

*The Testing
Of Pillars*

*by Nigel
Johnstone*

Published by Belmont Publications

© Nigel Johnstone, 2014
All Rights Reserved.

07917 007 207
belmontpublications.co.uk
publications.belmont@gmail.com

Contents

Samson's Conflict	3
Preface	4
Beginnings	5
Mr Francis Harris	7
The Soul of Roland Burrows	9
The Righteousness of Pooyan Mehrshahi	15
Others	25
A Serious Examination	27

Song 9

Samson's Conflict

1. A Nazarite unto my God,
 unshaven, I, since born.
 Out of the eater came forth meat
 and sweetness from the strong.
2. With ass's cheekbone did I smite,
 in Ramath – Lehi's place;
 heaps of mine enemies, on heaps,
 with ass's bony face.
3. O suffer me, lad, who dost hold
 my hand, whilst I, unseen,
 may feel the pillars which bear up
 this house, and on them "lean".
4. Remember me, Lord GOD, I pray,
 and strengthen me, I cry.
 Just once avenge me, O my God.
 With my foes let me die.

From 'Songs of the Witnesses'
Belmont Publications

Preface

During 2013 and early 2014, I visited Providence Chapel in Cheltenham and thus came into contact with men who are signatories to Affirmation 2010. I found that their doctrine disagrees with that of the apostles of Jesus Christ and I show that in these pages.

They form a system which does not permit itself to be examined and they perpetuate that system with a ministerial structure that is exemplified not in the apostles' fellowship but is rather a modern equivalent of those scribes, pharisees and doctors of the law who opposed the word of Jesus Christ and those whom he sent.

These neither have replied to my requests to show forth their personal testimonies, nor will they respond when asked of the doctrine they believe. They merely point me to a creed that is four hundred years old - the Confession of 1689 which is a slight adaptation of the Westminster Confession of 1643.

They who *abide* in the doctrine of Christ shall know the Father and the Son. But a creed is an archive; it is not an abode. And those who will not respond regarding justification - for they cannot respond, for their doctrine is false - show plainly that what they *hold* is not that by which they live.

But the just, saith the apostle, out of *his faith*, shall live.

Here, I consider their preaching.
And then I examine the creed to which they *say* they adhere.

Nigel Johnstone

Worcestershire, march 2014.

The Testing of Pillars

Beginnings

At the age of twenty one, in 1971, I wrote, in twenty five pages, my personal testimony of my spiritual experiences during my infancy and youth. This is freely available today and it is unchanged from that time. I have added more, particularly in one of the sections of my book, 'Crucified', but I also refer to my own experiences in several of my books.

Having privately written, and spoken, my testimony at the age of twenty one, I wrote no more and said little more for the next forty years while I learned of the best of those who had preceded me. I learned in subjection. I earned my own living. I earned my own pension.

At the age of about threescore years, I was moved, in 2010, to put the Lamentations of Jeremiah into English verse so that they could be sung; something that, as far as I am aware, has not been done before. This is where I began, personally, in my own expression of what I, myself, have received in my lifetime.

I was also moved, in late 2010, to verse the Song of Songs which is Solomon's; then I privately communicated 40,000 words on the text, When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.

Pillars

But my first book was, 'The Beginning of the Gospel', from Mark. This is where I, personally, begin. With a Lament, with a hope of the Song of Songs and the glory of the Lord, but beginning with the baptism of *metanoia*.

As I look around, I see many who simply carry on with that from which the Spirit of God has long, long departed. And some, now, attempt to start in that place and think, in the flesh, to make some kind of progress backwards into that which used to be better.

But the Spirit who moves within me is of another mind.

Only when men give up *everything*, admit that *all* is gone, relinquish *all* that they assume to hold or keep or gain in religion - only this will God the Spirit accept.

Nor is any one above any other one in this.
For all we like sheep have gone astray.
We have turned every one to our own way.

And this - our *religion* - individual and corporate - this *iniquity*, hath the Lord laid upon the Lamb of God. He beareth away this sin - that of the world. And only when a man sees *that* is he ready for anything more. Amen.

*Now, will I arise, saith the Lord.
Behold, I do a new thing.
First, judgment must begin at the house of God.*

Mr Francis Harris

In 2013 I attended Providence Chapel in Cheltenham and was disappointed to hear a sermon which was slanderous to both Philemon himself, regarding what was termed 'slavery' and slanderous to Onesimus regarding what was called, in the absence of any evidence, 'theft'. I also heard some very unedifying material about what was called 'sin'. Completely unnecessary. I was given to understand that this was a visiting speaker so I visited again, a journey, for me, of an hour in each direction.

After visiting again and hearing the incumbent, I wrote to him expressing my amazement that six hoary-headed elders sat throughout whilst a young novice administered hymn, prayer, reading, hymn, prayer and sermon. Receiving no reply to my letter I left matters for many months and then attended again whereupon he told me he had misplaced the letter.

I therefore very carefully wrote another letter, this time to the elders, and gave all of my books up to that point - nine, I think - plus all of my thousand verses. My letter gave personal details and testimony. Later, I offered to give my full personal testimony either privately to the elders or publicly to the congregation. My offer was acknowledged but never responded to.

Mr Harris gave me a copy of his book and was courteous to me until I sent him the letter, 'The Righteousness of Pooyan Mehrshahi' at which point he indicated that any further correspondence from myself would receive no response. It seems I am not permitted to comment on the doctrine of the incumbent, however much it may depart from the words of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

I thus received the distinct impression that here was a system of rule that did not permit itself to be examined. And here was doctrine that departed from that which was from the beginning.

Pillars

Of Mr Francis Harris, himself, I am grieved, for there are two sermons of his on record, both of which I have been edified to hear. My wife and I are presently reading through Revelation and I remember, each time we do so, the exhortation of Mr Harris that emphasises the first verse of John's book; that we should focus on whom the revelation reveals.

Gladly would I hear more of Mr Harris, an aged elder and a courteous man. Gladly would I, if permitted, seek his company privately for I am convinced he would have much to pass on to me. But, sadly - very sadly - the system to which he is so loyal is a system that, it would seem, prohibits this. For it is not possible that I should sit on a chair and listen to hours of unedifying and unscriptural talk in congregated subjection to a system of clergy that wholly departs from what I see in my bible.

Nor can I suffer any further, even were I permitted, to continue to hear that which I have commented upon in the pages that follow.

Nigel Johnstone

Worcestershire, march 2014.

The Soul of Roland Burrows

Roland Burrows spoke at Providence Chapel, 2nd february 2014, on, ostensibly, the subject of 'The Soul of Christ'. My square brackets indicate minutes and seconds on the recording.

Claiming [14:39] that the 'soul is the seat of our affections', which it is not, and that matters of the soul [15:33] are 'an essential part of life in this world', which they are not, he speaks [13:53] of a 'divine soul', which is a contradiction in terms, then of a 'human' soul, which is an unwise, unspiritual and unscriptural way in which to word the matter, for reasons which Mr Burrows then proves with distinction. Distinctly using the words 'as well' [14:00] he arrives at the situation of describing someone having two souls at the same time.

Jeremiah Learnoult Garrett held the notion of a 'divine soul' in relation to Christ and was exposed in his heresy by William Huntington under the title, 'Doctrine of Garrett Refuted' in 1808, republished in 1998 by Henry Sant due to the heresy resurfacing. If Mr Burrows objects to my exposure he is welcome to publish a transcript of his sermon and to explain his words.

My book, 'The Son, of man', contains more of these matters.

Mr Burrows claims [11:10] that God 'became a man', which he did not and he claims [11:43] that God 'truly became a man' which he truly did not. He calls Christ [11:13] a 'divine man' and elsewhere a 'God-man', neither of which the scriptures ever do. He also says of Christ that 'he is human' [06:45] which wording, also, does not - in strict etymology - appear in the holy writings.

I have carefully listened to the whole recording one particular time, trying to find a single occasion, during the entire forty one minutes, when he conveys what spiritual men have been at pains to convey for several generations as they have laboured against the many heresies that have surfaced and re-surfaced since the

departure of the apostles. What spiritual men do not fail to express in this area is that Christ possesses all the attributes that are true and proper to Deity and all the attributes that are true and proper to humanity and that he possesses that nature of Deity and that nature of humanity in a perfect union within his one Person. I cannot find one occasion where Mr Burrows expresses this to my own satisfaction.

This is where F E Raven began to depart from truth when he began to express his own philosophising, thus, 'The idea of union appears to me to have greatly clouded in people's minds the idea of incarnation'. Soon, he would descend into atrocious blasphemy, denying the everlasting relationship of the Son and the Father within the Deity. James Taylor then became the mouthpiece of the error and the Primitive Brethren were split asunder.

Mr Burrows chooses to re-iterate the superstitious error of Roman Catholicism which attempts to detract from Christ's redemptive bloodshedding after death, that is, after the righteous settlement of the matter of sin and the law and the first humanity - by death itself - and he also succeeds, thus, in detracting, enormously, from his own chosen subject in the very place and context where Jesus of Nazareth displays, in prayer to the Father, most singularly, a valuable insight into his soul. Mr Burrows claims [13:05] that Jesus of Nazareth 'sweat drops of blood' in the Garden of Gethsemane, which he did not. It was perspiration from the inward conflict - *agonia* - within his soul. This perspiration was 'as' or 'like' - '*wsei*', also written *hosei* - the dripping of drops of blood from a freely flowing scalp wound

Mr Burrows claims [08:50] that God is 'the supreme giver and upholder of all law' and that God is [09:08] 'the author of the ten commandments'. He says that these legal commandments [09:02] are a 'reflection of his own character'. This appears to be Mr Burrows' sole understanding of what Paul the apostle terms 'the righteousness of God' and which Paul the apostle clearly

indicates, throughout his doctrine, is another matter altogether than the ten commandments of Moses. For the law was laid down because of man's transgression, not for any other reason; and this not personally, but by a mediator, Moses, and by angelic distance. For grace and truth came by Jesus Christ, who was sent of the Father to bring such.

The righteousness of God is revealed, solely and only, to faith - not to the knower of good and evil, not to the legal worker - and is thus revealed solely and only in the gospel, wherefore this glorious gospel is not to be ashamed of, for the righteousness of God is revealed therein. And therein is the righteousness of God demonstrated to faith, and only to faith. Thereby is the righteousness of God logically accounted to all who thus view the demonstrated righteousness of God in the gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ.

But Mr Burrows speaks not of such things. Mr Burrows sees only the Law when he looks up to heaven. But the Law is not laid down before a righteous. Nor is that what a righteous lives by.

Mr Burrows says [11:04] that 'Christ redeemed mankind' without explaining what he means by those words. But it becomes evident, at least in part, what he means when he addresses an hypothetical person in his audience [34:05] 'if you are here in your sins, of course' then 'there is this all-atoning Lamb of God who has made full and sufficient reparation [sic] and satisfaction for all your sins'. Mr Burrows seems not to understand that the Lamb of God taketh away the *sin* of the world, that one was a propitiation for that of the whole world; nor to understand that the blood of the new testament was shed for many; nor to understand that the first man is forbidden from partaking of blood; for the life is in the blood.

Thus if Mr Burrows makes such a statement, without qualification, to any and every possible person sitting in his audience; and if he also makes the statement 'Christ redeemed

mankind' he must clarify what exactly he is talking about. But then he needs to clarify just about every single doctrine he has touched upon, in my view, for at the moment I see no difference in his words, on a variety of subjects, from those which a Roman Catholic priest might use, those which a Church of England vicar might speak and those which the loosest of the loose of vapid modern evangelicals standing at the front of an Open Brethren assembly or a General Baptist congregation might employ.

Mr Burrows has also addressed a Strict Baptist congregation in Wattisham on a number of occasions during 2013, which interests me. For they state, Article 16, that *'the believer's rule is the gospel, not the law'*; yet Mr Burrows' Articles state, *'The Law of God is an eternal rule of Righteousness, and in the hand of Christ it is the rule of our moral conduct. It is our solemn responsibility to seek grace to live according to the Law striving after holiness of life. The uses of the Law are not contrary to the grace of the Gospel, but they sweetly comply with it.'*

Did Mr Burrows actually attempt to keep the Law, he would find out just how 'sweet' the Law is, for cursed is everyone - who is under it - who continueth not in all things that are written therein to do them - not talk about them. Affirmation 2010 is strangely silent about this matter. Thus Mr Burrows is able both to be a signatory to Affirmation 2010 and also to present several talks at Wattisham. The content of his talks is available globally, as is his talk at Providence Chapel.

But those who profess that they follow someone who 'actively' kept the law on their behalf, feel no qualms about breaking the law, it seems to me. They have someone else who kept it by proxy on their behalf. Thus privileged - so they think - they are untroubled in their law breakings. They remain in an old covenant. They remain in the realm of the knowledge of good and evil. Did they but see the reality of the situation they would flee from their alternative gospel and flee from wrath to lay hold of a better hope in Jesus Christ.

I ponder on the future of Affirmation 2010; and the future of the remnant of those who seem, now, disinclined to remember Mr Willlam Huntington who, as far as history teaches myself, was the patriarch and forerunner of all that the Gospel Standard Strict Baptists once were. Not only did Mr Huntington disagree with Mr Burrows on one subject: '*divine soul*' saying, 'I find nothing like it, nor can you, nor shall you as long as the world stands' but he also disagreed with Mr Burrows, on the law, on just about any and every page of all the thirty five volumes that he wrote in his lifetime.

It remains to be seen just how minutely - and to what purpose - the articles of Affirmation 2010 have been crafted. A blushing bride may be 'sweetly' wooed, but someone has to take responsibility for the blusher and examine the precise details of the marriage contract, else shall she be liable to lose all that is distinctive to her - her entire inheritance for example - in the proceedings.

Mr Burrows, whilst being a signatory to a document that sets itself apart from fallen and apostate evangelicalism, nevertheless demonstrates many of its worst traits. He assumes a certain kind of familiarity with the historical figure of Jesus of Nazareth, sufficient to comment on the most intimate aspects of that person. But he does so with utmost insensitivity, with enormous disrespect, with sheer incompetence and with a deep misunderstanding - the 'd' is not a typographical error.

Thus, also, he comments upon God's character, God's nature and God's way of life without reverence, without fear and without knowledge. Witness his words [39:08], 'If we were God and if we were going to create some creatures and it was our aim to make these creatures happy' Without fear.

And this is what we are supposed to accept as the best of what is around us. This is what separates itself from others, saying, 'Come not near me for I am more separate than thou'. This is

what would instruct the next generation of so-called 'ministers' in seminary. This is what intercepts my email when I enquire of a congregation in Birmingham about meeting with them. This is what would have greeted me had I sought exhortation and edification from within the body of Christ in Cheltenham during february or at Birmingham generally.

Clumsy incompetence, shallow irreverence and unconcerned ignorance is what stands in the way of those who seek a genuine return to that which was from the beginning. This is what clutters up the pulpits and platforms whereon should be expressed what the Spirit saith to a heart broken remnant. This is what persists, deliberately inserting itself where it has no right, standing in the way of the gathering of individuals who do so not to exalt self in front of one another but to seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness without anxiously caring for tomorrow.

This is what often stands above others without warrant, sequestered and supported by the labours of persecuted sheep, the offscouring of the world, who work on the factory floor or in the hospital ward or in the office; working in an adverse environment, harrassed and oft derided, always in one discomfort or another as they struggle to achieve what all must achieve, yet with added burdens. And that which they earn, they must divide between their own families and also an unwarranted clergy which insists upon not earning an ordinary living for themselves. Woe unto them !

Here is genuine *apostasis*, the superlative - *apo* - rising up - *stasis* - which takes over the place of that which should be occupied by that which is of God, sidelining and ostracising that which would be a focal point of gathering for those who seek what comes down, in Spirit, from heaven, rather than that which rises up in apostasy from beneath.

The Righteousness of Pooyan Mehrshahi

1. The Doctrine

I listened to a number of recordings on the website of Providence Chapel, Naunton, in my search for the doctrine of the present incumbent of the position of 'Pastor'. This man, publicly, himself, testifies of his own efforts, thus - 'The congregation has become familiar only with a certain handful of often repeated phrases. The glorious gospel of Christ has been reduced to a few cliches and empty phrases. Such words and speech are not worthy of the christian; even less the minister of Christ'; youngpuritan.wordpress.com/2010/04/09.

This personal witness, of his own failure, I found to be true as I searched the tapes that my wife and I in Worcestershire might find some edification. Where I could find a little, I deliberately emailed and gave some encouragement, not willing to be negative. However I am truly appalled at what my wife and I heard as we listened to a recording headed, 'Jehovah Tsidkenu'.

Seeking to clarify his doctrine, I emailed him only to be spurned. I was merely referred to the Baptist Confession of 1689 and to the Affirmation 2010 documents, he refusing to actually tell me what he, himself, believed and refusing to clarify his doctrine to me.

It is with grief that I write the following words, transcribed from the recording :-

Misquoting from I John 3:5, in the context of God and the Father, in relation to the calling of the sons of God, I hear at, 28mins:45secs, 'Jesus [sic] was manifest to take away our sins and in him is no sin. But that's not enough [sic].' 29:05 'Salvation - atonement - and what Jesus has done is *not enough* [sic] to give us acceptance before the Holy God.'

Not enough ?

'Why hast thou forsaken me ?'Not enough ?

'Awake, O Sword against my shepherd, the man, my fellow.'

Not enough ?

Out of faith, unto faith; through faith; unto all and upon all that believe... Not enough ?

Paul says it *is* enough for Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, Romans 4:6, describing the blessedness of the man who believeth on him that justifieth, whose faith is counted as righteousness, quotes David when David describes the blessedness of the man unto whom the God imputeth righteousness, saying

Blessed are they whose iniquities are unburdened,
whose sins are covered,
to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity.

The unburdening - *aphesis* - is due to an uplifting; the inward experience of *nasa*.

The covering - *kaphar* and *apokalupto* - is because of him who bore sins in his own body.

The 'not imputing' is a result of Christ being made sin; sin being condemned in his flesh; and sin being destroyed in death.

I testify before God and before the Lord Jesus Christ and before the elect angels that -

This is Enough !
And let no man in my hearing say otherwise.

It is enough for David who experienced this blessedness.

It is enough for the chosen apostle of Jesus Christ who quotes David.

It is enough for Nigel who writes these words.

It is finished ! Cries he and cry I. And the righteousness of God, demonstrated in the execution of judgment upon his own Son -

in manhood - is, then, unto all that believe. Once this revealed righteousness is preached, and once the hearing of faith reckons this righteousness of God to be fully demonstrated; then the eye of God sees this faith - and accounts it for righteousness.

This is sheer logic - *logizomai*. This faith is the equivalent of the righteousness whose demonstration is believed. God who so demonstrated righteousness, *dikaiwmatos*, Romans 5:18, is believed on. And Abraham believed God and God counted *that* to him for righteousness.

Revealed - only in the gospel - this demonstration of the righteousness of God is believed. And righteousness of God is seen to be upon such a believing one. Then the Holy Spirit is given as a free gift. Thus life lives in the believing soul - the life of God. Then - 'I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way in which thou shalt go', Psalm 32, 'I shall guide thee with mine eye.'

From within. Not from tables of stone. Not from a creed. Not from a 400 year old document.

From within. From a living Spirit and with a living faith.

But this *kaphar*, this *nasa*, this *apokalupto*, this *aphesis* is not enough for the 'Young Puritan' as he styles himself on the internet, not enough for the 'puritanmind' as he describes himself in his email address.

I am of Paul; I am of Apollos; I of Cephas; I of Christ. Why all this aligning of oneself with a particular historic faction ? Why this advertising oneself under the umbrella of a previous leadership ? Why this specialisation, this lust for individuality, this seeking to be seen as a follower of a certain, laudable party ?

Puffed up, is what Paul says, I Corinthians 4:6. Self inflation is the object of the exercise.

Aware, within, of the weekly pretence of telling other men what

to do when one knows, secretly, that one's own state is utterly unsuitable to the task - this should result in resignation, not the global confession of the state whilst clinging to a title and a position that simply do not apply.

Unless, of course, one's entire religion consists of the earning of a living out of it. Otherwise, let us see genuine fruits of repentance and the relinquishing of that which is inappropriate.

And let no man ever dare to speak such words in my presence: 'Not enough'.

Had this man hungered and thirsted after righteousness; he should have been filled. Filled with the Holy Spirit who would teach him all things, he would not need to run to his bookshelves and his commentaries to cobble together his sermons which he reads out in public. Had this man thought not of the morrow and what progression he must make in his 'theological training' - which he thinks he 'finished in 2007', when he has not even started to understand the first principles of the doctrine of Christ - had he obeyed the words of Jesus and sought first, above tomorrow's career, the kingdom of God and his - God's divine; not his concocted human - righteousness; then he would not have uttered such grievous things as he did when he penned and spoke his 'sermon' on Jehovah Tsidkenu.

But this man has thoroughly misunderstood what righteousness is and what has been meticulously recorded in the holy writings, in which every word and every letter has weight and meaning. For it is definitely *not* the case as I hear at 18mins:16secs - (Deuteronomy 32:4 - just and right is he) - 'just and right is the same word.' Neither the Hebrew words, *tsaddiq* and *yashar*, nor the English words, just and right, are or mean the same thing. Rightness or righteousness may be expressed in a context and demonstrated in a circumstance where judgment is required and where judgment must be executed. That is justice and the proper execution of it is just. They are definitely *not* the same thing.

These roots in the Hebrew scriptures are of paramount importance and lay a foundation for further understanding in the apostolic word. We see the demonstration of righteousness by Phinehas in the execution of judgment; and Psalm 106 monumentally highlights the occasion. This is one of the threads we must follow if we would rightly understand the justification which is of God almighty.

But if men are pre-occupied with other things, like what to eat tomorrow, or how to assert themselves in religion that they might earn a living, they shall hurry over the more important matter of righteousness. And they shall, thus, not have any. For God is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him; and his righteousness. There is no reward for those who merely grasp an insurance policy of the hereafter as they rush to secure for themselves what is of this, present, failing world.

These holy things will be of no account to the man who is not of a broken and a contrite heart - heart, not lip - and who trembles at my word, as saith the LORD. Only that heart-trembling, as one handles every single precious word, will lead a man into the true understanding of the deep things of the LORD. The trite who skip their way across the surface of the page - picking at what they will only so that they may earn a living - they shall not see these things.

This is a matter of worship. And in this matter, every word of God is eaten, individually, for man shall not live by bread alone. One might claim, 4mins:24secs, 'special revelation' but the words of the mouth will reveal whether any revelation has occurred or whether one's natural idleness and spiritual neglect have resulted in strong delusion.

Righteousness is not, 'a standard of measurement', 22:36. Nowhere do I read of a standard of measurement being 'imputed' - *logizomai*, logicated. What I read of is the righteousness of God being logicated. This is an attribute of

Divine nature. By faith are some, by divinely empowered gift, described as being partakers of the Divine nature, II Peter 1:4, having escaped the pollutions of the world. The righteousness of God is a Divine matter.

But not to the speaker on the recording.

‘Jesus Christ is made our righteousness’, it is said by him, 25:46.

And Jesus, it is recorded, is a ‘perfectly righteous man.’ 27:37.

‘How could the goodness in your life be passed to someone else ?

You can’t do that.’ 25:46.

‘But the Lord Jesus has done it. He did it on his cross.’ 25:59.

Thus, I am being told, the goodness of a man - a human righteousness - was transferred to others. And this happened on the cross. I wrote, twice, asking for clarification, but this man does not see himself as being accountable to his hearers. He points to documents; refusing to declare his own faith.

No scripture describes this event. No apostolic record exists of this ‘transference’.

Auto de emeis este ev Xristw Iesou os egenethe emin sophia apo Theou dikaiosune te kai agiasmos kai apolutrosis, says Paul in I Corinthians 1:30. This reads, literally, But of him are ye in Christ Jesus who was made to us wisdom of God, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. What he is made is wisdom. The context clearly indicates this wisdom is a preached wisdom - a body of doctrine which is not like the wisdom that men convey to one another. This preached wisdom - this conveyed body of doctrine - contains three main subjects: righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

The speaker on the recording is expressing that he, himself, has obtained, somehow or other in a way that he does not explain to the slightest degree, a human doing of that which is right. Thus he does not need to do things himself. Good doing was done for him by another. Now, he may try to do good and fail, but that is

alright for he has already had transferred, in a way he does not catalogue, and in a way he cannot refer to from scripture - for scripture never speaks of it - he has already had 'imputed' a human righteousness involving someone else keeping the law for him.

Having made this clear, he then starts quoting biblical texts relating to the Righteousness of God.

But he did not describe the Righteousness of God or explain how *that* bears any relation to himself. *He merely slips from talking about 'Jesus' and 'Jesus' righteousness'* - which he has made abundantly clear is a human matter - to quoting *texts* about Righteousness of God. Thus he appropriates to himself that which he has not in any way given right or just explanation for possessing.

But the just shall not live by appropriating. The just shall not live by skating over scripture merely quoting words which have some resemblance to one another. The just shall live by his *faith*. And faith comes by hearing. Not by hearing the inept and the untutored who blunder around the bible bumping into things they do not understand. Hearing comes by the *word of God*. Hearing - that results in faith - comes by hearing someone who has *experienced* justification when it is applied by God Almighty; and such a one, if then gifted and called to do so, shall teach the same.

Such a one will be as Jesus describes; they that are greatest in the kingdom of heaven who do - first - and teach - second - and what they do and teach in context is; righteousness. And they are as the least. They seize no greatness; they pray not long prayers for pretence; they grasp not at the accoutrements of fleshly rule. They have no need. They have entered into the kingdom of heaven - because God accounts them righteous. They need not assert themselves in the company of men.

Such have a clear, strong, public testimony of their faith; how they were brought into such a faith; how they were before it; what occurred to them to bring them to such a momentous, soul changing, life shattering event. This will be very publicly displayed. And oft re-iterated from the platform; oft referred to in all the doctrine; oft would be the personal confession of one's personal faith.

Not, as this man professes online, 'My theological persuasion is Reformed Baptist'. Not a brief article - never completed - containing exactly two lines reporting the event of one's taking up religion; youngpuritan.wordpress.com/2007/10/02. Not the deliberate avoidance of expressing one's personal testimony, when requested. *And not the deliberate suppression of another who has actually had some worthwhile experiences.*

The just shall *live* by his *faith*.

Nor can a man escape such public exposure by professing, 'Jesus must make a new person [sic] with perfect righteousness', 32:41. That would be an unrighteous creation of a new being, I believe. A new person is a new being altogether. That would be a thoroughly unjust act. That would be an avoidance of all righteousness. Which was the whole point of the very salvation which, reported in temerity, is 'not enough'. For the immense work of God Almighty and his Son Jesus Christ was to bring certain beings - real persons - out of a first creation and out of a first humanity and into a new creation and under a new humanity by a new testament and by *apolutrosis* and by *apokattallasso* and by *apokatastasis*. And by a righteous justification involving Divine Righteousness.

This man supposes that 'new persons' spring into existence, unrighteously. Does he not understand what happened in Eden ? Has he not a single clue as to the purpose of the Father in bringing many sons to glory ? And what of the previous person ? Whence they ? Where have they gone ? This is sheer madness.

As to the supposed human righteousness, unrighteously transferred from one humanity to another, involving the engaging of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil which has been firmly stated to humanity that 'Thou dost not eat of that', this dunghheap of rags, this tattered excuse for a religion shall not bring anybody one single step of the way from the old creation into the new.

2. The Evident Effect

Nor does it in experience, nor in fact, for plainly testified, globally, is the failure of this doctrine to produce anything worthwhile as a christian or as a 'minister'. An excuse is set up early on in the recording, as early as 24mins11secs, 'Jesus came to bring us into a relationship with God - [I'm still waiting to hear any sensible details of this] - a relationship that does not expect perfection.'

'Does not expect perfection', it is said.

The words, 'Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect' is a very definite expectation of perfection, I would say, Matthew 5:48. But the supposed righteousness of the recording evidently and demonstrably does not bring the speaker into this perfection. He confesses his own failure himself, globally and thoroughly. Then why not resign, I ask ?

For rather than be honest and admit it, he not only attempts to cover it up, but then does the vastly worse act of standing up and inviting other men to be similar failures by believing the perverted gospel he teaches. This 'another' gospel he demonstrates, personally, that it doesn't work. But we knew that already.

All his gospel effects is to secure the higher room at feasts; and the chief seat in the synagogue. Thus he sits in front of a congregation who are praying to Almighty God, as though the one in the chief seat at the front were the object of prayer. This

gospel achieves nothing other than the self-prominence of the one speaking it.

Prayer; reading; protracted sermon - read out from notes copied from other men's writings. Then but a few minutes for the congregation to pray. Is this what Paul conveys in Corinthians - one hath a psalm; one hath a doctrine, the prophets speak two or three ? Paul's gospel results in men worshipping out of spiritual gifts in the assembly; they are not suppressed as one - hired - asserts an wholly inappropriate prominence. This is not the body of Christ !

But the downtrodden prayers of the people testify that this gospel is not benefiting them. They neither receive a real understanding of the force of the curse of the law - that it might bring them to Christ - nor do they receive the true liberty of the sons of God. For this would require an able minister of the new testament.

All the people get, at present, is to provide a living for the one in the chief seat.

Who confidently publicises, to the entire globe, that this is 'my beloved church'. Of these suppressed people, sat in chairs, listening to this appalling doctrine, he trumpets proudly, having confessed his abject failure to minister to them, that they belong to him.

Well this man does not.
And this man testifies of what he has seen and heard.

Others

Of Aaron Lewis and John Saunders I can say little. For they said little on their recorded pairs of sermons. For forty minutes, or so, they said little. What they conveyed could have been encapsulated, each time, in less than five minutes.

Paul says he would rather say five words in charitable edification than expand unnecessarily. I am vividly reminded of standing up in congregation to express just seven words myself, I think in my late twenties. Feeling obliged to say more, I did, but after a minute or two I retreated downwards to the safety of my seat. Scurrying home, wondering whether I had spoken inadvisedly, I received a phone call. It was rare for this elder to phone me up; this time, it was not a rebuke. He expressed how edified he had been and repeated the seven words which were, really, all I had to say - How great the Son of God is !
Amen.

This infatuation with owning or renting a large building, then hiring clergy to rule over the people is what J N Darby spoke of in the beginnings of that movement which was, then, genuinely a return to that which was from the beginning. I am not able to quote his exact saying, for I must avoid Brethren Dispensationalism, which I abhor and I also have to be careful regarding other wording.

The Notion of a Clergyman - sin against the Holy Spirit; is all I can, comfortably, convey.

This Notion is truly destructive, for what results is a self perpetuating system that maintains itself - and all who are subjected to it - in an unassailable position. And that is its purpose. To exalt one above all and to provide him with a living. How very, very convenient.

Personally, I walked out of all that in my teens. Despite that I was

Pillars

born into it and, with my heritage, needed to do very little to benefit from it, materially, for life, I walked away without a blink, without a thought; for I had better things to do with my time on earth.

One is the Master of them who follow. All the rest are servants. And the epitome of those was a tentmaker who preferred, more often, it seems, than not, to provide for himself.

Nigel Johnstone

Worcestershire, march 2014.

A Serious Examination of the Westminster Confession

The Apostolic Foundation

Paul the Apostle tells us that he, as a wise master builder, laid a foundation which none else can lay. This foundation is documented in his epistles. The Apostle Peter attests to this, telling us that all of Paul's epistles are scripture and in them are some things hard to be understood which some wrest to their own destruction. This tells me that some do not understand Paul's words and thus they wrestle them into a form which means something other than he meant by them. Thus, the wrestlers destroy - not the doctrine, but - themselves.

Paul warns us of another gospel, which is not another, and thus does he warn us in the context of his correction of a corruption of the gospel that involved the addition of legal elements to the gospel. He calls this a perversion.

Since the laying of this unique foundation it has been necessary, on occasion, to resist certain errors. But these errors are already dealt with in Paul's foundation and it requires only that reference be made to that which is within the foundation in order to expose and answer the errors. Full provision has already been made. For this foundation is not of man; it was given by inspiration of God. It is God-breathed, *theopneustos*; these are the holy writings, *hiera grammata*.

This foundation is not a treatise; it is not a textbook of items, arranged in order; it is not a catalogue of entries. Nor was this

foundation the result of debate, discussion, conference or agreement, for Paul tells us that in conference even those who were made apostles before himself could add nothing to him. This foundation was laid by one man in a real, living context on those occasions when Paul wrote to real situations, to real churches and to real individuals. It is clear that Paul's preaching would have been of the very substance that we read of in his epistles. This substance was that which, conveyed in word, was received, by faith, by those who were called out and gathered by his preaching, to become the *ecclesia* - one body; the church of Jesus Christ.

Peter in his first epistle and James, of Alphaeus, writing to those scattered, do not make reference to this once-laid foundation for it was not yet laid at the time that these epistles were written to the *diaspora*. But Peter, later, does thus refer in his second epistle; and Jude, also writing later, tells his readers to earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the saints; that is, once delivered by the apostle Paul. John, writing later still, perhaps towards the end of the first century, refers to, The Doctrine of Christ, making it clear that he who abides therein knows the Father and the Son, but he that does not so abide, knows not God.

Remarkably and wonderfully, John's writings, whilst of a completely different character to Paul's, and whilst making no overt reference to Paul's, nevertheless do not, in the slightest degree, show any variance in any way with the foundation which was already laid before John wrote. John's writings look back, in a profound simplicity and a stunningly perceptive spirituality, to that which was from the beginning, yet they, evidently, are an enhancement to the foundation being neither a contradiction nor a competition.

1. The Message

John tells me, This is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that one should love another. The word he uses,

message, is *aggelia*, which has a negative prefix, *ag*, added to the word *gelaos*. [*Noeoe* is to know; *agnoeo* is to be ignorant.] *Gelaos* derives from *ge*, earth, and *laos*, peoples. Thus the message, *aggelia*, is not of *gelaos* - that which is of the earth and the peoples upon it. The message is other than that.

Jesus' words, recorded by Luke in chapter six, tell me, Woe unto you that *gelaos* now, for ye shall weep. Now, in time, that which is of earth and peoples - that which bubbles up from within in satisfaction, joy and exuberation - is that which will, says Jesus, turn to weeping thereafter. James, the Apostle, confirms this and tells sinners and the double minded, Let your *gelaos* be turned to mourning. In English quotation, I am deliberately not being careful about exact Greek grammar; I am simplifying.

Rather than continue to *gelaos* until the time that it shall be, forcibly, turned to mourning, James exhorts to be sensible and to relinquish the *gelaos* state, voluntarily. I understand that which comes from the peoples upon earth to be the babble which was scattered abroad from Babylon when God said, Go to. Thus went God forth and scattered the nations across the earth, rather than have them, jointly gathered, erect upon earth that which would pretend to be heavenly. Their communications, thence, were a babbling that confounded the project.

The babbling that proceeds from the peoples upon earth is *not* that which is the message from the beginning.

John also tells me, We have heard, and, We have seen with our eyes, of the Word of Life. John, among others, heard somewhat first. Then he saw somewhat. He heard first. John heard the Word of Life, first. Afterwards, he saw that which was manifested. He heard that which was from the beginning. Before he saw.

Subsequently, John tells me, This then is the message that which we have heard of him, that God is light, and in him is no darkness

at all. The word, message, this time, is *epaggelia*, the same word as before but with the prefix *epi*. There is a subtlety to Greek prepositions and, thus, to those prepositions which are, also, used as prefixes. This subtlety is too expressive to be adequately explained by the cube with arrows which appears in some Greek grammars. That simplification may be sufficient to struggle through a school exam, but it is certainly inappropriate to those who would understand the spiritualities of the apostles' words.

Epaggelia has been translated 'promise', but this is, in my view, not quite correct. The use of the preposition *epi*, as a prefix, indicates to myself that this is a matter of consequence. This is so, then that is so. One thing follows, logically, from another. In my own perception of John's use of the word *epaggelia* is the concept of consequence. The message is thus; then follows further communication.

The AV translators have seen the problem. In other places, 'promise' fits the context adequately and has, thus, been employed. But here, they shy away from saying the statement 'God is light' is a promise. Therefore they revert to translating the root word *aggelia* - message - and do nothing about *epi*. Hardly a solution, sirs.

The *aggelia* is such; what follows is a message with added consequence. Promise - yes, for simplicity, but it is not quite adequate, in my view. A consequence is not exactly a promise; it is that which follows, logically. If God says a thing, then something else will, certainly, follow. One may call that a promise, or one may call it a consequence.

The message, *aggelia*, is that one should love another: the further, consequential, message, *epaggelia*, is that God is Light.

Added to this is the use of the word *paraggelia* when we read that God 'commandeth' all men, everywhere - to repent. *Para*-prefixed words follow the pattern of *paralios*, the sea-coast, *alios*

being the sea. My own understanding is that there is that which is parallel, or alongside, which is of the same natural form - in this case, a type of landscape - but is not of the same substance - in this case, water compared to rock, earth or sand. Being of different substance, they do not merge or mix; but being of the same form, they exist in alignment because of their very nature.

Thus is the *paramessage*. It exists alongside, in parallel to, the message. It is always there, alongside it. But it never merges. This is the baptism of repentance. The baptism of *metanoia*.

2. *Metanoia*

Metanoia has been given the meaning, betimes, of 'change of mind'. This is not correct. *Meta* does not convey the idea of change. *Metallasso* is used by Paul, in a certain place, in the context of a change upon a change, and this is actually what *meta* does to verbs. But the concept of 'change' lies with the *allasso* root, not with the *meta* prefix. *Meta* does the same to other verbs, applying the meaning of the verb in a further layer upon itself. James uses the word *metago* in the context of turning about a mounted animal by means of a bit in its mouth. Usually, *ago* is rendered 'bring'. Thus the animal, by means of the bit, is brought back the way it had previously been brought. The action is layered upon itself. Bring upon bring. Therefore, bring about. But the bring meaning is within *ago*, not within *meta*. *Meta* is the prefix whereby the layering procedure is initiated; whatever the verb may be.

Thus *metanoia* means something other than change of mind. *Noia* is mind, without any dispute, in a multitude of places. *Meta*, in my understanding, is the equivalent of our Old English prefix 'mid' as in midwife. A midwife is not a wife, exactly; but another kind of wife and in a context of what a wife does. Within the context of that which is - exclusively - a function of a wife, another 'wife' is present who assists the wife to do what the wife does.

John the Baptist says of himself that his function is as the friend of the bridegroom. That is, he acts, in the context of what a bridegroom does, as, I would say, a 'mid'groom. He is a helper of the bridegroom to do what a bridegroom does, just as does a midwife in another context.

Thus the baptism of *metanoia* is to do with the mind, of a certainty. And the *meta* prefix indicates that another mind is involved. A helper mind. A 'mid'mind which will aid the mind to do what the mind does.

This is a gift. Luke records Peter's words that, God exalted Jesus and gave repentance unto Israel. Luke also records that the apostles and brethren responded to Peter's further words and they said, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life. Repentance is given; repentance is granted.

This midmind is received by receiving word. Being thus receptive, word is drunk in, as the camels of the unnamed servant of Abraham drank, till they were filled, after which, and only after which, other service was ministered to them. As six, stone waterpots were filled to the brim with water. After which, and only after which, the water became wine.

Metanoia. Repent. Receive another mind. Be midminded.

This is that which God *paraggelia* all men to do. A communication alongside the *euangelion* - the evangel; the gospel. Distinct from the gospel, yet always alongside it, in parallel, in its very nature.

3. From the Beginning

The word *euangelion*, evangel, is not found in John's epistles nor in his book, Kata Johannan. It is found only once in his writings - when, in the Apocalypse, he speaks of the everlasting gospel. Neither are any of the Greek words translated 'preach' -

and there are several - found in any of his writings save on that same occasion when he sees, in vision, a messenger, *angelos*, flying in mid-heaven, having the everlasting evangel to evangelize.

John's unique ministry concentrates on the message that was from the beginning. Only at the end of his writings do we know that the *aggelia* and the *epaggelia* are part of the everlasting *euaggelia*.

There is a message. It is from the beginning. It is heard. There is also a message which is alongside a benevolent message; the two are in tandem, always - repentance and faith. And there is a consequential message.

And what was the message from the beginning ?

Just as John gives us, first, an intimation of the *epaggelia* - that God is light; thereafter telling us that the *aggelia* from the beginning was that one should love another, so, I believe, we see the same order in Genesis.

The first speech of God was - Let there be light.

In the beginning, God created.

And the Spirit of God moved.

And God said.... that which he said.

In the beginning was the Word. And God was the Word.

And God's first utterance, after the movings of the Spirit, were, in Word - Let there be light.

John's words tell us that the fact that God is light - is a consequence. He tells us also that in the Word was Life. And the Life was the light.

The light is the consequence of life.

I will repeat that - *The Light is a Consequence of Life.* Selah.

He was from the beginning. In him is Life. And the Life is the

Light.

The first speech of God to man ?

God blessed them.

'Be fruitful. And multiply. And replenish the earth. And subdue it. And have dominion.

Behold I have given you..... every tree in the which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat.'

Man was to eat that which was freely given. What was freely given, if eaten, had within it, fruit and in the fruit was seed. The tree, itself, is to be eaten. This will bring forth fruit. And thus, there will be seed for further fruitfulness. And all this was graciously given - freely.

This is the message from the beginning. That one should love another. And God demonstrates it in abundance.

God shows forth the example of abundant love toward another.

For God loved the world. God loved Adam.

After his transgression, and after he heard God say that the seed of the woman would bruise the head of the cursed serpent, Adam named her whom he had previously given only a name descriptive of her created nature. After revelation, Adam called her Eve, the mother of all living. Then did God clothe Adam and his wife. When Cain was questioned about his brother, the words are attributed to God. But I believe they came, in fact, from Adam's lips: Where is Abel thy brother ? And when Cain went out from the presence of the Lord - on an earth where man was now banished from Eden - I believe Cain went out from the Lord's presence in the household of Adam. An household of faith, I believe. Yes, God did indeed love Adam.

Of the life of God comes Light.

Of God comes all in an abundance of love.

This is what is heard.

This is what faith hears.
Before anything is manifest, this is heard and believed.
This is the message from the beginning.

And *this*, expanded into the apostolic foundation, is the everlasting gospel.

4. Righteousness

It is indisputable, on examination of Paul's epistles and, particularly, of the epistle he wrote summarising the foundation to those whom he had not, yet, seen in the flesh, I say it is indisputable that the mountain rising higher and broader than any other in his doctrine is the subject of righteousness. And it is indisputable to all but the deliberately perverse that this righteousness Paul speaks of is the righteousness of God.

True, he once makes mention that, *According to righteousness that in law, having become blameless*; Literal Translation. This clearly, in context, is a matter of what men saw of Saul of Tarsus - that, after he had so become, no other man could, visibly, blame him in legal matters. This, evidently, is not a matter of a man's relationship with the God who is a spirit, but of a man in the eyes of other men.

The evangel that Paul declares is that which reveals the righteousness of God. Nothing, but nothing, else does so reveal this righteousness. So says Paul the Apostle, the master builder of wisdom who laid a foundation that no other man could or can lay. The philosophies of man, the 'another' gospels of man, the heresies of man - none of them can reveal the righteousness of God. And, upon serious examination, none do. They know not what they say nor whereof they affirm.

For righteousness is of God.

It must be so. For he is God. God is right. For God *is* right. And

God is God.

Why do men have a problem with this ?

In his very nature, his very form, God is right. What God does is right. Rightness is that which is agreeable to the nature of him that is God.

Is it not obvious ?

There cannot possibly be any other rightness. For any other rightness would be agreeable to something other than the nature of God. And that would just not be right.

Would it ?

What else can be right, other than that which is in alignment and agreement with the nature of God ?

Then, what of man ?

Paul tells us, in his foundation: man believeth unto righteousness.

And again : the righteous shall live by his faith.

There we have it.

Righteousness is of God.

Humanity believeth.

It is an unrighteous thing for a man to attempt to be righteous by his own works.

This unrighteous thing is *anomia*. It is lawless.

It is a contradiction of all rule, all sense, all logic, that a created creature should think to appropriate to its own, created nature that which is only relevant to the uncreated, divine nature. Thoroughly lawless.

It just isn't right.

It is unrighteousness.

5. Adam's Clothing

Adam, records Moses in Genesis, was unclothed. He knew not that he was unclothed. God did not mention that he was unclothed. Then man engaged with a certain kind of knowledge which revealed to him that he was unclothed. Then he attempted to clothe himself. Discovered in this state, God clothed him with coats of skins, the first recorded death of flesh, man or beast, on earth.

Mark records that blind Bartimaeus cast away his - unwanted - garment, rose, and came to Jesus. Then, he received his sight. Garmentless, he went to Jesus for illumination.

Mark tells us that they brought the colt and cast their garments upon it, whereupon Jesus sat, exalted over the yielded garments. And many spread their garments in the way, so the colt of Jesus trod their voluntarily cast-off garments into the ground as they cried, Hosanna !

Mark records Jesus warning that none should turn back from the field of labour, to take up his garment, but that he should flee both labour and garment. Leave them, and run.

Mark tells also of a linen garment cast away as an unclothed young man flees the scene of Jesus capture; and he tells of a young man in the tomb who is clothed in a long white garment, who declares, He is risen.

John documents the Hebrew transliteration, *arrhaphos* - without seam - in reference to the tunic, woven from the top, throughout. John is also he who, stooping down, then going into the tomb, saw the linen cloths lying, and the napkin that was about the head, lying, not with the cloths but by itself, folded up, in a place. And John saw; and John believed.

John is also the one to see, in vision, the Lamb's wife given -

given to her - that she should be clothed in fine linen, pure and bright, for fine linen, John the Apostle tells us, is the righteousnesses of the saints. One garment - given freely - clothes the one body unto each member. Without works, freely.

Given all this evidence, is it not abundantly clear that Adam lacked something by creation; that the created creature does not possess a certain thing - he is 'unclothed' ? And is it not abundantly clear that Adam attempted to do that which is contrary to the creature in attempting to - first - seek the knowledge that would discover his condition and - second - attempt to cover up the discovery ?

And is it not abundantly clear, further, that Jesus Christ's *arrhaphos* 'garment' - seamless and able, in its very nature, only to clothe one individual - is seen, after suffering and death and resurrection, to have provided that which shall clothe the one who has come from his side in death ? And this unto every individual of whom the wife of the Lamb is constituted.

And is it not abundantly clear that the clothing comes - exclusively - from his sufferings and death and is provided upon his resurrection ? Are these things not clearly demonstrated ? And did not John, himself, upon seeing - believe ?

John the Apostle heard that message which was from the beginning.

Then his own hands handled that which was manifest.

The manifestation absent, he then saw that which was demonstrated before his very eyes.

And then, that man believed.

6. *Dikaois*

The Greek word for righteous - or just - used by the Apostle Paul in the foundation which he, alone, laid and upon which all who follow must, of necessity build is *dikaiois*. The prefix *di*, two, is

added to the root *kaoi*, to burn. And when one comes to examine the word *kaio*, one finds twelve mentions, five of which relate to spiritual illumination and seven of which relate to consuming judgment.

John was a burning and a shining light, for John bore witness to Light. But, he, himself, was not that Light. But his words illuminated that which was, truly, light. That Light was the Light that is of Life. And John lit up that Light with his words.

Did not our heart burn within us ? said the two to each other on the road to Emmaus after Jesus had expounded to them, in all the scriptures, things concerning himself. Their heart was that which burned. The voice of the Lord fired their hearts.

There are five of such references, the number five being indicative of the sustenance of a pilgrim people through an adverse environment; see Benjamin and portions.

The burning mountain, the burning star, the lake of fire and the burning of fire and brimstone are of the seven references which speak of consuming judgment.

This is the burning - a two fold burning - which is expressed in the word *dikaois* - *righteous* and which meaning is then carried into the various other nouns, verbs and adjectives which convey the meaning just, righteousness, judgment and so forth.

Righteousness is an intense burning of Life.

What is adverse to that Life will be illuminated and purged.....

- Or it will be consumed in judgment.

This is righteousness. And it is - only - an attribute of Divine nature. What man would dare pretend to be able to produce *this* by his own works ? Only a lawless and unrighteous man.

Righteousness is a feature of Divine Life.

And the Life is the Light.

For God is Light.

This burning light will expose all that is contrary to the Being and the Life of God.

Other than this Light, all other light is but darkness.

If that dark light be in a man, how great is his darkness !

The Righteousness of God

I wish to comment on the righteousness of God under four headings :

Revelation, Demonstration, Declaration, Documentation

1. Revelation

The righteousness of God is neither debated, discussed, conferred over or argued about. God, himself, reveals his own righteousness. And the righteousness of God is revealed in no other place and in no other way, than that of his own, divine choosing; namely, the gospel of God concerning his Son, Jesus Christ. There is only one evangel. And that one evangel was declared in the mouth of the Messenger of the Covenant, himself, personally; then by the twelve whom he, personally, chose.

How can any created man either discover or declare the righteousness of God ?

2. Demonstration

The righteousness of God is demonstrated and it is, only and solely, demonstrated at Golgotha - at Skull Place - where Jesus Christ was crucified by men, who suffered, according to the scriptures and who gave, voluntarily, his life a *lutron* corresponding to many. *Lutron* is neither an illegal bribe, ransom, nor is it, exactly, a deliverance. I understand *lutron* to be the means of deliverance. Here, a correspondence, *anti*, against

the many. It is a matter of redemption.

Here, in redemption only, as clearly stated by the apostle Paul, is justification effected. When Jesus Christ offered himself in propitiation. When the Appointed Testator suffered, died and shed his blood to bring in the Everlasting Testament. Here. Here alone.

Any man who attempts to detract from this, by confounding other things together and by speaking of that which he knows not, let him be silent.

Here, Golgotha, is justification effected.

Here - Skull Place - is where the righteousness of God was *demonstrated*.

The one righteousness of which Paul speaks - *enos dikaiwmatos eis pantas anthrwpous eis dikaiwsin zwes* - one righteousness unto all of men unto justification of life - this one righteousness is a righteousness that, by the execution of judgment is demonstrated.

It is demonstrated unto all by the execution of judgment by God upon his only begotten Son.

And by this means only.

This is what faith believes.

And *this faith* is that which God accounts as righteousness.

The righteousness of God by faith.

3. Declaration

The gospel in which the righteousness of God is revealed is declared. It is declared by those authorised to declare it. The unauthorised declare their lack of warrant by putting forth a gospel other than the true gospel; they demonstrate their ineptitude, show forth their inexperience, proclaim their

absence of any calling and loudly herald that it is they, themselves who have concocted a gospel which is, at best, unworthy of attention and, at worst, that which will lead souls into a lake of unquenchable fire. Woe unto them.

The everlasting gospel is declared by able ministers of the new testament. It is not declared by hirelings, by those who love the uppermost rooms and the chief seats, nor by them that go in long robes and desire titles like reverend and doctor - or even mister. Paul is what the chief apostle called himself. And Nigel is he that writes this examination.

The one who laid the foundation which is to be declared is one who was most often found working day and night - tentmaking and ministering - so that he would be chargeable to none. He suffered shipwreck to the point where he was a day and a night in the deep; he was beaten with rods, he was stoned, he received forty save one on several occasions and was treated as the offscouring of the world by the principal dignitaries of religion in the times in which he lived. Thus was his reward and this was his accolade - a scarred body.

The righteousness of God is not declared for filthy lucre; for a living; to gain an easy circumstance sequestered from the usual vicissitudes of earning one's bread or securing reasonable accommodation; much less to exalt oneself above any other at all. For the greatest in the kingdom of heaven - those who do and teach [righteousness], says Jesus, shall be as the least and shall be servants of all. Nor shall they capitalise the S to make it a title nor shall they capitalise on the function to secure a living, a house and a pension. Amen.

But the ox which treadeth out the corn is not to be muzzled, of course. Nor may it be forced to eat. And what good people organise among themselves, for mutual benefit, is entirely their own business.

4. Documentation

All we require is already given us, divinely, in one hundred and forty thousand Greek words, in twenty seven books by nine inspired writers. This is the documentation of the new testament and this is the foundation once laid, which no other may lay.

An individual, born of water and born of spirit; tutored by the law and, thus, brought to Christ; set apart, evidently, by the work of God and the providence of God; taught of God in the sanctuary; tried and proved in exceptional circumstances and, thus, proved faithful; one such called, sent and anointed man - and it is, always, a man - one such shall build upon the once laid foundation.

If any - such - build wood and hay and stubble upon the foundation, he shall, himself, suffer loss for it shall all be burnt in the day of dissolution. But if any - such - man build precious things upon this once laid foundation, he shall be rewarded.

Any - other - who attempt to alter, remove or substitute the foundation shall be rebuked and exposed, here and now.

It was the Holy Spirit, himself, who spoke among the church with such clear voice that Luke records the expressions of the body as the very words of God, the Spirit: Separate me Barnabas and Saul. From those who ministered to the Lord himself, were these singled out; nor were they singled out in the order in which men counted them. This was of God.

These shall build. None other.

Examination

These things being so, then with what seriousness can one take the document which I refer to as the WC - in convenience - which was originated by the Parliament of England; prepared by a gathering of hired clergymen; unspokenly authorised by an

earthly Monarch - or whomever substituted for one prior to his execution; written by men calling themselves 'divine'; published as 'humble advice' when it, actually, had the force and power of earthly government; and circulated as a competitive 'standard' of the real foundation ?

And what seriousness can be rendered to a document which shows the utter ineptitude of its writers in the matter of Adam's created nature - calling him 'righteous'.

Or what seriousness can be given to that which demonstrates a complete lack of understanding of the nature of God, the person of God, the divine nature of the Son of God - Jesus Christ Righteous, the nature of Jesus Christ's humanity, the meaning of the righteousness of God, the place of justification, the means of justification and the true nature of justification - I say what seriousness can be given when this document claims that the law was a means - by proxy - to justification, according to the manmade fiction of the so-called 'active obedience' theory ?

Or what seriousness could possibly be required when a document flagrantly contradicts the words of the apostle Paul in his epistle to the churches of Galatia by 'binding' believers to keep the law when Paul categorically and expressly indicates, throughout that epistle and throughout the epistle to those at Rome, that - the just shall live by his faith; that we are dead to the law by the body of Christ; that I, through the law, am dead to the law that I might live unto God; that the handwriting of ordinances was nailed to the cross and the writing lifted up from off the page; that we are delivered from the law; that we are not under law; that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made us free from the law of sin and death ?

What seriousness ?

None at all.

Any remnant of dignity left by this tattered mixture of old and new garment that, shamelessly, exposes any wearer thereof is removed by its convoluted attempt to 'threaten' with that which

is, supposedly, not being suggested as a covenant of works.

The writers of this ghastly piece of literature expose their inability to conceive of any righteousness other than that which, they suggest, is produced by law. But the law was not made for a righteous man, but for the unrighteous. The law was laid down - not 'added'; it is *prostithemi* - because of transgressions. The law came in, by and by, in a covenant addressed to Israel in the flesh in accompaniment to God's desire to display, physically, on earth the figure of spiritual matters.

The writers of this document think that righteousness exists by creation. They think that those born again of water and of spirit need the law to perfect them after they have believed and been filled with the being of the divine Holy Spirit. They suppose - from where they suppose it, is a mystery - that humanity on earth may, by thoroughly disobeying the word of the Creator not to partake of the knowledge of good and evil in order to live - may, by thus flagrantly disobeying, gain a 'righteousness' by proxy that is transferable to others.

Which others, then, having believed, are to - yet again - keep the same law themselves, under 'threat' though not as a covenant of works.

Apparently.

Conclusion

Serious ? Serious examination ? I think not.

As Paul desired would-be circumcisers and troublesome teachers of the law to 'cut themselves off' - the word is *apokophontai* - so desire I that those who preach and teach this WC document should wipe themselves away with it.

Nigel Johnstone

Worcestershire, december 2013.