

EXPLANATORY NOTES WILL FOLLOW THIS CHAPTER, AFTERWARDS...

Chapter 2
Should We Put Our Trust in Man?

Psalm 118:8-9

It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in man. It is better to trust in the LORD than to put confidence in princes.

There's a question that arises in many hearts: *Should we put our trust in man?*

1 Corinthians 11:1

Be ye followers of me, even as I also *am* of Christ.

This passage, as expressed by the editors of the King James Version (KJV) – a Bible translation which has reigned supreme for many years – may actually cause some individuals to misunderstand what Paul was suggesting.*⁵ We may hear Christian leaders today declare boldly: *"Follow me as I follow Christ!"*, just as the man Moses led the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt – as he himself was led by God. But, the children of Israel, in turn, had actually questioned Moses' authority, asking if he, indeed, were truly being led by God; as there were those who questioned the Apostle Paul's authority, and even that of Jesus. So, and since they were found to be true men of the Word, *why question any of our pastor's authority today?* Follow them, many say, as they are themselves following God. *Is that not the pattern of heaven?* . . . But, how do other Bible versions render that passage in 1st Corinthians?

Tyndale, 1535 AD

Folowe me as I do Christ.

About the same – which isn't surprising, though, seeing that the KJV (King James Version) is mostly an update of Tyndale's translation, anyway (as seen at the last part of my *Explanatory Note*, called: *'May actually cause some individuals to misunderstand what Paul was suggesting...'*) . . . But, how about J.P. Green's more modern, literal translation?

J.P. Green, Sr. Literal, from the Interlinear

Be IMITATORS of me, as I *am* also of Christ.

Now, that's a bit different . . . But, what does the Greek say?

Imitator/Follower: Mimetes, G3402, from Strong's Greek Dictionary: From G3401; an imitator: follower. [G3401, mimeomai: Middle voice from mimos (a mimic); to imitate: follow.]

So, either version could be right in one sense or another. However, the KJV could lead one to believe that pastors become authoritative leaders (*maybe even 'mediators' between saints and God*), when all along Paul could have simply meant that others should, on their own steam, press toward the mark and goal of Christ, even as he was trying himself, with fear and trembling (**Philippians 2:12**^{*6}) . . . So, what's the real answer? Do we follow the man of God (i.e. have him become our *'headship'* that we follow blindly) as he leads us to Christ? And, to let him be our mediator between us and God? Or, as J.P. Green Sr. suggested, to simply follow the pastor's *example*; *'imitate'* his pattern of Godly dedication? In fact, of the approximately 38 Bible versions

compared at the online page: 'Bible Study Tools' (which can be seen at: www.biblestudytools.com/1-corinthians/111compare.html), we see, boldly, that most of them emanate the *imitating* of Paul's own actions (or, suggests following his *example*), rather than the people following him personally, as if he were their headship . . . While having that in mind, let's now closely examine our modern-day man of God.

But, just who is the man of God? Again, is it our pastor? For, indeed, anymore and in many places, it seems as if the pastor is the only recognized authority; and, I've even have heard of church meetings where if you weren't even a pastor, you weren't allowed to get up to speak or preach. Ministers seem to forget that there were four other leadership offices mentioned by the Apostle Paul: *evangelist, prophet, teacher and apostle* (**Ephesians 4:11**). But, if you see what is happening, a pastor usually has the power over a group of people to be their spokesman for and from God. And, a lot of times, a pastor will even take on the office of a teacher; some will take on the office of a prophet; and, there will be a few to apostolize other churches. So, then, when the pastor becomes the *only* recognized authority (let us look at this in reality), how far should he go in becoming a shepherd to the people? How much power is he allowed to wield over the people under his care? Can any of the sheep question his authority? Is everything he teaches the people gold nuggets of truth streaming down from heaven?

In some cases – *and, yet, not in all cases* – once a person gets settled into their new church (after all the newness has died down), many folks will begin (but, again, this does not apply to everyone!) to become a little uneasy. And, if so, then why is this? What is happening? Well, you may begin to notice things that are very unusual. There are '*political*' things happening that you had never noticed before. Back-bitings; talebearers; whisperers; betrayals from your fellow Christians; and, even (*God-forbid*) from the pastor himself! And *if* so (again, *IF* so – as it actually happens in a lot of places that you may not be aware of), you were thinking that this pastor was a man of God, ordained by God – incapable of deceit, corruption, or betrayal; and, you may say to yourself: "*And he goes and commits this folly?*"*⁷ (***please see this very important Explanatory Note for better clarification on where my thoughts are going on all of this, and about pastors***) And, you then realize that he's just as human as you are yourself; and, can surely make mistakes, too. So, what do you do now? You found out, like I said, that your pastor was human, after all; and, he may have hurt you in one way or another. Some people, upon seeing these things, either quit church altogether, join another church, or start a new church of their own – sometimes in the same faith and belief; or, even start a new denomination. And, by so doing, they will add yet another name to the Earth. You found yourself naked, and was so anxious to clothe yourself with a new faith or belief or religion, so you clothe yourself with another name, and cover your nakedness with a fig leaf.*⁸

Again, what's happening? Why are there so many religions? Why are there so many men of God? Are those, who are claiming to be men of God, actual ministers? Why do so many want to rule over others? Why do so many want to be an authority and in power and not to be just an equal? Do we listen to that man on the platform who is behind the pulpit? Do we consider his words? Do we do what he says for us to do? Do we obey his words? How much power does that man have over us? Do we fear the powers that be, and take heed to his words of how to conduct our lives?

John 13:16–17 (*Jesus speaking*)

Verily, verily, I say unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him. If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.

In this scriptural reference, who is your lord of whom you are not greater than? *Your pastor? Your man of God?* Or, is it, as this passage actually suggested, only Jesus? No, you are not greater than, nor ever will have a higher status than the man Jesus; and, he's certainly our Lord; and, the rest of the people, namely you and I, are God's children – and, are not to usurp authority over one another (as I'll be covering, in detail, in the following, upcoming pages about my thoughts on all of that); for, again, usurping is simply the spirit of a Gentile – a type of fleshly wisdom and thought that we simply must put down and begin to actually prefer our brethren (brethren meaning both male and female – *see the Galatians quote just below*) above our own selves. And, this saying is true for both minister and saint.

Galatians 3:26–28

For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

But how far does this scripture go? Does that not include pastors or any other ministers in the equation? And, by me asking this, am I insinuating that God does not set apart a ministry to teach others who are of lesser understanding? . . . Actually, and what I'm trying to point out with all of this (*as, actually, this entire book is designed to explain the proper role of leaders*) is that just because one may have greater understanding on certain issues than another, that it does not mean, in the least, that they are a better person – as many ministers have taken upon that thought and action. But, in all actuality, if you truly are greater in your understandings, then you actually become a *servant* unto others, rather than you becoming the master. For, if a master role is taken by a minister, then a spirit of a Gentile does form.

Matthew 20:25–28

But Jesus called them *unto him*, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister [i.e. servant*9]; And whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

But, what has actually happened? Have (in *some* areas) the roles been reversed? Are the great being served by the less instead of the less being served by the great? And, in turn, making them greater than what they already are? And, does the earthly saying apply when it says that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer? Do the rich in truth and knowledge increase their learning whilst the poor in truth and knowledge decrease into nothing?

Surely, if things weren't getting so twisted and misconstrued, and earthen gain obtained by such bad fellows, then a book like this wouldn't even be necessary at all! But, unfortunately, so many bad things are happening in the church world today, that a book like this is actually needed in order to inform all who walk into churches of what to be careful of. *But, again, not in disrespect nor in childish backlashing!* – else, you yourself will be that person of sin; but, rather, in the handling of such things with proper Godly wisdom, as I certainly will continue to explain how herein.

Now, and to what is to be expressed in the next chapter, please take no offense; but, do consider and see things for what they truly are. And, do not think that I judge anyone personally by the things that I will be expressing from here-on-out. But, instead, let us look at this in the light of reality, and to observe these things with wonderment, and comparing them with scriptures with

what's happening in today's society. *Can we not glean actual happenings from the Bible and compare them with everyday lives?* And, cannot we see people for who they truly are? And *what* they truly are?

Ecclesiastes 1:9–10

The thing that hath been, it is *that* which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and *there is* no new *thing* under the sun. Is there *any* thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us.

Explanatory Notes for Chapter 2
Should We Put Our Trust in Man?

***5. May actually cause some individuals to misunderstand what Paul was suggesting...** I had actually went-over, in some pretty good detail (in my book: *In the Beginning: It was spiritual from the very start*'), about the pros and cons of biblical translations into English; I had also suggested therein that there are certainly differences in sentence and word expressions in ages gone-by than as compared to today; knowing, assuredly, that they, too (i.e. the King James Version panel), had to deal with ancient languages themselves when they translated the Bible from the original languages (*that is, when we realize that this translating task was mostly William Tyndale's work**), where (as I've just said) expression of thought and phrase can be varied as to what we might understand today ... I will be covering, with greater detail, the topic of Bible translations in an upcoming book, called *'The Bible is not a buffet;'* but, in the meantime, please know that with my present wording (i.e. *'the KJV may actually cause some individuals to misunderstand what Paul was suggesting'*) wasn't issued as a warning for the reader to be leery of that particular translation; but, to be aware, instead, of modern phraseology as opposed to older and more ancient phrasing; and, also knowing that the audience of the 1600's AD may have actually understood this KJV thought perfectly when it was compared to the original teaching that Paul was trying to convey in Greek. Also, and because of that, we aren't to suddenly think that the KJV is ready for the trash can; nor that it's no good for us today. That opinion belongs in the pros and cons argument of Bible translations, as well. I will add, though, that it may be a wiser decision to become educated on the KJV 'language' rather than trusting in some modern, 'corrupted' Bible versions. But, and again, as to what those are (that is, which versions may be corrupted), I will get in detail about that in my upcoming book on that topic.

***That is, when we realize that this translating task was mostly William Tyndale's work...** I slipped this statement in because I wanted to let my audience know that I'm aware of what the KJV claims on its cover page that, not only do the translators say that their version was *"newly translated out of the original tongues,"* but, it also said (and, more accurately, I might add) that it was also *"with the former translations diligently compared and revised."* These translations, one should know, were predominately only one, and that was William Tyndale's work from about a hundred years beforehand (approximately AD 1535), who was the first person to directly translate the Bible from the original languages; especially since John Wycliff's Version (circa AD 1390 – which, before Tyndale, was the only complete English Bible in existence) was merely translated from Jerome's Latin Vulgate of the late 4th century AD. The translations that appeared between Tyndale and the KJV were also, dominantly, Tyndale translations, too ... For further research on Tyndale's translation being a main influence (if not *the* main influence) for the KJV, please see *'God's Secretaries: The making of the King James Bible,'* by Adam Nicolson

(Perennial/Harper Collins Publishers, 2004) – especially on pages 221-225; and, without trying to infringe on copyright issues, I'd like to at least quote Mr. Nicolson on page 224, when he says: *"Far from burying Tyndale, the 1611 translators honoured him. They were quite explicit about their debt to the past."* Not only, but on page 220, when explaining that the KJV panel tried to put their task "beyond" his (as in, advancing, not destroying), he says: *"What they did could not have been done without Tyndale."* Also, see *'Book of Fire: William Tyndale, Thomas More and the bloody birth of the English Bible;'* by Brian Moynahan (Abacus, 2011). And, perhaps more especially, the works by David Daniell – who has been called the foremost modern authority on both Tyndale and Shakespeare. His works include *fresh Tyndale old and new testament publications* (1992 Yale University, OT; and 1989 NT). His introductions and notes therein are extremely helpful. Also, David Daniell's biography on Tyndale, called: *'William Tyndale: A Biography'* (1994, Yale University).

***6. With fear and trembling...**

Philippians 2:12

Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, **work out your own salvation** with fear and trembling.

***7. And he goes and commits this folly?...** I certainly hope that by now I haven't lost my audience! That is, in believing that I'm going into a direction that I'm really not. It may seem from my wording that I'm against churches or pastors; *but, such is certainly not the case* – as I had explained in my Introduction, which I have added-in because I wanted to detour any wrong thoughts concerning this writing before even beginning this journey ... In fact, one of my own mentors, years ago (back in the mid to late 1990's) whom I thought was dead-set against there being any pastors (*since he seemed to hound on them just about every time he preached!*), had told me, just a few days before he passed-on (whilst sick in a hospital bed) that he predicted that 'ol so-and-so would become a pastor themselves. I told him: "But, brother, you are against pastors! How can you make this prediction?" "Who said that I am against pastors?" he asked me, with a grimace. "I have gathered that from your own words," I replied. "Ted," he said to me, "I have never been against pastors – it's *dictators* that I am against! But, God had ordained for there to be pastors." And, that saying of his has stuck with me unto this day. It said a lot ... By the way, that prediction of his *did* come true ... I, too, am in agreeance that pastors are very much needed, *as well as the leadership of the other four offices, too*. And, as will be seen in the upcoming chapters, I do support a five-fold ministry (even though there are other callings and offices of the ministry, these five represent *leadership* positions in the church), but ONLY if they are conducted in the way that God had intended – and that's without (as my old mentor had said) being a dictator. A pastor, my friends, should be a loving, and kindhearted parent, who is interested in allowing and helping a child to grow-up, and to become mature themselves. Even in nature, a mother bird will sometimes kick her babies out of the nest if they are staying in too long, so that they can learn to fly, because the baby simply needs to learn how to gather and find food for their own survival. So, if it's 'unnatural' for any kind of parent to hold back a child, *then why is it healthy for a 'spiritual' parent to hold back God's children?* It's not only unnatural, it's unethical, wrong, and anti-biblical ... Please take note that most of my statements in this present chapter (chapter 2 – *and, indeed, carried on-over to chapter 3!*) are directed toward ministers who are holding people back from growing to their full, intended potentials – from both prematurely ordained novices, and, too (more especially, though), from actual *dictators*. But, I'm not meaning properly-called pastors who are working within their gifts correctly; for, I know for a fact that there are good pastors and ministers out there, even if they may seem to be the 'minority' of the pastoral group.

***8. You cover your nakedness with a fig leaf...** I almost left that statement out of this book, I now laughingly admit! For, it seems a little ill-fit with the rest of my words. My wife, however

(during the final editing stages), insisted that I leave it in; and, I realize that she's right, for it really does fit in perfectly with what I'm trying to convey. Back in the year 2000, however, when I first wrote those words in, I was in a passion to express a certain thought without realizing, though, that it could raise a serious eyebrow or two ... For the folks who know exactly what I meant by the statement, this *Explanatory Note* would probably seem unnecessary; but, I know for certain that others will be scratching their heads over the phrase ... Of course, this has a direct connection to the story of the Garden of Eden, with the incident of Adam and Eve when they realized that they had done something wrong.

Genesis 3:7

And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they *were* naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.

A host of thoughts can be gleaned from this situation; and, too, many more thoughts with my own connection in the main part of this book (i.e. during chapter 2); but, I will try and be brief with my explanation ... First of all, we should realize that, in proper, *metaphorical*, biblical analysis, there's a really huge difference in being '*naked*' and in being '*nude*.'

1 Corinthians 4:11

Even unto this present hour we both hunger, and thirst, **and are naked**, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwellingplace.

We don't, of course, imagine Paul and his comrades being *nude* in this situation! ... This next verse will explain his meaning:

Hebrews 4:13

Neither is there any creature that is not manifest [clearly visible] in his sight: but **all things are naked and opened** unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do.

Here, with this statement, we see a connection with the Genesis account, in that nothing can be hid from God. Naked, in this case, is an exposure toward God of the intents and thoughts of a person's heart ... Adam and Eve suddenly felt that they needed to have a covering other than God's – as if God's covering wasn't enough for them. Or, that they were too ashamed to have His covering anymore because of their wretched sin. That's why God asked them: "Who told thee that thou *wast* naked?" – **Genesis 3:11**. Especially since, earlier in the story, they were already aware of their nakedness, and weren't even ashamed of it.

Genesis 2:25

And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

Or, I should say, and as Paul had suggested in **Hebrews 4:13**, that their hearts and thoughts were open and exposed to God, and they weren't ashamed, and needed not to hide anything about themselves within God's Kingdom; because, up until that time, they had done nothing wrong. Committing a great sin, however (which sin, by the way, was a wish to usurp unearned, unmerited authority – to become as gods [**Genesis 3:5** "...your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil"], much like dictators over churches try to do; of which subject – concerning our first parents – I fully intend on exploring in my upcoming book on '*Adam and Eve*,' Part II in the '*Spiritual Side of Creation*' book series), they suddenly felt a great need to cover themselves with another name other than God's. That is, they needed the name of *Adam* (see **Genesis 5:2** "called THEIR name Adam..." – i.e. '1st man Adam', as is seen in **1st Corinthians 15:22** "in Adam all die...;" and **1st Corinthians 15:45** "The first man Adam was made a living soul; [but] the last Adam [Jesus] *was made* a quickening spirit"); which, all that basically means is possessing the name of religiously, carnal-man, as opposed to simply having the name of God. But, with the sin of their disobedience came a great shame, and a need for another covering besides what God had already provided. It's not a coincidence, therefore, that their new covering was made of a fig leaf ... *Why is that?* ... We must seriously ask ourselves why it had to be that of a fig tree. Why not any other tree leaf? Because of the size of the fig leaf? That it was bigger than the others? No. I'm sure that other leaves could have been big enough; but, there was a *spiritual* significance to it being that of a fig tree – a thought, of which, I had traveled

down pretty well in my book *'In the Beginning: It was spiritual from the very start,'* in linking the fig tree, metaphorically, to the religious, Israeli nation of the Old Testament (i.e. **Hosea 9:10b** "...I saw your fathers as the firstripe in the fig tree at her first time." And, as seen in the parable of **Luke 13:6-9** "A certain *man* had a fig tree planted in his vineyard; and he came and sought fruit thereon [i.e. Fruits of the Spirit – **Galatians 5:22-23**], and found none...", etc – which, in turn, links directly with **Matthew 21:19-20** and **Mark 11:13-14; 20** "And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not *yet*") ... I'm not speaking of the natural land over in Israel or Judea, though, but the Hebrew nation as a religious state: of their covenant and worshipping of God (which began with their fathers Adam, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob) – which ultimately led to the corrupted, religious leadership of Jesus' day: i.e. the historical Pharisees, Sadducees, etc ... Even Moses had warned the Israeli nation that they, religiously and spiritually, would fall horribly away from God's ways:

Deuteronomy 31:29

For I know that after my death ye will utterly corrupt *yourselves*, and turn aside from the way which I have commanded you; and evil will befall you in the latter days; because ye will do evil in the sight of the LORD, to provoke him to anger through the work of your hands.*

And, all of this because, *religiously*, they began to worship and serve in the name of Adam rather than in the name of God; i.e. they worshipped and served the *Creature* more than the Creator. So, in our account in Genesis, of the sin that began with Adam and Eve, we see for the first time in history a linking to the religiously carnal mind-set of man, and of wanting to operate, religiously, in their own name rather than God's; and, anytime man wants to do things their own way, *religiously* – especially for selfish gain, needs and wants – then they, too, are working within that same spirit that Adam and Eve had worked in all those years ago ... So, basically, what I'm saying is that the fig leaf did not represent a piece of natural clothing; it, instead (again, *metaphorically*), represented a religiously, carnal mind-set of how man had, from that day forward, served and worshipped God in fleshly form (*man's covering*); until, that is, Christ had come to reconcile man to the Father, and to introduce a *Spiritual* path. And, too, I'm also insinuating that every time somebody has a name other than Jesus for their religion, that they, too, had found themselves naked, and did cover themselves with that other name; which, again, is *Adam* (but, which – *indeed!* – comes, *modernly*, in the form of other names, too: religious names/applications that man had invented) ... This, however, is not an insinuation that, *since modern folks end-up wearing a fig leaf apron themselves*, that they had necessarily committed some atrocious sin as did our first parents; but, is a suggestion that they are operating in the flesh, as many do who are raised in man's religion and know only the fleshly aspects of Jesus (**2nd Corinthians 5:16** "...though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we *him* no more..."), without realizing, of course, that there's a different, and a much better way to Christ; and, that they can, instead, operate '*in Spirit and in Truth*' ... I'll certainly speak more on this idea (i.e. of how many are 'operating' in the flesh instead of the Spirit) within the upcoming chapters of this book; and, too, of Adam himself – of how he was the first to kick-off man's fleshly religion; and, of his connection with our current topic – which, I'll actually begin speaking on him in the very next, upcoming *Explanatory Note* – #9; and, a few more times throughout this book, too ... I will remind my readers, also (and especially those who have trouble with trying to 'spiritualize' some scriptures; or, rather, in seeing some as *metaphorical*) to please see my book, called: *'In the Beginning: It was spiritual from the very start,'* where I explain in detail that many verses in our Bibles can be read as allegories – especially the first four chapters of Genesis. Please refer to that book for an explanation.

***The work of your hands...** This statement has a religious connotation to it: *man's own dreamt-up religion is the work of their hands*; of which statement can be seen repeated

throughout the Bible. Herein, I will explore this idea later; such as in *Explanatory Note #51* in chapter 7, where I'll make it more obvious.

***9. Let him be your minister/servant...** The irony of the KJV translation, for **Matthew 20:26-27**, is in the fact that it said *minister* when it should have said *servant*; and, it should have said *slave* where it said *servant*. And, even though we had already spoken briefly about a servant/slave in an earlier *Explanatory Note*, it won't do any harm to say a bit more on it for the benefit of this study. Let us, therefore, look a little more closely at these two words:

Minister (from KJV translation), Diakonos, G1249, from Strong's Greek Dictionary: Probably from *Diakoō* (obsolete, to run on errands; compare G1377); **an attendant**, that is, (generally) **a waiter** (at table or in other menial duties); specifically a Christian teacher and pastor (technically a deacon or deaconess): - deacon, minister, servant.

Servant (from KJV translation), Doulos, G1401, from Strong's Greek Dictionary: From G1210; **a slave** (literally or figuratively, involuntarily or voluntarily; frequently therefore in a qualified sense of subjection or subserviency): - bond (-man), servant.

Either way you want to look at it, a minister (which, certainly, includes a pastor) is not a master, but a servant (or, I should say, not a 'master' as in modern terms – as one who has servants attending his or her every need). Of course, one could argue that since Jesus was both a servant and a master, that a modern-day minister also has that same right (*Even though it should be a no-brainer to realize that none of us have the same status and authority of Jesus; and, neither will we ever!* – even though, with my own ears, I have heard several ministers of the past putting themselves up to that level). One of my hopes, in this book, is to present a contrary thought to the idea of people waiting hand and foot on a ministry. Basically, if one is to be a *spiritual master* (as in, a biblical understanding of what that truly is: i.e. a spiritual father or spiritual mother), then one only should look upon that as a role of a loving parent, as I had already suggested (*and, of which, I will explore a bit further near the end of this present Explanatory Note*). Even Jesus said that a true minister would not take upon himself a usurping role – which a worldly person would certainly do. In fact, Jesus further pointed out, in verse 25, of Matthew chapter 20, that a usurping role (and, indeed, a worldly 'master' role) is a thing that only a Gentile would do, but not a true Jew ... Of course, I'm turning this situation, which happens in a natural setting, into *spiritual roles* for the minister. For instance, and again as verse 25 suggests, only a Gentile would take upon a usurping role over another person's head: which shows us that anybody today, who would do the same thing, would have that same kind of a spirit – hence, as I had pointed out, that modern-day person would be displaying a '*Gentile spirit*;' or, have the '*spirit of a Gentile*;' and, in like manner (or, I should say, in reverse roles), a 'true Jew' – *and, I'm not here meaning a 'natural' Jew, of course* – would leave such fleshly thoughts behind them.

Romans 2:28-29

For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither *is that* circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision *is that* of the heart, in the spirit, *and* not in the letter; whose praise *is* not of men, but of God.

So saying, that if we are born into God's Kingdom today (that is, born *again* through His Holy Spirit), then no matter what our fleshly nationality had been, we're now a Jew – *spiritually speaking, of course* – which means, beyond natural nationality, that we are a keeper of God's spiritual laws (**Romans 7:22** "I delight in the law of God after the inward man.") ... A lot of ministers seem to forget what their roles in the Kingdom should be, and they begin to look upon themselves as an authoritative, mighty titan, who's a lordly master, and who has baby sheep under his or her thumbs. This is exactly what had separated first man Adam from the second man Adam, as both of them had to deal with the same temptation of becoming a usurping god. However, the

second Adam succeeded where the first Adam had failed ... *How so?* ... Well, we know from scripture, that there was, indeed, a first man Adam, whom we began learning about in Genesis:

Genesis 2:7

And the LORD God formed man [Adam] *of* the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a **living soul** ... [2:19a] And out of the ground the LORD God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air; and brought *them* unto **Adam**...

Notice, though, how Paul handles Adam's situation compared to that of Jesus':

1 Corinthians 15:45

And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a **living soul** [as, again, was seen in **Genesis 2:7**]; the last Adam [Jesus] *was made* a **quickening spirit**.

As for any connecting scriptures that we can use to say that this second Adam was Jesus Himself, we need not go much further than this Romans passage:

Romans 8:11

But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also **quicken** your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

Knowing, assuredly, that Jesus was the first to resurrect from the dead (**1st Corinthians 15:20** "But now is Christ risen from the dead, *and* become the **firstfruits** of them that slept."), it's implying that Jesus was *quickened* (i.e. made alive – That is, unto *true* life [i.e. immortality], as opposed to Adam's *temporal* life); and, so, being the first to do so from the tomb, he would be considered the *new* Adam. That is, a *new man*.

Ephesians 2:15

Having abolished in his flesh [when he died on the cross] the enmity, *even* the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances; **for to make in himself of twain one NEW MAN**, so making peace.

And, we, too, are needing to do the same, to become a new Adam (a new man), such as he:

Ephesians 4:24

And that ye [you!] put on the **new man**, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

Now, so saying, we can make our connection between the two Adam's; and, we will be able to see clearly that one fell, but the other, in the same situation, had overcome. We need not, though, rehash too much about the first Adam's sin, since his story is quite plain from the Genesis account, and of which we can see, without much digging, from Genesis chapter 3, starting in verse 1. But, especially, is this evident from verse 5, when the serpent told Eve that when she and her husband would eat of the forbidden fruit, that not only would their eyes be opened up, but that they would become gods, knowing both good and evil. Of course, and according to verse 6, both Adam and Eve partook of that which was forbidden (*we will get into detail, in my book on 'Adam and Eve,' of what that forbidden fruit really was; and, too, of what [or, 'who!'] they were wishing to usurp authority over*). We now see Jesus (2nd Adam) in the same battle, during his wilderness experience, here:

Matthew 4:8-9

Again, the devil taketh him [Jesus] up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.

In other words, you can become a god, if you will bow down to me. And, by doing so, you will become an authoritative dictator over all the people ... Of course, Jesus, as opposed to first man Adam, actually resisted the devil:

Matthew 4:10

Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God [i.e. the Father], and him only shalt thou serve.

Now, one could argue the fact that Jesus *did* become a God after all! And, such a thought could possibly destroy my theory; except for the fact that because of His desire *not* to become the *man of sin* (that is, by bowing to satan's wishes, and being a god on satan's terms), it had afforded the Father to put His Son in that high position. Let's watch this in scripture:

Hebrews 1:8-9

But unto the Son [Jesus] *he* [the Father] *saith*, Thy throne, O God, *is* for ever and ever [See? Here, the Father calls His Son a God]: a sceptre of righteousness *is* the sceptre of thy kingdom. [Why? Because...] Thou [Jesus] hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God [the Father], *even* thy God [He's even Jesus' God], hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows [i.e. above any other prophet or minister of the Old Testament].

Even when Jesus physically walked this Earth, He let folks know who was in charge:

Matthew 19:16-17

And, behold, one came and said unto him [Jesus], Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? [Jesus' response?] And he [Jesus] said unto him, **Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God** [i.e. the Father]: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.

Not only so, but Jesus is going to, willingly, give-up all his rule and authority (that the Father had given Him), and give it back on-over to His Father:

1 Corinthians 15:24

Then *cometh* the end, when he [Jesus] shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he [Jesus] shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. [verse 28] And when all things shall be subdued unto him [the Father], then shall the Son [Jesus] also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God [the Father] may be all in all.

First man Adam did not have that kind of a spirit! He wanted power without God's involvement, consent, or blessing; Jesus, as we see from scripture, never disobeyed His Father, unlike first man Adam:

Hebrews 4:15

For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities [i.e. Jesus; see the verse just above this one]; **but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.**

So, what does all this mean? It means that if we are in our own religious name (i.e. Adam, carnal-man), then we cannot be a proper minister for God; neither can we even be a proper saint.

1 Corinthians 15:22

For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

Now, as far as a minister's role, in either being a *slave* or a *servant* to the saints of God, it's really quite evident of what that means. It's in things, foremost, which calls us to duty as a parent. A good parent would want their own children to succeed in life; and, we should want to see the saints of God triumphant, as well. If we see that a person displays a certain gift in the ministry, then we need to help develop that gift if possible – *even if it means that they'll use their gifts in other churches, or other cities, or other countries!* We cannot stand in God's way when He works with His children, for one of the biggest differences in rearing a spiritual child than a natural child is that we are only 'temporal' parents, knowing that God is their eternal parent. Therefore, once that child is *grown*, it is doubly important not to stand in their way, at all. The minister, also, is a steward of the Written Word; realizing, of course, that they're not *our* words, but God's; therefore, we are not to have a monopoly on the Gospel in any respect, nor to say that we know all possible truth, and 'organize' ourselves in that area; or, that nobody else can even know it as deeply as we. This certainly can confuse a child. It's even okay to say occasionally that you just don't know the answer to some questions – I know that I had to do that on several occasions, *but without embarrassment* ... The adolescent (in Godly years, not natural years necessarily) will certainly

want to know why there are so many divisions amongst Christians; so many denominations; of why they can't go visit another church – especially of another denomination. They should be taught that it is man that's divided, not God ... Now, I'm certainly not opposed to keeping a child safe during their baby years; but, once they start growing, we need *not* keep discouraging them of exploring other churches; but (*and hear me out!*), these churches should be within the Christian faith *only*. As I had explained in an *Explanatory Note* earlier, there is no other religion whereby man can be saved other than that of Christianity, nor any other name that we should be involved in other than Jesus Christ. A wise parent will know how to handle this. All I'm really suggesting here is that we use wisdom, as parents, when the child asks about other denominations, or even other Christian religions. I know this is a hard thing for many spiritual parents; because they, for the most part, are afraid of other churches, and other denominations; that's why, perhaps, it's best to become educated on these issues themselves first, with *unbiased investigations*, so that the parent can share proper warnings, but not discouragements; for, we must believe that if others are doing their best to find Christ – through the instructions of the Holy Scriptures, no doubt – to at least let the older student see things for themselves, and not to shelter them too much; for, just like natural teenagers rebel against sheltering, spiritual teenagers will do the same! However, if the other denomination in question doesn't have at least the five fundamental established truths, as I had shown in an *Explanatory Note* for chapter 1, as was written out by the *European-American Evangelistic Crusades*, then I, too, would be leery to see a student attend. Here are those fundamentals again:

- 1). *The Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ (John 1:1; John 20:28; Hebrews 1:8-9).*
- 2). *The Virgin Birth (Isaiah 7:14; Matthew 1:23; Luke 1:27).*
- 3). *The Blood Atonement (Acts 20:28; Romans 3:25, 5:9; Ephesians 1:7; Hebrews 9:12-14).*
- 4). *The Bodily Resurrection (Luke 24:36-46; 1 Corinthians 15:1-4, 15:14-15).*
- 5). *The inerrancy of the scriptures themselves (Psalms 12:6-7; Romans 15:4; 2 Timothy 3:16-17; 2 Peter 1:20).*

Certainly, it's a different matter entirely when an entire church or denomination doesn't understand the basics of these as opposed to a single, struggling, learning individual – as I had illustrated earlier. Those who call themselves teachers of the Word surely should know these things! Too, the ministry must remember that the Gospel was given for the perfection of the saints – not to stunt their growth:

Ephesians 4:11-12

And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; **For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.**

And this *perfecting* (or, much rather, *maturing*), is showing us that we really need to allow and help those kids to grow up. I cannot stress this enough, for I've seen too many kids remain kids, even when the saint themselves are older in natural years ... We also, as ministers (*and, I know that I will get flak for this!*) need to teach the child to ask *any* question that may come to their mind when it deals with God's Kingdom – *even if that question brings the deity of God under scrutiny*. We need not fear such questions from the those learning, but to prepare ourselves with wise answers, and kindly responses that uplift the scriptures without making the student feel stupid for asking ... Basically, folks, we serve God's children by teaching them and helping them, both spiritually and naturally. Of course, the *natural* side of helping certainly includes feeding them, housing them, clothing them, and helping them financially when serious needs arise – but, all within the confines of Godly discernment and prayer; but, never with instant, terrible judgment, as if they are nothing but lazy bums for being in such a predicament in the first place; or, that they're not worthy of our assistance. And, with whatever assistance we do give, we need not look down upon that person as if they are beneath us ... Remember, ministers serve the *people's* needs, and not the other way around! Unless, of course, the minister is the one in need

themselves ... But, with having said all that, I'm certainly not stressing only the natural end of things; but, help can certainly come in other forms, too – which can either be just as important, and sometimes even more important – such as in simply listening to people when they are down and depressed. You'd be amazed of how valuable your time is that you can give. And, of course, we serve them by expounding scripture as plain as possible, which not only helps during everyday lives, but can ultimately lead to salvation ... Now, I am more than aware that a lot of folks, who are poor in finances, might not always be able to feed, house, or clothe the needy, but there are always ways out there of helping. We just need to help these folks find the right paths, of what would be best for their situation – *we need to, at least, show them that we care* – but, certainly not faking the concern! ... If a church isn't functioning within the confines of helping others, we must seriously ask what they're even doing, at all. Do we think that if a church doesn't help others that it looks good to God? Do we believe that God's pleased that we paid \$1,000 for a new church sign when there's a family that hasn't eaten in days? Do we think that the pastor deserves a car newer than 3 years when there's an elderly couple that are barely getting by financially each month? (*assuming, that is, it was the church that had paid for that new car, and not from the pastor's own pocket*) Do we think the pastor and the other ministers should use church funds to make the church look beautiful when there are so many needs in their community? Folks, I hate to break it to you, but God loves the poor just as much as the rich. And, He looks at them all in equality.

James 2:1-4

My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *the Lord* of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; And ye have respect to him that weareth the gay [magnificent] clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool: Are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?

John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible (published in 1748-1763; 1809; public domain): *The saints are all brethren, they are children of the same Father, belong to the same family, and are all one in Christ Jesus, whether high or low, rich, or poor.*

However, I'm not judging churches that buy new church signs (*we've got to let people know that we are there!*); I'm not against the idea of buying the pastor a new car (or, any other working minister, for that matter; for, *they have to travel from city to city at times on God's missions*); or, etc. My only point was to stress "priorities!" We have to do all things in Godly balance, but not in the "respecting" of some, whilst downing others ... Godly discernment and wisdom must be employed.

END OF CHAPTER 2 – THIS BOOK CAN BE PURCHASED AT AMAZON.COM IN BOTH PAPERBACK AND KINDLE EBOOK. VISIT OUR OFFICIAL MINISTRY WEBSITE FOR MORE INFORMATION:
[www.SeekingTheGospel.com](http://www SeekingTheGospel.com)