

**WHAT'VE
THEY DONE
WITH
ABRAHAM'S
BLESSINGS?**

VOLUME TWO

*This Volume Destroys The Modernistic
Denial That Healing & Prosperity Belong
To Christians Now!*

Jay Snell

WHAT'VE THEY DONE WITH ABRAHAM'S BLESSINGS? Copyright © 1989 by Jay
Snell. Published by
Jay Snell Evangelistic Association
P.O. Box 59
Livingston, Texas 77351
Telephone: (936) 327-3676
Fax: (936) 327-6181 <http://jaysnell.org>

Reformatted and Republished on World Wide Web in Portable Document Format 2002
First Printing 1989
Printed in the United States of America

ISBN 0-1895458

"AMERICAN COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT VOLUME IV. Editor: Alvah Hovey. Copyright © 1882 by the American Baptist Publication Society: Judson Press Department. Valley Forge, PA. 19482. Used by permission of Judson Press."

"COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS (one volume). Author: F. Godet. Copyright © 1956 Zondervan Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, MI. 49506."

"ROMANS. Author: Robert Haldane. Copyright © 1963, Banner of Truth Trust."

"Taken from NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY, VOL. I edited by Colin Brown. Copyright © 1967, 1969, 1971 by Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus. English language copyright © 1975 by The Zondervan Corporation, U.S.A. and the Paternoster Press, Ltd., England. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House."

"Taken from NEW INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY, VOL. III edited by Colin Brown. Copyright © 1971 by Theologischer Verlag Rolf Brockhaus. English language copyright © 1978 by The Zondervan Corporation, U.S.A. and the Paternoster Press, Ltd., England. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House."

"THE BLOOD COVENANT. Author: H. Clay Trumbull. Copyright © 1975 IMPACT BOOKS, INC. 137 W. Jefferson, Kirkwood, MO. 63122. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED."

"THE NEW INTERNATIONAL STANDARD BIBLE ENCYCLOPEDIA. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, MI., Copyright © 1939."

"THE NEW SCOFIELD REFERENCE BIBLE. Copyright © 1967 by Oxford University Press Inc., Madison Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016."

"WEUST'S WORD STUDIES Vol. I. Author: Kenneth S. Weust. Copyright © 1977 William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Grand Rapids, MI. 49503."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME II

What've They Done With Abraham's Blessings?

Chapter One

The Denial That Healing and Prosperity Belong To Christians Is Based Upon The Greatest Theological Blunder In Old Testament History.

What is the Relationship of Moses' Law to Abraham's Blessings?

The Apostle Paul Supports Moses' View of the Relationship of the Law to Abraham's Blessings.

Chapter Two

Current, Christian Theology Built An Interpretive System Upon The Greatest Theological Blunder In Old Testament History, Which Strips Away From Christians The Abrahamic Blessing of Healing And Prosperity

Based Upon That Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, Current, Christian Theology (Which Strips Away From Christians the Abrahamic Blessings of Healing and Prosperity) Perches Precariously Upon Three More Great Errors.

The First Great Error Upon Which This Current, Christian Theology of Denial Perches Precariously, is Misunderstanding the Threefold Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder.

The First Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, is Demonstrated by the Great Amount of Space in the New Testament They Devoted to Its Overthrow.

The Second Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, is Demonstrated by the Urgency With Which They Fought the War Against It.

The Third Reaction of the New Testament Writers to the Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, is Demonstrated by the Language They Used Against It.

Chapter Three

The Second Great Error Upon Which This Current, Christian Theology of Denial Perches Precariously, Is Misunderstanding The Term "New" In "New Covenant" To Mean "New in Time," When In Fact It Does Not

Is the New Covenant Really New?

Nine Major Greek Dictionaries Declare That "New" in "New Covenant," Does Not Mean "New in Time," but "New in Quality."

The Hebrew Word for "New" in "New Covenant," Primarily Means "New in Quality," not "New in Time."

A Brief Study of Every New Testament Occurrence of KAINOS (New in Quality) Shows That "New" in "New Covenant," Means "New in Quality," not "New in Time."

Chapter Four

The Third Great Error Upon Which This Current, Christian Theology of Denial Perches Precariously, Is Confusing "Will Make" in Jeremiah's Statement, "I will make a new covenant...", To Mean "Start Up Something That Never Was," When In Fact, It Means To "Complete That

The Ceremony of the Abrahamic Covenant.

The Blood Covenant of Friendship.

The Full Explanation of "Will Make" in Jeremiah's Expression, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."

The Completion on Golgotha of Abraham's Covenant by Jesus, the Seed of Abraham, Who Was Both God and Man.

Chapter Five

More Bizarre Interpretations Derived From That Greatest, Old Testament Blunder That Has Thoroughly Permeated Current, Christian Theology

Galatians 3:22,23 and Romans 11:32 Wrongly Interpreted by the God-Looked-Down Theory.

These Popular Interpretations Disregard the Work of Satan.

These Popular Interpretations Disregard the Purpose of God.

These Popular Interpretations Disregard Common Sense.

These Popular Interpretations Disregard the Greek Text.

Index of Scripture References

Index of Greek and Hebrew Words

Glossary of Greek and Hebrew Words

Bibliography

List of Abbreviations

In this volume we insert directly into the text the appropriate abbreviations immediately following any reference to any author whose work is listed here. Then, we insert the page number(s) following the abbreviation. Unless otherwise indicated, all Bible passages are quoted from the King James Version (KJV).

ACC:	An American Commentary on the New Testament
ATR:	A Grammar of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Research
BAG:	A Greek – English Lexicon of the New Testament
DM:	A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament
EGT:	The Expositor’s Greek Testament
FG:	Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans
HC:	Biblico – Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek
HCT:	The Blood Covenant
ISBE:	The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia
JGM:	New Testament for Beginners
JHT:	Greek-English Lexicon of the Greek New Testament
JWV:	Fundamental Greek Grammar
KW:	Weust’s Word Studies
MM:	The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament
MP,III:	Matthew Poole’s Commentary on the Holy Bible
MV:	Vincent’s Word Studies of the New Testament
NID,I:	The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol. I
NID,III:	The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology, Vol. III
NSRB:	The New Scofield Reference Bible
RCT:	Synonyms of the New Testament
RD:	A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament
RE:	Word Meanings of the New Testament
RH:	Romans

RS: Essentials of New Testament Greek

TDNT: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament

TWOT,I: Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, Vol. I

WDC: An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament

WEV: An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words

WHD: Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament

WHAT'VE THEY DONE WITH ABRAHAM'S BLESSINGS?

Somebody, somewhere, has done something with them. You do not hear much said about them. In Volume I, we proved that Abraham's EULOGIA contains health and wealth as well as salvation. We demonstrated that Christians make up the "Membership Roster" of the Abrahamic Seed Group during the Church age and are at present, inheriting the same Abrahamic EULOGIA. We also looked at some "theories" used to escape the unbroken force of Abraham's EULOGIA. In this volume we look at the greatest, theological blunder in all the Old Testament. Then we look at the popular, traditional, Christian, theological system, built upon this greatest theological blunder of Judaism and the bizarre conclusions based upon this theological error.

This section is light, interesting, and easy to read. As you the reader, work your way through it, you will discover the answer to the questions, "What've they done with Abraham's blessings?" To ask the question differently, "Why don't we hear more about the fact that Abraham's blessings of health and wealth are indeed the Christian's Abrahamic inheritance?"

Chapter One

The Denial That Healing and Prosperity Belong To Christians Is Based Upon The Greatest Theological Blunder In Old Testament History.

The promises God made to Abraham (The Abrahamic Covenant) established a peculiar and special relationship between himself (God) and Abraham. These promises alone established this special relationship. He imposed no conditions or prerequisites. He required neither merit nor worthiness on their part. He based their relationship solely upon his grace. God made certain promises to Abraham And his heirs that granted them this privileged position forever.

Four hundred-thirty years later, when the descendants of Abraham numbered over two million, God forged them into a nation under the leadership of Moses. He named this new, fledgling nation "Israel." And the promises God made to Abraham included this nation of his descendants in its provisions and benefits. Even today, these same promises include this nation.

What is the Relationship of Moses' Law to Abraham's Blessings?

Under the leadership of Moses, God gave the Law to this young, special nation to enable them to maintain the flow of blessings granted them in the Abrahamic Promises. The Law of Moses neither originated nor secured this special relationship between God and Israel. God did not institute the Law for this reason. He gave the Law to enable them to maintain and continue the relationship that had been established with Abraham four hundred-thirty years earlier. Nowhere does Scripture teach that the promises to Abraham, which established their relationship to God, have been contradicted, canceled, postponed, replaced, superseded, set aside, or even modified by the Law of Moses or anything else.

The relationship of the Israelite in the Old Testament era to the sacrifices of Moses' Law is (at least in a limited sense) similar in function to the relationship of a Christian to the provisions of 1 John 1:9. The following discussion will make this similarity clear. When a man receives Jesus Christ as his personal Savior, God becomes his Father and the man becomes God's child. This relationship is permanent. When he sins, his fellowship is broken, but not his relationship. God is still his Heavenly Father and he is still his Father's child. The confession of his sin, according to 1 John 1:9, restores the fellowship between them. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just, to forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 John 1:9). Although the fellowship within the preexisting relationship was broken by sin, the relationship itself was not. However, the confession of a believer's sin in accordance with 1 John 1:9 neither originates, secures, nor establishes in any way, a relationship with God. This was established the actual moment of receiving Christ as their personal Savior. The confession serves to maintain the blessings of the preexisting relationship.

The sacrifices of Moses' Law performed the same function for the Israelite that 1 John 1:9 performs for Christians today. Neither the sacrifices nor the Christian's confessions were intended to secure a relationship with God. Both were given to maintain the blessings of a preexisting relationship. For the Israelite, the relationship existed because of the promises made to Abraham. When the Israelite sinned under Moses' Law, he presented the appropriate sacrifice to God. In so doing, he maintained the blessings of the preexisting Abrahamic relationship. The "works of the law," i.e., the prescribed sacrifices were never given to originate, earn, merit, or in any way secure a relationship with God. The sole purpose of the sacrifices were to maintain and continue the blessings established with Abraham and his heirs over four centuries earlier.

Nevertheless, by the time Jesus walked the shores of Galilee, Israel had departed from the original purpose of Moses' Law, i.e., to maintain the Abrahamic blessings. They had disconnected Moses' Law from Abraham's promises. They still claimed Abraham as their father, but his promises had taken a back seat to the Law, which had become their entire religion. They believed they could secure acceptance with God by earning it through keeping the law. By works, they attempted to deserve his favor, forgetting they already had it granted to them by grace in the Abrahamic Covenant. Sadly, Jewish religion had degenerated to a doctrine of works.

The great Jewish mistake, then, lies in their disconnecting the Law of Moses from the promises to Abraham. (In this book, we call this mistake The Great Disconnect Theory.) Having disconnected the two, they attempted to establish their own righteousness by the works of the law, not realizing that "...by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Galatians 2:16). By viewing the Law of Moses as "Dis-Connected" from Abraham, they lost sight of its only purpose: to continue the blessings in the Abrahamic Covenant. They tried to earn what they already possessed. They tried to secure a beachhead on the shores of God's blessings, forgetting that father Abraham had previously planted their flag on it. They no longer realized that they had no need to secure this beachhead. God's gracious promises secured it for them two thousand years before. Their disconnecting Moses' Law from Abraham's Promises is the greatest theological blunder in Old Testament history.

Moses laid the foundation that God gave the Law to maintain the Abrahamic Blessings. He began this foundation by citing the promises to Abraham as the sole reason God delivered the children of Israel from Egypt. Then, with their liberation accomplished, Moses set it in concrete: keeping the Law determined their future participation and continuance in the blessings of Abraham's promises. First, we look at Moses' statements citing the promises as the grounds for the exodus.

Numerous Scriptures cite the promises as the grounds for the Egyptian rescue. God warned Abraham, over four hundred years in advance, about the bondage of his descendants (Genesis 15:13). He also told Abraham that he would free them (v. 16). Later, during their slavery in Egypt, God "...remembered his covenant with Abraham, with Isaac, and with Jacob" (Exodus 2:24), and commissioned Moses to deliver them. In so doing, He identified himself to Moses as "...the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (Exodus 3:6). In like manner, He commanded Moses to "...say unto the children of Israel, the Lord God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob hath sent me unto you..." (Exodus 3:15). He also commanded Moses to call the elders together and reveal his (God's) identity as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exodus 3:16). Then, in Exodus 6:1-8, Moses cited the Abrahamic Covenant as the reason why Pharaoh would be forced to let his people go. In verse 4, God said that he established his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "...to give them the land of Canaan...." In verse 5, God said that he heard their groanings in Egypt and remembered this same covenant. In verse 6, he said that because of this same covenant, he is going to bring them out of Egypt. And, in verse 8, Moses specified this same Abrahamic Covenant as the reason God would shortly bring them into the land which he swore to give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob for an inheritance.

After the deliverance, Moses again cited the promises to Abraham as the reason "...he brought us out from thence, that he might bring us in, to give us the land which he swore unto our fathers." (Deuteronomy 6:23). Finally, Deuteronomy 7:7-8 confirms that God loved them, chose them, and brought them out of Egypt "...because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto

your fathers...." Every Scripture cited above specified the Abrahamic Covenant as the grounds for the deliverance from Egypt.

The preceding discussion established the promises to Abraham as the reason for the exodus. Next, Moses shows that God gave the Law to maintain these same promises that formed the basis for the exodus.

First, Moses said that the Lord had loved them, chose them, and delivered them from Egypt because he would keep the oath (covenant) that he had sworn to their fathers (Deuteronomy 7:7-12). Then, he said that he would continue keeping *the same covenant* and mercy (which formed the reason for the exodus) with them if they loved him and kept the Law. He said, "Know therefore that the Lord thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations" (Deuteronomy 7:9). In verse 12, Moses buttresses this statement, saying that, in the future, God shall continue keeping *the same covenant* and mercy (which formed the reason for the exodus) which he swore unto the fathers if they hearken to the Law, if they keep the Law, and if they do the Law. "Wherefore it shall come to pass, if ye hearken to these judgements, and keep, and do them, that the Lord thy God shall keep unto thee *the covenant* and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers" (Deuteronomy 7:12). These three verses demonstrate that God kept the covenant in the past (v.8); He is keeping on keeping the covenant in the present (v.9); He shall keep on keeping the covenant in the future (v. 12). In addition, Moses made it plain in verses 9 and 12 that obedience to the Law maintains the same covenant EULOGIA (which formed the reason for the exodus) in both the present and the future. In other words, *God gave the Law to maintain the same Sixty Promises-(BARAK-EULOGIA)- Abrahamic Covenant that formed the basis for the exodus.*

Furthermore, verse 8 describes the Abrahamic Covenant as "the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers...", while verse 9 describes the Abrahamic Covenant as the "covenant and mercy...to a thousand generations." (The Psalmist also applied this same term, "to a thousand generations," to the Abrahamic Covenant. In Psalms 105:8-9, he said. "He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac:...") And in verse 12, Moses described the Abrahamic Covenant as "the covenant and the mercy which he sware unto thy fathers." Verse 12 combines "which he sware unto thy fathers" from verse 8 with "the covenant and the mercy" from verse 9. Consequently, this context makes it crystal clear: *Moses declared that the Abrahamic promises that constituted the reason for the deliverance from Egypt are the same promises that obedience to the Law maintains.* The application of the Eight Questions to this passage, links this passage to the Abrahamic Covenant, showing that the "blessings" contained herein and maintained by obedience to Moses' "Law of the covenant," are indeed, derived from the Sixty Promises. In Volume I, *What Are Abraham's Blessings Anyway?*, we cited fifteen Scriptures, after the giving of Moses' "Law of the covenant," which identify specific blessings or EULOGIA. One of those Scriptures was Deuteronomy 7:6-15, cited above. In the following pages, we cite the other fourteen passages from Volume I. We do not name the Abrahamic EULOGIA, but we quote Moses' statements that demonstrate the "blessings" derived from Abraham's promises are maintained by keeping the Law. In Volume I, we asked the reader to apply the *Eight Questions of Scripture Analysis* to all fifteen passages. Consequently, all fifteen citations were traced to the covenant, i.e., all EULOGIA in the fifteen texts derive from Abraham's promises. Listed below are the remaining fourteen contexts showing that the purpose of the Law is the maintenance of Abraham's EULOGIA:

1. Exodus 23:25-33 cites eight covenant blessings ascribed to Abraham's promises. And concerning these eight blessings, Moses said that if "Thou shalt not bow down to their gods, nor serve them, nor do after their works: but thou shalt utterly overthrow them, and quite break down their images" (v.24). "And ye shall serve the Lord your God..." (v.25), then the eight Abrahamic "blessings" will be maintained. In other words, the continuance of Abraham's blessings is contingent upon their keeping Moses' "Law of the covenant."
2. Leviticus 26:4-12 cites twenty-three blessings attributed to the Abrahamic Covenant. Concerning these twenty-three Abrahamic blessings, Moses said that, "If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them:..." (v.3), then the twenty-three "blessings" derived from Abraham's promises will continue. To put it differently, obedience to the Law maintains the blessings of Abraham.
3. Deuteronomy 28:1-14 lists twenty-seven Abrahamic blessings concerning which Moses declared that "...it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day...and shalt not go aside from any of the words which I command thee this day, to the right hand or the left, to go after other gods to serve them," then the twenty-seven Abrahamic blessings shall be maintained. In other words, obedience to the Law maintains the blessings of Abraham.
4. In Deuteronomy 4:40, Moses said, "Thou shalt keep therefore his statutes, and his commandments, which I command thee this day,..." to maintain the Abrahamic blessings of going well with them and their children, and prolonging their days.
5. In Deuteronomy 5:32-33, Moses cried, "Ye shall observe to do therefore as the Lord your God hath commanded you: ye shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left. Ye shall walk in all the ways which the Lord your God hath commanded you,..." In so doing, they would maintain the "blessings" of Abraham.
6. In Deuteronomy 6:1-3, Moses stated that they could maintain the covenant blessings if "...thou mightest fear the Lord thy God, to keep all his statutes and his commandments, which I command thee, thou, thou, and thy son, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life:..."
7. Moses further stated that "Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes, which he hath commanded thee. And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord:..." (Deuteronomy 6:17-18). In so doing, they would maintain the Abrahamic blessings.
8. In addition, Moses said, "All the commandments which I command thee this day shall ye observe to do,..." (Deuteronomy 8:1) in order to maintain the covenant blessings.
9. The covenant blessings could be maintained only if "...thou shalt keep the commandments of the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to fear him" (Deuteronomy 8:6).
10. But, not only would their enjoyment of the covenant blessings be interrupted, they would also perish as a people if they disobeyed Moses' "Law of the covenant." Moses confirms this statement in Deuteronomy 8:19-20. He said, "It shall be, if thou do at all forget the Lord thy God, and walk after other gods, and serve them, and worship them, I testify against you this day that ye shall surely perish. As the nations which the Lord destroyeth

before your face, so shall ye perish; because ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God."

11. Since God gave no other way to maintain the blessings of Abraham, Moses further declares that, "Therefore shall ye keep all the commandments which I command you this day,..." (Deuteronomy 11:8-9).
12. And since God gave the Law to enable the Abrahamic Seed Group, before the time of Christ, to maintain the Abrahamic blessings, Moses said "...ye shall hearken diligently unto my commandments which I command you this day, to love the Lord your God, and to serve him with all your heart and with all your soul..." (Deuteronomy 11:13-15).
13. The purpose of Moses' Law was the maintenance of Abraham's blessings. Therefore, Moses wrote, "...ye shall lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, that they may be as frontlets between your eyes. And ye shall teach them to your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt write them upon the door posts of thine house and upon thy gates..." (Deuteronomy 11:18-21). Consequently, they could maintain the Abrahamic blessings.
14. Finally, since God gave the Law to maintain the blessings of Abraham, they must "Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them..." (Deuteronomy 29:9); Otherwise, the flow of Abraham's blessings cease until the proper sacrifice is made.

A complete exposition of the Law is beyond the scope of this work since we confine our discussion to its purpose: God gave the Law to maintain the promises he made to Abraham. But, a question naturally arises from this discussion – namely – If the Law maintains the promises to Abraham, how does it do it?

In Deuteronomy 6:20, Moses framed the same question: "And when thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgements, which the Lord our God hath commanded you?" Then, in verse 24, he answered the question. He said the testimonies, the statutes and the judgements are "...for our good always that he might preserve us alive as it is at this day." The "good" that the Law "preserved them alive" to receive, as we saw previously, was the EULOGIA of the Abrahamic Covenant. In other words, the Law was to "preserve them" so that they could continue receiving the Abrahamic blessings. The Law "preserved them alive," to receive the blessings in three basic ways. First, the regulations concerning their diet preserved their health, both as individuals and as a nation, so that sickness would not lessen their number. Second, the restrictions against mingling with the Gentile nations in the region preserved them against their being assimilated into foreign cultures and disappearing as a national entity. Third, the Ten Commandments preserved them against the wrath of God, in that it taught them what constituted sin against both man and God. Actually, a violation of any rule in any of the three categories described above constituted a sin.

Finally, God instituted the sacrificial system for use when any violation (sin) occurred in any of the above categories. The Law prescribed a specific kind of sacrifice for each violation. When they presented the specific, prescribed sacrifice to God, the violation was temporarily covered and the blessings of Abraham continued.

Disobedience to the Law resulted in the total loss of the covenant blessings, including the land (Deuteronomy 4:25-28). But a return to God and obedience to the Law restored the covenant

blessings. Moses said as much in Deuteronomy 4:30-31, "When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, even in the latter days, if thou turn to the Lord thy God, and shalt be obedient to his voice (For the Lord thy God is a merciful God), he will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which he swore unto them." In other words, a return to obedience to the Law would restore the blessings of "the covenant of thy fathers which he swore unto them."

The Apostle Paul Supports Moses' View of the Relationship of the Law to Abraham's Blessings

The apostle Paul supports this view. In Galatians chapter 3, he proves that God gave the Law to maintain the blessings in the Abrahamic Covenant. He does this in three ways (See Volume I): **(1)** He said that the Law did not set aside, disannul, or make of none effect the promises to Abraham. **(2)** He demonstrated the continuing force of the promises due to the New Testament era. **(3)** He concludes by showing us five distinct things about the relationship of the Law to the Abrahamic Covenant:

1. The Law is an act of grace.
2. As an act of his grace, God made the Law a part of the Abrahamic Covenant without changing, even slightly, the terms or the duration of the Abrahamic Covenant,
3. Added to the covenant, the Law functioned as their fortified defense, protecting the children of Israel against any possible loss of the Abrahamic blessings.
4. He shows precisely how the Law protects them against loss of the Abrahamic blessings.
5. He shows how long the Law performs this protective function.

We said previously that the promises of Abraham were an act of God's grace. Paul agrees. He said, "God gave it (the inheritance) to Abraham by promise" (Galatians 3:18). "Gave" in verse 18 is the translation of *KARIS*, the Greek word for "grace." Literally, God "graced" the inheritance to Abraham by promise. But, is the Law also an act of grace? Yes. In verse 19, Paul said that the Law "...was added (to the Abrahamic Covenant) because of transgressions..." (Galatians 3:19). The word "transgressions" tells why God added it. "Transgressions" is the translation of the Greek word *PARABAINO*; the combination of *PARA*, which means "by the side of" (from which comes the English word parallel) and *BAINO*, which means "to go." Jointly, they mean "a going aside," hence "transgressions." Therefore, God added the Law to the promises because of the "goings aside" or the transgressions of the children of Israel.

The expression "because of" in verse 19, denotes that the addition of the Law to Abraham's promises was an act of grace. "Be cause of" is the translation of the accusative case form of the same Greek word *KARIS*, meaning "grace," and translated "gave" in verse 18. *KARIS*, in this form, occurs nine times in the Greek New Testament. It is translated "wherefore" two times, "because of" two times, "for this cause" three times, "for the sake of" once, and "to speak" once. In every occurrence, this word designates a benevolence, a benefit, a favor (grace) for the one to whom it is directed.

The following list contains all occurrences of this form of *KARIS* in the Greek New Testament. Each occurrence contains a benefit or a grace directed to someone in the verse. And in

each occurrence, the benefit is conveyed by this form of the word KARIS. The readers may study each passage at their leisure.

In Luke 7:47, the woman directed the benefit of being loved much to Jesus because he forgave her many sins. In Ephesians 3:1, Paul aimed the benefit of his being Christ's prisoner to the Gentiles since God included them in the Church: the historic unfoldment of the Abrahamic Covenant. In Ephesians 3:14, Paul pointed his graceful act of bowing his knees to God because he made the Gentiles fellow-heirs with the Jews in the Abrahamic Promises. The younger women who deviated from Paul's instructions potentially directed a benefit to the Adversary in 1 Timothy 5:14. Paul directed the benefit of leaving Titus in Crete to ordain elders, and set things in order, to the various churches in Titus 1:5. In Titus 1:11, those who teach for money receive the benefit. In 1 John 3:12, Cain directs to himself the advantage gained from murdering his brother. In Jude 16, the benefit is directed to those who admire certain men, believing it to prove profitable to them. In Galatians 3:19, God directs the benefit (grace) to those who committed the "goings aside."

In other words, the transgressions of the people drew forth an act of grace on the part of a loving, caring God. Consequently, he added the Law to the promises to "preserve them alive" and enable them to maintain the blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant. The inheritance was "graced" by promise in verse 18. The Law was "graced" in verse 19. In a subsequent chapter, we demonstrate that the Law is by no means a "...ministration of death" (2 Corinthians 3:6). It was an act of God's grace.

As an act of his grace, God made the Law part of the Abrahamic Covenant, combining them. But this combination, this attachment, caused no rearrangement in the terms of the promises. Rather, this addition of the Law functioned as the guardian of the promises, guaranteeing their continuance for the children of Israel. And this, in spite of their "goings aside."

However, Paul's statement in verse 19, that the Law was added to the promises, contradicts his statement in verse 15. There, he said that a confirmed covenant could not be "added to" without the express consent of all parties. But, in verse 19, he states that the Law "...was added because of the transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made,..." (Galatians 3:19). Since Abraham died centuries before God added the Law to the covenant, obviously if he gave his approval for this addition, Scripture provides no record of it. We must conclude then, that God added the Law to the covenant without the approval of Abraham. (See Volume I.)

Therefore, verse 19 contradicts everything Paul said in verse 15. How can he say in one breath that a confirmed covenant cannot be "added to" without the express consent of both parties, and in the next breath say that God "added" the Law to the covenant four hundred-thirty years later without the permission of Abraham? How then, do we resolve this contradiction?

The resolution lies in this: Paul used two different Greek words in verses 15 and 19, both of which translate by the English word "add." He uses EPIDIATASSO in verse 15, which we noted previously, means "to rearrange," but he uses PROSTITHEMI in verse 19. This word combines PROS, meaning "to," with TITHEMI, which means "to put." Joined together, PROSTITHEMI means "to put to," i.e., "to put something to something;" hence, "add." Paul's use of two different words differentiates between what he meant in verse 15 and what he meant in verse 19. The following examples from the Greek New Testament make this difference in meaning clear.

In Luke 17:5, "...the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith." "Increase" is the translation of PROSTITHEMI. They asked Jesus for more faith to be added to the faith they already possessed. They asked for more "faith" to be put with the "faith" they had. They are not asking for the faith they have to be "rearranged," (EPIDIATASSO) so that it no longer resembles its original condition.

In Luke 20:11, we read that, "...again, he sent another servant and they beat him also..." "Again" is the translation of PROSTITHEMI. He sent the first servant in verse 10. In verse 11, he adds to the list of servants whom he had sent. And in verse 12, he adds yet another servant to the list of "sent" servants, sending three in all. He adds servant to servant to servant, i.e., PROSTITHEMI. He adds the same thing to the same thing; he adds servant to servant, equaling more of the same thing, more servants. He does not "rearrange" (EPIDIATASSO) the nature or the classification of the sent group, (i.e., he does not add presidents, kings, soldiers, etc.). Adding these, the classification would be rearranged. But he confines the classification to servants: he just adds more servants.

In these two examples, the difference emerges between EPIDIATASSO and PROSTITHEMI. The first means to "rearrange" the original by imposing upon it something not present in the original. The latter means simply "to put to" the original more of its own essence or substance. PROSTITHEMI does not "rearrange" by changing the substance or classification. It adds two or more of the same things together, making the total greater but not different. EPIDIATASSO, on the other hand, rearranges the original, making it different but not necessarily more. In conclusion, EPIDIATASSO rearranges, PROSTITHEMI adds, yet causes no rearrangement.

All occurrences of PROSTITHEMI in the Greek New Testament demonstrate this difference between the two words. Note the following examples: "...he proceeded further to take Peter also..." (Acts 12:3). "Proceeded further" is the translation of PROSTITHEMI. Herod had already vexed some disciples. Now, he adds Peter to the list of vexed disciples. The classification is not rearranged from disciples to sailors (EPIDIATASSO). Peter, the disciple, is added to the other disciples previously vexed. In Acts 13:36, "David...was laid unto his fathers,..." "Was laid" is the translation of PROSTITHEMI. David was "added to" His ancestors in death. The dead, being added to the dead, caused no rearrangement, just more of the same. Hebrews 12:19 states, "...which voice they heard entreated that the word should not be spoken to them any more:..." PROSTITHEMI is translated "spoken to any more." They wanted no more words "added to" the words they had previously heard.

In Luke 17:5, faith was added to faith (PROSTITHEMI). In Luke 20:11-12, servants were added to servants (PROSTITHEMI). In Acts 12:3, disciples were added to disciples (PROSTITHEMI). In Acts 13:36, the dead was added to the dead (PROSTITHEMI). In Hebrews 12:19, words were added to words. In each case cited above, the things added were always more of the same, never rearranging the original nature or classification.

Various writers used PROSTITHEMI eighteen times in the Greek New Testament. They always used it to add two or more of the same substances, things, etc. They never used it to add different things causing a rearrangement. There are no exceptions. Below is a brief examination of the remaining occurrences of this word in the Greek New Testament. Cubit is added to cubit (Matthew 6:27). The possession of things shall be added to your possession of things (Matthew 6:33). Measure is added to their measure (Mark 4:24). Evil is added to evil (Luke 3:20). Things shall be added to their possession Of things (Luke 12:31). Spoken things are added to spoken things (Luke 19:11). Souls were added to souls (Acts 2:41). The ones being saved are added to

the ones already saved (Acts 2:47). Believers were added to believers as members of the Lord's body (Acts 5:14). Much people were added to the Lord's people (Acts 11:24).

In the Greek New Testament, the use of PROSTITHEMI causes no change of substance, i.e., rearrangement in the things being added together. In the statement, "Apples plus apples equal more apples," no rearrangement occurs in the nature of the original apples. But, in the statement "Apples plus oranges equal *fruit*," the nature of the things being added (oranges), is different from the nature of the original (apples). A new condition (oranges) has been imposed upon the original (apples), thereby causing a rearrangement, *fruit*. No New Testament writer used PROSTITHEMI in this manner. EPIDIATASSO was used to add oranges to apples.

Paul's use of EPIDIATASSO, comparing a "man's" covenant and the Promise covenant, demonstrates that neither covenant could be rearranged (adding oranges to apples) without the consent of all parties. Abraham died before the Law was added and couldn't consent to a rearrangement. Therefore, Paul did not use EPIDIATASSO in Galatians 3:19 for the simple reason that Without Abraham's consent the Law could not and did not rearrange the terms of the promises. Rather, he used PROSTITHEMI, which adds two or more of the same things together, meaning more of the same. We must conclude then, that the Law of Moses and the Abrahamic Covenant are, in some way, the same thing, since they are added together, i.e., PROSTITHEMI. In what way then are these two entities separated in time by four hundred years the same?

We determined previously that both the covenant and the Law are the same in essence; they are both an act of grace. In addition, we can now conclude that they are the same in purpose. The covenant granted blessings to Abraham and his heirs. The Law guaranteed the same blessings to the same group. God added it to preserve the heirs, enabling them to maintain the blessings of the covenant, even when they sinned (Deuteronomy 6:24). Upon sinning, the presentation of the proper sacrifice guaranteed the continuance of the covenant blessings. The Law enabled the people to maintain the blessings. As such, both are identical in purpose, i. e., both deliver the promises in the Abrahamic Covenant. The covenant delivers by grant. The Law delivers the blessings of this same grant by preservation and maintenance. Where then, does the foregoing discussion lead us?

It leads us to this: the Law of Moses was not disconnected from the Abrahamic Covenant as the Jews of Jesus' day believed. If the addition of the Law to the covenant had set it aside in anyway, had it rearranged it only slightly, had it unauthorized it in the least, Paul would have used EPIDIATASSO in verse 19. This word, would have indeed demonstrated that the Law was disconnected and separate from the promises. But, Paul's use of PROSTITHEMI, adding as it does the same things together, refutes the Jewish error, The Great Disconnect Theory. The Law of Moses was not disconnected from the Abrahamic Covenant. They became, temporarily at least, one and the same in both essence and purpose, i.e., the covenant granted the blessings and the Law guaranteed them.

Summarizing to this point, Paul made seven decisive statements about the relationship of Moses' Law to Abraham's Covenant.

1. He said both are an act of God's grace. (How can an act of grace be a "ministration of death?")
2. His use of the Greek Perfect Tense emphasized the continuing force of the Abrahamic Covenant in the New Testament era. (See Volume I.)

3. His use of ATHETEO demonstrated that the Law did not set the covenant aside. (See Volume I.)
4. His use of EPIDIATASSO declares that the Law did not rearrange the terms of the covenant. (See Volume I.)
5. His use of AKURAO stated that the Law did not unauthorize the covenant. (See Volume I.)
6. His use of KATARGEO thundered that the Law did not reduce the covenant in rank so that it no longer works for the benefit of the heirs of the promise. (See Volume I.)
7. His use of PROSTITHEMI (adding the same together) denoted that the Law and the Promises are one and the same in essence (grace) and purpose (delivering the blessings of the covenant).

Added to the covenant, the Law functioned as a fortified defense, protecting the children of Israel against any possible loss of the blessings promised them through Abraham. Paul describes this fortified defense in Galatians 3:23. He said, "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." "We were kept" is the translation of FRUREO, the noun form of which means fort or garrison. The verb form used here, means "fortified" or "garrisoned." This is a military term used to express defense, security, or protection. Paul used this word in 2 Corinthians 11:32 describing the governor's turning of Damascus into an armed camp to prevent the loss of his fugitive. "In Damascus the governor...kept the city with a garrison...." "Kept with a garrison" is the translation of FRUREO. He used it again in Philippians 4:7, saying, "The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus." "Shall keep," here, is the translation of FRUREO. He means that God's peace shall put a garrison around their hearts and minds, holding them steady, stable, and fortified. Peter used it to reassure Christians that God's power keeps, garrisons, fortifies, and protects them. He said that Christians "...are kept by the power of God...." "Kept" is the translation of FRUREO. The above examples demonstrate that FRUREO means a fortified defense. And in Galatians 3:23, God made the Law their fortified defense and placed the heirs of promise under its protection. As such, the Law, God's act of grace, defended them against any possible loss of the Abrahamic blessings, even when they sinned. This defense was an act of pure grace, not a "ministration of death."

In addition, "shut up" in verse 23 is the translation of SUGKLEIO which means "enclosed on all four sides." Luke used this word in Luke 5:6 when Jesus instructed the disciples to let their nets down. And, when they did, "...they inclosed (SUGKLEIO) a great multitude of fishes..." The fish were shut up or enclosed on all four sides in the net. Paul's use of FRUREO and SUGKLEIO indicates two things. God made the Law a fortress, as it were, to protect, defend, and secure the heirs against any possible loss of the covenant blessings, even when they sinned. Then, by his gracious act, he completely enclosed them on all four sides within this fortress of defense and protection, not leaving them exposed and unprotected in any way. In Luke 5:6, the fish were enclosed in the fish net. In Galatians 3:23, the heirs were completely enclosed on all four sides in the protection net of the Law. Nothing, including their transgressions, could penetrate that defensive enclosure and deprive them of their promised blessings.

Since God's act of grace made the Law their fortified defense and completely enclosed them within it, how does the Law guard them against losing the blessings when they transgress? Put another way, how does the Law maintain the blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant for them

even when they sin? Paul answered this question in Galatians 3:24. He said, "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster...." The Law maintained the blessings for them when they sinned by functioning as their schoolmaster. "Schoolmaster" is the translation of PAIS, meaning "boy" or "child," plus AGO meaning "to lead." The combination then means "child-leader." Paul used the word in 1 Corinthians 4:15. "For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers...." "Instructors" is the translation of PAISAGO, which means instructor, trainer, teacher, or schoolmaster. The Law defended them against any possible loss of their blessings by giving them certain instructions as a schoolmaster, teacher, trainer, or leader.

What composed these instructions and how could these instructions fortify them against the loss of EULOGIA? The Law (instructions) taught them what constituted sin. It taught them what God required of them on the one hand, and what he prohibited them from on the other. These commands and prohibitions were "for their good, always" (Deuteronomy 6:24).

The teachings of the Law, however, did not stop with commands and prohibitions. The instructions included provisions for a complete sacrificial system to be utilized by them when they sinned. The teachings included complete directions concerning which sacrifice they must make for each kind of sin, when to make it, where to make it, and how to make it. When they broke a command or prohibition, the presentation of the prescribed sacrifice for that specific violation caused God to defer judgement against them. With the judgement deferred, they maintained the blessings. Failure to make the prescribed sacrifices, however, interrupted the blessings then and there. This shut off lasted until their repentance showed by resuming the prescribed sacrifices.

This gracious protection by the Law against loss of the blessings was temporary. It lasted "until the seed (Jesus) should come" (Galatians 3:19). It lasted unto "...the faith which should afterwards be revealed" (Galatians 3:23). It lasted "...unto Christ..." (Galatians 3:24). "Until" in verse 19 is the translation of AKRIS, the regular Greek word for "until." "Unto" in verses 23 and 24 is the translation of EIS. This word is used to express the duration of time or to set limits to time in Matthew 6:34; 21:19; Luke 1:20; 1:50; 12:19; 13:9; Acts 13:42; Philippians 1:10; 2 Timothy 1:12; Hebrews 7:3; and 1 Peter 1:11. EIS in Galatians 3:23 and 24 should be translated "until." Paul defines the relationship of the Law to Abraham's Covenant as temporary. He emphasized, three times, that their enclosure under the fortress of the Law would last until the faith should be revealed, and the schoolmaster function of the Law would last until Christ appeared. Christ's death terminated the Law forever.

The preceding discussion reveals no difference between Paul's view of the relationship of the Law to the Abrahamic Covenant and Moses' view. Both inspired writers declare that God gave the Law for the heirs of promise to maintain the blessings of the covenant with Abraham. Why then does Paul call the law a "ministration of death" in 2 Corinthians 3:7? For the answer, see the next chapter.

In addition, the next chapter shows how current, conservative, Christian theology has accepted as fact this great Jewish theological blunder of disconnecting Moses' Law from the Abrahamic Blessings. Current, conservative, Christian theology has not only accepted The Great Disconnect Theory as fact, but they use this same error as the basis for their theological system, building interpretations of Scripture upon this error. In so doing, the Church moves herself further away from Abraham. This is so because the basis of her theological system is itself disconnected from Abraham. Once disconnected, the Abrahamic EULOGIA of health and wealth soon became forgotten. And we Christians even forget that we are the "Seed Group" of Abraham. When we do remember it, what difference does it make? We are part of a theological system that, because of

error, has no part in Abraham's EULOGIA. Abraham is, in current Christian thought, nothing but a fuzzy, nebulous example of faith. We call this current, Christian theological system the God-Looked-Down Theory, and show in the next chapter how this theory separates the Church from Abraham.

Before leaving this chapter, may we say that "the proof is in the pudding"? The answers to the following two questions attest that most Christians do not know that Moses' Law was given to maintain the Abrahamic blessings. Did you, the reader, know the real purpose of the Law? Most do not. How many sermons or Sunday school lessons have you heard which declared that Moses' Law was given to maintain Abraham's blessings? Probably not very many. Were these sermons and lessons based on The Great Disconnect Theory?

Chapter Two

Current, Christian Theology Built An Interpretive System Upon The Greatest Theological Blunder In Old Testament History, Which Strips Away From Christians The Abrahamic Blessing of Healing And Prosperity

The great mistake of Judaism was the "dis-connecting" of Moses' Law from Abraham's promises. They lost sight of the scriptural reason for the giving of the Law and its attendant sacrifices. They came to view the Law, not as an act of grace to enable them to maintain the blessings promised them through Abraham, but as a system of works, whereby they might approach God and secure his blessings. Unfortunately, the Church has established its theology upon this error, The Great Disconnect Theory, and sees herself also "disconnected" from Abraham. This can be demonstrated from the reader's own frame of reference. When you, the reader, hear the term Judaism, what do you think of? Most think of Moses, the Law, and the sacrifices. If we think of Abraham at all, we think of him primarily as our example of faith. We see him as a man whose faith we would do well to pattern ours after.

But, do we think of the promises of prosperity and good health promised him by God as being our inheritance also? Unfortunately, most of us do not. Why? Because we are the product of a wellmeaning but flawed theology that is based upon The Great Disconnect Theory. Consequently, it is a theology which is itself disconnected from Abraham. In this work, we call this disconnected theology, The God-Looked-Down Theory, and its description, frankly goes something like this: "One day, God looked down from heaven and saw that Judaism was not working the way he thought it should. He saw the people breaking the Law of Moses right and left...and they were not making the sacrifices in the right spirit either...if they made them at all. So he said to himself, "I'm going to set me up a brand-new religion...something that's entirely new...a religion the world has never seen before. I'll name it after my Son. I'll call this new religion Christianity. I'll send my Son to fulfill the Law of Moses and he will be the final sacrifice for sin.

Other than his final sacrifice for sin, there will be nothing in my new religion that even resembles Judaism, my old religion. Sure, I inserted some prophecies in the Old Testament to alert the people that I was sending a Messiah. And yes, I worded those prophecies in such a way that the Jews would be looking for a Jewish king. But, that's not the way my new religion will be. I'll throw out everything pertaining to Judaism but one...my Son will be the final sacrifice for sin and fulfill the Law of Moses forever. By his sacrifice, everybody, Jew and Gentile, can be saved. The vehicle of my new religion, this new Christianity, I'm going to name the Church. From now on, the Church will be my brand new covenant. And since I have now set up a brand new covenant, I'm going to throw out all my promises to give the Jews the land of Palestine forever. Over one thousand times the *word* give is used in my Old Testament, the preponderance of which pertains to my giving Palestine to the Jews. But, no matter. All that's over now. That doesn't count any more. After all, I've set myself up a new religion, a brand new covenant, and called it Christianity.

They don't need to think that I'm obligated to heal their sickness anymore. Sure, I promised them that if they would keep the Law of Moses, or make the appropriate sacrifices if they broke it, I'd be their healer and take all sickness away from them. But, I'm not going to worry myself about keeping this promise. After all, I've got myself a new religion now. If they get sick, they will just have to pray, "If it be thy will," please heal me. Then, I'll check my will out and see if I happen to want to heal them.

My new religion is going to be based on poverty too. No matter that I promised the Jews that I'd prosper them and bless everything they set their hands to. No matter that I promised to bless their land, barns, fields, and cattle. Why, everybody ought to know that they can be a better Christian if they are extremely poor anyway.

My new religion will save their souls, but it will take away their land, their security in the land, their prosperity, and their healing. This is enough to do for anybody. Anyone who is grateful at all should be content to be saved from hell and let well enough alone concerning the rest. This is my new religion, my brand new covenant, called the Church and Christianity. And, if those Jews want to be saved from hell, they are going to have to forget everything in their old religion and join the Church and get baptized like everybody else!"

Is it any wonder that a Jew looks at a Christian as if he is insane when we witness to him about his new "superior religion" called Christianity? The Jew at least thought he had the blessings of salvation, land, security in the land, health, and prosperity promised by Moses if he kept the Law and its attendant sacrifices. He cut himself off from the above promises when he disconnected Moses from Abraham, but he still thought he had them. He based his thought upon The Great Disconnect Theory, still thinking, however wrongly, that he could secure the blessings listed above by obedience to Moses' Law.

The God-Looked-Down Theory of the Church corrects this error, this doctrine of works, but in correcting it, all the Jew is granted is the salvation of his soul. But, this "brand new religion" takes away his land, security in the land, health, and prosperity and doesn't replace it. The God-Looked-Down Theory doesn't replace it because this theory, also, views the Church as disconnected from Abraham, unaware that only through Abraham can the above blessings be realized. If The God-Looked-Down Theory of the Church is correct, we would all be better off if we were Jews under Moses, maintaining the blessings of Abraham by making the appropriate sacrifice when we've sinned, since those who did so were saved (Romans 3:25-26; Hebrews 9:15). And salvation of the soul is all The God-Looked-Down Theory gives the members of the Church at this present hour. But according to the Abrahamic Covenant, in addition to the salvation of their soul, the Jews also had the promised land, security in the land, health, and prosperity guaranteed to them.

The "superiority" of this view of Christianity is not "superior." Judaism offered more, much more. The obedient Jew, standing before the altar of old, an ax in one hand and the warm body of a sacrificial animal in the other hand, his clothes drenched with the blood still spurting from the freshly made wounds, was better off in many ways than a member of The God-Looked-Down Theory Church today. Why? He was as saved from hell as any Christian today, but he also had the temporal blessings of Deuteronomy 7:12-26 and Deuteronomy 28:1-14 going for him. The God-Looked-Down Theory, however, takes it all away from him. Neither does this theory grant these blessings to the Church today.

Consequently, we are forced in our "superior, new religion" to pray, "If it be thy will" concerning sickness or financial needs. Then, when God checks the agenda for "his will" for that day, and perhaps, makes a decision to help us (based on nobody knows what), then so be it. Otherwise, we must content ourselves with being raped, plundered, ravaged, and devastated by the Devil.

And we wonder why it is so hard for a Jew to become a Christian. The God-Looked-Down Theory has taken his land, his security in his land, his healing, and his prosperity. It grants

him salvation for his soul. But, he at least thought he had that anyway. No wonder it is difficult to win the Jews (God's chosen people, his people beloved above all people) to Christ as their Messiah, Savior, and Lord.

This volume demonstrates that the Church is not disconnected from Abraham and the promises made to Abraham are valid today and are her rightful inheritance not in the sweet by and by, but now while we need help with bills and illnesses. But first, why was The God-Looked-Down Theory concocted to start with? What is its theological foundation?

Based Upon That Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, Current Christian Theology (Which Strips Away From Christians the Abrahamic Blessings of Healing and Prosperity) Perches Precariously Upon Three More Great Errors

The God-Looked-Down Theory perches precariously upon three things: **(1)** the New Testament writers' reaction to the great Jewish theological blunder: The Great Disconnect Theory. **(2)** a misunderstanding of the term "new" in "new covenant" as meaning "new in time," when in fact it does not mean "new in time" or, as we would say, "brand new," **(3)** a misunderstanding of Jeremiah's expression "will make" in his statement, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel...." The God-Looked-Down Theory interprets "will make" as the equivalent of "start up" when in fact "will make" means the opposite, or "to bring to completion."

In this chapter, we look at the first "theological footing": the reaction of the New Testament writers to The Great Disconnect Theory. In chapter three, we look at the confusion about what "new" really means. And, in chapter four, we clear up the misunderstanding of "will make."

The First Great Error Upon Which This Current, Christian Theology of Denial Perches Precariously, is Misunderstanding the Threefold Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder

Now, we look at the first "theological footing" of The God-Looked-Down Theory, which is the reaction of the New Testament writers to that colossal, Jewish blunder of separating God's Law from Abraham's covenant on the one hand, and setting up the law on the other hand as a system of salvation by works. Just exactly how did they react to this salvation-by-works of the law heresy? They reacted in three basic ways: **(1)** the tremendous amount of space devoted in the New Testament to the overthrow of the salvation-by-works heresy, **(2)** the urgency with which they presented their case, and **(3)** the language they used as they attempted to replace this error with the truth that salvation is all of grace by faith. When these things are fixed firmly in the mind, i.e., the space taken up in the New Testament with combating The Great Disconnect Theory, the desperate urgency with which the New Testament writers press the war, combined with the proper categorizing of the language they used, the true nature of The God-Looked-Down Theory looms before us: it is a house of cards built on sand.

The First Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, is Demonstrated by the Great Amount of Space in the New Testament They Devoted to Its Overthrow

The first reaction of the new testament writers to the heresy of salvation by works of the Law is demonstrated by the tremendous amount of space they devoted to its overthrow in the pages of the New Testament. Verse after verse, page after page of the New Testament is consumed with one purpose: to correct The Great Disconnect error of attempting to attain

Salvation and blessings by works of the law. To correct this error of salvation by works of the law and replace it with salvation by grace is the all-consuming concern of the New Testament writers. The teachings of both Jesus and Paul demonstrate this fact.

The teachings of Jesus concerning the law were negative in many instances. They had to be negative because his was a message given to correct their Great Disconnect Theory of the law. He never repudiated the scriptural purpose of the Law (the Law was given as an act of grace to guard them against the loss of the Abrahamic blessings), but his messages concerning the law attempted to correct the perversion of making the law a religion of salvation and blessing by works. On numerous occasions he said, "Ye have heard that it hath been said...but I say unto you..." He would explain to them the error of what they had heard about the purpose of the law, and then correct it by quoting the correct Scripture to them. By this combination, "Ye have heard...but I say unto you..." he bathed their error in the floodlight of the true, actual purpose of the Law.

The major passages in the New Testament in which Jesus corrected their perversions of the law are Matthew 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; and Luke 6:1-5; in which he corrected their view of the Sabbath. And he continues his Sabbath corrections in Matthew 12:9-14; Mark 3:1-6; and Luke 6:6-11. The first three Scriptures listed above correct the criticism of the Pharisees concerning the picking of grain by Jesus' disciples on the Sabbath. The second three Scriptures correct their view that healing or "doing good" on the Sabbath is unlawful.

Their view of the law was cold, legalistic, to the letter. Jesus corrects this in Matthew 23:23-24 and Luke 11:42-44. He taught them the weightier matters of the law: love, justice, mercy, and faith. In the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:17-48), he said he came to fulfill both the law and the prophets, not to abolish them. He had no problem with the Law in its scriptural purpose, function, and result. But he spent a big part of his public Ministry correcting the mistakes of The Great Disconnect Theory.

When Saul of Tarsus became Paul the Apostle, more than any other man he carried the war into the front lines of the enemy. He waged war against the Jewish view of salvation by works until silenced by death. The major passages in which Paul wrote to combat The Great Disconnect Theory are Romans 3:20-21, in which Paul shows a righteousness of God based upon faith like Abraham's which has nothing to do with the Law; Romans 6:14, in which he maintains that the law has no more dominion, even as a protector of the blessings, since Jesus, the Seed, has come; Romans 7:4-6, in which he states that we are released from the law; Romans 8:2-4, in which he shows the law is powerless to enable human nature to do the works of the law; Romans 9:31-32 declares that Israel had not righteousness by following the law because righteousness can only be attained by faith; Romans 10:5-13 shows faith righteousness is easier to attain than law righteousness; 2 Corinthians 3:6-11, in which he sees the law as the letter that kills; and Galatians 3:10-14, declaring that those trying to be saved by works of the law are accursed.

In every passage, Paul makes corrections to Jewish thinking concerning their severance of the law from the Abrahamic Promises. He boldly declares that without the link-up between the two, the law, rather than an act of grace to maintain the flow of blessings, has become an instrument of death.

The Second Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, is Demonstrated by the Urgency With Which They Fought the War Against It

The war of salvation by grace versus The Great Disconnect Theory of salvation by works of the law, was for Paul, more than "words and theological clichés." He viewed with alarm the eternal damnation of his brethren, the Jews. He saw that their great error had dragged them into hell by the millions down through the centuries. The Great Disconnect Theory had become, for the Jews, the doorway to hell and must be closed at all costs. Although called to the Gentiles, Paul never forgot his brethren according to the flesh. He knew that as long as they followed The Great Disconnect Theory, they had no hope of salvation forever. He said "That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites:..." (Romans 9:2-4).

While reading his words, one can feel the urgency, the desperation that Paul felt. His countrymen were in desperate straits and didn't realize it. Paul ferociously lunged into the war with both his preaching and his pen. With all the energies he could bring to bear, he never drew back from the conflict. He tried as hard as any man to shut this doorway to hell. With word and pen, he replaced error with truth. He tore into the error of salvation by works like a savage. His fixation, with its overthrow, was like that of a crazy man. No matter how fiercely the battle raged, Paul never asked for a time out, nor did he give one. He fought on. He fought on until his body was severely damaged by the scars that battle inflicted upon him. He asked Jesus three times for deliverance, and he fought on.

When the battle scars were caused by a shipwreck in the deep, he accepted it and fought on. When the battle scars were inflicted by flesh-tearing whips, he never flinched; he fought on. When thrown into prison, he gazed at the bars that bound him and sang praises to God at midnight; he fought on. He called it the sufferings of Christ which must be filled up in his body. Perils caused by waters, robbers, Jews, or Gentiles never stopped him; he fought on. Perils in the city, in the wilderness, on the sea, or among false brethren never shook him; he fought on. Weariness, painfulness, watchings, hunger, thirst, fastings, cold, and nakedness never floored him; he fought on.

This error, this doorway to hell, must be closed for his brethren. No matter how the scars of battle damaged his own body, he must close this doorway to hell. Paul, more than any man, fought on. He declared a Holy War that screams from the pages of the New Testament..."the doorway to hell must be closed...no matter what the cost...the doorway to hell must be closed!" More than any other man, the Apostle Paul pressed the attack and sounded the battle cry: "The doorway to hell must be closed at all costs!" He fought on! He battled every enemy and carried in his person the scars of it. He fought the Great Error of Judaism until death stilled his hand and silenced his lips. More than any man in the stream of human existence, he deserved to write his own epitaph: "...I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord...shall give me..." (2 Timothy 4:6-8). And, when he entered into Glory and appeared in the presence of Jesus, one cannot help but say, "He did more than any man to close the doorway to hell; he fought on." And one cannot help but believe that when Jesus saw him in heaven, he said, "Well done, my son...welcome home." He had fought on. God bless you, dear Paul.

With the death of Paul and the other great warriors of that first century, the developing Church moved into the battle stations and took up the cry: "The doorway to hell must be closed at all costs. Salvation by works of the law is the doorway to hell and must be closed at all costs. Salvation is only through faith in Jesus Christ! Salvation by works of the law is the doorway to hell and must be closed at all costs."

Because of the two reasons presented above to overthrow the heresy of salvation by works of the law in the New Testament, Christian thought has been consumed primarily with this one issue. We fail to see much else. Up to a point, this is as it should be. Salvation by works of the law versus salvation by faith is the crucial issue. For this reason, it rightly receives prominence in the pages of the New Testament. This preponderance of space given to this battle in the New Testament combined with the fervency, the urgency, even the desperation of the New Testament writers to "close the doorway to hell at all costs," has had a greater influence upon the Church than is realized. Because of the space given and the fervency with which it is presented, the Church has no doubts that the doctrine of The Great Disconnect Theory (salvation by works of the law of Moses) is the doorway to hell. The Church also has no doubt that Jesus is the "end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believeth" (Romans 10:13). But, unfortunately, the Church is not as certain that Jesus "is the Seed to whom the promise of Abraham was made" (Galatians 3:19). Neither is the Church at all certain that those historical promises God made to Abraham belong to her by inheritance.

The Third Reaction of the New Testament Writers to that Greatest, Old Testament Blunder, is Demonstrated by the Language They Used Against It

In addition to the above, the language used by the New Testament writers is their third reaction against the The Great Disconnect Theory, causing the Church's preoccupation with it, pushing other matters to the back burner. When considering the language the New Testament writers used concerning the Law, we must exercise much care, because this is the point at which The God-Looked-Down Theory has made its greatest blunder. This theory has blurred the distinctions that must be made when reading about the Law in the New Testament documents. Because the advocates of this theory have not kept uppermost in their minds the purpose of the Law, to maintain the Abrahamic blessings, they have attributed meanings to various passages of Scripture which those Scriptures do not have. An examination of the New Testament statements concerning the Law reveals that these statements must be grouped into four separate, distinct categories.

Category One speaks of the Law from the viewpoint of its original purpose. When Paul said, "...the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good" (Romans 7:12), he spoke of God's reason for giving the Law, i.e., the maintenance of the Abrahamic blessings. Concerning its original purpose, it was holy, just, and good.

Category Two speaks of the law as a result of what it has become because of the Great Disconnection. It was designed to maintain the Abrahamic blessings. The Jews, instead, set it up as a separate religious system, a doctrine of salvation and blessings secured by their works. As such, it became an instrument of death, and those who followed this system, separated from Abraham, became accursed.

When Paul calls the Law the "ministration of death, written and engraved in stones" (2 Corinthians 3:7), did he actually mean that the Law really was a ministration of death? Of course not. The Law was an act of grace given to maintain the flow of blessings promised through Abraham. How can an act of grace designed to bless be a ministration of death? It cannot. Then what did Paul mean? He means that by following The Great Disconnect Theory, the Law no longer functions as an act of grace, but has become, for them, an instrument of death. When he said that "as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse..." (Galatians 3:10), what does he mean? He means that their separation of the Law from Abraham has turned that which was given to bless them into nothing more than a religion of works and merit. As such, this act of

separation has turned the Law into an instrument which will curse them. In Galatians 5:1, Paul refers to the Law as a "yoke of bondage," as something grievous to be born and implores his readers not to be entangled in it any more. Was the Law, according to its original purpose, really a "yoke of bondage"? No, it was an act of grace. It is a yoke of bondage only as a result of disconnecting it from Abraham and using it as an independent system to secure by works the blessings of God.

In Acts 15:10, Peter called the Law a "yoke upon the neck...which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Was this the effect of the Law upon them and their fathers when viewed from its original purpose? No. The Law was impossible to bear and became a yoke around their neck only after they set the Law apart as an independent doctrine of salvation and blessings by merit. In Romans 4:15, Paul states, "...the law worketh wrath:..." Was this God's original intent? No. The Law was an act of grace. Only when severed from Abraham and used as an independent religious system of salvation by works does it result in wrath. Romans 3:19 declares that "...under the law...all the world may become guilty before God." This passage also views the Law as the result of the Jewish error since "to make the world guilty" was not its original purpose. Had the original purpose been followed, the appropriate sacrifice would have been made, the offender would have been held blameless, and the Abrahamic blessings that he already possessed would have been maintained.

All the above examples are Category Two statements. Not one passage speaks from the perspective of the true purpose of the Law, i.e., God's act of grace to guard the children of Israel against the possible loss of their blessings because of transgressions. Each statement views the Law from the standpoint of what they turned it into as a result of The Great Disconnect Theory. The Law is not a yoke of bondage, a yoke impossible to bear, an instrument of death, cursing people, resulting in guilt and wrath. These conditions accrue only as the Law is divorced from its original purpose. When it becomes an independent religious system of works and merit, the Law becomes all of the above. When used as an act of grace to maintain the preexisting Abrahamic relationship, it is none of the above. The Law is holy and just and good.

Category Three statements describe the Law by the terms and definitions used in The Great Disconnect Theory. In countering an argument, one must sometimes use an opponent's own terminology and definitions, to refute his position by showing that his terminology and definitions are erroneous. The New Testament writers did just this, meeting head on, and refuting the definitions and terminology employed in The Great Disconnect Theory. Hebrews 8:7 is a case in point.

In this passage, the advocates of the Great Disconnect Theory failed to link Moses to Abraham. For them, Abraham had receded so far back, and Moses had become so predominate in their thinking that Moses' Law had become the "first" covenant. This "disconnection" between Abraham's promises and Moses' Law was so complete, that the Law was "first" to them, even though it appeared in history four hundred-thirty years after Abraham. They simply failed to see that the Law was added to Abraham's promises to enable the Seed Group to maintain Abraham's EULOGIA. They had set apart Moses' Law as a system of salvation by works, independent of Abraham. Abraham received little prominence, while Moses moved to "first" place in every aspect of their religious life.

Furthermore, those advocates of The Great Disconnect Theory, failed to see Jesus as the "seed of Abraham" or the "end of the law." For them, the appearance of this Jesus who "passed himself off" as the Christ, was a fraud. They viewed both Jesus and his teaching as a farce. They viewed his teaching as a "second," inferior, fake covenant, when compared to Moses' "first," real

covenant. Since Moses' "first" covenant was real, it was to them, perfect or "faultless," therefore, there was no need for a "second" covenant. Consequently, their "stock answer" maintained that their "first" (disconnected from Abraham) covenant was "faultless," and therefore they had no reason to seek out a "second" covenant. In other words, "perfection" can't be improved upon. In their eyes, their "first" covenant was "faultless," therefore "perfect" in every way. Why look for a "second" covenant?

The author of Hebrews acknowledges the above as their position in Hebrews 8:7, which states, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." In this passage, he used their terms and definitions. As such, he acknowledged their view that Moses' Law was separated from Abraham's promises, having become "first" to them. He acknowledged their belief that this "first" covenant was "faultless," even though separated from Abraham. He acknowledged their view of Jesus presenting a "second" covenant in opposition to Moses' Law, their "first" covenant, and since this "second" covenant was unnecessary to them, they sought no "place" for it.

In Hebrews 8:7, "faultless" is the translation of AMEMPTOS. This word combines A, the Greek negative, with MEMPTOS, which means defective. The combination then, means "nondefective" or "faultless." Of course, from the perspective of God's real, actual purpose of the Law, it was faultless. Not one thing was wrong with it. Nothing was "defective about it. But, from the perspective of The Great Disconnect Theory (disconnected from Abraham), the Law was totally defective. An act of grace had been turned into an instrument of death. From this perspective (The Great Disconnect Theory) this "first covenant," Moses' Law, was not "faultless," it was fatally flawed.

However, the Jews believed that the Law (their "first" covenant) was "faultless" from their viewpoint. They erroneously believed the Law of Moses was a "perfect" system of salvation and blessing even though they disconnected it from Abraham's promises. Their mistaken theology viewed their mistaken conception of the Law as "faultless." The author of Hebrews meets, head on, their mistaken Notion that Moses' Law was "faultless" when separated from Abraham's Covenant and used as a system of salvation by works. In other words, having described the Law using their terms and definitions, he absolutely refutes them in Hebrews 8:7, with a Greek device called the "Contrary To Fact Conditional Sentence."

Hebrews 8:7 is a Greek construction called a "Contrary to Fact Condition." When a Greek employed this construction, he placed something in its worst possible light. He says things that are contrary to fact or reality. He says the very opposite of what he perceives the facts to be: hence, the name a "Contrary to Fact Condition."

In the following discussion, we cite five other Scriptures showing conditions that are "Contrary to Fact." These examples will make clear, by illustration, to the reader's mind what the author said in Hebrews 8:7. Then we will give a fuller explanation of this "Contrary to Fact" construction. We cite seven Greek grammarians' explanations of this "Contrary to Fact" device, including five more Scripture illustrations of this same "Contrary to Fact" device. Finally, we apply the device to Hebrews 8:7.

FIVE SCRIPTURE EXAMPLES OF "THE CONTRARY TO FACT" DEVICE

1. In Matthew 23:30, Jesus accuses the Pharisees of saying to themselves that if they had been in the days of their fathers, then they would not have been partakers with their fathers in the blood of the prophets. However, both the condition and the conclusion

in this verse are contrary to the facts in their case since they were not in the days of their fathers, and they were still partakers in the blood of the prophets.

2. "Except the Lord had shortened those days, no flesh should be saved:..." (Mark 13:20). Both these statements, however, are Contrary to Fact, since the Lord did not shorten the days and some flesh was saved.
3. "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me..." (John 5:46). These two statements, both condition and conclusion, are Contrary to Fact. The facts are that they did not believe Moses, and therefore, neither did they believe on me (Jesus).
4. Mary said, "...Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother (Lazarus) had not died" (John 11:32). Again, both the condition and conclusion are Contrary to Fact. The Lord was not there and consequently, Lazarus died.
5. Jesus said to the disciples that "...If ye loved me (with supreme love), ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father:..." (John 14:28). Again, both the condition and conclusion are Contrary to Fact. The disciples did not love (AGAPAO) him with a supreme love and therefore they did not rejoice at Jesus' return into heaven.

The reader should be able to grasp this "Contrary to Fact" device by now. This kind of sentence simply contains a condition (the "if" clause) which is contrary to the facts, plus a conclusion (the "then" clause) which states what would logically follow if the condition (the "if" clause) had been true or factual. But, since the condition is Contrary to Fact, the conclusion drawn from the "unfactual" condition will be "unfactual" also. In Greek grammar, the "if" clause (condition) is called the *Protatis* and the "then" clause (conclusion) is called the *Apodasis*. The "it" clause is introduced with EI, a Greek word meaning "if." The conclusion usually contains the Greek word AN. This word is not usually translated into English. It is, however, the Greek's way of signaling us that what is said in the conclusion is not to be taken seriously. In other words, AN is the Greek's device for throwing doubt on a given conclusion. All Greek grammarians concur with the preceding analysis. The following quotes demonstrate this fact:

Summers says, "Second class condition is contrary to fact condition. This is to many one of the most baffling constructions in the English language where it is expressed by the subjunctive mood. In Greek it is expressed by the secondary tenses of the indicative mood. The correct form is EI with the indicative in the protasis and AN with the indicative in the apodasis" (RS p. 109).

Davis says, "It is the condition determined as unfulfilled. The condition is assumed to be contrary to fact...The condition has EI plus a past tense of the indicative, the conclusion has a past tense of the indicative usually with AN" (WHD p. 157).

Machen states that, "Conditions contrary to fact are expressed by the secondary tenses of the indicative in both protasis and apodasis. The protasis is introduced by EI and the apodasis has the particle AN, which, however, is sometimes omitted" (JGM, p. 157).

Voelz affirms that, "A contrary to fact conditional sentence imagines a possibility that is definitely impossible, either in the present or the past...Greek does not use the subjunctive for conditional sentences contrary to fact. They deal neither with the future nor with uncertainty, instead, they deal with the past or present and they contradict fact" (JWV pp.266-267).

Robertson and Davis declare, "Then the 'assumption' is that the condition is untrue...In neither case does the condition deal with the actual facts. In Luke 7:39, "...This fellow, if he were the prophet (which he is not), he would know (as he does not). So the pharisee argues about his guest. He 'assumes' two errors about Jesus, one that he does not know, the other that he is not the prophet he claims to be. He 'assumes' and 'states' as contrary to the fact and so untrue two actual truths for Jesus did know and was the prophet" (RD p.351).

A.T. Robertson says, "In this somewhat difficult condition only past tenses of the indicative occur. The premise is assumed to be contrary to fact...A good illustration is found in Luke 7:39. The Pharisee here assumes that Jesus is not a prophet because he allows the sinful woman to wash his feet. Jesus is therefore bound to be ignorant of her true character. The form of the condition reveals the state of mind of the Pharisee, not the truth about Jesus' nature and powers. As a matter of fact, it is the Pharisee who is ignorant...The statement of unreality here from the standpoint of the speaker or writer, is as clear cut and as positive as that of reality...The term "unreal" as applied to this use of the indicative properly belongs only to the standpoint of the user. To him the case is impossible and he makes a positive statement to that effect with the indicative" (ATR pp.1012- 1013).

Dana and Mantey concur, saying, "The premise is assumed to be contrary to fact in this class, and only the past tenses of the indicative are used. As suggested above, this condition states a thing as if it were untrue or unreal...The protasis is introduced by EI, and AN usually occurs in the apodasis" (DM p. 289).

Next, we briefly cite five more Scripture illustrations showing this construction.

1. Jesus said, "if ye were of the world, (then) the world would love its own:..." (John 15:19). However, the fact is that they are not of the world, therefore, the world does not love them.
2. Paul said, "...if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ" (Galatians 1:10). But, the "if" clause is Contrary to Fact since Paul does not go about pleasing men. Consequently, the conclusion is also opposite of that which is stated in this verse since Paul is most definitely a servant of Christ.
3. Paul said, "...If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O ye Jews, reason would that I should bear with you:..." (Acts 18:14). But, it never hinged upon a wrong or wicked lewdness. Consequently, Paul doesn't have to tolerate them.
4. A good example of a "Contrary to Fact Condition" is Hebrews 8:4, which states, "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest,..." Both of these assertions are contrary to the facts because Jesus is not on earth, he is in heaven, and since he is in heaven, he is a priest.
5. Another example is Matthew 11:21. In this passage, Jesus said to Chorazin and Bethsaida, "...for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." These two assertions, however, are factually just the opposite. The mighty works were not done in those cities. Neither did they repent.

In all ten of the preceding verses, illustrating the "Contrary to Fact" device, EI is used in the "if" (condition) clause and AN is used in the "then" (conclusion) clause. This is the regular

way the Greeks structure the "Contrary to Fact" device. This is also the way Hebrews 8:7 is structured since it is a classic case of this device.

In addition, the two assertions made in Hebrews 8:7 are factually contrary to reality. From the perspective of their theology, the "first" covenant or Moses' Law was not "faultless." It was fatally flawed since their disconnecting it from Abraham turned it into a "death instrument." Furthermore, a place for the "second" or "new" covenant was indeed sought. Both statements in this verse state the opposite, then, of what the facts are. In other words, by casting their terms and definitions in the Contrary To Fact Device, this author not only declared that reality contradicts their terms and definitions, but also their entire theological theory. For the author of Hebrews, Moses' Law was not disconnected from Abraham's promised EULOGIA. (See Volume I.) Moreover, the author declares that *God himself never viewed Moses' Law as defective from his perspective of his original purpose for it*. Rather, he found fault with the people who responded to the original purpose of the Law by separating it from Abraham's Covenant and making it a system of salvation by works. He said, "For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant..." (Hebrews 8:8). *Note well that God found fault with "them" and not with his act of grace, the Law, given to maintain an uninterrupted flow of Abraham's EULOGIA.*

Category Four statements are those statements about the Law that are true, whether viewed from its original purpose or from the standpoint of the error. One such passage is the declaration in Galatians 2:16, "...for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." This statement is true when regarded from the view of its true purpose. God never intended for the Law to be used for justification. He gave it to guard the descendants of Abraham from losing their blessings. However, the statement is also true from the perspective of the error. As a separate system of salvation and blessings, it was never able to perform justification for them. Thus, the statement is true from both perspectives.

The failure to properly categorize the Law statements has been a chief source of problem for the Church. Had the Law statements been properly grouped, the purpose of the Law as a vehicle of grace to maintain the Abrahamic blessings would be recognized, and such statements as "the Law is a ministry of condemnation" and "the Law was a jailer" would never have been made. Since the days of Martin Luther, the Church has had sermons preached from Romans 3:20, "for by the law is the knowledge of sin." And, "the wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). Then, the commandments are preached, screaming, "thou shalt not." As a result, the world is brought under conviction by "thou shalt nots," since the hearers know they are not perfect (Romans 3:20), and they know that unless they "get right with God," they are in danger of hell (Romans 6:23). *Consequently, they have associated the Law with eternal damnation. As a result they do not see the Law as a vehicle of grace.* The Church gives Category One meaning to Category Two statements. If the Church would only stop and think, she would group the Law statements in their proper category, and The God-Looked-Down Theory would collapse.

The God-Looked-Down Theory fails to make this necessary distinction of properly categorizing the Law statements. Because of the great number of times (space given to close the doorway to hell) the Law is spoken of from a Category Two perspective, the followers of this theory read the Scriptures which state that the Law is bondage, wrath, guilt, a yoke, etc. *They accept these statements as fact, assuming they represent the actual purpose and reason for the Law.* They fail to distinguish Category One from Category Two statements, thus confusing their proper meanings. This blurring of the categories adversely affects the theory's interpretations of many Scriptures. As we shall soon see, *the blurring of the Categories of Law statements renders*

The God-Looked-Down Theory so incredible that a forced rethinking of its basis, and therefore, its acceptance is now necessary.

The New Testament battle to close the doorway to hell is so intense that much space is given to it. Because of its overriding importance, the urgency of the message leaps from every page, capturing our attention and forcing our concentration upon it to the exclusion of almost everything else. In addition, since the actual, true scriptural fact that the Law was an act of grace to maintain the blessings has not been kept firmly in mind, the strong language used in the corrective passages cited above has influenced the Church to view the Law as an "actual" doctrine of works from which the world needs to be saved. In other words, the Church views Moses' Law as indeed, disconnected from the Abrahamic Covenant. And when the Church reads, "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to everyone that believes" (Romans 10:4), they see Jesus as "fulfilling the law" (Matthew 5:17), but they do not see him as the "Seed to whom the promise was made" (Galatians 3:19). And since he fulfilled the Law, as the end of the Law, the Law must have been a system of salvation by works from which man himself needs to be saved, because it is by the Law that man is aware, every day of his life, that he sins.

As we are forced to concentrate so intently upon the Law by the preponderance of space given to it, as we feel the urgency and passion of the New Testament writers as they attempt to close this doorway to hell, and as we fail to properly categorize the language they used, Abraham recedes into the background of Christian thought and the Law as an actual, real system of salvation by works fills our vision. Consequently, Jesus really has become the mediator of a "Brand New Covenant," (separated from the Abrahamic Covenant) who fulfilled the Law, but the Church has lost sight of him as "the Seed" of Abraham to whom "the promise was made." Therefore, the relationship of Abraham to the Church is "nebulous" at best. If the Church sees Abraham related to herself at all, she sees him as a "father-figure" who had a great faith she would do well to copy.

Because of the above three reasons, the Church took a natural, and easy step in viewing herself as "disconnected" from the Abrahamic Covenant. Therefore, The God-Looked-Down Theory became her basic theology, unrelated at all to the promises of health, prosperity, etc. The interpretations given by The God-Looked-Down Theory, to the vast majority of the New Testament demonstrates that the Church is preoccupied with the Law of Moses to the exclusion of Abraham.

Before considering some New Testament examples of their bizarre interpretations, we need to summarize to this point, the results of the downward spiral taken by the Church, from the lofty heights of the Law as an act of grace, to groveling in the dust with a knee-jerk reaction to the Jewish error of disconnecting the Law from Abraham's EULOGIA. On page 1268, the New Scofield Reference Bible has a note which perfectly summarizes The God-Looked-Down Theory's confusion over the purpose of the Law and substantiates the statements made in this section. Scofield says, "Before the Law the whole world is guilty, and the Law is therefore of necessity a ministry of condemnation, death, and the divine curse." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, page 1848, has also given Category One meaning to Category Two statements, confusing the real purpose of the Law with what the Law has become as a result of making it an independent religion of works. They say, "Indeed, so far from blessing coming to sinners by way of the Law, the Law worketh wrath: not wrath in men against the Law's restrictions as some have argued, but the holy wrath of God..."

Finally, since God seems to have given the Law to condemn, to bring wrath, death, guilt, a yoke no one can bear, then it follows that this view will be reflected in every Scripture this

theory attempts to interpret. In other words, everything else they interpret in Scripture will be influenced by the mistakes of The God- Looked-Down Theory. Their entire theological system will reflect these errors concerning the purpose of the Law. Everything in their system will reflect this "truth" that the Law is guilt, wrath, a yoke, and death. The next section demonstrates that, indeed, they do interpret other Scriptures in the light of this "truth" as we look at the misunderstanding of "New" in "New Covenant."

Again, the "proof is in the pudding." And this cliché fits what we've said in this chapter like a glove. One question demonstrates this assertion. How many sermons or Sunday school lessons have you, the reader, heard which reflects the law as wrath, guilt, damnation, etc.? We've heard them all our Christian lives. These sermons and lessons all derive from The God-Looked-Down Theory, and are all deadwrong.

Chapter Three

The Second Great Error Upon Which This Current, Christian Theology of Denial Perches Precariously, Is Misunderstanding The Term "New" In "New Covenant" To Mean "New in Time," When In Fact It Does Not

The God-Looked-Down Theory gets rid of the salvation-by-works doctrine of the Great Disconnect Theory, by simply erecting a "brand new covenant" (disconnected from Abraham) based on the extremely misleading translations of Jeremiah 31:31 and quoted in Hebrews 8:8. These passages state from the English translations that, "...I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah...." But the Hebrew and Greek words translated "new" in these two passages do not necessarily mean "new in time." Neither does the expression "will make" mean "startup" in Hebrew or Greek. Instead, "will make" means just the opposite of "start up something new." Rather, it means "to complete something that already is." But now, let's look at this "brand new covenant" presented to us by traditional, Christian theology that has accepted as fact the greatest theological blunder in Old Testament history.

Is the New Covenant Really New?

The new covenant, taught by Jeremiah in the Old Testament and by Jesus, Paul, and the writer of the Book of Hebrews in the New Testament, is the renewal, restoration, and completion of the covenant God made with Abraham. Consequently, no such thing as a "new" covenant exists.

Jeremiah, however, seems to contradict this statement. He said, "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, which my covenant, they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord:" (Jeremiah 31:31-32). Then he explains the characteristics of this new covenant that God will someday make with them. "But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts: and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more" (Jeremiah 31:33-34).

Jesus, Paul, and the writer of Hebrews also seem to contradict our assertion of no "new" covenant. Jesus sounded the new covenant theme in the upper room as he brake the bread and passed the cup. He said, "This is my blood of the new testament (covenant), which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matthew 26:28). He repeated the same statement almost verbatim in Mark 14:24 and Luke 22:20. (The Greek word for covenant is DIATHAKA and is translated in the King James Bible by both "covenant" and "testament".) The Apostle Paul also seems to contradict this position of no "new" covenant. While instructing the Church at Corinth concerning the Lord's Supper, he Quotes Jesus, "After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament (covenant) in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me" (1 Corinthians 11:25). In his second letter to the same Church, he said that God "...hath made us able ministers of the new testament (covenant)...." (2 Corinthians 3:6). The writer of the Book of Hebrews quotes Jeremiah 31:31-34 almost word for word concerning the new covenant. In Hebrews 8:13 he says, "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old." Finally, in Hebrews 9:15 and 12:24, he says that Jesus is the mediator

of this new covenant. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament (covenant), that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (Hebrews 9:15). "And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel" (Hebrews 12:24).

The above ten Scriptures emphatically declare a new covenant. To believe otherwise is to repudiate all ten of them. How can we justify our contention that no such thing as a new covenant exists, when Jeremiah, Jesus, Paul, and the writer to Hebrews say there is? Our justification is this: the contradiction is only apparent, and not real. This appearance is caused by the translation of two Greek words and one Hebrew word with the English word "new." This chapter will demonstrate that these words contain shades of meaning which cannot be adequately translated just by our English word "new." We begin with the two Greek words, NEOS and KAINOS.

NEOS means new in time. It represents something as being chronologically new. It denotes that which just came into being. NEOS is used when a time comparison is called for: to show that something is more recent than that which began at an earlier date.

KAINOS, on the other hand, denotes that which is qualitatively new or different. It denotes that which is not necessarily new in time, but that which has existed for some time. Then a change occurs in its quality or character, however slight, that makes it different, qualitatively, from what it was before. This difference in quality makes it new in the sense of KAINOS. This difference makes it new, not in time, but in quality. In other words, something could be a hundred years old and acquire a new and different quality, and it would be considered new in the sense of KAINOS.

Nine Major Greek Dictionaries Declare That "New" in "New Covenant," Does Not Mean "New in Time," but "New in Quality"

Thayer says, "NEOS denotes the new primarily in reference to time, the young, recent; KAINOS denotes the new primarily in reference to quality, the fresh, the unworn" (JHT p. 318). The One Volume Theological Dictionary of The New Testament says, "As distinct from NEOS, new in time, KAINOS means new in nature with an implication of better" (TDNT p. 388). Vine states, "KAINOS denotes new, of that which is unaccustomed or unused, not new in time, recent, but new as to form or quality, of different nature from what is contrasted as old" (WEV III p. 109). "NEOS signifies new in respect of time, that which is recent; it is used of the young and so translated, especially the comparative degree "younger". NEOS and KAINOS are sometimes used of the same thing, but there is a difference" (WEV III p. 110).

Walter Bauer says that KAINOS means new, "(1) in the sense unused... (2) in the sense of something not previously present, unknown, strange, remarkable, also with the connotation of the marvelous or unheard-of..." (BAG p. 394).

Moulton and Milligan declare that the distinction between KAINOS and NEOS is retained in papyrus (non - biblical documents) usage. They say, "Papyrus usage hardly tends to sharpen the distinction between KAINOS and NEOS" (MM p. 314). In other words, the papyrus utilizes the sharp distinction existing between these two words.

Cremer marks the distinction between KAINOS and NEOS. He states that KAINOS is "new, and that, too, in opposition to what has already existed, is known, has been used and consumed: KAINOS therefore looks backwards, whereas its synonym NEOS looks forwards =

young, fresh; KAINOS = not yet having been; NEOS = not having been long" (HC p. 321). In other words, KAINOS is the opposite of something that previously existed that is worn out, used, or consumed. Rather, KAINOS would describe something that previously existed but is "not yet having been worn, consumed, etc."

The condition of the American automobile industry in the early 1980's illustrates the distinction between these two words. Sales of cars were so poor one year that the manufacturers had hundreds of unsold new cars left in their inventories at the end of the model year. Some of those "brand-new, year-old" cars did not sell until nearly a year later. These cars were a year old but were still "brand new." How can this be? When they were sold, they were not new in time (NEOS) or "not having been long." But they were new in quality (KAINOS) in that "they were not yet owned," or to quote Cremer above, they were "not yet having been" owned.

Ralph Earle sees the distinction between NEOS and KAINOS. He quotes Trench, cited below, in his discussion of the new bottles (KAINOS) in Mark 2:22. Then, he says, "The best translation at the end of the verse is "fresh wineskins" (PE p. 33). He also quotes Trench in his discussion of the KAINOS man in Ephesians 4:24. Then, he says, "So, "the new man" refers to the new quality of life that comes with Christ's entrance into the human heart" (RE pp. 315-316).

The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology says that NEOS is the "...new, young and previously non existent...." It states further that KAINOS is "...new in the qualitative sense of something previously unknown, unprecedented, marvelous" (NID II p. 669). "But the New Testament has significantly used KAINOS with its more qualitative sense in order to give expression to the new character of the advent of Christ." KAINOS is derived from the root QEN, "turn out fresh,"... and denotes that which is new in its own way. "In secular usage KAINOS denotes that which is qualitatively new as compared with what has existed until now, that which is better than the old, whereas NEOS is used temporarily for that which has just made its appearance" (NID II pp. 669-670).

Having defined the distinction between NEOS and KAINOS correctly, this same dictionary contradicts its own definitions of these two words by blurring their distinctions in stating they are sometimes synonymous to each other. "In the course of time the differences of meaning between NEOS and KAINOS became blurred, even to the point of occasional synonymity" (NID II p. 669). "The Synoptics use KAINOS from time to time with the same meaning as NEOS...." (NID II p. 671). "There is no strict differentiation between NEOS and the generally synonymously used adjectives KAINOS and PROSPHATOS...." (NID II p. 674). In other words, this dictionary contradicts its own definition of NEOS and KAINOS. But, this won't wash. And the verses they list to prove their point of synonymity do not prove their point at all. Every occurrence of KAINOS in the New Testament doesn't deviate one bit from the actual definition: KAINOS describes the qualitatively new while NEOS describes the chronologically new. Later in this chapter we examine every instance of KAINOS in the Greek New Testament so the readers can determine for themselves the distinction between KAINOS and NEOS. An examination of these passages should be undertaken from the view that no synonymity occurs.

Even this same dictionary recognizes the weakness of its assertion of synonymity. The last sentence in its articles of KAINOS-NEOS contradicts its previous contradiction of the definitions of these two words. It states that, "Even though the word groups NEOS and KAINOS are largely used synonymously, the observation may still be made that NEOS tends to stress the reality of salvation in the present, whereas KAINOS emphasizes more strongly the character of eschatological fulfillments." (NID II p. 676). Stripping away the fluff from this statement, this author equates NEOS with "present," which is "new" or "more recent" in time. And he equates

KAINOS with "character" or "quality." In their so-called synonymous use, NEOS still means new in time and KAINOS still means new in character. If these distinctions can still be observed in their so-called synonymous occurrences, then in fact, these words are not synonymous at all.

Furthermore, their statement that PROSPHATOS, as well as KAINOS, are synonyms for NEOS devastates their contention for synonymity. PROSPHATOS means "freshly slain or slaughtered." The author of Hebrews used it in Hebrews 10:20, depicting Christ as the "new" and living way. "New" is the translation of PROSPHATOS. Jesus, as the way to God, was "recently slain" or "freshly slaughtered," but due to his resurrection, he is still living. He was "recently slaughtered" but living nonetheless. If "recently slaughtered" or PROSPHATOS is a synonym for NEOS which means "new in time," rather than say "The man built a NEOS house," we should be able to substitute PROSPHATOS for NEOS, and declare "The man built a 'recently slaughtered' house." Obviously, this cannot be done. Therefore, neither KAINOS nor PROSPHATOS is a synonym of NEOS.

Trench has an excellent article on NEOS and KAINOS. He declares, "Some have denied that any difference can in the New Testament be traced between these two words. They derive a certain, plausible support for this denial from the fact that manifestly NEOS and KAINOS, both rendered "new" in our version, are often interchangeably used...the words, it is contended, are evidently of the same force and significance. This, however, by no means follows, and in fact is not the case" (RCT p. 219).

The above authorities all concur: NEOS means new in time, while KAINOS means new in quality. Is this distinction in Scripture? The following examples show that it is.

Consider the case of the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea where they placed the body of Jesus. Joseph "laid it in his own new tomb (KAINOS), which he had hewn out in the rock:..." (Matthew 27:60). "Now in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden: and in the garden a new (KAINOS) sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid" (John 19:41). In both verses, Matthew and John used the Greek word KAINOS. Why didn't they use the word NEOS, since it was a "new" tomb? Because the tomb was not new in time. Joseph had hewn it out, but he could have hewn it twenty or thirty years before they placed Jesus in it. How could it be said that it was new in time when it was probably several years old? It couldn't!

It was, instead, qualitatively new. It was unused, unworn. This quality of being unworn, unused, makes the tomb new in the sense of KAINOS. The sepulchre was already in existence, having been there for some time (KAINOS describes that which is already in existence.) Then, an additional quality or the embellishment of some present quality or characteristic causes a difference in it, however slight. This slight, qualitative difference renders it new in the sense of KAINOS. In this case, the grave was not new in time, NEOS, for it had been hewn from the rock prior to Jesus' use of it, but it was new in quality, KAINOS, since it was not used yet.

Sometimes both words are used to describe the same thing. A prime example is Paul's doctrine of the "new" man in Colossians 3:10 and Ephesians 4:24. How is this possible, using both words to describe the same thing, considering the above distinctions between the two words? The answer is that the new (KAINOS) man mentioned in Ephesians 4:24 is viewed from the standpoint of the qualitative changes brought about by his salvation experience. In the context of Ephesians 4:24, the new (KAINOS) man is viewed as being "created in righteousness and true holiness." This is the new creation of 2 Corinthians 5:17. Assume the man described in the above passage was 35 years old when he received Jesus as Savior. He certainly would not be considered new in time (NEOS); he has been in existence for 35 years. However, his salvation experience

completely changes his character so that he now possesses new qualities, which are "righteousness and true holiness." These qualities are now new within him and denoted by the word KAINOS.

But, in Colossians 3:10, Paul is making a time comparison to the old man in verse 9. The "old man" dates back to Adam. The "old man" has now been put off and the "new (NEOS) man" has now been put on. The new (NEOS) man is more recent in time than Adam or the old man. As in this example, NEOS is *always* used when comparisons of time are made contrasting that which is recent, to that which is old.

A classic example of a time comparison using NEOS is Hebrews 12:24. This verse calls Jesus the mediator of the new (NEOS) covenant. This is the only instance in the New Testament where NEOS describes the new covenant. In this context, the new covenant is called NEOS because it is being compared to the Mosaic era, which began nearly 2000 years before. Trench concurs with this conclusion. He says, "So, too, the covenant of which Christ is the mediator is a NEOS covenant, as compared with the Mosaic, confirmed nearly 2000 years before...." (RCT p. 225). Consequently, when both words are used to describe the same thing, NEOS views it from the perspective of time, whereas KAINOS views it from the perspective of a qualitative difference, which means qualitative newness.

Nine of the ten new covenant passages cited above are from the New Testament, and eight of the nine use KAINOS to characterize the new covenant. All eight teach the same thing: there is a preexisting covenant to which Jesus gave a qualitative difference, making it new in the sense of KAINOS. This covenant is not new in time. It was in existence before the time of Jesus. He did something unique to it, however, improving its quality, making it KAINOS.

The Hebrew Word for "New" in "New Covenant," Primarily Means "New in Quality," not "New in Time"

But what about Jeremiah 31:31? This passage is written in Hebrew. The word translated "new" in this verse is the Hebrew word KHAWDASH, the root Meaning of which means to "renew, repair, rebuild, and restore, with secondary, adjectival meanings of new and fresh" (TWOT,I pp. 265-266). The following examples from the Old Testament support this definition. In Psalms 51:10, David asked God to, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." The word translated "renew" is the same Hebrew root, KHAWDASH, used by Jeremiah. David already possessed his spirit. He was asking for a renewal of what he already had. In 2 Chronicles 24:4, we find that "Joash was minded to repair the house of the Lord," which had been allowed to deteriorate. The house of the Lord, in this verse, was already in existence. It was run down and in need of restoration. So, Joash collected money and in 2 Chronicles 24:12, "...the king and Jehoiada gave it to such as did the work of the service of the house of the Lord, and hired masons and carpenters to repair the house of the Lord..." In both verses, "repair" is the translation of KHAW- DASH, the same Hebrew root used by Jeremiah to depict his "new" covenant. In both verses, there is a renewal, a repairing, a restoring of that which was already in existence.

Unless the context indicates otherwise, this same distinction obtains in the derivative, adjectival use of the word. The adjective form is usually translated "new." Exodus 1:8 says, "Now there arose up a new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph." This same root, KHAWDASH, is translated "new" here, also. The person who became king was not new in time since he was several years old. However, he was new to the office of king. He was new in that he was now king, whereas before, he was not. When Deborah was judge in Israel, Judges 5:8 informs us,

"They chose new gods...." KHAWDASH is translated "new." But, the gods were not new in time. They had been around for centuries. The newness of the gods in this passage lies in this: they were new to the choice of the people. The gods were now chosen, whereas before they were not. In Judges 16:11, Samson tells Delilah that he would be as weak as other men if they "...bind me fast with new ropes that never were occupied...." "New" is the translation of the adjective form of KHAWDASH. The ropes are not new in time, they were qualitatively new in that they were not yet occupied or used. In 1 Kings 11:29, Ahijah "had clad himself with a new garment." KHAWDASH is used again. The new garment is not new in time since it was not manufactured at that moment. It was new in that it was unused, unworn, by Ahijah.

Long before the birth of Christ, a group of scholars translated the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek. This translation was called "The Septuagint," and designated it by the symbol LXX. These scholars translated KHAWDASH in Jeremiah 31:31 with the Greek word KAINOS. They understood the practical identity between the two words. They understood the root meaning of KHAWDASH to denote a renewal, a restoration of that which is. They also recognized that the adjective form of KHAWDASH, translated "new," describes a qualitative newness of that which is, by marking it off as unused, unworn, not consumed, and not yet marred with age. As such, KHAWDASH is practically identical with KAINOS, which also marks off that which is, as unused, unknown, etc.

There is no occurrence of KAINOS in the Greek New Testament that does not "mark off that which is, as unused, or with a new twist. etc." Also, no occurrence of KAINOS in the Greek text blurs the above, described distinction between KAINOS and NEOS.

As a consequence of the sharp, welldefined, difference between "new" in time and "new" in quality, it is obvious that Jeremiah spoke about a covenant already in existence that will become new in character. It is just as obvious that Jesus spoke of a covenant already in existence, even as he broke bread and passed the cup in the upper room, that he was about to make new in quality. Paul taught us in both the Corinthian letters about an existing covenant that Jesus had made new in quality. The writer to the Hebrews, quoting Jeremiah's new covenant, declares that Jesus made this very same covenant, spoken of by Jeremiah, new in character and quality and became the Forerunner and Mediator of it.

The purpose of this work is to show that the preexisting covenant that Jeremiah spoke of and Jesus completed is none other than the covenant God made with Abraham, that the completed Abrahamic Covenant is still in effect, and the provisions of that covenant, specifically, salvation, health, and prosperity are the rights of every Christian at this present hour.

The preceding word study demonstrates a primary reason why some view the Church honestly, but mistakenly, as a "brand new" covenant or entity in the plan of God. There are other reasons which are dealt with in this volume, but the misunderstanding caused by the English word "new" as the translation of KAINOS and KHAWDASH is a primary one. We have looked previously at the reaction of the New Testament writers to one of the greatest theological blunders of all time. This mistake, called in this work, "The Great Disconnect Theory," is dealt with at length in chapter one. This theory serves as a foundation for examining the other reasons why many mistakenly view the Church as a "brand new" covenant, unaware that this new covenant is the historic unfoldment of the completed Abrahamic Covenant, and that the temporal and spiritual blessings of Abraham are the Christians' present inheritance.

Finally, how many sermons or Sunday school lessons have you learned explaining the difference between these two Greek words translated "new"? How many sermons or Sunday

school lessons have you heard that declared the new covenant is "new in quality" but not "new in time"? Can the reader be sure that sermons and lessons that do not explain the above, were not based on The God-Looked-Down Theory.

A Brief Study of Every New Testament Occurrence of KAINOS (New in Quality) Shows That "New" in New Covenant, " Means "New in Quality," not "New in Time"

Every occurrence of KAINOS in the Greek New Testament is listed below, The distinction described above between KAINOS and NEOS is present in every occurrence. In addition, there is no incident of KAINOS in the Greek New Testament that does not "mark off" the word it modifies in one of two ways:

1. KAINOS "marks off" that which exists already as "new in quality" by designating that it is not worn yet, not used yet, not consumed yet, etc.
2. KAINOS "marks off" that which exists already as "new in quality" after some new "twist" or "characteristic" has been added to it that it did not possess before.

In the discussion below of every occurrence of KAINOS in the Greek New Testament, one of the above two "mark offs" will be observed. There are no exceptions. And, in many of the verses we examine, there are more interpretive possibilities than we show here. The reader may apply the two "mark offs" to each verse for even more possibilities. This section can be skipped, and the reader can go to the next chapter, referring to this material at his/her leisure.

New Bottles (Matthew 9:17) - NEOS would have denoted the bottles to have been of recent manufacture, i.e., new in time. On the other hand, KAINOS denotes only that they were "not used yet." The bottles could have been manufactured for quite a while. See Mark 2:22 below for a fuller discussion.

New Things out of the Treasure (Matthew 13:52) - Two kinds of things can be brought out of the disciples' treasure: **(1)** Things that are worn out or wearing out by age. This is defined by PALAIOS (v. 52). PALAIOS is translated in KJV by "old" and means "worn out" or "wearing out with age." **(2)** The other things that can be brought out of the disciples' treasure are not things that are new in time (NEOS), but things already contained in the treasure "not worn or wearing out with age yet," (KAINOS). Trench says that KAINOS, "not worn out with age yet," is absolutely demanded as the opposite of PALAIOS when PALAIOS is used in the sense of "worn or wearing out with age." He states, "As often as PALAIOS is employed to connote that which is worn out, or wearing out by age, it will absolutely demand KAINOS as its opposite" (RCT p. 66). The new things are not new in time (NEOS) but new in the sense of "not worn or wearing out yet" (KAINOS) (RCT p. 253).

New Fruit of the Vine (Matthew 26:29) - At the last supper, Jesus instituted the fruit of the vine (wine) as the symbol of his blood which is shed for many. This institution of the wine as the symbol of his blood was "brand new" at that particular moment in time. That very same night, his disciples drank of the wine as the new symbol. Indeed, his followers have been drinking of this symbol ever since. Jesus, however, refused to drink of the wine as the symbol of his blood. He said that someday he would drink it "new" with them in his Father's kingdom. He did not mean that the wine would be new in time when he drank it. This would require NEOS rather than KAINOS. Neither did he mean that the symbolizing of the wine as his blood would be new in time. This occurred in the past in the upper room. Instead, wine as the symbol of his blood was "not drunk yet" (KAINOS) by our Lord in the upper room. Indeed, the symbolized wine is to

remain "not drunk yet" by our Lord "until the kingdom of God shall come" (Luke 22:18). NEOS would denote new in time, whereas KAINOS here denotes "not drunk by Jesus yet, as the symbol of his blood."

New Tomb (Matthew 27:60) - We noted earlier that the tomb could be decades old. It was, however, "not used yet," (KAINOS), when they placed Jesus' body in it.

New Doctrine (Mark 1:27) - In the synagogue, Jesus did two things with authority. He taught with authority and he cast out demons with authority (vv. 22 and 26). The new doctrine (v. 27) was not new in time since Mark did not use NEOS. Jesus' doctrine had been around for a long time. It was the doctrine of the Old Testament. One such qualitative difference or newness in Jesus' teaching of the Old Testament is this: prior to Jesus, the scribes had "not yet taught it as having authority," (KAINOS). Jesus was the authority of the Old Testament and the "newness" of his teaching of the "doctrine" of the Old Testament was that his teaching had "authority," compared to the scribes who "had not yet taught it with authority" (KAINOS).

New Cloth (Mark 2:21) - This passage contains the same play on words as Matthew 13:52. There, we noted earlier that "old" is the translation of PALAIOS which means "wearing out with age." We also noted that this usage demands KAINOS as its opposite. Jesus did not say here that the sewed cloth is new in time (NEOS). He said one doesn't sew a piece of cloth that's "not worn out yet" (KAINOS) on a piece of cloth that is worn out with age (PALAIOS). The sewed piece could be quite old and "not worn out yet;" hence, KAINOS.

New Bottles (Mark 2:22) - This verse contains the same words as Mark 2:21, Matthew 9:17; and 13:52. But, in addition, NEOS and KAINOS are used in the same sentence. Jesus said that no one puts wine that is new in time (NEOS) into bottles that are worn with age (PALAIOS). Rather, wine that is new in time (NEOS) is put into bottles that are "not worn yet" (KAINOS). Although the wine in this sentence is new in time, the bottles were not. Regardless of how old they might have been before using, they were "not worn or not used yet."

New Fruit of the Vine (Mark 14:25) - See the identical discussion above for Matthew 26:29.

New Tongues (Mark 16:17) - The tongues are not new in time (NEOS). In this context, believers are to be accompanied by signs following. One sign is new (KAINOS) tongues. If "tongues" refers to the physical organ of the tongue, the passage would mean organs that are "not used as an instrument of signs yet" (KAINOS). If "tongues" refers to languages, then the passage would mean languages "not spoken as a sign yet" (KAINOS).

New Piece (Luke 5:36) - See the discussion of Mark 2:21 above.

New Bottles (Luke 5:38) - See the discussion of Mark 2:22 above.

New Covenant (Luke 22:20) - The covenant was not new in time (NEOS). It was to be new in quality (KAINOS) in that it was "not complete yet." In a subsequent chapter, we shall deal at length with the completion of the Abrahamic Covenant by Jesus, the Seed of Abraham.

New Commandment (John 13:34) - The commandment to love one another is not new in time (NEOS) since this commandment is the very heart of the Old Testament. Jesus added a new quality (KAINOS) to the existing commandment. They were not only to obey the previously existing Old Testament Commandment of loving one another, but now, they were to obey it to the

same degree that Jesus loved them. The commandment was new (KAINOS) in that it had "not been given with Jesus' love for them as the measure of their love for others, yet."

New Sepulchre (John 19:41) - See the discussion of Matthew 27:60 above.

New Doctrine (Acts 17:19) - The doctrine was Paul's preaching Jesus to them (v. 18). This message was not new in time (NEOS) but was new (KAINOS) in that it was "not familiar to their ears yet." The message was, rather, "strange things to our ears...." (v.20). It was not new in time but it was strange, different, and unfamiliar to them.

New Thing (Acts 17:21) – The thing is not new in time (NEOS). Luke does not say the Athenians wanted the latest news (NEOS), but he says they wanted something "newer." This word is KAINOTEROS, which is the comparative of KAINOS. Had the Athenians wanted something "latest in time," Luke would have used the comparative of NEOS, or NEOTERON. This would be translated by "latest news." But the Athenians wanted something qualitatively different (not numerically other) from what had gone on before. They were looking to hear the same things they had heard before except with a new, different twist to it, thereby making it qualitatively new (KAINOS).

New Testament - Covenant (1 Corinthians 11:25) - The covenant is not new in time (NEOS). It is the Abrahamic Covenant that is "not completed yet" (KAINOS). In a subsequent chapter, we explain the "completing process" of the Abrahamic Covenant.

New Testament - Covenant (2 Corinthians 3:6) - The covenant is not new in time (NEOS). This context views the Abrahamic Covenant as having been completed, an additional quality, which previously was "not present yet" (KAINOS). In other words, The Abrahamic Covenant was new (NEOS) in time in Genesis. It has been in force ever since. After two thousand years, Jesus completed it. The additional quality of "completion" makes the Abrahamic Covenant, not new in time (NEOS), but new in quality (KAINOS). We see how Jesus "completed" it in a subsequent section.

New Creation (2 Corinthians 5:17) - A man is "in Christ" at the moment of his new birth, i.e., the moment he receives Christ as his Savior. He may be a teen or an elderly person. As such, he was not created new (NEOS) in time since he has been living for several years. But at the moment of his salvation experience, his human spirit, which he has had since birth, is made new and alive to God. Previously, his human spirit had been dead towards God. This creative act of God on his preexisting spirit creates the additional quality of "spiritual life" in the human spirit. Neither the physical man or his spirit was created new in time (NEOS) at the point of new birth. Rather, God imparted by creation another quality to the human spirit which it had not possessed yet (KAINOS). With its new spiritual life, the preexisting human spirit is new in quality (KAINOS), not new in time (NEOS).

New Things (2 Corinthians 5:17) - The "old things" have passed away, but they are not annihilated. "Passed away" is the translation of PARA, which means "beside," plus ERCHOMAI, which means "to go." PARERCHOMAI means to "go by," or "pass beside," hence, "pass away." The same word is used in Luke 17:7 where Jesus is asking about one coming from work in the fields. He wants to know if his master will say to him, "Go and sit down to meat?" "Go" is the translation of PARERCHOMAI. The hired hand is not annihilated as a result of "going to eat." This word contains no thought of annihilation. It simply means to pass by a place on the map or to pass through a point in time (2 Peter 3:10-12 below). Consequently, the "old things" have "fresh coloring" (KAINOS) because of the new birth. J. H. Bernard says, "...the old thoughts of

God and of sin and salvation have received fresh colouring...." (EGT III p. 71). The KAINOS creation man has the same old capacities he had before his salvation experience. He had the capacities of affections, passions, notions, apprehensions, inclinations, will, thought, counsels, and designs. Prior to the new birth, all these attributes were directed away from the things of God. But now, enabled by the Spirit, these same capacities are directed towards the things of God so that the KAINOS creation man will have "...new qualities, new apprehensions in his understanding, new inclinations in his will and affections, new thoughts, counsels, and designs" (MP III p. 616). The old things have now the "fresh coloring" of the Holy Spirit, whereas before they did not.

New Creature (Galatians 6:15) - See the discussion of 2 Corinthians 5:17.

New Man (Ephesians 2:15) - The context of Ephesians 2:11 through 3:12 deals with one subject, namely the Gentiles being included in the saved Jewish Remnant. That Remnant is pictured in this verse as a "man." This man is not new in time (NEOS) because he is composed of the saved of the ages. But now, he has a quality, an attribute, a characteristic he did not have before. Now the Gentiles are included in this Remnant man. This addition of the Gentiles to the saved Remnant makes the "man" in Ephesians 2:15 new in quality (KAINOS), not new in time (NEOS). This work elaborates on this thought throughout.

New Man (Ephesians 4:24) - See the description earlier in this chapter.

New Covenant (Hebrews 8:8) - This covenant is not new in time (NEOS). This is the completion of the Abrahamic Covenant by Jesus Christ (KAINOS). See chapter 4 on "The Completion" for a full discussion.

New Covenant (Hebrews 8:13) - This also refers to the Abrahamic Covenant in a completed state. See chapter 4 on "The Completion."

New Covenant (Hebrews 9:15) - This also refers to the Abrahamic Covenant after its completion by Jesus. See chapter 4 on "The Completion."

New Heavens and New Earth (2 Peter 3:13) - If these were new in time in this verse, NEOS would have been used. Rather, KAINOS is used which denotes a new, different quality that obtains to the heavens and the earth. The Greek text of 2 Peter 3:10-13 substantiates Peter's use of KAINOS (new in quality of that which is) rather than new in time (NEOS). In this context we see some things about **(1)** the heavens, **(2)** the elements, **(3)** the earth, **(4)** the works that are in the earth. The second coming of Christ will have a profound effect upon the relationship of these four things to both the present and future world orders.

The heavens of this present world order are pictured as the vault in which the elements of atoms, matter, molecules, stars, sun, moon, etc., are contained. "The heavens' equals "the sky." Peter shows the effects of Christ's second coming upon the heavens of this world order. **(1)** These heavens "pass away," literally "go by," the translation of PAERECHOMAI. This Greek word combines PARA, meaning beside, from which comes our word parallel, and ERCHOMAI, which means to come, to go, to pass. This word does not, however, signify "to annihilate." This same word is used in Luke 18:37, which says "Jesus passed by...." By no stretch of the imagination can we make it mean that Jesus was annihilated so that he ceased to be. He was still the same after he "passed by." **(2)** At the Second Coming, the heavens of this order will be set on fire. "Fire" is the translation of PUROO, which does not necessarily mean "to consume by flames." The same word is used in Revelation 3:18 where Jesus tells them to buy him gold tried

in the fire. "Tried in fire is the same basic word that Peter uses to describe the heavens. In Revelation 3:18, the gold is not annihilated, it is refined, tried, purified, and cleansed of impurities. At the Second Coming, Jesus will purify the heavens in fire, in like manner. **(3)** The heavens are "dissolved," which is the translation of LUO, which means "to loose." When Lazarus came out of the tomb in John 11:44, Jesus said, "Loose him and let him go." "Loose" is the same word used by Peter (LUO), which is translated "dissolve." Jesus never said for Lazarus to be annihilated or dissolved. He meant for him to be loosed. In like manner, Peter never said the heavens are to be annihilated. They are simply to be "loosed" from the present scheme of things.

Peter says two things about the earth and the works therein. First, he says they are to be "utterly burned," the translation of KATAKAIIO. Second, he says in verse 11 they also are to be "loosed" (LUO) from the present scheme of things. Neither of these two things concerning the earth and the works there in mean "annihilation."

Peter shows three effects of the Second Coming upon the elements of this world order: **(1)** They are pictured in verses 10 and 12 as melting with fervent heat. Both verses express the translation of KAUSOO, which simply means to burn. In other words the elements are seen as "burning." **(2)** They are seen as melting in verse 12 only. "Melt" is the translation of TAKA, which means "turn to liquid." **(3)** Not only are the elements being liquefied by burning, but they are also being "loosed." Whether they are annihilated or not is unclear. Perhaps the melting actually annihilates the sun, moon, and stars of this present world order. What became of the works in the earth is also unclear. Verse 13 makes no mention of the continuation of either the elements or the works. But, verse 13 speaks of an earth and the heavens, the first order of which has "gone by," and that has not only been loosed, but has been purified for the new order by the refining fires attendant to the Second Coming. The new heavens and the new earth are not new in time (NEOS). They are "not purified yet;" whereas, at the Second Coming they will have that difference, that quality of "purification," rendering them "new" in the sense of KAINOS.

New Commandment (1 John 2:7) - The commandment in this verse is the same old commandment they had from the beginning. The commandment cannot be considered even qualitatively new (KAINOS), since John said "I write no new (KAINOS) commandment to you...." (1 John 2:7).

New Commandment (1 John 2:8) - In this verse John adds a quality to the old commandment which it did not possess before (KAINOS). The old commandment is that we love our brother. (See the discussion of John 13:34 above.) The additional quality of this commandment is that John equates loving our brother with "abiding in the light" (v. 10). He also equates not loving our brother with "walking in darkness" (v. 11). In other words, the old commandment of loving our brother was "not equated with abiding in the light yet" (KAINOS); whereas, now it is.

New Commandment (2 John verse 5) - See the discussion of 1 John 2:7 above.

New Name (Revelation 2:17) - The name is not new in time (NEOS). The name has been around a while, but it is new in that it is "not written yet" (KAINOS).

New Jerusalem (Revelation 3:12) - This heavenly Jerusalem is not new in time (NEOS). There is no way to calculate how long it has been under preparation. Even so, it is new (KAINOS), in the sense that it has "not come down out of heaven from my God yet."

New Name (Revelation 3:12) - Like the New Name of Revelation 2:17, there is no way to determine its age. However, we know it is not new in time (NEOS); only that its "not written yet" (KAINOS).

New Song (Revelation 14:3) - The song isn't new in time (NEOS), it's "not sung yet" (KAINOS).

New Heaven and Earth (Revelation 21:1) - See the discussion of 2 Peter 3:10- 12 above.

New Jerusalem (Revelation 21:2) - See the discussion of Revelation 3:12 above.

New Things (Revelation 21:5) - The things are not new in time. Previously, the things were characterized by tears, death, sorrow, crying, and pain (v. 4). They were "not free from tears, death, sorrow, crying, and pain yet" (KAINOS).

In conclusion, we find no such thing as a "brand new covenant." KAINOS prevents such a view. Rather, we find a preexisting covenant made new in quality. In the next chapter we discover what this "new" quality is. We also look at the misunderstanding caused by the English translation "will make" concerning Jeremiah's assertion "I will make a new covenant...." We shall find that "will make" doesn't mean "start-up something new." Rather, it means to "complete that which is."

How many sermons and Bible lessons have you heard which fail to distinguish between "new in time" and "new in quality"? Can you be sure they were not based on the God-Looked-Down Theory?

Chapter Four

The Third Great Error Upon Which This Current, Christian Theology of Denial Perches Precariously, Is Confusing "Will Make" in Jeremiah's Statement, "I will make a new covenant...", To Mean "Start Up Something That Never Was," When In Fact, It Means To "Complete That

In this section, we look at the third and final theological "footing" upon which The God-Looked-Down Theory so precariously perches. This "footing" is as unstable as the other two discussed previously. It is the misunderstanding by traditional theology of Jeremiah's expression translated by "will make" in Jeremiah 31:31, and quoted in Hebrews 8:8. However, before looking at "will make," we need to look at the ceremony that accompanied the Abrahamic Covenant.

The Ceremony of the Abrahamic Covenant

The Abrahamic Covenant existed as "promises" in the beginning. These promises are recorded in Genesis 12:1-3; 13:14-17. In Genesis 15, God placed the "promises" in covenant form through a solemn, sacred ceremony. In Genesis 17, God requires the circumcision of Abraham and his male descendants as a sign of their eternal fidelity to the covenant. In Genesis 22:15- 18, because of Abraham's fidelity to the covenant, God backs his Promise Covenant with his own oath. In this section we look closely at the ceremony described in Genesis 15. What kind of ceremony was it?

The Blood Covenant of Friendship

The ceremony in Genesis 15 was a form of covenanting common in the world at that time. Indeed, this form of covenanting was common in many parts of the world, from antiquity to the present. It was known as the Blood Covenant of Friendship, employed by man when he desired to make a binding covenant with another man or chose to make a binding covenant with his God. I am indebted to the book *The Blood Covenant*, by H. Clay Trumbull, for information on this form of covenanting. This book was first published in 1885 and is now available through Impact Books in Kirkwood, Missouri. Mr. Trumbull says, "One of these primitive rites, which is deserving of more attention than it has yet received, as throwing light on many important phases of Bible teaching, is the rite of blood-covenanting: a form of mutual covenanting, by which two persons enter into the closest, most enduring, and the most sacred of compacts, as friends and brothers, or as more than brothers, through the inter-commingling of their blood, by means of its mutual tasting, or of its inter-transfusion. This rite is still observed in the unchanging East, and there are historic traces of it, from time immemorial, in every quarter of the globe" (HCT pp. 4-5). He further states, "There are many forms of covenanting in Syria, but this is the most extreme and sacred of them all. As it is the inter-commingling of very lives, nothing can transcend it. It forms a tie, or a union, which cannot be dissolved. In marriage, divorce is a possibility: not so in the covenant of blood" (HCT p. 6). "He who has entered into this compact with another, counts himself the possessor of a double life; for his friend, whose blood he has shared, is ready to lay down his life with him, or for him" (HCT p. 7). "There are indeed, various evidences that the tie of blood covenanting is reckoned, in the East, even a closer tie than that of natural descent; that a "friend" by this tie is nearer and is dearer, "sticketh closer," than a brother by birth" (HCT p. 10). "The oneness of nature which comes of sharing the same milk; or even than that which comes through having blood from a common source, by natural descent" (HCT p. 12). What does he mean by "intercommingling" or "sharing" blood? This question can best be answered by

describing the six basic elements of the Blood Covenant of Friendship, and explaining what they mean.

The Blood Covenant of Friendship was always composed of as many as six basic elements. Those basic elements, or parts, are described below.

TERMS MADE PUBLIC

1. The terms of the covenant were made public. Each requirement of each covenanting party was published. Nothing was left out; nothing could be added later. None of the terms could be changed or modified; none of the terms could be abrogated.

BLESSINGS AND CURSINGS

2. Blessings were pronounced upon each contracting party if they adhered to the provisions of the covenant. Cursings were pronounced upon each party if he failed to live up to the terms of the Blood Covenant. (See Deuteronomy Chapters 27, 28.)

THE CUTTING

3. The covenant always involved the "cutting" of a sacrificial animal, their own bodies, or both.

THE FEAST

4. This involved two things. First, the flesh of the sacrificial animal was eaten. Second, the blood of the animal was drunk by both parties. They drank it in one of three ways: directly, mixed in juice or wine, or substituting juice or wine with no blood in it at all. They did the same thing with their own blood. (Of course, in no biblical account do they drink blood directly, or mixed with juice or wine.) Sometimes their wrists were cut and rubbed together, making them "blood brothers," (but not in scripture).

THE MEMORIAL

5. After the feast, they erected a memorial to perpetuate the covenant. This could be the planting of a tree, the piling up of stones, or dedicating a flock of livestock or sheep to reproduce without ceasing. This memorial served to remind all that a binding covenant existed between the contracting parties, which was as enduring as the life of the memorial itself.

THE GIFTS

6. Many times, the exchanging of gifts between the contracting parties accompanied the "cutting" of the Blood Covenant of Friendship. The gifts represent the desire of each heart to do something good for his blood covenant friend.

The mutual partaking of their own blood or the blood of the sacrifice symbolized the giving of their very lives to each other. The sacrifice was not viewed as the taking of a life, but rather as the giving of a life. From the time of the covenant, each was viewed as having given his very life to the other, to enforce and to guarantee the terms of the covenant. Each would defend the terms of the covenant to the other, laying his life down, if need be. In this sense, each

considered himself to possess two lives; his own plus the life of his blood covenant partner. This was a covenant to the death. Leviticus 17:11 says, "The life of the flesh is in the blood." Even the heathen recognized this fact. The giving of the blood was the giving of life for the benefit of the other. The partaking of the blood represented life, but the partaking of the flesh of the sacrifice, represented nourishment provided by that life. As they partook of each other's lives (represented by their own blood and/or the common blood and flesh of a sacrificial substitute) so they were nourished. They shared a common life. Their care, support, upholding, defense, provision, and nourishment of each other is now complete. More than brothers, they are "blood brothers." They have entered the Blood Covenant of Friendship, and their lives now belong to one another. They are truly Blood Covenant Friends.

In the biblical record of the Blood Covenant of Friendship, not all six elements are present in each occurrence. This, however, is not necessary because this form of covenanting was common in the world and was understood by the readers of Scripture at that time. Moreover, there are enough of the six elements present to plainly identify the various occurrences as the Blood Covenant of Friendship. We briefly cite four instances of the Blood Covenant of Friendship that certain men initiated with other men in Scripture. The common characteristic of all examples cited is the translation of the Hebrew word KARATH by the English word "make" or "made." KARATH means "to cut." The KJV translates KARATH, "to cut" the covenant, by "make" the covenant. No complete exposition of the four passages are intended here. They are simply identified as the Blood Covenant of Friendship by listing those elements of the six that are given in the passage that identifies them as such. The reader may study the individual passages for him/herself.

1. The Blood Covenant of Friendship between Abraham and Abimelech (Genesis 21:27-32).

- They "cut" the covenant (KARATH) (vv.27, 32).
- They explicated the terms of the covenant (v.23).
- The gift of sheep and oxen are exchanged (v.27).
- The memorial, composed of seven ewe lambs and a planted grove, are explicated (vv.27, 33).

2. The Blood Covenant of Friendship between Isaac and Abimelech (Genesis 27:26-33).

- They "cut" the covenant (KARATH) (v.28).
- They presented the terms of the covenant (v.29).
- The feast of eating and drinking is presented (v.30).

3. The Blood Covenant of Friendship between Jacob and Laban (Genesis 31:44-45).

- They "cut" the covenant (KARATH) (v.44).
- They cited terms of the covenant (vv.49- 53).
- They named the sacrifice (v.54).

- The feast is mentioned (v.54).
- They explicated the memorial, the "heap of witness," composed of a stone pillar, and stone heap (vv.45, 46).

4. The Blood Covenant of Friendship between Jonathan and David (1 Samuel 18:1-3).

- The "cutting" (KARATH) occurs (v.3).
- The gift is explicated (v.4). This Blood Covenant of Friendship between these two men was renewed (1 Samuel 20:13-20).
- The "cutting" (KAPATH) occurs (v.16).
- The terms are explicated (vv.13-23).

Because of the Blood Covenant of Friendship between Jonathan and David, even after the death of Jonathan, David cared for his son Mephibosheth. He said twice that he would show him kindness for Jonathan's sake (2 Samuel 9:1, 7). He restored to him all his land, had it tilled for him, had the fruits of the land gathered for him, and provided for him to always eat at his (David's) table (2 Samuel 9:1-13).

The examples cited above are all between man and man. But, the Blood Covenant of Friendship was also made between man and his god. H. Clay Trumbull says, "Beyond the idea of inspiration through an interflow of Godrepresenting blood, there has been in primitive man's mind (however it came there) the thought of a possible inter-communion with God through an inter-union with God by blood. God is life. All life is from God, and belongs to God. Blood is life. Blood, therefore, as life, may be a means of man's inter-union with God. As the closest and most sacred of covenants between man and man; as, indeed an absolute merging of two human natures into one,—is a possibility through an inter-flowing of a common blood; so the closest and most sacred of covenants between man and God; so the inter-union of the human nature with the divine,—has been looked upon as a possibility, through the proffer and acceptance of a common life in a common blood-flow" (HCT p. 147). Again he says, "Man longed for oneness of life with God. Oneness of life could only come through oneness of blood. To secure such oneness of life, man would give of his own blood, or of that substitute blood which could best represent himself. Counting himself in oneness of life with God, through the covenant of blood, man has sought for nourishment and growth through partaking of that food which in a sense was life, and which in a larger sense gave life, because it was the food of God, and because it was the food which stood for God" (HCT p. 184). He further says, "In the primitive rite of blood-covenanting, men drank of each other's blood, in order that they might have a common life; and they ate together of a mutually prepared feast, in order that they might evidence and nourish that life. In the out-reaching of men God-ward, for the privileges of a divine-human inter-union, they poured out the substitute blood of a chosen victim in sacrifice, and they partook of the flesh of that sacrificial victim, in symbolism of sharing the life and nourishment of Deity" (HCT p. 274).

In Genesis 15, God initiated the Blood Covenant of Friendship with Abraham. Moses recorded three of the six elements in this passage:

- 1.** The covenant was "cut" (KARATH) (v.18).

2. The sacrifices are named (vv.9, 10). They were a three-year-old heifer, a three-year-old she-goat, a three-year-old ram, a turtle dove, and a young pigeon. They were cut down the middle and probably stacked in two piles.
3. The terms are explicated (vv.13-21). The terms contained everything in the Sixty-Promises-(BARAK-EULOGIA)-Covenant that God had previously promised to Abraham. The Promises were brought under the authority of the Blood Covenant of Friendship.

During the process of this ceremony, Abraham passed under a deep sleep and a horror of great darkness fell upon him; at which time, when the sun had gone down, something that appeared to be a smoking furnace and a burning lamp passed between the pieces of the sacrificial victims.

In Genesis 17, God required the rite of circumcision as a token of the Blood Covenant of Friendship between himself and Abraham. This token included not only Abraham, but every male child who was eight days old, "...in your generations..." (Genesis 17:12). Abraham and his male descendants must shed their blood through circumcision as a token of the covenant between God, Abraham, and his seed. Nothing is mentioned, however, of God shedding his own blood, either directly or substitutionally; yet, the rite of circumcision lasted until the death of Jesus Christ. As a result of the Blood Covenant of Friendship God initiated between himself and Abraham, Abraham is the only man in all the Bible who is called by name, "the friend of God." Jehoshaphat asked the question, "Art not thou our God, who didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people, Israel, and gavest it to the seed of Abraham, thy friend forever?" (2 Chronicles 20:7). Isaiah said, "But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob, whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend" (Isaiah 41:8). James said, "And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God" (James 2:23). Because of the Blood Covenant of Friendship ceremonialized in Genesis 15, Abraham became, henceforth the "Friend of God."

The Full Explanation of "Will Make in Jeremiah's Expression, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah"

As with Jonathan and David; who "cut" the covenant again (1 Samuel 20:13-20), Jeremiah prophesied that the Blood Covenant of Friendship between God and Abraham would be "cut" afresh, anew (KAINOS). He said, "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" (Jeremiah 31:31). We have already seen that "new" is the translation of KHAWDASH, which means "new in quality." "Cut" is the translation of KARATH, which means literally "to cut." In other words, the Abrahamic Covenant, already in existence when Jeremiah prophesied, is to be "cut" anew at some future time. When is this future time? The author of Hebrews viewed it as the beginning of the Christian era or Church age. He quotes Jeremiah's prophecy almost verbatim (Hebrews 8:8-12), with a small commentary (v. 13). In verses 8 through 13, the English word "make" is used twice, once in verse 8 and once in verse 10. The English word "made" is also used twice, once in verse 9 and once in verse 13. All four uses, two "makes" and two "mades," are the translations of four different Greek words, while "make" and "made" are just different tenses of the same English word. We shall examine these four words, beginning with verses 9, 10, 13, and look last at the instance in verse 8.

In Hebrews 8:9, the English word "made" is the translation of the Greek word POIEO, which means "to do" or "to make" some thing. Our English word "poem" comes from POIEO. In

this verse God is saying that his (KAINOS) "new" covenant will not be according to the Mosaic Covenant that he "made" (POIEO) with their fathers.

In verse 10, God said "...this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel..." In this verse, "make" is the translation of DIATHASOMAI. The Greek noun or word for covenant is DIATHAKA. The word translated "make," here, is simply the verbal form of the Greek word translated "covenant." "Covenant" becomes verbalized stating, "This is the covenant that I will covenant with the house of Israel."

In verse 13, "made" is the translation of PALAIOS, which means "to make old by declaration." This is a qualitative word which doesn't necessarily define "old" by referring to the ancient beginning of something. Rather, this word stresses the qualities caused by the passage of time without necessarily referring to its beginning. In this sense, PALAIOS must be distinguished from ARKAIOS, which means "old with reference to its beginning point." PALAIOS, on the other hand, designates the qualities caused by age, i.e., old age, worn out, obsolete, etc. Trench says, "As often as PALAIOS is employed to connote that which is worn out, or wearing out, by age, it will absolutely demand KAINOS as its opposite" (RCT p. 253). Is PALAIOS used this way in verse 13? Is KAINOS used as its opposite in verse 13? Why is it necessary that only KAINOS and not NEOS be employed as its opposite when PALAIOS means "worn out by age"?

Yes, PALAIOS means "worn out" in verse 13, which states, "Now, that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away" (Hebrews 8:13). Yes, KAINOS is used as the opposite of PALAIOS. "New" is the translation of KAINOS. KAINOS is demanded as the opposite of PALAIOS in this case because both are qualitative words: PALAIOS representing the quality of "wear," and KAINOS representing the quality of "newness" because of some new twist given a preexistent entity, etc. For those cases where PALAIOS represents something old or ancient, with reference to a beginning, its opposite would then be NEOS, meaning new in time from a point of beginning.

This distinction is important. Why? Because as this verse is written, the comparison is between the "oldness in quality" of the Mosaic Covenant and the "newness of quality" of the KAINOS covenant. The verse compares "quality" with "quality." This is comparing, as it were, "apples to apples." If the "new covenant" was indeed "brand new," as taught by The God-Looked-Down Theory, NEOS would be used in the place of KAINOS. But, this would result in an "apples to oranges" comparison in this context, unless PALAIOS was changed to ARKAIOS, which means "new with reference to a beginning point." If in fact Hebrews 8:13 was comparing the "oldness in time," i.e., "old" with reference to a beginning point of the Mosaic legislation with the "newness in time," with reference to a beginning point of the "brand-new" covenant, ARKAIOS would have been used with NEOS. This would still be comparing "apples to apples." But, to view the (KAINOS) "new covenant" as "brand-new in time," i.e., "God's brand-new thing," in conjunction with PALAIOS in this context, is a comparison of "apples to oranges," i.e., new in time measured from a recent beginning point compared to the qualities of old age measured by wear. This is not so! The "new covenant" is new in quality, not in time. This "newness" quality is compared to the quality of "wear" of the Mosaic Law. Also, PALAIOS is in the Perfect Tense, which means a finished action, the results of which are still standing. Therefore, the standing result of the Mosaic Covenant is the quality of "being worn out." Unless one is prepared to accuse the author of Hebrews of comparing apples to oranges, one must view the (KAINOS) "new covenant," not as "brand new in time," but as a covenant already in existence, to which has been added a different characteristic, making it different, fresh, and new in quality. We have seen that Jeremiah 31:31, in the Hebrew Old Testament, uses the word KARATH or "cut," which is translated "will make" a new covenant (KJV). The author of Hebrews, quoting Jeremiah in

Hebrews 8:8, uses the Greek word SUNTELEO to translate KARATH. This word is the combination of SUN, a Greek preposition meaning "together with," plus TELEO, meaning end or completion, and is translated by the expression "will make" (KJV). This translation, "I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel," sounds as though some future, brand-new covenant would be made by God with Israel. But, the word SUNTELEO will not permit this conclusion. In every instance where this word occurs in the Greek New Testament, it means to conclude, end or complete a preexisting thing or process. SUNTELEO never refers to a future, brand-new undertaking. It means to end, complete, conclude, finish, fulfill, or consummate. A quick look at every use of SUNTELEO in the Greek New Testament will demonstrate this. The parenthesis in the following phrases will show how SUNTELEO is translated:

- Matthew 7:28 "...when Jesus (**had ended**) these sayings...."
- Mark 13:4 "...when all these things shall (**be fulfilled**)?"
- Luke 4:2 "...and when they were (**ended**),..."
- Luke 4:13 "And when the devil (**had ended**) all...."
- Acts 21:27 "And when the seven days were almost (**ended**)...."
- Romans 9:28 "For he will (**finish**) the work...."

Even the noun form, SUNTELEIA, means "end."

- Matthew 13:39 "...the harvest is the (**end**) of the world:..."
- Matthew 13:40 "...so shall it be in the (**end**) of this world...."
- Matthew 13:49 "So shall it be at the (**end**) of the world:..."
- Matthew 24:3 "...and of the (**end**) of the world?"
- Matthew 28:20 "...unto the (**end**) of the world."
- Hebrews 9:26 "...once in the (**end**) of the world hath he...."

In every instance, in both the noun and the verb forms of this word in the Greek New Testament, SUNTELEO means "to end, finish, complete, fulfill, conclude, or consummate." As a matter of fact, Hebrews 8:8 may be the only place and time in the history of the world where this word SUNTELEO, which means "to complete the preexisting," is translated in such a way as to emphasize the beginning of something, i.e., "to start up something which has never been." And yet, in this same passage of Scripture, the translation "will make" calls for a brand-new undertaking. This is not so. The covenant Jeremiah said would be "cut" again was already in existence. The writer of Hebrews says that the preexisting covenant will be completed, not that God "will make" a brand-new covenant in the future. He sees Jeremiah's future "cutting" as the "completion" of the Abrahamic Covenant, which begins the Christian era.

In addition, the translation should be "the" new covenant, not "a" new covenant as in the KJV. This is so for two reasons: **(1)** The Greeks would omit the definite article when they were referring to only one of a kind (WDC p. 57). The Abrahamic New Covenant is definitely one of a

kind. (2) A noun is made definite when it has a defining adjective (M III p. 179). In this verse, the noun "covenant" has a defining adjective "new" (KAINOS). Therefore, the meaning of verse 8 is that God will "complete" "the" covenant by "cutting." This "completion by cutting" is the quality "the" covenant did not previously have, and which gives it a "newness;" hence, the word KAINOS is used for "new in quality."

Furthermore, the above meaning of SUNTELEO is not hidden away. Current, Christian scholarship knows that SUNTELEO means "complete," (that which is in existence already) and in no way implies the "start up" of something new (that which did not exist before). Modern translations of the New Testament prove these assertions:

1. The Emphasized New Testament: A New Translation by J. B. Rotherham translates SUNTELEO in Hebrews 8:8 by "**...I will conclude....**"
2. The New Testament: An American Translation by Edgar J. Goodspeed translates SUNTELEO in Hebrews 8:8 by "**...I will conclude....**"
3. The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, American Bible Union Version by John A. Broadus et al, translates SUNTELEO in Hebrews 8:8 by "**...I will complete....**"
4. The Twentieth Century New Testament translates SUNTELEO in Hebrews 8:8 by "**...I will ratify....**"

And yet, no one challenges, openly at least, the tradition that God "started up" a covenant which had not existed before. Tradition dies hard. But, thank God, somebody once openly challenged the tradition that the earth was flat! In like manner, The God-Looked-Down Theory must now be challenged openly and discarded.

The Completion on Golgotha of Abraham's Covenant by Jesus, the Seed of Abraham, Who Was Both God and Man

How was this "completion by cutting" of the Abrahamic Covenant accomplished? It was accomplished in the person of Jesus Christ, who in the days of his flesh was both God and man. How he came to be both God and man is best understood by examining the Greek word EPISKIADZO. This word combines EPI, a Greek preposition meaning "over or upon," with SKIADZO, meaning "shadow." This word is used five times in the Greek New Testament and is always translated "overshadow." Each use of this word concerns the Spirit of God coming upon human flesh, enabling it to accomplish what it could not accomplish apart from the power of God. In Matthew 17:5; Mark 9:7; and Luke 9:34, a cloud "overshadowed" Peter, James, and John enabling them to hear the voice of God, which said, "This is my beloved Son." In Acts 5:15, the people brought the sick so that the shadow of Peter might "overshadow some of them." "They were healed everyone" (Acts 5:16). In Luke 1:35, the angel said unto Mary, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." In Matthew 17:5; Mark 9:7, and Luke 9:34, the "overshadowing" enabled Peter, James, and John to audibly hear the very voice of God. In Acts 5:15, the "overshadowing" enabled human flesh to be healed by the power of God. In Luke 1:35, the "overshadowing" enabled Mary, in the flesh, to produce an offspring which was both God and man.

As man, Jesus was the seed of Abraham. "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" (Galatians 3:16). "It (the law) was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promises were made;..." (Galatians 3:19). "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham" (Hebrews 2:16). As the seed of Abraham, Jesus was circumcised into the Abrahamic Covenant. "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived in the womb" (Luke 2:21). Jesus viewed circumcision as the token of the Abrahamic Covenant, not as having originated with Moses. "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision: (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man" (John 7:22).

In addition to being the seed of Abraham, Jesus is also God in human form. In Matthew 1:23. Jesus is called "God with us." "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us." In Hebrews 1:8, the Son is called "God," by God himself. "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom." In 2 Corinthians 5:19, God himself is said to be in Christ. "To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." In John 1:1 and 1:14, both Jesus and God are called "the Word" and are seen as the same person. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (v. 1). "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (v. 14). Finally, in Acts 20:28, Paul says that the blood of God himself, paid the purchase price for the redemption of a world of lost sinners. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Jesus was born of a woman that he had created with his own hands. As a tiny baby in Bethlehem's manger, he weighed just a few pounds. Yet, he was bigger than the mother who gave him birth. When he was just minutes old, lying in Mary's arms, he was eons older than she. He was so helpless as a baby, yet even then his power kept the planets his own hands had made in their icy tracks. As a little child, he knew nothing, save the security of his mother's breasts. Even then, somehow, "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18). Here, in a stable in Bethlehem cradled in his mother's arms, lies the one who cradles all of creation, including his own mother in his own arms. It staggers our minds to think that 2000 years ago, God was born of a little Jewish virgin, entered the stream of human existence, and actually lived and walked on this planet as a human being. And we stand amazed, even more, when we realize that some 33 years later, this same God in human flesh, mounted a cruel cross on Golgotha's rugged brow, and gave up his own life, completing the Abrahamic Covenant; fulfilling the demands of Moses' Law, thereby delivering the eternal salvation promised Abraham. Jesus' "completion by cutting" contains all six elements of the ceremony attached to The Blood Covenant of Friendship. When the promises were "ceremonialized" in Genesis 17, God required Abraham and his male descendants to shed their blood as a token of their fidelity to the Abrahamic Covenant. Nothing, however, was said of God's blood. But now, it is His own blood that must be shed, to complete forever the ceremony begun between God and Abraham (Acts 20:28). Again, no sacrificial animal will do. The "cutting" is in the human flesh of God himself. (The six elements of the Blood Covenant of Friendship completed by Jesus on Golgotha are listed below):

THE CUTTING

1. The cutting began with the scourging (Matthew 27:26; Mark 15:15). They scourged a malefactor in those days with a Roman cat-o-nine-tails: a whip with small whips on the end. They attached to the end of each small whip a sharp, jagged piece of metal or bone. They stripped the victim at least to the waist. Each time the whip struck, bits of flesh and skin were torn away by the jagged bone or metal teeth of the whip. It was not uncommon for the whip to completely surround the victim's body, striking him in the face, chest, and stomach. Eyes could be gouged out, teeth knocked down his throat, even his face torn away. The whip cut his stomach so that it lay open, the inner organs spilling down his front. The beating left his back a lacerated mass. Jesus, God in human flesh, endured such a scourging. The "cutting" had begun. The blood was drawn.

They jerked his beard from his face (Isaiah 50:6), leaving it a bloody mess. They blindfolded and hit him in the face (Luke 22:63). They (Roman soldiers) crowned him with a crown of thorns (Matthew 27:29). The thorns surely dug into his skin, also causing the blood to flow. The "cutting" progressed.

With his back, neck, and shoulders beyond recognition, resembling a mass of raw meat, they clothed him in a scarlet robe, put a reed in his right hand, and mocked him, saying, "Hail, King of the Jews" (Matthew 27:29). They spat on him. They took the reed from his hand and hit him in the head with it. They then took off the scarlet robe and put his own garment on him and led him away to be crucified (Matthew 27:30-31). Simon, of Cyrene carried his cross (Luke 23:26). On the way to "the place of the skull," he spoke briefly to the women (Luke 23:28-31), the blood still flowing.

Having ascended Golgotha, they fastened him to the cross with three iron spikes seven inches long. The feet that had walked the sandy shores of beautiful Galilee were now nailed together with one spike to the cross. The hands that had ministered to the poor and needy were nailed separately to the cross, first one hand, then the other. The "cutting" was now in full force as his blood ran freely. Yet, in his heart and Spirit, he ministered even unto death (Luke 23:34; 42, 43). Finally, after he gave up his blood and very life, the Roman spear penetrated his heart, blood and water poured forth. The "cutting" was complete. That which began 2000 years before between God and Abraham was complete. Beginning with Animal substitution, followed by Abraham's blood in circumcision. God completed the "cutting" by the drawing of his own blood (Acts 20:28). The Abrahamic Covenant now has the additional quality of "completion by cutting;" hence, the use of (KAINOS) rather than NEOS, meaning "new in quality." Now, we can define with precision the meaning of new (KAINOS) when used in the New Testament in conjunction with the word covenant. The expression "new covenant" in the New Testament, means, "The Abrahamic Covenant made complete by the cutting of Jesus' flesh and the drawing of Jesus' blood." Below, we list every occurrence in the New Testament of the expression, the new (KAINOS) covenant. The above expanded definition of KAINOS plus covenant is substituted for the simple and inaccurate "new" covenant in the King James translations of each occurrence. The following translations, then, enable the reader to see at a glance, this exact definition and what it means in the various verses where KAINOS plus covenant occur:

1. (Luke 22:20) "Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the Abrahamic Covenant made complete in my blood (by the cutting of my [Jesus'] flesh and the drawing of my blood) which is shed for you."

2. (1 Corinthians 11:25) "After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the Abrahamic Covenant completed in my blood (by the cutting of my [Jesus'] flesh and the drawing of my [Jesus'] blood): this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."
3. (2 Corinthians 3:6) "Who also hath made us able ministers of the Abrahamic Covenant made complete by the cutting of Jesus' flesh and the drawing of Jesus' blood...."
4. (Hebrews 8:8) "For finding fault with them (the people), he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will complete (SUNTELEO) the Abrahamic Covenant (by the cutting of Jesus' flesh and the drawing of Jesus' blood) with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah."
5. (Hebrews 9:15) "And for this cause (his shed blood and offered life in v. 14), he is the mediator of the Abrahamic Covenant made complete (by the cutting of Jesus' flesh and the drawing of Jesus' blood), that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance."

In addition, this same act of death was the final sacrifice for sin under Moses' Law, terminating the Law forever. Jesus' death not only ratified Abraham's Covenant with God's blood, but terminated Moses' Law with God's blood.

THE TERMS

2. The terms of the concluding ceremony, the "completion by cutting," were the promises of health, wealth, and salvation made to Abraham. Hebrews 9:15 says that Jesus became the mediator of the covenant that had been "completed by cutting." "And for this cause (the given blood of Christ in verse 14) he is the mediator of the new (KAINOS) testament or covenant (DIATHAKA), that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament (covenant), they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance" (Hebrews 9:15). Prior to the "completion by cutting," all the provisions of the Abrahamic Covenant came through Abraham to his heirs. After the "completion by cutting," all the provisions of the Abrahamic Covenant comes to the Abrahamic Seed Group through Jesus, the ultimate seed to whom the Abrahamic promises were directed. In other words, prior to the death of Jesus, Abraham mediated the blessings. After Jesus' death, Jesus himself mediates the blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant.

The Christian community universally maintains that Jesus' death secures the redemption for transgressions after his death. And, in Hebrews 9:15, we learn that Jesus' death also secured the redemption for the transgressions that occurred prior to his death, i.e., those that were under the first, or Mosaic Testament or Covenant. (The author uses their term "first" to communicate in their ballpark. Moses' Law was to them "first" in priority, as they had disconnected Moses from Abraham. But, in actuality, the Abrahamic Covenant was "first" in time to Moses.) We also learn that the redemption from transgressions that were under the "first" covenant is the condition upon which the promises of eternal inheritance might be received.

We saw that the Abrahamic Covenant established an eternal relationship between Abraham and God which included Abraham's heirs. We saw that God added the Law 430 years later, to guard his heirs against losing this preexisting relationship because of their transgressions. This act of grace, the Law, functioned as their schoolmaster, teaching them what constituted sin and providing a system of sacrifices when they sinned. God never intended for their obedience in performing the appropriate sacrifice to blot out their sin. Instead, it provided a "covering" which

enabled God to "wink at it," to temporarily overlook it. As a result, God deferred judging or dealing with their sin until Christ came. He then judged and forgave all Old Testament sin for the obedient Remnant based on the blood of Christ. Galatians 3:23, 24 says that the Law temporarily guarded the Remnant only until Christ, the object of faith, "came." But before the faith came, they were guarded under the Law, being shut up (for their protection) until the faith (comes) which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore, the Law was our schoolmaster, (lasting) until Christ (came) that we might be justified by faith."

Romans 3:25, as well as Hebrews 9:15, says that Christ's death and blood secured redemption for Old Testament sins committed by the obedient Remnant. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." "Remission" is the translation of PAREISIS, which means "a passing over, a temporary overlooking, a suspension of judgement, and a withholding of punishment." "Forbearance" is the translation of ANOCHE, which means a holding back, a delay, and "withholding of punishment." The appropriate Old Testament sacrifice enabled God to defer dealing with the sins of the saved, Old Testament Remnant until the death of Christ. Upon Christ's death, God "moved" those sins committed by the saved, Old Testament Remnant under the blood of Christ. In so doing, he no longer "winked at them." Rather, he "washed away" the sins of the Old Testament Remnant, having moved them under the blood of Jesus! Only then were they "redeemed."

In Hebrews 9:15, the Sacred Writer makes the expression "redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament (covenant)" and the expression "receive the promise of eternal inheritance," (which we previously saw was EULOGIA, or health and wealth in addition to salvation) depend on each other. He also made their dependence on each other, rest entirely upon the Sixty- Promises-BARAK-EULOGIA contained in the Abrahamic Covenant. In other words, the complete "Inheritance" of the Abrahamic Covenant could not be received until the "Redeemer" (and his redemption) came. (See Promise 60.) And the Redeemer could not come, indeed, he would not exist apart from the same Abrahamic Covenant that declared the "promise of eternal inheritance." Therefore, these expressions are not only dependent on each other, their dependence on each other depends solely on the Abrahamic Covenant since both provisions (Redeemer and Inheritance) are explicated by it. And, unless one can prove beyond a doubt that Old Testament salvation, health, and wealth were not derived from Abraham's EULOGIA Promises, then the expression, "promise of eternal inheritance" must be a synonymous phrase with "the Abrahamic-Sixty Promises- (BARAK-EULOGIA) Covenant." Since Old Testament salvation, health and wealth were in fact based upon Abraham's Promises, then these two expressions, "redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant" and "receive the promise of eternal inheritance" link together the Abrahamic Covenant and Old Testament salvation, health and wealth in one New Testament verse.

But this isn't all this New Testament verse accomplishes. This verse also links this Old Testament salvation, health and wealth, based on the Abrahamic Covenant to the "new (KAINOS) Covenant" (which is the ratification with Jesus' blood of the same Abrahamic Covenant), by showing that the contents of the "new" (KAINOS) covenant which Jesus mediates during the Church age, is in fact the contents of the Abrahamic Covenant, which, as we have seen, endures "forever," spanning both Old and New Testament eras. In other words, the content of the Abrahamic Covenant and the content of the "new (KAINOS) covenant," mediated by Jesus, are one and the same. This assertion is strengthened by defining more precisely who the author meant by his expression "they which are called might receive...."

"They which," is the translation of OI, meaning "the ones." Who are "the ones"? Since "the ones" are to "receive the promise of eternal inheritance," which is a synonymous phrase with "the Abrahamic Covenant," then "the ones" are none other than Abraham and the Abrahamic Seed Group. And since we proved in Volume I that the Abrahamic Seed Group includes Isaac, Jacob, and Israel before the Law, the Remnant of Israel after the Law, and all Christians during the Church age, then "the ones" in Hebrews 9:15 includes the "saved" of both the Old and New Testament ages. The author of Hebrews demonstrated that "the ones" included the saved of both the Old and New Testaments by including himself and all Christians in the salvation based on the Abrahamic Covenant. For a full discussion of this, see Volume IV, [How To Obtain Abraham's Blessings](#).

Common sense also demonstrates that "the ones" is the Abrahamic Seed Group of both Testaments. Who else would be in a position to receive anything from Abraham's promises except those who were included in them? Only the Abrahamic Seed Group, the saved Old Testament Remnant of Israel, those saved descendants of Abraham, those of Israel who composed the Old Testament "Membership Roster" of the Abrahamic Seed Group could receive "the Abrahamic promise of eternal inheritance." No one else could receive this inheritance. And Christians receive the same inheritance for the same reason, their inclusion in the Abrahamic Seed Group.

Further proof that "the ones" includes the Abrahamic Seed Groups of both Testaments is provided by the universal belief of all but a few Christians; the "new" covenant spans the entire Church age and includes all Christians within its borders. And since we proved in Volume I that Christians now compose the "Membership Roster" of the Abrahamic Seed Group, it is no wonder that the author of Hebrews includes himself and all Christians, as well as "the ones redeemed from Old Testament transgressions" in the salvation based on the Abrahamic Covenant. In other words, the same salvation, health and wealth derived from the same Abrahamic Covenant, extending to Abraham and his one and only Abrahamic Seed Group which began with Isaac, then included Jacob, then took in the saved Remnant of Israel after the Law, and finally enclosed all Christians within its borders is what we have here. The same salvation, health and wealth, based on the same covenant, for the same Abrahamic Seed Group, and attested by **(1)** the author's inclusion of himself and all Christians in this same "eternal inheritance," **(2)** common sense, and **(3)** universal Christian belief is the thrust of Hebrews 9:15.

To summarize what we have said so far about Hebrews 9:15, we list the following:

1. The salvation, health, and wealth in the Old Testament and under the new covenant is the same salvation, health, and wealth.
2. Old Testament salvation, health, and wealth and new covenant salvation, health, and wealth, being the same, are based upon God's covenant with Abraham.
3. This same salvation, health, and wealth based on the Abrahamic Covenant is mediated by one person, Jesus Christ, to the saved of both Old and New Testament ages.
4. Those who obtain this salvation, health, and wealth mediated by Jesus Christ are in fact in the Abrahamic Seed Group, spread out over thousands of years of time.

In addition, "are called" is the translation of KALEO, which means "to call." The form of KALEO here, is the Perfect Passive Participle, and should be translated "having been called." Passive means the calling was not done by themselves but by one other than themselves. In other

words, God alled them. The Perfect Tense means the calling occurred in the past, but the results of that calling still exist in present time. The rule for the Perfect Participle states that unless the context indicates otherwise, the time of the action denoted by the participle occurred in time prior to the time of the main verb, with the results of that previous action still standing at the time of the main verb. The main verb in verse 15 is "is," which is in the Present Tense. In other words, in the past, God made promises to Abraham and his seed group, calling them with those promises to an eternal inheritance. (For a fuller discussion of the Christians' Abrahamic Inheritance, see Volume I, What Are Abraham's Blessings Anyway?) The results of this calling action contained in the Sixty- Promises- (BARAKE-ULOGIA) - Covenant are *still standing*, i.e., The Abrahamic Seed Group is *still called* to an eternal inheritance at the time of the writing of Hebrews 9:15. To put it differently, the Abrahamic Covenant is still valid.

Note well that the author of Hebrews includes himself and all Christians within the borders of the Abrahamic Seed Group because Christians make up that group. Since the Perfect Tense denotes that the "calling" extended to the Seed Group is "still standing," and Christians are that Seed Group as well as those in the Old Testament era, the same salvation, health, and wealth contained in that "calling still standing," based on the same Abrahamic Covenant, is the same for both the Old and New Testament ages.

This is amazing! Salvation, health, and wealth in the Old Testament were based solely upon the Abrahamic Covenant. Moses' Law guarded those blessings temporarily. Verse 15 speaks exclusively of the relationship of Christ to that Old Testament "inheritance." The "called group," that is, the Abrahamic Seed Group in verse 15 was the obedient Remnant of Abraham's promises. The author, throughout Hebrews, includes himself as well as all Christians in that same, Old Testament Seed Group. But notice! The author is a Christian. He is in the Church age, under the so-called "new covenant." He is a member of God's "brand-new thing"—the Church, and Jesus is said to be the mediator of God's "brandnew covenant." What then, is the content of that which Jesus mediates in God's so-called "brand-new covenant"? According to Hebrews 9:15, Jesus is mediating the Old Testament "inheritance" of salvation, health, and wealth (the same promise of eternal inheritance given Abraham and the Remnant) to the self-same Old Testament "called group." In addition, the author includes himself, and all Christians, not in a brand-new unheard of group called the "Brand-new Covenant Church" taught in the God-Looked-Down Theory, but in "the ones called" group which spans both Testament eras. He makes no distinction between himself and both the Old and New Testament Remnant. He makes no distinction between salvation based upon the Abrahamic Covenant and the salvation he presently enjoys; for the body known as the Remnant in the Old Testament and the body known as the Church in the New Testament are the same group. *Both are the Abrahamic Seed Group*. Even though the "calling" occurred prior to Jesus' death, the results of that "calling" are still standing, and the author of Hebrews included himself, and all Christians in those *standing results*. Jesus mediates (dispenses) in the New Testament era the content of the same "calling" to salvation, health, and wealth that they had in the Old Testament, which was based upon the Sixty Promises-(BARAKEULOGIA)-Abrahamic Covenant Structure.

To argue that the "new (KAINOS) covenant" is not the historic unfoldment of the Abrahamic Covenant leaves us wondering why the content of the "new (KAINOS) covenant," mediated by Jesus in Hebrews 9:15, is the Old Testament inheritance of salvation, health, and wealth which is in fact, based upon the Abrahamic Covenant. In addition, if the "new (KAINOS) covenant" is not the historic unfoldment of the Abrahamic Covenant, since Jesus is to be mediating the "promise of eternal inheritance," attributed to the Old Testament era, one must be prepared to prove that salvation, health, and wealth in the Old Testament were not based upon the promises to Abraham. The Jews attempted this by disconnecting the Law, apart from Abraham,

as a "plan of salvation." This will accrue to their eternal regret. But, if the Old Testament salvation was "disconnected" in some way from Abraham, then what was Old Testament salvation based on?

Finally, since Jesus is mediating Old Testament salvation in Hebrews 9:15, both to those before and after the cross, then, if the Church is not the historic unfoldment of the Abrahamic Covenant, we are forced to conclude that Jesus is mediating one thing to the "called group" of verse 15, but mediating something entirely different to "another group" (Brand-New-Covenant-Church- Entity-Thing) proclaimed to us by The God-Looked-Down Theory. But, what else is he mediating and where is the Scripture that defines it? Who is this "other group-entity-thing" and where is the Scripture that identifies them? Is it possible there are two churches, one based on the Abrahamic Covenant and the other pulled from thin air, both claiming Jesus as its Savior? No! The Church is the historic unfoldment of the Abrahamic Covenant. The terms of the "cutting" of the flesh of God, in human form that day on Golgotha's rugged heights, was the full force of everything God promised Abraham and his Seed Group in the Sixty Promises-(BARAK-EULOGIA) Covenant.

We must keep in mind that no eternal inheritance of health and wealth, in addition to salvation, was possible under their so called "first covenant." Remember, their "first covenant" was Moses' Law separated from Abraham's promises. As such, it was a doctrine of works. Consequently, it never produced salvation, health or wealth for anyone who followed this flawed theology. We have shown previously (The Contrary to Fact Condition) that the author of Hebrews considered their doctrine of the "first covenant" to be fatally flawed.

In addition, nowhere in Hebrews does the author even imply that their "first covenant" ever produced any form of an inheritance for them, eternal or otherwise. Even his expression in Hebrews 9:15, "redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant" contains no hint that their "first covenant" produced any form of inheritance for them. In the above expression, "under" translates the Greek word EPI, which in this context, means "during the time of." This word, EPI, also means "during the time of" in 2 Corinthians 1:4; Ephesians 4:26; and 1 Thessalonians 3:7b. In other words, the author declares that Jesus mediates the inheritance provided by the Abrahamic Covenant and protected by Moses Law "during the time covered" by their so-called, erroneous, "first covenant." He absolutely, nowhere, even hinted that the inheritance was "produced by" their flawed theology. By no stretch of the imagination, can anyone make "during the time of" mean the same thing as "produced by." Their flawed theology, their "first covenant," produced the damnation of their souls and nothing more. It could not, and did not produce either the redemption, or the inheritance spoken of in the Old Testament. To think otherwise is to give a Category One meaning to a Category Three statement.

If we attribute the inheritance mentioned in Hebrews 9:15 to their so called "first covenant," then we accept The Great Disconnect Theory (Moses disconnected from Abraham) as a fact, and must admit that salvation in the Old Testament really was achieved by works, i.e., by keeping Moses' Law. But, if we allow this, since Jesus is now mediating the same Old Testament salvation (inheritance) during the Church age, then we must conclude that Jesus is mediating a Christian salvation which requires Christians to be saved by works also, i.e., Christians must also keep Moses' Law to the letter. This, of course, is not so. Unfortunately, this is the logical conclusion of the teachings of The God- Looked-Down Theory, i.e., of traditional, Christian theology.

Paul buttresses the above discussion by his assertion in Galatians 3:8. He equated "Christian gospel" with the Abrahamic Covenant, specifically Promise 8. He said, "And the

Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." In other words, the "gospel" and Promise 8. "In thee shall all nations be blessed," mean the same thing. "Preached before the gospel" is the translation of PROEUANGEL-IDZOMAI. This Greek word combines PRO, meaning "before," and EUANGEL-IDZOMAI, which means to "evangelize" or to "preach." Thus, the consolidation of these two mean "to preach the gospel beforehand" to Abraham. (See Vincent's Word Studies of the New Testament, Volume IV, p. 117.) To put it differently, Paul declared that before the Church age began, the Christian gospel of "salvation of the heathen by faith" was preached to Abraham as Promise 8. Of course God did the preaching. But God and his Word are the same, and since the Scriptures are God's Word, Paul personifies the Scriptures as God's preaching. In this passage, the "gospel" that covers the so-called "New Covenant Age" and Promise 8 of the Sixty Promises- (BARAK-EULOGIA)-Covenant God made to Abraham and his Seed Group are the same. In Hebrews 9:15, the so-called new covenant that Jesus mediated to the Old Testament saved Remnant was also the Sixty Promises-(BARAK-EULOGIA). *So then, the "gospel," the content of the "new (KAINOS) covenant" and the "Sixty Promises- (BARAK-EULOGIA)- Covenant" are the same. These terms are simply synonymous of each other.* Since the gospel, the content of the new (KAINOS) covenant and the Abrahamic Covenant are all synonymous terms, and since we've seen in Volume I that the Abrahamic Covenant is still in force for Christians, then why do we need a so-called "new covenant" proclaimed by The God-Looked-Down Theory? To persist in this theory means that Scripture contains two covenants, existing side by side, that provide the same things. The Abrahamic Covenant provides Jesus, the Savior and Mediator. So does the so-called "new covenant." The Abrahamic Covenant provides the gospel. So does the so-called "new covenant." But, the Abrahamic Covenant provides health and wealth for the Seed Group. The so-called "new covenant" does not because it has so carefully disconnected itself from Abraham. And yet, in Galatians 3:8, "blessed" is the translation of EULOGIA, which still includes health and wealth in addition to salvation when applied to the Abrahamic Seed Group. Of course, this verse is addressed to the Seed Group. (The reader should apply the Eight Questions of Scripture Analysis to this verse.)

The writer of Hebrews 9:15 was not swayed by the Fulfillment Theory. If the Abrahamic Covenant ran its course, and was terminated in Joshua's day, this author was unaware of it. Neither was he aware that the Jews had to occupy the land (The Residential Theory) since they obviously were not occupying it in the manner prescribed by Moses when he wrote this book. In addition, if the Division Theory had any substance at all, he would have mentioned it here. There is, however, no mention of any division of salvation from healing and prosperity here (or anywhere else) for the simple reason that no division of Abraham's EULOGIA exists.

Finally, even a superficial reading of Hebrews 9:15 reveals that this author rejected entirely the view that Abraham's Covenant and faith are simply our examples (The Example Theory). In linking Jesus' ministry as Mediator to it during the Church age, he shows once once again, its continuing force as a reality, not just an "Example of Faith."

THE MEMORIAL

3. In the Blood Covenant of Friendship between Abraham and Abimelech, we saw that Abraham planted a grove of trees as a memorial. In the Blood Covenant of Friendship between God and man which Jesus "completed by cutting," he also planted a tree as a memorial. He was hanged (crucified) on a tree called "The Old Rugged Cross." Although the actual wood of that tree disappeared long ago, the cross lives on in the hearts of those who follow him. It will be forever a memorial to Jesus and what he did in "cutting the covenant" for us. As long as there is a Christian on this earth, the cross, that memorial tree that Jesus planted, will live in his heart.

THE GIFTS

4. The gifts are health and wealth, in addition to salvation, and all the promises contained in the Abrahamic Covenant.

THE BLESSING

5. All the provisions and promises made to Abraham and his Seed Group are "the blessings."

THE FEAST

6. The feast was composed of the substitute blood and flesh of the sacrifice. In this case, the sacrifice was the blood and flesh of Christ himself, and the substitute for his flesh and blood is the bread and juice of the Lord's Supper. In Luke 22:19-20, we read, "And he took the bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new (KAINOS) testament (covenant - DIATHAKA) in my blood, which is shed for you." In 1 Corinthians 11:23-26, we read Paul's version of the feast. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new (KAINOS) testament (covenant) in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."

In Genesis 15, when God "cut the covenant" with Abraham, God provided sacrifices for the flesh and blood of the Blood Covenant. In Genesis 17, he required the blood of Abraham and his heirs via the token of circumcision. On the cross, the blood of Christ was given up. In the upper room, the bread and wine (The Lord's Supper) became the substitute feast, representing Jesus' blood and flesh. By partaking of that feast, his followers, symbolically partake of the life, nature, and resources of Christ himself. Remember Trumbull's words: "Counting himself in oneness of life with God, through the Covenant of Blood, man has sought for nourishment and growth through partaking of that food which in a sense was life, and which in a larger sense gave life, because it was the food of God, and because it was the food, which stood for God" (HCT p. 174). Concerning the Lord's Supper, Mr. Trumbull further says, "Here was the communion feast, in partaking of the flesh of the fitting and accepted sacrifice;—toward which all rite and symbol, and all heart yearning and inspired prophecy, had pointed, in all ages. Here was the realization of promise and hope and longing, in man's possibility of interunion with God through a common life—which is oneness of blood; and in man's inter-communion with God, through participation in the blessings of a common table. He who could speak for God here proffered of his own blood, to make those whom he loved of the same nature with his God; to bring them into blood-friendship with their God; and he proffered of his own body, to supply them with soul nourishment, in that Bread which came down from God. Then it was, while they were together in that upper room, for the consummating of that bloodcovenant of friendship...." (HCT pp. 281-282).

After instructing the disciples concerning the feast of the Blood Covenant of Friendship, the Lord's Supper, Jesus then called them "friends." "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends..." (John 15:13-14). "Henceforth, I call you not servants; for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth: but I have called you friends..." (John 15:15). Now

they can understand what Jesus had said to them in John 6:48-58. "I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat of it and not die. I am the living bread that came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews, therefore, strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give up his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. He who eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink Indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live forever." Finally, in verse 63, he says, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

In conclusion, traditional Christian thought, i.e., The God-Looked-Down Theory misread the reaction of the New Testament writers to The Great Disconnect Theory. This misreading caused them to thoroughly and completely misunderstand the purpose of the Law. In addition, they misread "new" in new covenant. They attempt to see a "new in time" covenant, when the covenant actually is the Covenant between Abraham, the Seed Group, and God, made "new in quality." Finally, they turned "complete the Preexisting" into "start-up something which has never been before."

But the saddest part of all is this: the so-called new covenant of The God-Looked-Down Theory has developed a system that eliminates healing and prosperity for Christians. Some groups try to insert them into this theological system, but until the continuing force of the Abrahamic Covenant is recognized, the advocates of this theory can arbitrarily and adequately deny it. But once Abraham's covenant is given its proper place, the advocates of denial are left to stare and gasp because The God-Looked-Down Theory becomes an unsupported nothing.

How many sermons or Sunday school lessons have you heard which explained that "will make" in our KJV translates "cut" in Hebrew and "complete" in Greek? Probably not very many. How many have you heard that distinguishes between "startup some thing that never was" and "complete that which is already"? The God-Looked-Down Theory fails in this regard.

But, the problems do not stop with the above. In addition to taking Abraham's EULOGIA of health and wealth completely away from us, these errors continue tainting their interpretations of other Scriptures. The next section demonstrates this fact.

Chapter Five

More Bizarre Interpretations Derived From That Greatest, Old Testament Blunder That Has Thoroughly Permeated Current, Christian Theology

In this section, we verify our previous assertion that the confused view of the purpose of the Law by the followers of The God-Looked-Down Theory adversely affects their interpretations of other Scriptures. When a theological system is erected upon an error, everything in the system beyond that error will be tainted. To get rid of Abraham's EULOGIA, The God-Looked-Down Theory must hold to the Jewish Great Disconnect Theory of the law. As such, their whole theology is tainted.

Galatians 3:22, 23 and Romans 11:32 Wrongly Interpreted by the God-Looked-Down Theory

Consider their interpretation of the following New Testament examples. "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe" (Galatians 3:22). "But before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed" (Galatians 3:23). "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all" (Romans 11:32).

By common consent, The God-Looked-Down Theory regards these passages as teaching that God and the Scriptures have enclosed all mankind in the prison-house of unbelief, sin, and the law so that the only way they can escape is by faith in Jesus Christ. God and the Scripture are seen as the jailer and the human race as the prisoner. God and the Scripture locked all men in this prison of unbelief, sin, and the law, forcing them to stay there until they agree to believe in Christ. Both God and the Scripture refuse to let them escape by the works of the law, but will allow them to escape if they believe on Jesus. Earlier we proved from the Greek text that the Law was added to the Abrahamic promises without changing them. The Law became an integral part of the promises. It was of the same substance since there is no New Testament example of PROSTITHEMI, adding apples to oranges. We also determined that the Law, like the promises, was an act of grace, and that it functioned (until Jesus came) as a guardian to prevent the Jews from losing the Abrahamic blessings. Now, we compare the above with the confused interpretation of Galatians 3:23 by the followers of The God-Looked-Down Theory. An American Commentary says, "The pronoun 'we' appears to represent the Jewish Christians, who, before the gospel came proclaiming the way of life through faith in Christ, were guarded under the Law, lest they might escape from its control" (An American Commentary on the New Testament, p. 49: Galatians). Weust says, "The law is a ministry of *condemnation*" (KW p. 107). "The law was a *jailer* who held in custody those who were subjected to sin in order that they should *not escape* the consciousness of their sins and their *liability to punishment*" (KW p. 109). "The Law shut them up to one avenue of *escape*, namely, faith in Christ...." (KW p. 109). Such words and phrases as condemnation, jailer, held, custody, subjected, sin, not escape, punishment, and shut them up, demonstrate that The God-Looked-Down Theory has failed to group the Law statements properly. In this passage, they give a Category Two interpretation to a Category One statement. Rather than an act of grace, they see the Law as wrath, punishment, jailed, etc. Again, it must be underscored, this negative view of the Law rests upon these three things: **(1)** the space given to close the doorway to hell, **(2)** the fervency and urgency of the New Testament writers, **(3)** and the failure to properly categorize the corrective language used in the Law statements.

This flawed, negative view of the purpose of the Law affects their interpretations of the other two Scriptures also. In demonstration of this, we look now at their view of Galatians 3:22 and Romans 11:32, as the proponents of this Theory speak for themselves. In the following quotes it is apparent at once that since the Law, according to their theological system, has become a negative (associating the Law with punishment, guilt, jail, custody, wrath, sin, no escape, etc.), this same, flawed negativism permeates their entire interpretative system. Since the Law, (a positive act of God's grace), is associated with the above listed negatives, to be consistent they are forced to jam other Scriptures which teach the grace of God into the same negative, interpretative frame. They have no choice. Consistency demands a uniform, interpretive framework for any theological system, including this theory. Since this theory has been built upon the negative reaction of the New Testament writers to The Great Disconnect error, everything in the system, as will be seen, is of necessity also negative and flawed. Proof of this statement is seen in the following interpretation of the two abovementioned Scriptures as the proponents of this theory are allowed to speak for themselves.

Haldane says, "God has shut them up in unbelief under the power of sin, like condemned criminals in prison, without any possibility of escaping, except by means of that salvation which, in his good pleasure, is provided by their deliverance" (RH p. 547). "Paul, in Galatians 3:22, shows that those who are thus shut up in disobedience and sin will never experience the benefit of God's mercy, and will, consequently, ever remain in prison and in bondage, unless they become believers in Christ. This contingency (whether men will accept God's mercy or not) is not here in view, but simply God's act itself" (An American Commentary on the New Testament, page 262: Romans).

Godet states, "The term SUGKIEINEIN, to shut up together, applies to a plurality of individuals enclosed in such a way that they have only one exit, through which they are all forced to pass." "But, in our passage, the action is not ascribed to an impersonal subject like Scripture; the subject is God Himself." "The verb can, therefore, only refer to a real act...." "The domain of disobedience within which, God has successively shut them all up, leaves both, in the end only one issue, that of humbly accepting salvation from the hand of mercy" (FG p. 416).

Wuest maintains, "But...the more obvious meaning seems to be that the shutting up was God's doing". "We need not shrink from the plain meaning of the expression, viz., that says, "Scripture in its divine utterances regarding the universality of sin, is spoken of as jailer who shuts all up in sin as a prison" (KW p. 108).

This interpretation of The God-Looked- Down Theory won't wash, however, for at least five reasons: it disregards the work of Satan, it disregards the purpose of God, it disregards the purpose of the Law (wrong grouping), it disregards common sense, and it disregards the Greek text.

These Popular Interpretations Disregard the Work of Satan

Ezekiel 28 declares that Satan committed the first sin in heaven. Then, he came to earth and deceived Eve, and then Adam into sinning. God had placed the dominion of the earth in Adam's hands. However, by his sin he forfeited it to Satan. First John 5:19 states this truth: "The whole world lieth in the Wicked One." Consequently, Satan, who has dominion over the world, has it cradled in his arms like a baby. He has become the god of this world" (2 Corinthians 4:4).

Sin entered the world primarily because of Satan and secondarily through Adam. "Wherefore, as by one man, sin entered into the world...." (Romans 5:12). "For as by one man's

disobedience, many were made sinners..." (Roman 5:19). Consequently, "sin hath reigned...." (Romans 5:21). Now, sin has dominion (Romans 6:14). Sin caused Paul to do the things he hated because "sin dwelleth in me..." (Romans 7:17), and he stated indwelling sin as his reason: "Now, if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me...." (Romans 7:20). Sin has an attraction to men because "...men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil" (John 3:19). God doesn't need to shut men up in sin because Satan has already done it. He is the god of this world system and cradles it, as it were, in his arms. Because of his control, sin has dominion. Why, therefore, is it necessary for God to shut all men up in the very thing that he hates (sin)? Again, why would he do to us the very same thing for which he sent Jesus to die? It is the work of Satan to enclose the human race in sin, not the work of God.

Neither is it the work of God nor the purpose of Scripture to enclose men in unbelief, or disobedience. This, also, is the work of Satan. "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them" (2 Corinthians 4:3-4). He blinds the minds of unbelievers to keep them from believing. He also takes the word of God out of the hearts of many who hear it so that they do not believe and be saved. "Those by the wayside are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved" (Luke 8:12). Satan enclosed humanity in both sin and unbelief God does neither. To maintain that God does is to disregard both the works of Satan and the purpose of God. And, just what is the purpose of God?

These Popular Interpretations Disregard the Purpose of God

God's purpose is to redeem the race from the very things The God-Looked-Down Theory says he has locked them into: sin and unbelief. As far back in the past as Eden, God promised a redeemer who would bruise Satan's heel. "...For this purpose, the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil" (1 John 3:8b). Jesus came to destroy the very works of the devil (sin and unbelief) that The God-Looked-Down Theory insists that both God and the Bible had to lock us in before he would save us. Hebrews 2:14b-15 declares that God's purpose is not only to destroy the devil's works, but to destroy the devil also, "...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 life time subject to bondage." God's purpose was to destroy the one who already holds them in bondage and deliver them who have spent their lifetime in his grip. His purpose can be summed up clearly in Colossians 1:13- 14: "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." He never said that he delivered us from what he, himself, had locked us into, but he delivered us from the power of darkness which is Satan's power. It is inconceivable that The God-Looked-Down Theory requires God to enclose the human race in sin and unbelief before he will save them by faith. This interpretation makes the purpose of God and the work of Satan join hands. And embarrassing questions remain! Why is it necessary for God to enclose the human race in the works of Satan before he can save us by faith? Why does The God-Looked-Down Theory require God to do what Satan has already done? Why must it be done over by God? Why is what Satan has done not considered sufficient? Is God so impotent that he is forced to employ Satan's handiwork to aid him in the salvation process when his purpose from Genesis to Revelation, with regard to Satan and his works, is to deliver them who are already enclosed in Satan's sin and unbelief?

These Popular Interpretations Disregard Common Sense

If one admits that sin and unbelief are the works of Satan and that he has already effectively enclosed and locked the human race in them both, then to believe that God locks them in the same thing is equivalent to saying to someone locked in a room, "I am going to lock you in the room," when they are already locked in and you know they are already locked in the room.

To agree that Satan already has the race locked in sin and unbelief, but that God is only going to keep us locked in until we quit trying to achieve salvation by works and believe in Jesus as our only means of escape, is equivalent to saying to a prisoner serving a life sentence, "I am going to keep you from escaping," when you know he cannot escape anyway.

To reject the fact that sin and unbelief are the works of Satan, and that Satan's works already have the race enclosed in sin and unbelief, is equivalent to accusing God of being the author of sin.

In addition, there is no common-sense connection between God's locking someone in sin and unbelief and his having mercy on them. This is equivalent to saying to someone, "I will lock you in the rain so I can dry you off, while you are still getting soaking wet in the rain." If it is your purpose to dry someone off, you do not lock them in the rain, you enclose them in a dry place. To have mercy on someone, you put them in the place of mercy, not the place of sin and unbelief.

One more point of common sense: To say that God locked man in sin and unbelief to keep him from escaping until he believes on Jesus, is to imply that had God not locked man in sin and unbelief, man could have escaped out of the prisonhouse of sin and unbelief without believing on Jesus. Could he? NO!

To imply that man could have escaped had God not locked him in is to imply that man could save himself. Can man save his own soul? NO!

And since this implies that man can save himself, man could choose to save himself some way other than Jesus. Is this possible? Can salvation be achieved by someone other than Jesus Christ? NO! Scripture reinforces this in Acts 4:12.

Furthermore, he cannot escape sin and unbelief no matter who enclosed him in it, whether God or Satan. Since man cannot escape sin and unbelief regardless whether God locked him in it or not, then why make such an illogical fuss trying to force the Scripture to fit into an error by stating that God closed man in sin when it doesn't matter anyway? If man is in a condition from which he cannot escape, whether God locked him in it or not, then it is illogical to conclude that God locked him in to keep him from escaping. But, if God didn't "enclose" all men in sin and unbelief, what did he enclose them in? Obviously, he enclosed them in something. But what?

The question now is, "In what did God enclose them?" The answer is to be found both in the verses themselves and in the surrounding contexts. We look first at the context of Romans 11:32. Romans 11:30 says: "For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained *mercy* through their unbelief." The key word in this verse is "*mercy*." Romans 11:31 states, "Even so have these also now not believed, that through your *mercy* they also may obtain *mercy*." The key word in this verse is also *mercy*. Romans 11:32 states, "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have *mercy* upon all." The key word in this verse is still *mercy*. Romans

12:1 states, "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the *mercies* of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." The key word in this verse is *mercy*. What did God enclose all unbelieving men in? He enclosed them in *mercy* in order that he may show *mercy* to all unbelievers!

The same principles of interpretation apply also to Galatians 3:22, which states, "But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." The expanded interpretation of this verse from the Greek text is, "But shut up the Scripture, all mankind, the ones under sin, in order that the promise, the one of Abraham, by faith of Jesus Christ, might be given to the ones believing." "All" is the translation of PANTA, which in this case means all mankind. "Concluded" is the translation of SUGKLEIO, which means "enclosed on all four sides." The phrase "in sin" tells where mankind happened to be when they were enclosed by the Scripture. "In sin" tells where the enclosing took place and not what they were enclosed in. (More on this later.) Otherwise, we are back to our unscriptural, illogical position of drying someone off in the rain. All sinful mankind have been enclosed on all four sides by the Scripture. The question remaining to be answered is, "In what has the Scripture enclosed sinful mankind?" Both this verse and the entire context of Galatians 3 and 4 leave absolutely no doubt: mankind is enclosed in the Covenant Promises of Abraham. Verse 22 states that the purpose of their enclosure was that the promise "by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to the believing ones." But not just any promise is in view here. The specific promise in verse 22 is the Covenant Promise to Abraham, concerning which, Jesus is the seed, and in which all sinful mankind have been enclosed. The following Scriptures from Galatians 3 and 4 demonstrate this fact. "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Galatians 3:7). "...In thee shall all nations be blessed" (Galatians 3:8b). "So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham" (Galatians 3:9). "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith" (Galatians 3:14). We have already seen in verses 15, 16, and 17 that the promise is still valid. God gave the inheritance "...to Abraham by promise (Galatians 3:18). "And if ye be Christ's, then ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise" (Galatians 3:29). "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise" (Galatians 4:28). All of chapters 3 and 4 of Galatians teach two things: the Covenant Promise to Abraham is still valid and all sinful mankind is enclosed in the same Abrahamic Promise to be appropriated by faith in Christ.

The contexts of Romans 11:32 and Galatians 3:22 scream in defiance of The God-Looked-Down Theory that God did over the devil's work of enclosing all mankind in sin so he could have mercy on them. The God-Looked-Down Theory would have us believe it is sensible to dry people off in the rain. But, worse than this, if God's locking all mankind in sin doesn't make him the author of sin directly, at the very least it makes God responsible for the devastating effects of sin on the human race. Sin is not just a theological cliché. It is a devastating reality. It is not just a passive word we banter about in theological debate. Sin is deadly and aggressive.

Child abuse, wife battering, drug abuse, alcoholism that destroys homes, and hungry little children are all the consequences of sin. The starving masses in Ethiopia, little children in hospitals around the world, their little bodies wracked with pain from disease and death, are all consequences of sin. Murder, rape, war, the Holocaust, lying, hate, and stealing are all consequences of sin. If God has actually locked the human race in sin as The God-Looked-Down Theory says he has, then he is at least partially responsible for every drunkard, every dope addict, every prostitute, every unfaithful husband, every battered wife, every broken home, all wars, murders, rapes, diseases, hatred, and all things low, foul, base, mean, evil, and Satanic...because The God-Looked-Down Theory would have us accept that God locked the human race in sin. If the followers of this theory would only stop and think, they would realize that they are using the

word "sin" as a passive, theological cliché only, and not as a reality. They would understand that sin is deadly and aggressive. Once they see the consequences of their position, to prevent God from being responsible for the results of sin upon the human race, they would interpret Romans 11:32; Galatians 3:22; and 3:23.

Finally, to say that God locked all mankind in the prison-house of sin is the same as locking someone up in a diphtheria colony when your purpose is to protect them from the consequences of the disease. Would you, the reader, lock someone you love in a diphtheria colony when your purpose is that of protection rather than harm? No, you would not! Neither did God lock the human race in sin since his purpose is to deliver them from the ravages of sin (John 3:16). A forced re-thinking of the theology of The God-Looked-Down Theory has now become necessary.

These Popular Interpretations Disregard the Greek Text

The preceding discussion shows how The God-Looked-Down Theory views Romans 11:32; Galatians 3:22, and 3:23. This theory disregards the works of Satan, the purpose of God, the purpose of the Law, the surrounding contexts, and common sense. But, what about the Greek text? Does the Greek text throw any light on our path? Yes, it does. The Greek text shows the relationship between the expression "in sin and unbelief" and the expression "God and Scripture hath enclosed or concluded." In so doing, the Greek text drives the interpretation of The God-Looked-Down Theory from the field. What, then, is the relationship of "in unbelief" to "God hath concluded, i.e., enclosed"?

In answering this question, we shall do two things. We shall determine the word order of the sentence structure of Romans 11:32. Then we shall compare the structure and word order to two other groups of verses which appear to be identical to Romans 11:32. We shall find that the second group of verses (Verse Group B), although identical to the first group (Verse Group A), contains a very subtle difference that causes the verses in group B to differ radically in meaning from those in group A. We shall also find that Romans 11:32, though identical to the verses in Verse Group A, belong, in fact, to Verse Group B. What then is the word order or sentence structure of Romans 11:32?

THE WORD ORDER OF ROMANS 11:32

This verse has a very simple structure: subject, verb, direct object, and prepositional phrase. "God" is the subject. "Hath enclosed" is the verb. "Them all" is the direct object. "In unbelief" is the prepositional phrase. "In" is the translation of the Greek preposition EIS. "In unbelief" is in the accusative case. The English translation of Romans 11:32 appears to cause no particular trouble. We simply take it to mean that God used sin or unbelief as a "prisonhouse" within which he enclosed them all. When we compare this verse with the English translations of the verses in Verse Group A, we are strengthened in our conclusion that "in sin-unbelief" became the instrument that God used to enclose them all within.

VERSE GROUP A

The verses in this category are numerous in the Greek New Testament. However, we shall compare Romans 11:32 to only three of them.

(1)"And many spread their garments in the way..." (Mark 11:8). The word order of this verse is identical to Romans 11:32, containing a subject, verb, direct object, and prepositional phrase

using EIS in the accusative case. "Many" is the subject. "Spread" is the verb. "Garments" is the direct object. "In the way" is the prepositional phrase. "In" is the translation of EIS. "In the way" is in the accusative case. We can legitimately infer from both the context, and especially the English translation, that the subject "many" actually strewed the garments "in the way." As a result of this strewing by "many," the "way" became the "containing instrument" of the garments, i.e., the "way" actually "held" or "contained" the garments. Consequently, there is nothing in the English translation of this passage to prevent us from viewing "the way" as the "instrument of containment" for the garments after the "many" "strewed" them there.

Since the structure of this verse is identical to Romans 11:32, can we not also infer that "in unbelief" became the "containing instrument" of God's enclosing in the same respect that "in the way" became the "containing instrument" of the garments that "many strewed"? The answer, on the surface, appears to be yes. And, an analysis of our next verse in Verse Group A seems to strengthen this inference even more.

(2) "And he received him in his arms..." (Luke 2:28). This verse is also structured like Romans 11:32. It contains a subject, verb, direct object, and prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. "He" is the subject. "Received" or "took up" is the verb. "Him" is the direct object. "In the (his) arms" is the prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. This verse also appears to be an exact replica of both Romans 11:32 and Mark 11:8. Common sense naturally allows us to infer that his "arms" became the "containing instrument" of "him" as a result of his "taking up."

Since we can easily infer that "the way" became the "containing instrument" for the garments and "his arms" became the "containing instrument" for "him," can we not also infer that "in unbelief" became the "containing instrument" for God's enclosing? Again, the answer would appear to be yes. A further comparison with Revelation 6:15 seems to add more weight to this conclusion that, yes, we can indeed infer that "in unbelief" is the "containing instrument" of God's enclosing.

(3) "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains..." (Revelation 6:15). Various categories of "men" is the subject. "Hid" is the verb. "Themselves" is the direct object. "In the dens" is the prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. This final verse of Group A is also identical in structure to Mark 11:8; Luke 2:28; and Romans 11:32. It contains a subject, verb, direct object, and a prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. From this verse also, we may easily infer that "in the dens" became the "containing instrument" of "themselves" as a result of the men's hiding.

The English translations seem to permit us to infer that the prepositional phrase in all three verses (Mark 11:8; Luke 2:28; Revelation 6:15) became the "containing instrument" of the direct object as a result of the action of the subject expressed by the verb in each verse. Since all three verses Verse Group A are identical in structure to Romans 11:32, it would seem certain that we may also infer that "in unbelief" is the "containing instrument" for God's enclosing. In other words, if "many" used "the way" as an "instrument" to contain "garments," if "men" used "dens" as an "instrument" to contain "themselves," and if "he" used "his arms" to contain "him," then it would seem logical to conclude that God used "unbelief" as a prison-house to contain "men." The above comparisons seem to be the logical justification of The God-Looked-Down Theory in its interpretation of Romans 11:32.

However, before we can accept the above conclusion as valid, we must compare Verse Group A with three more verses listed in Verse Group B. On the surface these two groups appear to be identical to each other. Group B also has a subject, verb, direct object, and a prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. But, there is a subtle difference between the two groups that creates a radical difference in meaning. The difference is subtle because it is not readily discerned. It is radical because it changes the meaning entirely.

The difference is this: In Verse Group A, the prepositional Phrase describes "where the direct object is" as a result of what the subject of the sentence did to it. But in Verse Group B, the prepositional phrase describes "where the direct object is" before the subject of the sentence does something to it. This distinction becomes clear as we examine three verses in Verse Group B. Group A verses are numerous in the Greek New Testament. Group B verses are not.

VERSE GROUP B

(1) "And in the house his disciples asked him again of the same matter" (Mark 10:10). Structurally, this verse is a replica of the three verses in Group A. It has a subject, a verb, a direct object, and a prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. "Disciples" is the subject. "Asked" or "questioned" is the verb. "Him" is the direct object. "In the house" is the prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. But, the similarity stops here. Why? The direct object "him," meaning Jesus, was not "in the house" as a result of the disciples' questioning. He was "in the house" as a result of his own doing. Jesus put himself in the house. In other words, the prepositional phrase "in the house" does not occur as a result of the action performed by the expressed subject of the sentence, i.e., the disciples. "In the house" results from action by one other than the expressed subject. This verse has a subject and verb *implied* which performed a previous action on the direct object which resulted in the state of rest described by the prepositional phrase "in the house." Jesus is the *implied* subject and what he did is the *implied* verb since he was "in the house" as a result of his own doing. And this occurred before his disciples questioned him. Consequently, their questioning him had nothing to do with his being in the house or not. "In the house" simply tells where Jesus was when the questioning occurred and where the questioning was performed.

This verse can be viewed as two sentences combined. Sentence 1: "Jesus put himself in the house." In that condition, in that state of rest, "in the house," Sentence 2 presents itself: "The disciples questioned him." In other words, the disciples questioned him where they found him.

There is a sense in which we can infer that "many" turned the "way" into a "containing instrument" of the garments in Mark 11:8. This can be inferred because "in the way" was the result of what "many" did to the direct object, "the garments." Likewise, there is a sense in which we can infer that "he" turned his "arms" into a "containing instrument" for "him" in Luke 2:28 because "in his arms" described the result of what "he" did to "him," the direct object. There is also a sense in which we can infer that "men" turned the "dens" into a "containing instrument" for "themselves" in Revelation 6:15 because "in the dens" describes the result of what the men did to "themselves." But since Jesus, the direct object in Mark 10:10, was not "in the house" as the direct result of what the disciples did to him, can we still infer that the disciples turned the house into a "containing instrument" for Jesus? Can we infer that the disciples turned the house into any kind of instrument at all? If so, what kind of instrument? Did they turn the house into a "questioning instrument"? What is a questioning instrument? Perhaps they turned the house into a dictionary to enable them to better frame their questions. All that can be said here is that Jesus put himself into a condition of rest "in the house." Then, the disciples performed the act of

questioning where they found him. And they found him where he was before their verbal act was performed, which was in the house as a result of his own doing.

(2) "Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie, And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself (John 20:6-7). For our purpose of comparison, we shall reduce these two verses to the following simple form. "Peter seeth the napkin in a place by itself." In this simplified form, this assertion has the identical structural appearance of the three verses in Verse Group A, having a subject, verb, direct object, and prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. "Peter" is the subject. "Seeth" is the verb. "Napkin" is the direct object. "In a place" is the prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. But, like Mark 10:10, the similarity stops with the comparison of the structure since this verse has an *implied* subject performing an *implied* action on the napkin before Peter ever laid eyes on it. One simple question brings the proper focus. Was the napkin "in a separate place" as a result of those who buried Jesus' body having placed it there or because of Peter's seeing it? The answer is obvious. The napkin was "in a separate place" because those who buried Jesus placed it there and not Peter's act of seeing.

Since Peter did not place the napkin "in a separate place" by his action of "seeing," is there any way in which we can infer that he turned "place" into a "containing instrument"? Could he turn "place" into a "seeing instrument"? Perhaps Peter turned "place" into a large pair of "bifocals" to enable him to see better!

We can understand this verse better if we view it as two separate sentences joined together; yet, which contain two subjects doing two separate actions to one direct object. In other words, those who buried Jesus' body placed the napkin "in a place." Then Peter performed his action of "seeing" the napkin where they left it. "In a place" simply tells us where Peter's "seeing" took place. We cannot logically conclude that Peter's "seeing" turned "place" into any kind of "instrument" at all, including a giant pair of "bifocals."

(3) "Insomuch that we desired Titus, that as he had begun, so he would also finish in you the same grace also" (2 Corinthians 8:6). The basic elements of subject, verb, a direct object, and a prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case are present here. "Titus" is the subject. "Should finish" is the verb. "Grace" is the direct object. "In you" is the prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. On the surface, this verse appears to be a replica of those verses in Verse Group A. Actually, it differs radically from Verse Group A since this verse also has two subjects and two verbs (one subject and verb are expressed in the verse itself while the other subject and verb are implied) but only one direct object. One simple question frames it for our understanding. Was "grace" in the believers at Corinth because of Titus or was "grace" in the Corinthian believers because of the work of the Holy Spirit? Titus can teach and preach but he cannot place the grace of God in the heart of any man. Neither can anyone else. This is the work of the Holy Spirit.

When we view this verse as two separate, complete sentences, the meaning becomes crystal clear. The Holy Spirit placed the grace of God in the Corinthian believers. As a result of this, Titus should finish this same grace where the Holy Spirit had placed it, i.e., "in them."

The only way we could infer from the above that Titus turned the Corinthian Christians into a "containing instrument" for "grace" is to rewrite the verse, making Titus the one who placed the "grace" in them rather than the Holy Spirit. But, as is, can we logically infer that the believers at Corinth became any kind of "instrument" for Titus' action of "finishing"? If so, what

kind of instrument? Could he turn them into a "finishing instrument"? What is a "finishing instrument"? How does any man, Titus included, mature, develop, or finish grace in a believer? We normally think that "growing in grace" involves prayer, reading the Bible, and listening to sermons. Perhaps Titus turned the Corinthians into "sermons" to enable him to "finish in you this same grace also." Maybe he turned them into "sermon instruments" to function as his "finishing instruments."

From the above comparison of the two verse groups, some observations can be made. Verse Group B can be interpreted properly only when viewed as two separate sentences. Verse Group A has the subject and verb expressed in the sentence itself. The direct object in this group enters the state of rest designated by the prepositional phrase as a direct result of the verbal action of the expressed subject. In verse Group B, the direct object is already in the state of rest described by the prepositional phrase. This is not the direct result of the verbal action of the subject expressed in the sentence but of the implied action by the implied subject. To view Group B otherwise is to attribute the action necessary to produce the state of rest described by the prepositional phrase to the expressed subject of the sentence. This is by no means the case in Verse Group B. This would have us conclude that the disciples placed Jesus in the house, that Peter placed the napkin in a separate place, and have Titus doing the work of the Holy Spirit in placing the grace of God in the Christians at Corinth. Obviously this is not the case.

The verses in Group B are really two separate statements combined into one, with each separate statement having different subjects and different verbs, but both statements maintain the same direct object. However, both statements relate to that same direct object in different ways. One relates to the direct object as causing the state of rest described by the prepositional phrase, the other relates to the direct object as a result of a previously caused state of rest described by the prepositional phrase. In Mark 10:10; John 20:6-7; and 2 Corinthians 8:6, the direct object is in the state of rest (designated by the prepositional phrase) caused by the implied subject. It is important to note that the state of rest, designated by the prepositional phrase and caused by the implied subject, is in existence prior to the action of the expressed verb in the sentence. Since the state of rest of the direct object (designated by the prepositional phrase) is existing prior to the action of the expressed verb upon the direct object, we can readily understand that the expressed subject did not cause the state of rest. Instead, it reacted to a state of rest caused by one other than itself. In other words, the expressed subject acts upon the direct object as a result of what the implied subject previously did to it. Consequently, the verses in Group B simply mean that "as a result of the state of rest of the direct object previously caused by the implied subject, and designated by the prepositional phrase, the expressed subject carries out the expressed verbal act with reference to the same direct object."

The application of the preceding analysis to the individual verses of Group B clarifies the meanings of those verses much better than our present English translations do. Note the following clarifications:

Mark 10:10 ("As-a-result-of-the-factthat) Jesus placed himself in the house, the disciples questioned him in the house."

John 20:6-7 ("As-a-result-of-the-factthat) the ones who buried Jesus placed the napkin in a separate place. Peter saw it there."

2 Corinthians 8:6 ("As-a-result-of-the-fact- that) the Holy Spirit had placed the grace of God in the Corinthian Christians, Titus should finish this same grace in them."

When the direct object is in a state of rest designated by a prepositional phrase, using EIS in the accusative, and caused by other than the subject of the expressed verb in the sentence, the preposition EIS should be translated "as a result of." Turner (M III p. 266) and Dana and Mantry (DM p. 103) say it can be translated "because of." This also is sufficient.

Romans 11:32 has the same structure as Group B, that is, a subject, verb, direct object, and prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case. "God" is the subject. "Hath enclosed" is the verb. "Them all" (meaning both Jews and Gentiles) is the direct object. "In unbelief" is the prepositional phrase using EIS in the accusative case.

Did God or Satan place man in the state or condition of unbelief? God did not. If one maintains that he did, then God is the author of unbelief. Very few theologians are willing to make this assertion for obvious reasons. Therefore, Romans 11:32 belongs to Group B and should be structured as two sentences. We have demonstrated that Satan placed all men in unbelief. As a result of this fact, God enclosed them all. But for the reasons given in the analysis above, we cannot infer that "unbelief" became God's "enclosing instrument" or "prison-house" as The God-Looked-Down Theory would have us believe. To view "unbelief" as God's "enclosing instrument" would require us to view "place" as a bifocal, "house" as a dictionary, and the "Corinthian Christians" as sermons.

All that can be said of the verses in Group B is that the expressed subject in each sentence carried out the expressed verbal actions where they found the direct objects as a result of where the implied subjects placed them and left them.

The following "expanded translation" gives the proper interpretation of Romans 11:32. ("As-a-result-of-the-fact-that) Satan plunged them all into the helpless, hopeless condition of unbelief, God hath enclosed them all in his great mercy."

The forgoing analysis of the Group B verses prevents us from inferring that the prepositional phrase, using EIS in the accusative case, can be interpreted as a containing instrument. Neither can we infer that the prepositional phrase is "anykind- of-instrument" at all. "Place" is not a bifocal. "House" is not a dictionary. "You" is not a sermon. "Unbelief" is not a prison.

The God-Looked-Down Theory is tainted throughout and should be discarded. This is so since no theological system deliberately separating itself from the Abrahamic Covenant can be trusted. No theological system can be relied upon which does not give the Abrahamic- (BARAK-EULOGIA)-Sixty Promises- Covenant Structure its proper place. The God-Looked-Down Theory does not. Since the Law, according to this theory is not a positive act of God's grace, but is a negative, damning, wrath, guilt, death, yoke, bondage, prison-house instrument, any relationship between mankind and the Law must necessarily be a negative relationship. Then, to be consistent, this same negative mindset must color everything else in their interpretive system. So this negativism, based on their fuzzy, confused view of the purpose of the Law, is transferred to Romans 11:32 and Galatians 3:22. The followers of this negative, flawed theology are absolutely unable to see that God enclosed the human race in his mercy and in Abraham's promises.

In Volume III, we demonstrate more fully The Unbroken Force of Abraham's Blessings, and in Volume IV, show how to appropriate the Abrahamic EULOGIA of health and wealth.

Index of Scripture References

GENESIS

12:1-3
13:14-17
15
15:9-10
15:13-21
15:13
15:16
15:18
17
17:12
21:23
21:27
21:27-32
21:32
21:33
22:15-18
27:26-33
27:28
27:29
27:30
31:44
31:44,45
31:45,46
31:49-53
31:54
ch. 15
ch. 17

EXODUS

1:8
2:24
3:6
3:15
3:16
6:1-8
6:4
6:5
6:6
6:8
23:24
23:25
23:25-33

LEVITICUS

17:11
26:3
26:4-12

DEUTERONOMY

4:25-28

4:30,31

4:40

5:32,33

6:1-3

6:17,18

6:20

6:23

6:24

7:6-15

7:7,8

7:7-12

7:8

7:9

7:12

7:12-26

8:1

8:6

8:19,20

11:8,9

11:13-15

11:18-21

28:1-14

29:9

ch. 27

ch. 28

JUDGES

5:8

16:11

1 SAMUEL

18:1-3

18:3

18:4

20:13-20

20:13-23

20:16

2 SAMUEL

9:1

9:1-13

9:7

1 KINGS

11:29

2 CHRONICLES

20:7

24:4

24:12

PSALMS

51:10
105:8,9
105:9
105:12

ISAIAH

41:8
50:6

JEREMIAH

31:31
31:31,32
31:33,34

EZEKIEL

ch. 28

MATTHEW

1:23
5:17
5:17-48
6:27
6:33
6:34
7:28
9:17
11:21
12:1-8
12:9-14
13:39
13:40
13:49
13:52
17:5
21:19
23:23,24
23:30
24:3
26:28
26:29
27:26
27:29
27:30,31
27:60
28:20

MARK

1:22
1:26
1:27

2:21
2:22
2:23-28
3:1-6
4:24
9:7
10:10
11:8
13:4
13:20
14:24
14:25
15:15
16:17

LUKE

1:20
1:35
1:50
2:21
2:28
3:20
4:2
4:13
5:6
5:36
5:38
6:1-5
6:6-11
7:39
7:47
8:12
9:34
11:42-44
12:19
12:31
13:9
17:5
17:7
18:37
19:11
20:10
20:11
20:12
22:18
22:19,20
22:20
22:63
23:26
23:28-31
23:34

23:42,43

JOHN

1:1

1:14

3:16

3:19

5:46

6:48-58

6:63

7:22

11:32

11:44

13:34

14:28

15:13,14

15:15

15:19

19:41

20:6,7

ACTS

2:41

2:47

4:12

5:14

5:15

5:16

11:24

12:3

13:36

13:42

15:10

15:18

17:18

17:19

17:20

17:21

18:14

20:28

21:27

ROMANS

3:19

3:20

3:20,21

3:25

3:25,26

4:15

5:12

5:19

5:21

6:14
6:23
7:4-6
7:12
7:17
7:20
8:2-4
9:2-4
9:28
9:31,32
10:4
10:5-13
10:13
11:30
11:31
11:32
12:1

1 CORINTHIANS

4:15
11:23-26
11:25

2 CORINTHIANS

1:4
3:6
3:6-11
3:7
4:3,4
4:4
5:17
5:19
8:6
11:32

GALATIANS

1:10
2:16
3:7
3:8
3:8b
3:9
3:10
3:10-14
3:14
3:15
3:16
3:17
3:18
3:19
3:22
3:23

3:24
3:29
4:28
5:1
6:15
ch. 3
ch. 4

EPHESIANS

2:11-3:12
2:15
3:1
3:14
4:24
4:26

PHILIPPIANS

1:10
4:7

COLOSSIANS

1:13,14
3:9
3:10

1 THESSALONIANS

3:7b

1 TIMOTHY

5:14

2 TIMOTHY

1:12
4:6-8

TITUS

1:5
1:11

HEBREWS

1:8
2:14b,15
2:16
7:3
8:4
8:7
8:8
8:8-12
8:9
8:10
8:13
9:14
9:15

9:26
10:20
12:19
12:24

JAMES

2:23

1 PETER

3:10
3:10-12
3:10-13
3:11
3:12
3:13

1 JOHN

1:9
2:7
2:8
2:10
2:11
3:8b
3:12
5:19

2 JOHN

v. 5

JUDE

v. 16

REVELATION

2:17
3:12
3:18
6:15
14:3
21:1
21:2
21:4
21:5

Index of Greek and Hebrew Words

A
AGAPAO
AGO
AKRIS
AKURAO
AMEMPTOS
AN
ANOCHE
ARKAIOS
ATHETEO
BAINO
BARAK-EULOGIA
DIATHAKA
DIATHASOMAI
EI
EIS
EPI
EPIDIATASSO
EPISKIADZO
ERCHOMAI
EUANGELIDZOMAI
EULOGIA
FRUREO
KAINOS
KAINOTEROS
KALEO
KARATH
KARIS
KATAKAIO
KATARGEIO
KAUSOO
KHAWDASH
LUO
MEMPTOS
NEOS
NEOTERON
OI
PAIS
PAISAGO
PALAIOS
PANTA
PARA
PARABAINO
PARERCHOMAI
PAREISIS
POIEO
PRO
PROEUANGELIDZOMAI

PROS
PROSPHATOS
PROSTITHEMI
PUROO
SKIADZO
SUGKIEINEIN
SUGKLEIO
SUN
SUNTELEIA
SUNTELEO
TAKA
TALEO
TITHEMI

Glossary of Greek and Hebrew Words

Terms defined here are translated in their proper usage and applications of the Scriptures used throughout this volume.

* Denotes meaning

A: Greek negative

AGAPAO: * God's supreme, unconditional love

AGO: * "to lead"

AKRIS: * "until"

AKURAO: Combination of two Greek words: A – Greek negative plus KURAO – “authorized” or “confirmed” * to “negate the confirmation,” “unauthorize,” or “unconfirm”

AMEMPTOS: Translated “blameless” * “not faulty,” “faultless,” “unblamably,” “non-defectively”

AN: This word is not usually translated into English; the Greek’s way of signaling that a given conclusion is not to be taken seriously; throwing the doubt on a given conclusion

Anaphoric Use of the Article: * to denote previous reference

ANOCHE: Translated “forbearance” * “a holding back,” “a delay,” “withholding of punishment”

ARKAIOS: * “new with reference to a beginning point”

ATHETEO: Combination of two Greek words: A – Greek negative plus THETEO – “to place,” “to set,” “to put”; translated “disannuleth” * “a negative placement,” “set aside,” or “unplace”

BAINO: * “to go”

BARAK: Hebrew word translated “bless,” “blessed,” “blessing.” (Relating to those 60 specific promises of the Abrahamic Covenant) * “to endue with beneficial power” – Old Testament abundant life where God alone is the source of “blessing” for every area of life

BARAK-EULOGIA: * “God’s beneficial enduement of power to produce well-being in every area of life”

DIA: * “through”

DIATHAKA: Translated in KJV by “covenant” and “testament”

DIATHASOMAI: Verbal form of DIATHAKA translated “make”

EI: * “if”

EIS: *Translated “unto,” “until” – used to express the duration of time or to set limits to time:
translated “in,” “into” in the accusative case

EPI: * Greek preposition meaning “upon” or “over,” “during the time of”

EPIDIATASSO: Combination of three Greek words: EPI “upon” with DIA – “through” and
TASSO – “to arrange orderly”; translated “addeth” * means “rearrangement in
the Greek New Testament

EPISKIADZO: A combination of two Greek words: EPI – “upon” or “over” with SKIADZO –
“shadow” * “overshadow”; concerns the Spirit of God

ERCHOMAI: * “to go”

ESOTROPON: Translated “glass” * “mirror”

EU: * “well”

EUANGELIZOMAI: * to “evangelize” or to “preach”

EULOGIA: Combination of EU meaning “well” with LOGOS meaning “speech” * “well spoken”
(In the LXX, EULOGIA is the usual translation of the BARAK group, meaning
“blessing”)

FRUREO: Translated “we were kept” * noun form – “fort or garrison”; verb form – “fortified,”
“garrisoned”

Greek Definitive Article: Usually translated by the English word “the”

KAINOS: * “new in quality,” represents something qualitatively new or different

KAINOTEROS: A comparative of KAINOS * “newer”

KALEO: Translated “are called” * “to call”; Perfect Passive Participle - * “having been called”

KARATH: Hebrew word translated “make,” “made” * “to cut”

KARIS: Translated “gave” * “grace”; Accusative case form – “because of”

KATA: * “according to,” * “down”

KATAKAIO: Translated “utterly burned”

KATARGEO: Combination of two Greek words: KATA – “down” plus ARGOS – “not
working,” “inactive,” “inoperative” * “reduced in status or rank to position of no
longer working or being active” * “of none effect”

KAUSOO: Translated “burn,” “burning”

KHAWDASH: Hebrew word translated “new,” * the root meaning of which means to “renew,” “repair,” “rebuild,” “restore” with secondary, adjectival meanings of new and fresh

KURAO: Translated “confirmed” * noun form – “lord” or “one in authority” * verb form – “authorize” or “confirm”

LUO: Translated “dissolved” * “to loose”

MEMPTOS: * “defective”

NEOS: * “new in time,” represents something as chronologically new; used when a time comparison is called for

NEOTERON: A comparative of NEOS * “latest in time”

OI: Translated “they which” * “the ones”

PAIS: * “boy” or “child”

PAISAGO: Translated “instructors” * “instructor,” “trainer,” “teacher,” “schoolmaster”

PALAIOS: Translated “old” * “wearing out with age,” “worn” * translated “made” – “to make old by declaration” – stresses the qualities caused by the passage of time without necessarily referring to its beginning

PANTA: Translated “all”

PARA: English word parallel comes from PARA; * “by the side of,” “beside”

PARABAINO: Translated “transgressions”

PARERCHOMAI: Combination of two Greek words: PARA – “beside” with ERCHOMAI – “to go” * “to go by,” “pass beside,” hence, “pass away”

PAREISIS: Translated “remission” * “a passing over, a temporary overlooking, a suspension of judgment, a withholding of punishment”

POIEO: Translated “made” * “to do” or “to make”

PRO: Greek preposition meaning previously

PROEUANGELIDZOMAI: A combination of two Greek words: PRO – “before” and EUANGELIDZOMAI – “to evangelize” or to “preach” * “to preach the gospel beforehand”

PROS: * “towards”

PROSOPON PROS PROSOPON: Combination of “PROSOPON – “face,” PROS – “towards,” and OPS – “eye”; translated “face to face” * “towards the eye”; full expression “face towards face”

PROSPHATOS: Translated “new” – not a synonym for NEOS * “freshly slain or slaughtered”

PROSTITHEMI: Combination of two Greek words: PROS – “to” with TITHEMI – “to put”; translated by the English words “add,” “increase” * “to put to,” “to put some thing to something,” hence, “add”

PUROO: Translated “fire”; not necessarily “to consume by flames”

QEN: Root from which KAINOS is derived

SKIADZO: * “shadow”

SUGKIEINEIN: * “to shut up together”

SUGKLEIO: Translated “shut up,” “concluded” * “enclosed on all four sides”

SUN: Greek preposition translated “with” * “together with”

SUNTELEIA: Noun form * “end”

SUNTELEO: A combination of two Greek words: SUN – a Greek preposition meaning “together with” plus TELEO – meaning “end or completion” and translated by “will make”

TAKA: Translated “melt” * “turn to liquid”

TASSO: * “to arrange orderly”

TELEO: Translated “will make” * “end or completion”

THETEO: * “to place,” “to set,” “to put”

TITHEMI: Translated by the English word “add,” “increase” * “to put”

TO: Translated “that which” * “the thing”

Bibliography

- Bauer, Walter. A Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted by William Gingrich. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey W. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (abridged in one volume). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1985.
- Brooks, James A., Carlton L. Winbery. Syntax of New Testament Greek. The University Press of America, 1979 c.
- Brown, Colin Editor. The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology Vol. I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1975.
- Brown, Colin Editor. The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology Vol. II. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1978.
- Chamberlain, William Douglas, M.A., Ph.D., D.D. An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Cremer, Herman. Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. 38 George Street, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Dana, H.E., TH.D., Julius R. Mantey, TH.D., D.D. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. The MacMillan Company, 1960.
- Davis, William Hersey. Beginner's Grammar of the Greek New Testament. San Francisco, California: Harper & Row Publishers, 1923 c., 1942 edition.
- Earle, Ralph. Word Meanings in the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1987.
- Godet, F. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1956.
- Haldane, Robert. Romans. 63 East Louthier Street, Carlisle, PA.: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1963.
- Harris, Archer, Walthe, Editor. Theological Workbook of the Old Testament Vol. I. Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, 1961.
- Hovey, Alvah Editor. An American Commentary on the New Testament Volume IV, 1882. Chestnut St., Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1701-1703.
- Machen, J. Greshem. New Testament Greek for Beginners. The MacMillan Company, 1923 c., 1951.
- Moulton, James Hope, George Milligan. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1985.

- Nicoll, W. Robertson, M.A.,LL.D. The Expositor's Greek Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Poole, Matthew. Matthew Poole's Commentary on the Holy Bible Vol. III. McLean, Virginia: MacDonald Publishing Company.
- Robertson, A.T. A Grammar of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press.
- Robertson, A.T., W. Hersey Davis. A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 10th edition, 1979.
- Summers, Ray. Essentials of New Testament Greek. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman Press, 1950.
- Thayer, Joseph H. Greek – English Lexicon of the New Testament. 38 George Street, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958.
- Trench, Richard C. Synonyms of the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1966.
- Trumbull, H. Clay. The Blood Covenant. Kirkwood, Missouri: Impact Books Inc., 1975.
- Vincent, Marvin. Vincent's Word Studies of the New Testament Vol. IV. McLean, Virginia: McDonald Publishing Company.
- Vine, W.E. An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words: Four Volumes in One. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1986.
- Voelz, James W. Fundamental Greek Grammar. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1986.
- Weust, Kenneth S. Weust's Word Studies Volume I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1977.
- The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1939.
- The New Scofield Reference Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1967.

This Volume Destroys the Modernistic Denial That Healing and Prosperity Belong To Christians Now.

This modernistic denial perches precariously upon three great errors which are based upon the most colossal theological blunder in Old Testament history. This volume exposes, defines, and destroys this most colossal theological blunder. Then one by one, this volume exposes, defines, and destroys the three great errors upon which this modernistic denial so precariously perches.

This book is one of a kind. It is a real faith-builder. Read it and see for yourself. Doubt no more that healing and prosperity belong to Christians now.

This is the only book on this subject based entirely on the Greek New Testament but written in plain English you can understand. Consequently, it contains Faith-building Truths you have not seen before.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

JAY SNELL is a former Southern Baptist Evangelist. He holds the Southern Baptist record for the number of evangelistic campaigns held in a given time span. As a pastor, every church he served experienced exploding growth. One church he pastored gained over five hundred in average Sunday School attendance his first twelve months in the field. Considering the location of this church, the condition of the buildings and the poor financial posture, this ministry also set records. And during that same pastorate, Jay led that state in baptisms all five years he was there.

One pastor said, "God's eternal record will confirm Jay Snell to be the most graphic, forceful preacher of our generation." The late Jewish evangelist, Hyman Appleman, said, "If ever a man was gifted for evangelism, Jay Snell is that man."

Jay achieved proficiency in New Testament Greek. This book and its companion volumes required seven years to research the Greek New Testament and write them.

ISBN 0-1895458