

The Two Aspects of Righteousness

There are four basic divine principles that are foundational to the terms of the true gospel. However they are also the aggressive targets of the instinctive serpent thought process, fueled by uncircumcised hearts. These are life, death, sin and righteousness. There are dual divine aspects to each of these four categories that the human heart relentlessly seeks to oversimplify into just one aspect. The dual nature of these principles offer a balance enabling the pursuit of divine righteousness. These are the dual aspects of each of these four principles:

- Life: 1) Resurrection to Immortal life Following Judgment
 2) Resurrection to mortal life for the purpose of judgment
- Death: 1) Permanent Death (2nd death, perishing, eternal death)
 2) Temporary Death (the death of anyone who will experience the resurrection to judgment)
- Righteousness: 1) Personal Righteousness
 2) Imputed Righteousness
- Sin: 1) Sin Nature (no guilt whatsoever, no repentance required... just cleansing from an innocent but divinely unclean state)
 2) Transgressional Sin (guilt is always assigned, repentance & reconciliation are needed)

Each of the **first** of these dual aspects are relentlessly opposed by the natural human thought process.

- 1) **Resurrection to Immortality from mortal nature**: The sons of men, whether Pagan/Christian/ Moslem/Buddhist or whatever- completely reject the concept of a necessary change in nature from mortal to immortal. They all embrace the serpent lie that we don't really die and that evil can be just as eternal as righteousness. Their Creator despising delusions of immortal souls or endless reincarnation all support the original serpent opposition to the divine Edenic testimony. In fact it has been the inappropriate blending of these two separate resurrections into the presumption of a single resurrection that has created division in the Christadelphian community. Immortal Emergence was one separating issue in the early 20th century. Another manifestation of the same mistake was how the terms of qualification for the resurrection to immortality following judgment were inappropriately applied to the quite separate resurrection to mortality prior to judgment, resulting in the clarifying Amendment to the BASF in the late 19th century.
- 2) **Permanent death** is certainly not a component of the serpent philosophy emanating naturally from the uncircumcised human heart. All forms of apostasy reject any understanding of a permanent cessation of life. It is eternal Bliss or eternal torture that are the only options offered by the natural thought process creating all the various but complimentary forms of apostasy.
- 3) The concept of **Personal Righteousness** is fought energetically by the natural thought process so that the conscience can be deadened when behavior does not validate professed faith. Christianity promotes the foolishness that salvation is entirely based on grace, accessed by the tiniest expression of a shallow faith and that divine forgiveness has no limits whatsoever. Challenges within the enlightened community to the necessity for personal righteousness is a symptom of the subtle prodding of the natural heart generated resistance to divine principles. Uncorrected, this resistance to the endless scriptural

references to personal righteousness will eventually result in a fearless presumption of divine acceptance. The absence of the fear of God defines a complete absence of wisdom.

4) The concept of a **sin condemned nature** (sin in the flesh... Rom 8:3) that naturally produces transgressional sin is arrogantly opposed by the mind that serves an uncircumcised heart. Mankind incorrectly presumes that human life is inherently sacred. Despite our Christadelphian pioneers repeatedly defining human nature as a synonym for sin (although guiltless) and defending divine truths and principles against the disciples of clean flesh and inherited sin, we are again hearing and reading claims that sin is **only** the transgression of the law and that all other references to sin that cannot possibly fit within that limited definition have to be nothing but shadowy metonymous expressions, and therefore 'fake' sin. This is just another variation of the same clean flesh challenge that refuses to accept the appropriate divine sin-condemnation of the flesh nature. As Dr Thomas explained, we suffer no guilt for our condemned nature whatsoever, but our condemned human nature is definitely used interchangeably with the term sin throughout scripture.

Our consideration in this commentary addresses item number three: Personal Righteousness. The extreme error in reference to this issue is Christianity's inappropriate insistence that since salvation cannot be earned, that we don't have to **do** anything except have faith in order to enjoy the benefits of salvation. Although Christadelphians officially and academically oppose this false doctrine there is a leavening influence in our community that expands our presumptions progressively in that extreme direction. This is the objection to the concept of personal righteousness. The reasoning for the objection to this phrase representing the divine requirement for personally projecting God's righteousness in our personal lives is presented in the same procedure as a magician's trick... which is based on misdirection. The objections to the concept of personal righteousness oddly presume that if we accept the concept of personal righteousness that this has to be somehow **opposed** to God's righteousness.... that since there can no righteousness apart from God, therefore there can be no 'personal' righteousness. That presumption is as ludicrous as actually believing an entertainer can magically pull a rabbit out of a top hat.

Of course there is no righteousness apart from our Creator. That is a premise accepted by everyone. The point of differentiation on the basis of the term "personal" is certainly not with our Creator... but with each other. Since *all unrighteousness is sin* (1 John 5:17) then anything apart (or differentiated) from our Heavenly Father's right-ness would qualify as sin. It is not simply an overt transgression but also the absence of righteousness that qualifies as sin. However, the human heart's default yearning for the evil of equality attempts to shift the focus of the word 'personal' in relation to the righteousness to God as opposed to the appropriate differentiation between ourselves... which challenges the flesh-cherished understanding of equality. That frame of reasoning is completely illegitimate. However when this objection to the concept of personal righteousness on the basis of being separate from Yahweh is presented quickly and emotionally by a indignant gifted speaker he can certainly draw out from those lambs of Christ that he addresses their instinctive heart's yearning for effortless salvation... and thereby the leavening influence grows.

As is the case with all divine truths, we can prove each individual eternal truth in unlimited ways. This is the principle of God manifestation, where every interdependent part of a singular whole fits together perfectly. If we try to remove or harm any single component of a multitudinous singularity we will affect everything. Divine examples of this principle of God

manifestation include the family unit, the human body, the ecological integrity of creation and of course... the Bible. Therefore, by attacking one component of divine truth we attack the entire harmonious structure. Therefore we can confirm truths and deny error by examining how these understandings blend or contrast with all other components of divine truth. Understandings about divine principles and truths should never-ever rest upon a single verse or two, especially when different Bible translations and paraphrases and lexicon manipulations will accommodate any inversions, twisting and doctrinal contortions we can imagine in order to accommodate our natural, heart generated preferences.

Possessive Personal Pronouns

So let's begin with an obvious frame of thought that automatically confirms this reasoning independently of all the other supporting evidence. This is the scriptural and particularly divine use of the **possessive personal pronouns** in relation to righteousness. Do we really think we have the right to contradict our Creator and our savior when they clearly assign personal, individual ownership to some degree of righteousness on the basis of behavior?

Deut. 6:25 *And it shall be **our** righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.* Moses notes that righteousness is personally owned, based on one's performance of divine commandments. Moses certainly believed in personal righteousness. His use of the plural possessive personal pronoun (our) certainly identifies a personally identified status of righteousness. Moses's concept of personally assigned righteousness certainly didn't eliminate Yahweh from that righteousness equation. The only qualification for any degree of righteousness is the right-ness of Yahweh in the first place.

2 Sam 22:21 *The Lord rewarded me according to **my** righteousness: According to the cleanness of my hands hath he recompensed me.* David relates his personal blessings directly to the righteousness he expresses as belonging to himself, using the possessive personal pronoun "my". David's righteousness was not somehow separate from Yahweh, it was on the basis of David demonstrating Yahweh's righteousness in his life. Therefore it was David's (personal) righteousness... as opposed the righteousness of Saul or Joab or Asaph or Ahithophel or anyone else.

Ps. 7:8 *Judge me, O Lord, according to **my** righteousness, and according to mine integrity that is in me.* David accepts the fact that his God will judge him according to his own righteousness, his personally identified righteousness...separate from other men but not possible to be separated from God. It is impossible to separate right-ness from our Creator, but it is certainly not impossible to separate one believer's pursuit of God's right-ness from another believer. That is the basis for the possessive personal pronoun application we are noting.

Is. 54:17 *No weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper; And every tongue that shall rise against thee in judgment thou shalt condemn. This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord, And **their** righteousness is of me, saith the Lord.* God defines through Isaiah in what sense personal righteousness can be assigned. Using the possessive personal pronoun (their) Yahweh declares that the righteousness assigned to His servants is derived from Him. This is exactly the same sense as Moses and David identifying personal righteousness on the basis of personally operating according to the divine standards of right-ness, as opposed to other individuals or groups that do not.

Ezek. 3:20-21 *Again, When a righteous man doth turn from **his** righteousness, and commit iniquity, and I lay a stumblingblock before him, he shall die: because thou hast not given him warning, he shall die in his sin, and **his** righteousness which he hath done shall not be*

remembered; but his blood will I require at thine hand. ²¹ *Nevertheless if thou warn the righteous man, that the righteous sin not, and he doth not sin, he shall surely live, because he is warned; also thou hast delivered thy soul.* Yahweh Himself (again) declares the principle of personal righteousness, using the possessive personal pronoun (his) and then declares the basis for that righteousness being assigned to that individual: “*which he has done*”. Why would anyone presuming to want Yahweh’s favor choose to contradict the Creator by suggesting that there is no such thing as personal righteousness? That claim declares God to be a liar. That is a very unwise course of action.

Ezek. 14:14,20 *Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by **their righteousness**, saith the Lord God. Though Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, as I live, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall but deliver their own souls by **their righteousness**.* Yahweh declares that the levels of righteousness personally possessed by these faithful men had power to save, but in the context of the extreme wickedness of that body of believers (the Christadelphians of their day) the value of that righteousness they could call their own could not be extended to anyone beyond themselves... therefore highlighting the ‘personal’ aspect of their righteousness. Our personal pursuit of Yahweh’s right-ness can certainly be differentiated between ourselves (making it personal) but can never be separated from Yahweh, as then it would not qualify as righteousness... but only sin, as sin is unrighteousness (1 John 5:17).

Ezek. 18:26-29 *When a righteous man turneth away from **his righteousness**, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.* ²⁷ *Again, when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive.* ²⁸ *Because he considereth, and turneth away from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die.* ²⁹ ***Yet saith the house of Israel, The way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel, are not my ways equal? are not your ways unequal?*** Our Creator declares that just as we can have personally assigned wickedness we can also have personally assigned righteousness (which He defines as “*doing that which is lawful and **right***”). Isn’t it interesting that the body of believers accused Yahweh of inequity in his judgments on the basis of this foundational understanding? When Christadelphians deny the possibility of personally assigned levels of righteousness (the degrees to which our lives individually project the exclusive standard of God’s righteousness) are we not initiating the same challenge to our Creator? Is it wise to challenge our Creator’s judgments? See also Ezek 33:12-20 where Israel contested God’s right to judge on the basis of consistent or inconsistent performance of righteousness... as if we should all be equal in the divine estimation.

Matt. 5:20 *For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.* Just like his Father, Jesus also assigns a level of personal ownership of righteousness to individuals. He even assigns the ownership of some degree of righteousness to the scribes and Pharisees. We have no right to contradict Jesus and suggest these enlightened men in covenant relationship with Yahweh had absolutely no personal righteousness. This is one of the great instinctive mistakes made in our understanding of righteousness. It is somehow assumed that we either have righteousness or we don’t. That is a completely false understanding, based on all the previous quotes noted above that present

righteousness in the sense of degrees, such as the righteousness personally assigned to Noah, Daniel and Job that would have been capable of saving themselves but not their loved ones in the impending judgment on the body of believers. Jesus later advises his listeners to do what the scribes and Pharisees tell them to do, but not to do what they did (Matt. 23:1-3). Therefore the scribes and Pharisees were partially right. They had a degree of right-ness - on the basis of at least saying the right things, however it was insufficient by Christ's standards for the consideration of being awarded the gift of citizenship in the Kingdom of God... and therefore the basis for a warning to anyone wanting to inherit that Kingdom.

On what basis were the sheep defined as righteous in Christ's judgment parable in Matt. 25? It was because they fed the hungry brethren of Christ and clothed the naked brethren of Christ and tended to his sick family. They were righteous on the basis of demonstrating the **right** principles of the Heavenly Father. While faith can also separately assign righteousness (imputed righteousness), it is not exclusive. Individual behavior that demonstrates the exclusive divine standard for what is right can also qualify for the assignment of a personally possessed righteousness.

The Illegitimacy of Either-Or

So what is the **real** problem? How can there be challenges to the concept of personal righteousness after reviewing these easily found expressions? It is the same answer for the challenges to each of the four dual principles identified in the beginning of this commentary. There are two separate categories of righteousness. Those who object to the concept of personal righteousness can easily identify the other righteousness category: imputed righteousness. That assignment of righteousness is based on faith and not works. The human heart latches onto that far simpler and less challenging application immediately. Unfortunately the great weapon of the human heart is the oversimplifying "**either-or**" choice. The serpent philosophy maintains that **either** righteousness is (1) imputed **or** it is (2) personal, but it can't be (1+2) both. This oversimplification reasoning process is applied against each of the personally degrading, meekness demanding aspects of those four principles that were highlighted in blue (life, death, sin and righteousness). Supposedly, we cannot have **both** guilty sin for personal transgressions as well as guiltless sin nature that needs cleansing, as Dr Thomas presented in Elpis Israel and Bro Roberts defended, repeatedly and valiantly. Supposedly we can't have both a permanent category of death as well as a temporary category of death, as if there is no "second" death. Supposedly there is only one category of resurrection and not two separate categories where one group of people rise from the grave to mortality prior to judgment on the basis of their accountability to their Creator and another different but over-lapping group rises from mortality to immortality following the judgment on the basis of their divine approval. Why do we constantly hear and read of "**the**" resurrection in Christadelphian commentaries as if there could only be one? Why do the Unammended insist on applying the conditions of the resurrection to immortality as if they somehow are supposed to apply to the very separate resurrection to judgment? It is the instinctively motivated 'either-or' reasoning weapon of the serpent driven mind that creates the inappropriate challenge to the divine principle of personal righteousness.

What is Righteousness?

Our next reasoning task will be to understand 'righteousness' from the divine perspective. Righteousness is not some ethereal, mystical condition that one either has or doesn't have.

Righteousness is simply right-ness, the practice of being right. It just isn't all that difficult to understand. The constraining condition for what constitutes being right is that there is only one standard for what is right. Our Creator is always right, 100% of the time. That isn't always easy to understand as Yahweh's judgments can certainly challenge the presumptions of the fleshly mind. The instant incineration of Nadab & Abihu for a ritual modification has to be balanced against the fact that not only was their father's golden calf production sin forgiven but in addition that he was appointed the High Priest of God's people. We also have to balance how a young man picking up firewood on a Saturday morning had to be bludgeoned to death with stones by his family but Jesus declares that his disciples were guiltless for harvesting grain for personal consumption on a Saturday. Achan and his whole family are stoned to death because Achan took some spoil from Jericho but King David is forgiven for his adultery and contract murder of Uriah. It isn't always easy to balance the judgments and determinations of our Creator. However, If we can't understand how seemingly contradictory judgments can both be right... then the problem is with our thinking, not with Yahweh. He is **always** right.

When the enlightened faithful think, act and speak in ways that align with and project the right-ness of Yahweh then we also are right, but only on the basis of our agreement with that exclusive standard for right-ness. When we exhibit this divinely 'right' behavior, then that right-ness status can be considered our own -individually- as opposed to being shared with others among the enlightened who do not think, act and speak in the same right-ness validating manner. The 'personal' aspect of the principle of personal righteousness is never scripturally presented as being some different standard of righteousness than our Creator... as it is defensively and emotionally emphasized by some within our enlightened community. This distinction of personal righteousness and its contribution to the framework of our salvation opportunity is not inconsequential.

The principle of personal righteousness is endlessly expressed throughout scripture as the basis for Christ's judgment, despite the emphasis by many today in the community of the enlightened that salvation (atonement) is strictly about forgiveness. This false teaching is a very dangerous distortion of divine truths and principles. We are told repeatedly that we will be judged according to our deeds (Rev. 22:12; Rom. 2:6; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 20:11-13; Matt. 16:27) and not in accordance to whether or not we have been forgiven for all of our failures. Our Creator is searching for people who appreciate His truths and principles and are willing to sacrifice temporary advantages and relationships to cling desperately to His principles. He wants to see Himself in us. Mere verbally professed faith and a confidence in some automatic forgiveness presumption offers too little validation for the divine understanding and behavioral template that is sought in the enlightened. Our Creator's expectation of an appropriate behavioral response (righteousness emulation on a personal level) from the introduction of an enlightened understanding is demonstrated powerfully in the features of creation as the principle of fruitfulness.... further validating our premise.

Personal Righteousness and Fruitfulness

Our Creator is the ultimate Husbandman. He sowed mankind into his vast creation project. Man was the focal point of the entire project, being originally made in His image and likeness and given authority over everything that was made. Unfortunately that likeness was not maintained, by the failure upon the serpent challenge to the divine testimony. Therefore both the divine likeness and divine image were forfeited. Our current energy fading, diseased, waste generating, decaying and decaying human nature is certainly not a representation of the

divine 'image'. Nor could it even qualify for the divine approval status of being "very good" (Gen. 1:31). Inheriting that divine image of immortality, with all its physical holiness benefits, is actually the hope of the enlightened faithful... not a present possession. The parable of the creational features of the agricultural process is a validation of the scriptural principle of this expected personal and individual projection of divine righteousness.... the fruit that the husbandman has a right to expect after cultivating the ground, planting the seed, fertilizing, weeding and nurturing.

Scriptural reference to this creation parable of the divine expectation of fruitfulness (the personal application of the Creator's right-ness) is incredibly extensive. The enlightened community is constantly paralleled to fruit bearing plant life throughout the Bible: i.e. barley, the vineyard, wheat, olive trees, figs and fig trees. However the **unenlightened** are exclusively paralleled to non-fruit bearing plant life: i.e. briars, thorns, grass (Is. 40:6-8; Num 33:55; Song of Sol. 2:2; Ps 118:10-12, Nah. 1:10). The refusal of the enlightened to live by the right standards of Yahweh is defined in terms of fruitlessness, barrenness and famine (Hos. 10:1-2; Ezek. 15; Lk. 6:43-45; Heb. 6:7-8)). This consistency is even maintained on a very subtle level, such as the divine law concerning cutting down trees during a military siege.

Deut. 20:19-20 *When thou shalt besiege a city a long time, in making war against it to take it, thou shalt not destroy the trees thereof by forcing an axe against them: for thou mayest eat of them, and thou shalt not cut them down (for the tree of the field is man's life) to employ them in the siege: Only the trees which thou knowest that they be not trees for meat, thou shalt destroy and cut them down; and thou shalt build bulwarks against the city that maketh war with thee, until it be subdued.*

The reason for that law was that "*the tree of the field is a man's life*". This is a direct validation of our recognition of the agricultural parable within the features of creation that validate the principle of a divinely expected harvest of righteousness 'fruit' where the Creator has planted the seed of His likeness and nurtured it lovingly. Extending the application of this statement is the creational design feature where trees supply the necessary oxygen for our continued life, converting carbon dioxide into life sustaining oxygen. If a tree does not bear fruit (the absence of personally generated divine righteousness validations in the life of an enlightened man or woman) then it must be cut down (Lk. 13:6-9; Ezek. 15).

This creational parable of the agricultural process saturates the written word of our Creator. It is a powerful validation of the understanding of our premise, that the enlightened must develop demonstrations of divine righteousness on a personal and individual basis (fruitfulness) if we expect to have any hope whatsoever in participating in the blessings of eternal salvation (the divine harvest). Paul references the lesson of the seed to those within the Corinthian Ecclesia unfamiliar with how the lesson of the seed validates the promise of resurrection.

1 Cor. 15: 35-38 *But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die: And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat, or of some other grain: But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.*

It is fascinating to see how Paul quotes creation to prove divine truths, as they were being already challenged in the fairly young Gentile Ecclesia at Corinth. This practice of quoting creation to prove the eternal truths and the righteousness of our Creator is a common scriptural practice. Jesus quotes the terms of creation (weather patterns) to prove that the enlightened are supposed to benefit all men and not just those who make us feel good about ourselves (Matt: 5:43-47). Paul quotes the terms of creation as a warning to those possessing

Holy Spirit gifts who would use that power as contradictions of divine righteousness (Heb. 6:4-8).

There is great depth, breadth and height to this creation parable of expected fruitfulness (the creational validation of our premise that personal righteousness is demanded by our Creator). This is a feature of divine glory. When we truly understand eternal truths and principles we will be able to validate those truths and principles endlessly in the written and spoken expressions of our Creator. Creation is the result of the spoken word of the Creator as each of the six days of creativity were responses to the verbal commands of the Creator. Understanding divine truths and principles empowers our capacity to 'see' His glory. When we diminish those truths and principles we become blind and deaf to that glory... reduced to trying to prove our heart generated postulations by quoting an endless variety of Bible translations and manipulating Hebrew and Greek words with constant Lexicon juggling.

In fact the three divinely appointed harvest feast weeks in each year under the laws of the Kingdom of God served as a perfect projection of the three great immortalization events in the divine plan... extending the validation of our demonstration that personal fruitfulness (the individual & personal projection of divine righteousness) will be a basis for divine acceptance (harvesting the fruit from a mature, productive plant).

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1. Feast of Unleavened Bread (barley harvest) | 1. Christ's immortalization |
| 2. Feast of First Fruits/Weeks/Pentecost (wheat harvest) | 2. Beginning of Kingdom |
| 3. Feast of Tabernacles (final ingathering) | 3. End of Millennial Kingdom |

These three great immortalization events (harvests) are also projected in the three rituals in the Most Holy chamber in the Tabernacle on the annual Day of Atonement every year:

1. The fire generated conversion of the aromatic dust of the incense into the cloud embracing the Mercy Seat to save the life of the High Priest;
2. The dual spattering of the bullock blood across the Mercy Seat both east and west to make an atonement for the family of the High Priest;
3. The dual spattering of the goat blood to make an atonement for the rest of the nation.

These three great immortalization events in the divine plan are also projected through the three doorways progressing into increasingly holier stages of the Tabernacle design.

1. The first doorway was into the Tabernacle Courtyard through the curtain.
2. The second doorway was into the Holy Place
3. The third doorway was into the Most Holy Chamber.

These three great immortalization 'harvests' in the divine plan are also shadowed in the three outpourings of the Holy Spirit power on the enlightened at the transition point from the conclusion of the First Kingdom Age into the introduction of the Ecclesial Age:

1. The pouring out of the Holy Spirit on Christ at his baptism
2. The baptism by fire at Pentecost in Jerusalem when the Holy Spirit was poured out on the 120 together (Acts 2)
3. The pouring out of the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles at the home of Cornelius (Acts 10).
There were no other records of any Holy Spirit outpourings in this divinely appointed transitional phase, just those three, which flawlessly mirrors the three rituals and participant categories on every Day of Atonement.

These observations are offered simply as a further validation of the identification of the three harvest feasts with the three immortalization events in the divine plan. Understanding the three

immortalization (salvation/atonement) events as 'harvests' emphasizes the significance of the requirement for those invested with the seed of enlightenment being expected to bear fruit... in other words to generate understanding and behavioral projections of divine right-ness (personal righteousness) on an individual basis.

Depth & Breadth & Height

Cementing this divinely shadowed relationship between the three feast weeks and the three immortalization events in the divine plan is the obvious timing identifications. The first immortalization event (Christ) took place during that first harvest feast week: the Feast of Unleavened Bread that immediately followed Passover. The projection of the second immortalization event in the divine plan (the pouring out on the faithful of the Holy Spirit - what Paul defines as the earnest of the promise of immortality - 2 Cor 5:5) takes place during the second harvest feast week at Pentacost, which was also known as the Feast of First Fruits and also as the Feast of Weeks (Acts 2) which followed the Feast of Unleavened Bread by 50 days. Further cementing this relationship is that while it was the first fruits of barley harvest that was featured in the Feast of Unleavened Bread it was the first fruits of the wheat harvest that was featured in the second divinely appointed harvest feast week, coinciding perfectly with Christ's definition of the second immortalization event as the harvest of the wheat (Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43). Yet another validation of this relationship would be the complete absence of leaven from the first feast week (depicting the first immortalization event of our Messiah) while the second feast week could not begin without the waving of two 'leavened' loaves of the wheat first-fruits (Lev. 23:17), ritually portraying the immortalization of the saints at the beginning of the Millennial Kingdom. The basis for the immortalization of our Messiah was that he was leaven-free. He introduced no polluting leavenous factor into his perfect righteousness projection of his Father throughout his entire life. He was completely leaven free. This is why leaven was never allowed on the Christ altar of burnt offering (Lev. 2:11). **Jesus was saved on the basis of works...** personal righteousness. Death could not hold him. However, **we** have the opportunity to be saved despite the presence of leaven in our lives. We are saved on the basis of grace. Death could certainly hold us if not for the promise of grace. The absence of leaven in the first harvest feast week projecting the first immortalization event of our Messiah along with necessary presence of two leavened wheat loaves to initiate the second feast week projecting the second immortalization event of the saints is a seamless prophetic statement that also blends three-dimensionally with all other divine truths and principles. Personal righteousness cannot save us apart from imputed righteousness. However, imputed righteousness will never be extended if we do not personally and individually generate validations of our Creator's righteousness in our thoughts, words and deeds.

Understanding the truth of divine principles removes the scales from our eyes. We are enabled to see an expanding degree of the glory of our Creator and how everything fits together so perfectly and synergistically to validate His eternal truths and principles. When we object to divine truths, on the basis of heart generated presumptions... then we are blinded to that divine glory. We have eyes but we do not see and we have ears but we do not hear. It should be understood that Jesus used that phrase (unseeing eyes and unhearing ears) in the context of **the enlightened** in covenant relationship with his Father, just as his Father had also originally applied it (through Isaiah) in the exclusive context of **the enlightened**. That condition of having eyes that don't see and ears that don't hear does not refer to the 'world' of the **unenlightened**. It applies to the body of believers... originally the Jews and now the Christadelphians... but always to the children of Abraham. Blind eyes and deaf ears are a

condition of the enlightened... today identified as the Christadelphians. Just as the enlightened Jewish community refused to understand Christ's message of salvation by grace when he came the first time, so Christadelphians are beginning to reject his balancing message of salvation also being based on the righteous deeds of the faithful... by increasingly dismissing the principle of personal righteousness as illegitimate. We need both. It is not an either-or choice.

The speaking and writing Brethren among us who covet the glory and influence accompanying the attendance to the endless itching ears in our community will accommodate the default reasoning of the human heart with loud, emotional denials of the principle of personal righteousness, thereby leavening our community.

2 Tim 4:3-4 *For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.*

They promote the false understanding that any idea of personal righteousness can only be at the expense of divine righteousness. That is a fable. This is the diabolos serpent philosophy within us, seducing our minds to embrace the concept of ignoring our dependence on the necessity for our compliant sacrificial behavior and to rest comfortably in the delusion that our ultimate divine acceptance is absolutely assured on the basis of grace alone. This initial leavening will always progress. That is the nature of the deceitful human heart. First it is the denial of the principle of personal righteousness.... added to that is the heart generated delusion that the fear of God is only reverential... added to that is the false understanding that salvation is only about forgiveness... added to the idea that the over-emphasis of the offer of salvation by grace as being exclusive. The next natural step is to presume that the concept of instant guaranteed salvation ("have you been saved?") is legitimate. The leavening of the community of the enlightened is accelerating dramatically, as these specific and highly dangerous minimalizations are being promoted from Christadelphian podiums and magazines constantly.

Judgment Terms

When we limit our understanding of salvation to nothing more than sin forgiveness, we undermine the exhortation for our necessity to project our Creator's righteousness personally in our thoughts, words and deeds. Jesus made it perfectly clear that we will be judged on more comprehensive issues than simply whether or not we have had all our sins forgiven or not. The three judgment parables he presented to four of his disciples on the Mount of Olives are recorded in Matthew 25. Each of these parables present some of the terms for acceptance and rejection by Christ at our own final judgment. Not a single parable is about committed sins that have not been resolved. They are each about personal righteousness that has or has not been demonstrated. The five unwise wedding attendants were not rejected on the basis of any law transgressions they committed. They were refused at the door by Christ because they did not do what they should have done. The slothful servant did not steal his talent or waste it. He simply did nothing with it. The rejected goats directed to Christ's left had not victimized the least of Christ's brethren. They did not transgress any particular commandment. They simply did nothing when they should have demonstrated the Creator's rightness with beneficial and sacrificial service. Their rejection was for not doing what was right. Their rejection was not on the basis of doing what was wrong. Each of those rejected in the three judgment parables did not generate the necessary personal righteousness that might have qualified their consideration for salvation.

This is why the bronze man in Ezekiel's vision of the Millennial Kingdom temple had **two** measuring tools by which to measure that temple (Ezek. 40). Our Messiah is that bronze man who will measure us to determine if we qualify as building components for the construction of the ultimate divine sanctuary of the immortalized saints. Jesus tells us that he and his Father will come to the faithful and make their abode in them (Jn 14:23 *Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him*). The design and purpose of the Tabernacle and Temples are parables reflecting the design and purpose of the multitudinous Christ. That bronze man used a six cubit reed and a flax line of undetermined length. The reed is appropriately six cubits as it represents how our judge will measure our lives to determine how we avoided and reconciled sin, as sin is associated frequently with the number six in scripture. The 'endless' flax line represents how our judge will measure our lives for how we demonstrated the right-ness of his Father in our thoughts, words and deeds. We certainly cannot **earn** a position in that ultimate divine sanctuary. Unlike Jesus, we can only be saved on the basis of grace. However, that doesn't mean we don't have to do anything at all ... just coasting on a presumption of acceptance on the basis of grace built upon enlightenment, as if we have nothing to fear from our judge's potential rejection. Without personal righteousness, our rejection is absolutely assured. Without fruitfulness (personal righteousness) we will be simply burned with the other tares when the acceptable fruitful wheat is separated out and placed in the barn of the divine husbandman (Matt. 13).

It is the balancing of the dual applications of these four foundational divine principles (death, life, righteousness and sin) that denies any opportunity to the instinctive heart generated distortions emanating from within all of us. We need both imputed righteousness as well as personal righteousness. The significance of this dual necessity is validated in the definition of the white wedding robes awarded to the Messiah's bride, representing her immortalization... the covering of her shameful nakedness (mortality) with blessed immortality.

Rev. 19:7-8 *Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready. And to her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints (many translations read "righteous deeds of the saints").* **This is the personal righteousness aspect.**

Rev 7:13-14 *And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.* The fact that these robes are white is due to the blood of the lamb, therefore obviously highlighting '**imputed**' **righteousness** which qualifies as the second necessary aspect of righteousness.

Both righteousness applications are demonstrated in the white robes... not just one. Those white robes are a projection of the principle of the salvation covering that eliminates our nakedness before our Creator (1 Cor. 15:51-54; 2 Cor. 5:1-4)

The fact that the wedding guest without a wedding garment was ejected from the marriage of the King's son in Christ's parable is a declaration that this man who had been invited (therefore obviously enlightened) had not developed any righteous deeds. He had no personal righteousness and therefore no white wedding garment, therefore disqualifying him from any possibility of the wedding participation. He was identified as "friend" before his ejection. There will be no 'friends' allowed at the wedding of the son of God, only family (Matt 22:1-14). In fact

the last statement of this parable should be particularly frightening: *For many are called, but few are chosen*. This is a judgment parable. Therefore we are being told that many will be called to the judgment but only a few of those being called are going to be chosen. We appropriately identify our community as the 'ecclesia' ... which means 'the called'. Jesus warns us that only a few of 'the called' are going to be chosen at the judgment. It is odd to see how our community has deflected the frightening aspect of this warning by pretending this phrase should be applied to preaching... that many are called to understand the truth but that few are chosen (in the sense of being baptized). That preaching application is a completely illegitimate distortion, but fairly commonly expressed in our community.

The truth of the matter is that at every significant judgment point in the divine record there were always very few in the enlightened community that were chosen to be spared: only 8 at the flood; only 2 brethren leaving Egypt actually entered the promised land (Joshua & Caleb); only Lot and his two daughters escaped Sodom with literally hundreds of his enlightened community left behind to face that fiery divine judgment; Jeremiah and a small remnant left behind by Nebuchadnezzar after the destruction of Jerusalem; and lastly the few who listened to the warning from Jesus about leaving Jerusalem after they saw the city surrounded by armies and not coming back (Lk 21:20-21). The wise escaped Jerusalem after Vespasian's army abruptly ended their siege and before Titus returned months later to destroy the city at the Feast of Unleavened Bread. The warning of many facing judgment but few being chosen to escape that judgment is a consistent scriptural and historic pattern. It will be no different at the ultimate judgment to separate the sheep and the goats. It is the goat herd to the left of the judge that will be immensely larger than the sheep herd to his right, since many will be called but few chosen.

We need to be careful to avoid over-emphasizing any one righteousness aspect to the expense of the other. The Jewish community over-emphasized the personal righteousness aspect to their blindness concerning the concept of grace and the necessity for being awarded the extended gift of righteousness from their Messiah. They concentrated exclusively on works. The Christians overcompensate, concentrating exclusively on grace. A number of Christadelphians have begun to mentally migrate to that same excessive concentration on exclusively grace in relation to salvation by denying the concept of 'personal' righteousness. It is an easy 'sell' to the itching ears within the enlightened community.

The consideration of Job's righteousness and his sufferings and vindication is a study in the balance of these two aspects of righteousness. Job had to learn that although his personal righteousness was substantial, it was insufficient. Bildad, Eliphaz and Zophar inappropriately promoted the false understanding of exact retribution, also dependent on the exclusive understanding of personal righteousness. Once Job realized that God was always right, no matter what, and that his own righteousness could never challenge the Creator's righteousness... then Job's suffering ended and his blessings flowed again. We have to balance both aspects of righteousness... both imputed and personal. Concentrating exclusively on one or the other will imbalance our understandings and therefore our behavior toward a divinely unacceptable pattern.

Oversimplification is the greatest impediment in the development of the mind searching for the glory of our Creator. It is our hearts that should be made small, not the Creator's truths and

principles. It is meekness that empowers a greater and greater vision of the divine glory that will eventually cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.