (2 Tim 2:20a). *Prove all things; hold fast that which is good (1 Thess 5:21)*. You would be foolish to throw off The Westminster Tradition if they have ministered life to you. You would also be foolish to endorse and propagate teachings and practices which you suspect to be false.

*If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good. Romans 12:18-21.*

Daniel Harper; 25th October 2018.

List of mailings from which e-mails gleaned:

Fwd: Worship Agenda 29 April 2018

Request for summative report 01/12/17

TJT 29 Nov 2017 28/11/17

Tract distribution & printing 06/10/17

BRC (generic format) 28/08/17

David Debbarma 22/08/17

Blossom Abundantly 10/07/17

PI take this copy 06/07/17

Worship Agenda 28 May 2017 24/05/17

Finance matters on BRC 12/11/16

On BRC reports & work 08/11/16

Letter circulated to brethren 23/10/16

Worship Agenda 25 Sept 2016 23/09/16

Bundle of joy 15/04/16

Worship Agenda 3 April 08/03/16

Jerusalem Times 8 March 23/01/16

Myra Patacsil 10/01/16