

SALVATION OLD & NEW TESTAMENTS

DIVINELY ESTABLISHED IN AN UNCHANGEABLE MANNER IN GENESIS

On the salvation issue in Scripture, first of all it would probably be best to forget the two divisions of Scripture as man has designated them (O.T. & N.T.) and see the whole of Scripture *as one continuous book*.

“Testament” is simply a synonym for, another way of saying, “covenant” (Heb., *Berith* [translated almost exclusively “covenant” in the O.T., KJV]; Gk., *diatheke* [translated both “testament” and “covenant” in the N.T., KJV]); and Scripture is not a covenant per se. Rather, *the whole of Scripture is a revelation from God to man*.

Thus, *Scripture* is one thing, *covenants* are another. Covenants, rather than being used to refer to Scripture (O.T., N.T. [i.e., Old Covenant, New Covenant]), form a vital part of Scripture and are among the subjects that can be found in Scripture.

(Scripture is often referred to different ways in various passages — e.g., in Isa. 8:20, *the whole of Scripture* [O.T., though *there is NOTHING in the New that is NOT in the Old*] is referenced two different ways [“Law” and “Testimony”]; or, in Luke 24:27, *the whole of Scripture*, in this same respect, is referenced through “Moses and all the Prophets”; then, note *the same thing* at the close of the O.T. Scriptures through the reference to Moses [Law] and Elijah [Prophets] in Mal. 4:4, 5.

And since “the Law” is *the Old Covenant*, there could be some precedent for calling the section of Scripture from Genesis to Malachi “The Old Testament.” But a similar precedent would not exist for calling the remainder of Scripture “The New Testament.”)

Aside from the preceding, beyond Genesis chapter twelve, covenants are made *with Israel* (Rom. 9:4). *NO* covenant has been made or ever will be made *with the Church*. Thus, to see that part of Scripture beginning with Matthew's gospel called "The New Testament ['The New Covenant']," with numerous books dealing directly with the Church, appears rather strange.

And this would appear strange even more so since the New Covenant is yet to be made with the house of Israel.

The Old Covenant (Mosaic, inseparably associated with the Abrahamic) *was made with Israel*; and the New Covenant, one day replacing the Old (also inseparably associated with the Abrahamic), *will be made with Israel*.

BOTH have to do with the theocracy, as do ALL covenants made or to be made with Israel (Davidic, Palestinian, New).

NONE of the covenants *have ANYTHING* to do with *eternal salvation*. *ALL* since Abraham's day were made with a *people ALREADY saved, or WILL be saved when the New Covenant replaces the Old*. *As well, ALL were made/will be made with the people comprising the ONLY nation with a God*.

And, in reality, *ALL* could be classed as "The Magna Charta for the Kingdom," with the Mosaic, and evidently the New, since it will replace the Old, having to do with *the rules and regulations governing the people of God in the theocracy*.

Creations, Sonship

NOR do "creations" — *the Adamic* (Gen. 1:26-28), *the old creation in Jacob* (*new* at the time [Isa. 43:1]), or *the new creation in Christ* (II Cor. 5:17) — *have ANYTHING to do with salvation*. *NOR does "sonship" have anything to do with salvation*.

(*Sonship* has to do with "creation." Adam was God's *son* because of "creation" [Luke 3:38]. This status *DID NOT change* following the fall. Israel is God's *son* because of "creation"

[God's *firstborn son* because of a *subsequent adoption*] and remains God's son today [God's *firstborn son*], even though in an unsaved state (Ex. 4:22, 23; Isa. 43:1; Rom. 9:4).

And Christians are God's *sons* because of "creation" as well [*new creations* "in Christ," *STILL separate from salvation* (*NOTHING* about *death and shed blood* in "creation" itself), though occurring at the same time, with "creation" occurring *because of an individual AVAILING HIMSELF of that made possible through Christ's death and shed blood*].

To further illustrate the point in relation to *salvation*, note that *ALL angels are God's sons because of their individual "creation,"* and that position remained unchanged in relation to Satan and his angels following their fall [Gen. 6:2]. *ALL angels remain God's sons today — fallen or unfallen, for ALL are "created" beings.*)

In the first two creations (Jew and Gentile), a person cannot move from one creation to the other.

That is, a Gentile cannot become a Jew (he can do no more than become a Jewish proselyte); nor, in the same respect, can a Jew become a Gentile. And the reason for the preceding is simple: Both have to do with *the physical man*. That which is *physical* simply cannot be changed.

The third creation, of course, is formed from the first two. A Jew or a Gentile becomes a *new creation in Christ* through "belief." *And a person can move from one creation to the other in this respect because the spiritual man rather than the physical man is involved.*

Believing Jews or believing Gentiles remain in their respective creations *physically* (that cannot change), but both become *new creations* "in Christ" — Christians — a *spiritual* rather than a *physical* change.

As well, since *the physical* is involved with Jews and Gentiles, their respective creations can be passed from father to son through procreation.

But, such cannot occur at all for Christians, for *the spiritual* is involved — a realm where man cannot operate, a realm which has nothing to do with natural procreation.

Salvation in One Book

Now, with all of that in mind, let's look at the salvation issue in one Book, not two Testaments, for *the salvation issue NEVER changes throughout Scripture.*

The whole of the matter is *set forth and established in AN UNCHANGEABLE MANNER in the opening chapters of Genesis.* The manner in which God would restore ruined man, a ruined creation, was set forth at this opening point in Scripture, where God restored the ruined material creation; *and NO CHANGE CAN EVER OCCUR, for the matter was established PERFECT in the beginning.*

The first thing we read relative to the restoration of a ruined creation is: *The Spirit of God moved, God spoke, light came into existence, and God formed a division between the newly existing light and the remaining darkness* (Gen. 1:2b-5):

“And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.

And God saw the light, that it was good: and God divided the light from the darkness.

And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.”

And *the remaining darkness* would reveal that God had not finished with His restoration work at the end of day one (*cf. Rev. 21:22-25*). Five more days of work remained, completing six days, with a view to the seventh day).

Thus, in relation to fallen man (a subsequent ruined creation, in need of restoration), the Divine work seen on day one *can ONLY foreshadow God's initial work pertaining to*

man, having to do with his eternal salvation (a beginning work to restore the ruined creation).

And the Divine work seen beyond this, seen in days two through six, *can ONLY foreshadow God's continued dealings with saved man (a continued work to restore the ruined creation).*

And the Divine work seen throughout all six days is with *a view to that foreshadowed by the seventh day, which Scripture later reveals is related to the salvation or loss of the soul, the life, of a man who has passed from death unto life.*

But, let's stay mainly with the work on day one.

Note something about the work on day one in passing. Once God had finished with His work on this first day, *He DIDN'T go back and re-deal with anything from this day. Rather HE BEGAN to deal with that remaining, as it pertained to THE COMPLETE RESTORATION of the ruined creation seen in that foreshadowed by God's work during the subsequent five days.*

Thus, *EXACTLY as in the type, God DOES NOT go back and re-deal with saved man today RELATIVE TO ANYTHING having occurred in his passing from death unto life. Rather, He NOW deals with man ON THE BASIS OF, NOT RELATIVE TO his now having life, with light shining out of darkness (Gen. 1:3, 4; John 1:4, 5; 5:24; II Cor. 4:6), with a view to the seventh day.*

Now, moving from this initial information to Genesis chapters three and four, we see several things pertaining to that initially occurring on day one in Gen. 1:2b-5.

Chapter three relates man's fall, resulting in a subsequent ruined creation.

And *HOW* does God restore a ruined creation? The answer, of course, along with the purpose for restoration — *ALL as previously dealt with* — *is seen back in the opening thirty-four verses of Genesis.*

THEN, additional information relative to the matter at hand begins to be revealed in chapter three.

In this chapter, a man (Adam, typifying Christ 4,000 years later) partook of the forbidden fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, bringing about the fall. But, remaining in complete conformity to Christ's work at Calvary, *Adam, who had NOT been deceived (I Tim. 2:14), partook of the fruit from the tree WILLINGLY and for a PURPOSE.*

In effect, *ONCE Eve had partaken of the forbidden fruit, Adam was left WITHOUT a choice.* He found his bride in a fallen state (though the fall didn't actually occur in all its completeness *UNTIL Adam, as the federal head, had eaten of the fruit himself*).

BUT, the ONLY way Adam could effect Eve's redemption, with a view to both one day partaking of the tree of life together and realizing the purpose for their very existence (Adam partaking of the tree as a COMPLETE being, which would necessitate Eve's presence with him), was to partake of the forbidden fruit himself, which he did. And this, as previously stated, was with a view to REDEMPTION.

Note how this is clearly seen in the antitype:

Christ, in complete conformity to the type, found His bride in a fallen state. And He Who knew no sin became sin (II Cor. 5:21). And *THIS was with a view to REDEMPTION*, in order that both Christ and His bride might one day partake of the tree of life together and realize the purpose for man's existence (*Christ partaking of the tree as a COMPLETE being, which will necessitate His bride — bone of His bones, and flesh of His flesh (cf. Gen. 2:23; Eph. 5:30) — being present with Him.*

Then a clear inference to death and shed blood is introduced later in the chapter through God clothing Adam and Eve with animal skins (they had lost the covering of Glory at the time of the fall).

(Note again that man at this point is *NOT* placed completely back into the position which he had occupied before the fall [*a restoration of the covering of Glory, which, in subsequent Scripture, is seen restored ONLY on the seventh day*].

There was a *restoration of the Glory*, after a fashion, during Moses' day at Mt. Sinai when the Glory filled the tabernacle [Ex. 40:1ff]. And this may be what is being referenced, or at least is in view, in Rom. 5:14 — “Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses...” — but man being brought *completely back into the position from which he fell* will require a restoration of the Glory *after the SAME fashion* seen prior to Adam's fall. Such a restoration will require man to, *once again, be enswathed in Glory.*)

Then in chapter four, more information is added. Man, seen acting in the previous chapter, would be the one to die and shed his blood (*Cain slaying Abel, Israel slaying Christ*). And putting all of this together from these four chapters, *the COMPLETE salvation picture is seen, a picture which NEVER changes.*

Eternal salvation is A DIVINE WORK, performed by a Man (Who has to be God), with DEATH and SHED BLOOD involved.

ALL fallen man can do is simply RECEIVE that which HAS BEEN DONE on his behalf (through BELIEVING in the One Who DIED and SHED His BLOOD).

NOTHING MORE can enter into the matter.

And note again that once man has passed from death unto life, God's dealings with man *THEN* move to that which lies out ahead. God *NEVER AGAIN* deals with man relative to the salvation which he presently possesses.

In that respect, note *the absurdity* of saying that a saved man can lose his salvation. *HOW could he lose something which he had NOTHING to do with obtaining, particularly since God is NO LONGER dealing with him relative to the matter?*

Now, a lot of time has been spent on this overall salvation issue from the first four chapters of Genesis for the simple reason that *these foundational truths pertaining to salvation are*

needed to understand the subject at hand — salvation as seen throughout ALL subsequent Scripture, particularly as it MUST be seen in the camp of Israel on both sides of Calvary.

(Note the importance of beginning where God began and studying Scripture after the manner in which God structured His Word.

Understand how the subject is set forth in its foundational respect at the beginning of Scripture and you will know how to handle the same subject matter when it appears later in Scripture, though perhaps dealt with from different perspectives at times.

But fail to understand the subject in this foundational respect...)

Events in Genesis chapter twenty-two or chapter thirty-seven further illustrate and provide additional information for that seen in the opening four chapters of Genesis, but let's move on to Exodus chapter twelve.

In this chapter we have that previously illustrated from several types in Genesis brought together in the institution of the Passover.

A lamb from the flock was to die in a vicarious manner in the stead of the firstborn in the family. And a lamb dying in this manner, with the blood caught and properly applied — in line with the way that the sacrifices or other types were seen back in Genesis — pointed to the Paschal Lamb dying at Calvary, shedding His blood.

Now, a self-answering question:

In relation to man's eternal salvation, did God recognize death and shed blood in all these sacrifices throughout man's 4,000-year history preceding the events of Calvary?

Certainly He did! After all, He is the One Who instituted these sacrifices, with man [God Himself in Gen. 3] only carrying out that which God had previously instituted.

ALL of these sacrifices were inseparably associated with the One actually slain BEFORE man even fell, or BEFORE one sacrifice was ever offered. Christ was “slain from the foundation of the world” (Rev. 13:8), which takes matters back to the beginning of the restoration of the ruined earth, preceding man’s creation, in Gen. 1:2b.

In reality, ALL of the O.T. sacrifices foreshadowed an event which God looked upon as having ALREADY occurred (Eccl. 3:14, 15; Isa. 48:3ff).

At the time Christ was here on earth, the Jewish people were still sacrificing *the Passover lamb*. And in this respect, with *death and shed blood involved — the death of the firstborn involved —* the Jewish people at Christ’s first coming *could ONLY* have been just as saved as the Israelites during Moses’ day or any others who had availed themselves of God’s provision during succeeding years or during the preceding 2,500 years of human history.

Or, we can move matters to anytime during the 2,000 years this side of Calvary and say that saved individuals throughout this time were/*are NO more or NO less* saved than individuals who were saved throughout the 4,000-year history of the human race preceding Calvary. *It matters NOT* where you view salvation by grace — during Adam’s day immediately following the fall, or today 6,000 years later — *it’s THE SAME throughout, by DEATH and SHED BLOOD.*

Again, Jews in view at Christ’s first coming would have been individuals who were having a part in the sacrifice of the paschal lambs year after year (*which could ONLY have been the nation at large, else Christ could NOT have come to this nation and dealt with them relative to spiritual values, offering to the Jewish nation the kingdom of the heavens*).

Salvation on Both Sides of Calvary

NOW, let’s look at *THIS* status of the Jewish people on

both sides of Calvary in relation to the offer and re-offer of the kingdom of the heavens to Israel (again, *ref. Rev. 13:8*).

(But, note something about events in John chapter eight first. In this chapter, Christ, during His earthly ministry, referred to Jews who had believed in Him [v. 31] as being “of your father the devil” [v. 44].

Don’t try to read *saved-unsaved issues* into this chapter. Christ was dealing with *saved Jews being brought forth from below rather than from above, doing the work of Satan rather than the work of God*.

The issue in this chapter, as the central issue in the book as a whole, is not eternal salvation. Rather, the issue has to do with the message being proclaimed to Israel at that time, which pertained *to the kingdom*.

[Note the same thing relative to Christians in I John. *Reference to a bringing forth from above rather than from below appears ten times in this book*. Understand that this expression is used of Christians [those to whom the book has been written], *NOT* the unsaved, and *you will have FAR, FAR less trouble with I John*].

For additional information on the preceding, refer to the author’s book, *From the Beginning*.)

Question: Jews rejecting Christ, responsible for the events of Calvary, were they saved or unsaved?

Then another question: If saved — which they, of course, were — did that status change once the Paschal Lamb had died, with God then no longer recognizing animal sacrifices as before, nullifying their salvation?

How could a status in their salvation possibly change? God had previously *ESTABLISHED* and *RECOGNIZED* animal sacrifices in this respect; and, according to the original type in the opening two chapters of Genesis, or any other type,

once a man had passed from death unto life, God *NEVER dealt with the person on THAT basis again. ALL of God's dealings with the person, beyond availing himself of the blood sacrifice, were NOW focused ON that which lay ahead, NEVER on THAT lying behind.*

Had not the status of these Jews remained the same (*i.e., just as saved following Calvary as they had been before Calvary*), *there could have been NO re-offer of the kingdom to Israel, as seen throughout the Book of Acts. And had God continued to recognize animal sacrifices beyond Calvary, the re-offer of the kingdom could conceivably have continued indefinitely (as long as Israel remained in a position to and continued to sacrifice the paschal lambs year after year).*

But, following Calvary, *God recognized ONLY the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb, NOT sacrifices of paschal lambs as before.*

And, on the basis of Rev. 13:8, *one could ONLY say that God, in reality, had recognized ONLY the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb since before man fell, which was seen and foreshadowed in ALL the paschal lambs slain up to Calvary.*

Thus, the re-offer of the kingdom could remain open as long as a saved generation of Jews remained on the scene (*NOT Christians, BUT saved Jews [individuals still rejecting the One Who had BOTH presented Himself to them and been crucified in a REGAL respect]*). *BUT, once this generation had passed off the scene, there could be NO continued re-offer of the kingdom.*

The preceding is why the re-offer, of necessity, ceased after some thirty years (from 33 AD to about 62 AD). The saved generation of Jews was rapidly passing off the scene, leaving unsaved Jews to replace them. *And THAT having spiritual values could NOT have been offered to individuals separated from spiritual values.*

And, aside from the preceding, a new entity had been brought into existence to be the recipient of that which Israel had rejected.

(By way of summation, note the Jews saved throughout the four gospels, then on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2, or subsequently throughout Acts, including Paul saved en route to Damascus.

ALL should be thought of in the sense of the conversion of individuals already saved, with a view to the proffered kingdom, i.e., saving the saved [like present aspects of salvation, with a view to the future kingdom, seen in the lives of Christians today].

The preceding is evident from that seen throughout the ministries of John, Jesus, the Twelve, the Seventy, and Peter's message and response to a question in Acts 2:14-39 on the day of Pentecost, setting the stage for that seen throughout the Book of Acts.

Attempts by some to read "eternal salvation" into ANY part of this can ONLY be detrimental to ANY sound method of Biblical study.

And, in this SAME respect, moving beyond Acts 2, it would be ABSURD to think of Paul, a zealous Pharisee, NOT having previously availed himself of God's sacrificial provision — i.e., NOT having previously observed the Passover [with Paul ALSO being counted among those in that SAME saved generation].

Then, note a few related, companion thoughts:

It is commonly believed and taught in Christendom that the O.T. saints were saved *through believing God* [e.g., Abraham in Gen. 15:6; cf. Rom. 4:3]. *BUT, IF SO, since there was NO death and shed blood, ONLY belief, this would be CONTRARY TO the foundational types, set forth particularly in the opening four chapters of Genesis [cf. Heb. 9:22 (see next section, p. 13)].*

And, as well, this would be equally CONTRARY TO ALL subsequent types [which MUST follow the foundational types] or anything else in Scripture dealing with the subject [e.g., Israel's seven festivals in Lev. 23, beginning with the Passover, beginning with death and shed blood (cf. Ex. 12)].

And the same thing can be seen at Christ's first coming. If Christ came to an unsaved Jewish nation and Jews could be saved by believing on Him [or the Samaritans in John 4], *WHERE was the death and shed blood? Christ had YET to die and shed His blood, ALLOWING belief of this nature.*

It is true that Christ was “slain from the foundation of the world” [Rev. 13:8], *but God STILL required/requires death and shed blood, BOTH past and present [present, of course, through the PAST, finished work of Christ at Calvary, which was FUTURE during His entire ministry as seen in the four gospels].*

Thus, note the importance of UNDERSTANDING and ALWAYS remaining with the overall, UNCHANGEABLE, GOD-ESTABLISHED foundations from Genesis.

One either goes right or goes wrong AT THIS POINT!

“Without Shedding of Blood...” (I)

“And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission” (Heb. 9:22).

God rejects first things: “He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second” (Heb. 10:9).

God rejected the first earth (the present earth, to be replaced by a new earth), the earth’s first ruler (Satan, to be replaced by Another), the first man (Adam, to be replaced by the second Man, Christ), etc.

God, rejecting the first man, who sinned, has rejected the first birth. And the firstborn, being rejected, *MUST DIE*, for “the wages of sin is death” (Rom. 6:23).

But, on the other hand, the individual *MUST live, NOT die*, to one day realize the purpose for God creating man in the beginning, else Rom. 11:29 —“For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance [‘without a change of mind’]” — *COULD NOT remain true.*

And this is where *death and shed blood* enter into the picture, something which *MUST* be seen in man’s complete salvation (both past and present, with a view to the future), from the time Adam sinned in Eden to that future time beyond the Millennium, in the eternal ages, when sin and death have been done away with.

UNTIL THEN, death and shed blood MUST be seen throughout.

And the foundational word picture which God provided, both preceding and following man's sin — pertaining to the beginning, foundational aspect of the matter, the past aspect of salvation — is seen in Gen. 1:2b-5; 3:21, followed by additional information in Gen. 4, 22, 37. Then, all of this is put together in the death of the firstborn in Ex. 12 (both *personal* and *national*), where the birth of a nation descending from Abraham through Isaac and Jacob occurred.

The firstborn *had to die*, yet the individual (and nation) *had to STILL live*. There was *NO ALTERNATE*, and there was *NO OTHER WAY* that this could be accomplished aside from *THE ONE WAY* which God *UNCHANGEABLY* established in the beginning.

The firstborn could EITHER die a substitutionary death (another paying the penalty on his behalf, with God recognizing *death and shed blood* in this respect) *OR the firstborn could pay the penalty himself.*

There was/is NO alternate to the preceding!

And this can be clearly seen the night of the Passover in Egypt in Ex. 12. When the Lord passed through the land of Egypt at midnight, He looked for *ONE THING and ONE THING ONLY*. He looked for *THE BLOOD* of a slain lamb, properly applied to the door posts and lintel of each house.

Seeing the *BLOOD*, the Lord knew that *DEATH had already occurred in that house*. *The firstborn had DIED*, vicariously; a lamb from the flock had died in his stead.

God recognized this vicarious death which He had previously established, God was satisfied, and He passed over that house.

HOWEVER, if the Lord DIDN'T see ANY BLOOD, THEN the firstborn in that house had to pay the penalty himself, for the firstborn MUST DIE!

The firstborn THEN died apart from a substitute, for God has REJECTED the firstborn, and the wages of sin is DEATH.

Now let's look at all of this in the light of several things which have previously been dealt with to an extent but will now be dealt with in a different or fuller respect.

1) *Death and Shed Blood, Abraham's Salvation*

Abraham believing God in Gen. 15:6 ("And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness") is quoted by Paul in Rom. 4:3 ("Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness" [ref. Gal. 3:6 and James 2:23 where Gen. 15:6 is also quoted]). And Abraham believing God at this time — a number of years after he had entered the land of Canaan — is often seen *as the TIME that Abraham was saved.*

But, how can anyone come to such a conclusion concerning Abraham's salvation, though many do? After all, some years prior to this time Abraham had left Ur "by faith," believing God.

And during the intervening years up to and following Gen. 15:6 Abraham continued exercising faith, continued believing God (Heb. 11:8, 9).

Decades later, Abraham, by faith, believing God, offered his son, on a particular Mount which the Lord had chosen (Gen. 22). And note how Abraham's actions and the outcome are worded in James 2:23 (cf. vv. 21, 22), with reference made back to and quoting Gen. 15:6 — "And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness..."

Genesis 15:6 is set in a section having to do with *Abraham believing God relative to a promised seed and the promised land in the Abrahamic Covenant.* The structure of the verb "believe" in the Hebrew text of this verse shows that *Abraham's faith — EXACTLY THE SAME FAITH spoken of here — PRECEDED this time, NOT began here. Abraham made a previously existing faith KNOWN after the fashion stated.*

Also, *death and shed blood* are seen in connection with the verses in both Genesis and James, *but NOT in connection with Abraham*.

In Genesis, *death and shed blood have to do with the covenant concerning the land grant (15:7-21)*.

Then, in James, *death and shed blood have to do with a substitute sacrifice for Abraham's son (2:21-23 [cf. Gen. 22:10-13])*.

Abraham's salvation, which many look for in Gen. 15:6, is *NOT* dealt with in Scripture. It could *ONLY* have occurred in Ur, prior to his departure, else *he could NOT have gone out by or continued to exercise "faith," in the manner seen*.

(The typology of Abraham leaving Ur for another land would *CLEARLY* show the preceding.

But first, note a later type [comparing Scripture with Scripture] dealing with the same thing — the Israelites under Moses [the nation which sprang from the loins of Abraham], over four hundred years later, *leaving Egypt for the SAME land*.

The Israelites *COULDN'T* leave Egypt [a type of the world] *UNTIL* blood sacrifices had occurred and the matter of their eternal salvation had been settled — the death of the first-born [Ex. 12:1ff].

EXACTLY the SAME thing is seen in the life of an individual today. A person simply *CAN'T* exercise faith and leave the things of this world and begin moving toward the land of his calling [which in this case is a heavenly land] *UNTIL AFTER* he has been saved [availed himself of the blood Sacrifice].

NOR could Abraham have previously left Ur [a type of the world] *UNTIL EXACTLY the SAME thing — a blood sacrifice — had occurred.*)

2) *Death and Shed Blood, the Gospels*

It is rather strange to see individuals begin the gospel accounts, particularly John's gospel, seeing Christ coming to an unsaved Jewish nation and, through the proclama-

tion of a message concerning the kingdom, offer to these people eternal salvation. That is about as far removed from reality as one can possibly get in any semblance of correct Biblical interpretation as one moves from the O.T. over into the N.T. But, nonetheless, a message of this nature, or some semblance of this type message, is *EXACTLY* what is *NOT ONLY* widely taught in Christian circles today *BUT* widely accepted as well.

The only death and shed blood seen in the gospel accounts in this respect — prior to the events of Calvary near the close of each account — has to do with the Jewish sacrificial system, beginning with the slaying and application of the blood of the paschal lambs.

And God could ONLY have looked upon the death of paschal lambs, the application of the blood, and the death of the firstborn in the camp of Israel at this time EXACTLY as he had done during Moses' day in Ex. 12.

Yet, completely contrary to the way matters had been laid out in the O.T., then carried over into the N.T., individuals see Christ and His disciples proclaiming a salvation message to individuals *whom God could ONLY reckon as having ALREADY experienced the death of the firstborn — individuals who were ALREADY saved being told how they could be saved, through believing on the Paschal Lamb WHO HAD YET to die and shed His blood.*

All of this (things presently being proclaimed), from a Scriptural standpoint, makes little to no sense. But, nonetheless, that's what is being believed and taught in much of today's Christendom.

3) *Present Aspects of Salvation, O.T., N.T.*

As death and shed blood are seen throughout the past aspect of salvation, they are seen throughout the present aspect of salvation as well.

The O.T. priestly ministry in the Tabernacle/Temple, on behalf of the Jewish people, centered around *death and shed blood*; and Christ's present ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, on behalf of Christians, centers around *death and shed blood* as well.

As long as sin, requiring death, exists, God's requirement for *death and shed blood* will exist (*cf.* Ezek. 43:19ff). It will *ONLY* be during the eternal ages beyond the Millennium that sin and death will no longer exist, with God no longer requiring *death and shed blood*.

“Without Shedding of Blood...” (II)

“And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and *WITHOUT* shedding of blood is *NO* remission” (Heb. 9:22).

As previously seen in this article, it can be easily shown, beginning with Gen. 3, *that death and shed blood MUST be present for ANY aspect of salvation to exist or be efficacious.* And that, of course, would include *NOT ONLY the past aspect of salvation BUT the present aspect as well, with a VIEW to the future aspect.*

THEN, something invariably overlooked is the fact that this has to do with *MORE than just fallen man; this, as well, has to do with the material creation, presently under a curse because of man's fall.*

The preceding can easily be seen in Rev. 5, where Christ — *NOT* as “the Lion of the tribe of Judah” (v. 5) *BUT* “a Lamb as it had been slain” (v. 6) — acts in *THIS* capacity, for the seven-sealed scroll which the Son took from His Father's right hand contained *the redemptive terms of the earth* (vv. 1, 7; *cf.* Rom. 8:19-22).

And God's Son, taking this scroll (a yet future work), subsequently breaks the seals (Rev. 6:1ff) *while exercising the office of the SLAIN Lamb, NOT that of the Lion (though in view because of the judgmental nature of that about to occur).*

REDEMPTION is in view, which requires, NOT just a lamb, BUT a PARTICULAR Lamb (vv. 2-6). And, beyond that, THIS Lamb HAD to be slain. There HAD to be DEATH and shed BLOOD.

DEATH and shed BLOOD are required for the future redemption of the earth. In this respect, APART from DEATH and shed BLOOD, the earth could NEVER be redeemed.

Thus, APART from Christ's finished work at Calvary, it is NOT just man that would find himself separated from redemption BUT the earth as well.

Then, if the preceding is true, and it is, HOW could God have previously performed a redemptive work in relation to the same earth when He, over six days time, restored the ruined earth in Genesis chapter one.

After all, Christ's finished work at Calvary lay 4,000 years in the future.

WHERE was the DEATH and shed BLOOD, by ONE PARTICULAR LAMB, when God restored the earth 6,000 years prior to the time when He will do it again, as seen in Revelation chapter five (cf. vv. 2-6)?

After all, IF God required DEATH and shed BLOOD the second time, would He NOT have required it the first time as well?

THEN, beyond the preceding, note that the first restoration of the material creation foreshadows man's restoration, following the fall in Genesis chapter three.

This is the original type, establishing a foundation which NOT ONLY NEVER changes BUT a foundation upon which ALL subsequent material dealing with man's salvation MUST rest.

And, since DEATH and shed BLOOD MUST be present when redemption is in view — whether man or the material creation, again, WHERE was the DEATH and shed BLOOD in the restoration account in Genesis chapter one?

Are we to think that DEATH and shed BLOOD were ABSENT

in Genesis chapter one — relative to the earth's redemption, foreshadowing man's redemption — NOT being seen UNTIL Genesis chapter three?

HARDLY!

The necessity of *DEATH* and *shed BLOOD* being present in the earth's redemption in *BOTH* Genesis chapter one and Revelation chapter five, along with Genesis chapter one forming the original foundational type foreshadowing man's redemption (both past and present, with a view to the future), is *WHY* Christ is seen in Rev. 13:8 as "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (in a book dealing specifically with the earth's future redemption, reflecting back on a past restoration).

Apart from God working things out in this manner there could have been *NO* restoration of the earth in Gen. 1, there could have been *NO* complete original type of man's salvation (*complete with DEATH and shed BLOOD*), and there evidently could have been *NO* efficacy in animal sacrifices for the first 4,000 years of human history (reflecting back on *the Lamb slain prior to that time*).

THUS, Man's Day begins in Genesis with redemption, inseparably associated with DEATH and shed BLOOD, having to do with BOTH the material creation and man.

THEN, redemption in connection with DEATH and shed BLOOD is seen throughout Man's 6,000-year Day, redeeming man to ultimately rule this material creation.

AND, Man's Day is brought to a close in Revelation with redemption, DEATH, and shed BLOOD, redeeming once again the material creation for man to rule.

AND, even during this subsequent 1,000-year day, the Lord's Day, DEATH and shed BLOOD will STILL be seen.

It will be ONLY following the destruction of the present heavens and earth, in the new heavens and earth, that DEATH and shed BLOOD will NO longer be seen.