

What I learned from the class.

God's Blueprint for Spiritual Protocol is a detailed Six Part Spiritual Commentary. It is filled with God's wisdom and teachings concerning spiritual study, spiritual anointings, spiritual giftings, spiritual callings and spiritual offices in the Body of Christ. This Six Part Spiritual Commentary will assist all leaders, spiritual and secular, and every Christian in the understanding and fulfillment of their spiritual purpose and destiny in God.

The first part is on the book "Understanding Your Bible". Among other things it talks about what the bible is not, what the bible is, what is inspiration, what is revelation, and rules of interpretation of scripture.

The book "Understanding Your Bible" quotes the Bible as saying in 2nd Timothy 2:15 "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

My understanding of other readings on this is:

This scripture came out of a time when they were building the temple at the construction site. The stones were all hewn, squared and numbered at the quarries where they were raised.

This can be found in the 1 Kings account of the construction of King Solomon's Temple. 1 King 6:7 reads, "In building the temple, only blocks dressed at the quarry were used, and no hammer, chisel or any other iron tool was heard at the temple site while it was being built."

While transporting these huge boulders from the quarry to the building site, men were actually die-ing when these boulders rolled back on them. If the mason's measurements were wrong, and it was necessary to transport another bolder, then this was an unnecessary sacrifice for doing God's work. To this end the first time the error occurred the mason's head was shaved and his beard was cut. The second time he was killed. The point was that people's lives, were dependent on the accuracy of the mason. We could say that people's lives are now dependent on the accuracy of the preacher or teacher. This speaks to my need for accuracy on the interpretation which I am about to give.

Furthermore, before I get to the interpretation example, some rules of interpretation that I learned from the class are the following. The book "Understanding Your Bible" says on page 59 "One of the most fundamental rules of interpretation is that of comparing Scripture with Scripture." This is confirmed by the bible which says in 1 Corinthians 2:12-13.

-Here begineth the reading of God's holy word.

1 Corinthians 2:12-13.

12 Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

13 Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual.

-Here endeth the reading of God's holy word.

In addition "Understanding Your Bible" says:

Before arriving at the whole truth, be sure that all the Scriptures on a subject are collected together and read at one time.

Furthermore, the book "Understanding Your Bible" goes on to say: one great fault with many people is the acceptance of only part of the Scriptures on a subject and the rejection of other passages that contradict their theory (pages 59, 9, b and d).

The book "Understanding Your Bible" goes on to say, on page 59, "No doctrine founded upon a single verse of Scripture, contains the whole of the subject; so do not be dishonest, and wrest with Scripture, or, force a meaning into a passage, that is not clearly understood in the passage, or in parallel passages on the same subject."

And finally my brotheren, the book "Understanding Your Bible" says:

No one, important omission, can be found in comparing all these copies and versions of the Bible. pg 33 6e.

I have expressed all of these principles of properly interpreting scripture in order to express the following unconventional exegesis. God told me, that if I don't give to you, the word that he gave, to me, that he was not going to give me another Rama word. It is surely a blessing to know that God loves you so much that he will reveal his secrets to you. For what saitheth the Lord. "Shall I reveal my secrets to Abraham? So this is me giving to you, what God has given to me.

If that is not somber enough, then let me continue by saying this. My mentor often teaches with what he calls shock therapy. He starts out by saying something that paints himself into a corner such that people are on their toes listening to see how he is going to get out of the corner, which he painted himself into. Then he goes on to say, much like Elijah, "aint nobody saying this but me, at least nobody as far as he knows.

What Elijah said was, "All the prophets are dead except me. Yet, in Andrew's case I've checked the records, and in Andrew's case I am convinced that it is true. In Elijah's case it was not true, and the consequences were significant. Elijah lost his ministry. Yet, by the Grace of God, God sent a chariot to pick Elijah up. Nevertheless, in Andrew's case, at the time that he began saying certain things, there wasn't anybody else saying it but him.

Now you know, that is a very dangerous position to be in. Most likely the reason that no one else is saying, what you are saying is because, what you are saying is not true. Nevertheless, if it is true, then it begs the question; Where did you get it from? "aint nobody saying this but me", is the definition of a rama word from the Lord. What I am about to say about Romans 5:13, I am persuaded is a rahma word from the Lord. For we make an on purpose and deliberate effort to give God the glory for all good things that happen in our lives. We don't give the credit to

ourselves. We don't give the credit to circumstances, nor do we give the credit to coincidence. For what did Paul say. I account all of my accomplishments as dunn.

I pray that God's spirit of discernment will be with you. For, it has been said by men that, to the extent that a man has right on his side, but he is unable to convince reasonable men, then the fault is his, and to some extent I agree.

To that end more likely than not, this message, although short, will give you an understanding that you did not have before hearing it. So again this is me working myself out of the corner which I painted myself into. All praises be to God.

I could summarize this message with four statements, which comes out of comparing scripture with scripture.

1. Where there is no law, there is no transgression (Romans 14:15).
2. Where there is no law, there is no imputation of sin (Romans 5:13).
3. Adam transgressed (Romans 5:14).
4. And finally, there was a law at the time of Adam's transgression which was before the Law of Moses.

Sin is not imputed when there is no law, is a principle that started with the creation of Adam. The bible says, these things are written for our learning. The explanation of this principle, Sin is not imputed when there is no law, is, this principle started back in Adam's day, continued through Mose's day when the law said the sins of the father is visited unto the children to the third and fourth generation, and ended with Jesus's righteousness being imputed to us, when Jesus imputed all of our sins to himself, including the sins of Adam. The only sin that is left is the sin of not accepting Jesus. Praise God!

As I have said, verse 13 states in part that "sin is not imputed when there is no law" to transgress. This verse is often interpreted by many commentators to mean that before the law of Moses God was not imputing men's sin unto men. Therefore God was not holding man's sins against him until the law of Moses.

Therefore, if a man committed a sin before the law of Moses, up to and including killing another man, God did not hold it against the offender, because there was no law against murder. I strongly disagree with this analysis.

First and foremost we know that there must have been a law when Adam sinned before the law of Moses, because sin, (inherited sin), was then imputed when Adam transgressed the law and sinned. The KJV, AMP, and the ASV make it clear that Adam did transgress a law.

Romans 5:14 says;

Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of, \*\*\*Adam's transgression\*\*\*, who is the figure of him that was to come.

Hosea 6:7 A.S.Vee. says:  
But they like Adam have -transgressed- the covenant.

Furthermore, Romans 14:15 says that where no law is, there is no transgression. If Adam transgressed, then there had to have been a law at that time. Therefore the law that verse 13 is talking about, when it says sin is not imputed when there is no law, is the law of God, (do not eat), and not the law of Moses. The text makes it clear that in order for imputation of sin to occur there has to be a law in place. The scripture makes it clear that imputation of sin first occurred during Adam's day. Sin, hereditary sin, was charged to men's account when Adam transgressed the law of God.

Again, Romans 5:14 says:  
"Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come."

The word, "Nevertheless", joins Romans 5:14 to Romans 5:13. When reading Romans 5:13 and 14 together, the grammatical structure of, "Nevertheless", implies the following. Romans 5:14, that is the thing that comes after the word nevertheless, appears to be a contradiction to the thing that came before the word nevertheless. That is to say that, death reigned from Adam to Moses, appears to be a contradiction to "sin is not imputed when there is no law". It would be equally valid to say, although, death reigned from Adam to Moses, nevertheless, sin is not imputed when there is no law. What we receive is the following.

It is evident from this that if men after Adam died, but sin was not imputed when there is no law, and the law of Moses did not exist, then nevertheless, men must have died by reason of Adam's sin. That is they died as a result of some other law, being held against them, other than the law of Moses. For example the law of God, do not eat. That's Paul's point.

Therefore, it is the law to Adam that the text is referring to, not the law to Moses. Any logic that we advance, that negates this obvious truth, is a straight uphill climb with no relief. I strongly suggest that we exert our mental energies trying to think how might this obvious truth agree with all of scripture rather than the converse.

The text might very well read, for until the law {of Moses} sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no {law of God, law of Moses, or law written on our hearts}, that is no law anywhere. We know this usage of "law of God" is correct because, sin was imputed when Adam sinned. Therefore, there must have been a law at that time. Actually, the text is saying the opposite of what theologians are saying.

Let us state the premise in the positive instead of the negative, and change some things around which we seem to be having a problem with because equals can be substituted for equals. The text might read. "In order for the imputation of sin to occur, there has to be a law in place. Nevertheless, sin was in the world before the law of Moses." We might ask how was sin in the

world before the law of Moses, if there was no law of Moses. The answer is suddenly obvious. Before the law of Moses, there was a law of God, which was the cause of the imputation of sin.

In conclusion the only scripture that supports the conclusion that God was not imputing sin to men until the law of Moses is Romans 5:13, and that is not rightly dividing the word of truth.

Again, the book "Understanding Your Bible" says on page 59 "No doctrine founded upon a single verse of Scripture contains the whole of the subject; so do not be dishonest and wrest with Scripture, or, force a meaning into a passage that is not clearly understood in the passage or in parallel passages on the same subject."

Now, I know that I am sharing some things that are quite controversial, and I know that I am stepping on some toes. Nevertheless, I am persuaded that God can heal your toes. It is amazing that people fight so hard when repeating what somebody else said.

In this exegesis I have spoken on the following:

1. Where there is no law, there is no transgression (Romans 14:15).
2. Where there is no law, there is no imputation of sin (Romans 5:13).
3. Adam transgressed (Romans 5:14).
4. There was a law at the time of Adam's transgression which was before the Law of Moses.

Now, I want to drive the point home by establishing that it was Adam's transgression against the law of God that was responsible for God holding sin against men before Jesus came.

\*\*\*\*\*

Again the emphasis of this message is in Romans 5:13, and expresses the principle that "sin is not imputed when there is no law". I have read many commentators, and virtually all of them say in one way or another, that the imputation of sin started with the Law Of Moses. Or more percisely they say that this scripture says, right here, that "sin is not imputed when there is no law, means that God was not holding sin against men's account until the law of moses.

There is a right and wrong way to interpret God's Word. You can preach a truth from a certain passage, yet it may not be the truth the verse is proclaiming. This is not handling the Word of God correctly. That is this is not rightly dividing the word of truth.

For instance, a person could take Exodus 20:8, which says, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy," and expound an Old Testament truth that would put people under bondage about observing certain days. The New Testament makes it clear that the Sabbath was a picture of an New Testement reality that was fulfilled in Christ (see Colossians 2:16-17)., which says: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days:

Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ."

If people don't reveal the New Testament reality of what the Old Testament Sabbath shadowed, then they aren't rightly dividing the word of truth. Of course the consequences of not rightly dividing the word of truth here in Romans 5:13-14, given its historical nature, may be of less significance, because whether God was imputing sin to men's account in the patriarchal days or not, he is not imputing them now. Therefore, people are not currently being held under bondage. Praise God!

There is a lot more that I could say on this subject, but the spirit of the prophet is subject to the prophet. On that note I am going to end this teaching. Grace and peace be unto you from God our father and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

.=====.

These verses in Romans 5:12-19, explain Adam's sin. Adam's sin is contrasted with our righteousness through Jesus Christ. Verse 13 uses the concept of imputation of sin. It explains that the imputation of sin is parallel with the imputation of righteousness. Let's first look at the definition of imputation.

In the Bible Dictionary imputation is used to designate any action or word or thing as reckoned to a person. Thus in doctrinal language;

- (1). the sin of Adam is imputed to all his descendants, that is, it is reckoned as theirs, and they are dealt with therefore as guilty;
- (2). the righteousness of Christ is imputed to them that believe in him, or so attributed to them as to be considered their own; and
- (3). our sins are imputed to Christ, that is, he assumed our place, answered the demands of justice for our sins. In all these cases the nature of imputation is the same.

The dictionary explains that in Romans 5 the nature of imputation is the same whether it is the imputation of sin or the imputation of righteousness. Let's look a little further to see what natures of imputation are available.

To count something to somebody means to reckon something to a person, to put to his account, either in his favor or for what he must be answerable. When something is counted to somebody for something, it denotes that it is imputed to the person in a substitutionary manner.

Imputation is "to count, reckon", namely, unrighteousness (whether one's own or another's) to one's discredit; or righteousness (whether one's own or another's) to one's credit whether in man's account or in the judgment book of God.

Therefore, how can we say that "sin is not imputed when there is no law, means that God was not holding sin against men's account until the law of Moses, given that imputation of sin

means that the sins are reckoned as theirs, and they are dealt with therefore as guilty. Now, just because the sin is charged to our account, does not mean that the banker, God, has to collect on the debt until he decides to. For example, God decided to collect on the debt when God destroyed Sodom because of the sins of men before the Law Of Moses. God destroyed the whole world because he decided to collect on the debt before the law of Moses.

Now let us contrast personal sins to inherited sins.

According to the dictionary the nature of imputation in Romans 5 is the same, whether we are talking about imputation of sin or imputation of righteousness. Furthermore, imputation can be the result of our own sin or righteousness, or someone else's sin or righteousness. Clearly, the nature of righteousness in the text, is someone else's righteousness or inherited righteousness. Therefore, far more likely than not, the text is talking about someone else's sin or inherited sin. That is Adam's sin, inherited sin. In Romans 4 and 5 the concept of imputation is mentioned maybe as many as 10 times. Clearly, every time except one time in Romans 5:13, we agree that imputation, is talking about, counting to another person's account, either sin or righteousness. That is inherited sin or righteousness, It is only in Romans 5:13, that the idea of counting to one's own account is perceived. That is it is only in Romans 5:13 that the idea of personal sin, is interpreted by some. We say, God was not holding our personal sins against us before the Law of Moses.

I submit to you that the idea of counting sin to another person's account or inherited sin is what Romans 5:13 is addressing. The statement sin is not imputed when there is no law, is synonymous with saying inherited sin is not charged to men's account when there is no law. The text is not saying personal sins are not charged to men's account when there is no law. Nevertheless, the premise that God was not charging sin to men's account before the Law of Moses does imply that God was not charging personal sins to men's account before the law of Moses. Thus the principle, where there is no law there is no imputation goes array, because it is not clear that God was not imputing or charging personal sin to men's account before the law of Moses. Now, let us examine how the text could make sense if the imputation of sin is someone else's sin in Romans 5:13. To be more precise, there are many examples in the bible where God was charging personal sins to men's account before the Law of Moses.

For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

Exodus 20:5; 34:7.

Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me;

This is an example of imputation of sin after the law of Moses. This sin is credited to someone else's account. The text is saying that this type of imputation would not have been just if there was no law to the father. Thus this would not have occurred before the Law of Moses, because there was no law of Moses. Nevertheless, the imputation of sin, or inherited sin was visited

upon men before the law of Moses due to Adam breaking the law of God (do not eat). If there had not been a law to Adam, there would not have been an imputation of sin to us as a result of the sins of Adam. This is the heart of the text, "sin is not imputed when there is no law".

Crediting or charging sin to someone else's account, is a unique definition of imputation. Does, imputation in the principle, "but sin is not imputed when there is no law" in Romans 5:13, refer to sin being charged to the account of the person committing the sin, often called personal sins. Does it refer to sin being charged to someone else's account, often called inherited sin. Finally, does imputation here refer to both, the account of the person committing the sin as well as someone else's account, that is personal and inherited sins. I submit that the context makes it clear that imputation here refers to if there was no law to Adam, there would not have been any inherited sin as a result of the law to Adam. It does not refer to personal sins, as a result of the Law Of Moses. It does not say that if there was no law to us by the Law of Moses, there would not be any imputation of personal sins. The erroneous interpretation that if there was no Law Of Moses, personal sins would not be charged to men's account, comes from the reference of the Law Of Moses in verse 14, "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses". The usage of the word sin, in the principle, "sin is not imputed when there is no law", could very well be stated as, sin is not inherited when there is no law to the person committing the sin. This definition comes out of the context. Actually, there are many examples in the bible where sin was charged to the account of the sinner before the Law of Moses, which we will see shortly.

This concept that the sins of one man is charged to the account of another proceeds from the understanding that, of course it is just to charge sin to the account of the person committing the sin. We do not need to be told that that is true. However, the point that the text is making is that, it is unjust to charge sin to the account of someone that he represents if there is no law to the person committing the sin. It is unjust to charge sin to the account of the son if there is no law to the father, if there is no high-handed sin. This principle, proceeds in part from the principle that, when there is a law to transgress, violation or transgression of the law constitutes an, in your face, or high-handed sin attitude. This, in your face attitude, does not exist when the sin is unknown, uncertain, by accident or manslaughter. This difference is highlighted by the way we treat murder and manslaughter. So the concept indicates a difference between high-handed sin and unknown sin. This difference was also brought out by the fact that there was no personal sin offering for high-handed sin in the Old Testament.

Furthermore, Romans 2:12-14 focuses on God dealing with our personal sins before the law of Moses or during the patriarchal dispensation. It makes it clear that personal sin was charged to our account before the law of Moses. It goes on to say that God is justified in charging our personal sins to our account, "you are without excuse old man", because we have the law written on our hearts. The undisputable evidence of the fact that the law is written on our hearts is; we accuse others when they steal, kill and rape us, then we try to excuse ourselves when we do the same thing to them, just because there is no law. This is often categorized as getting off on a technicality. Therefore, we are inexcusable and will be judged accordingly. Our personal sins will be charged to our account whether or not there is a written or spoken law. After all, God counted sin to men's account before the law of Moses. For in Romans 5:4, in

reference to sin before the Law of Moses, God said "You are without excuse old man", whether you had a law written by Moses, a law written by God, or a law written on your heart, because in either case you knew. Knowing it what makes you personally liable.

While all in every generation have sinned, verse 14 shows that only the patriarchal dispensation is under consideration here. We know that during the time between Adam and Moses there were laws from God to which men were accountable, laws written on their hearts as well as direct positive commands. Others besides Adam, had positive laws during the patriarchal age. Where there is no law sin is not imputed. There must therefore have been a law during that period, because sin (inherited sin) was then imputed when Adam sinned. There must therefore have been a law during that period, because sin (personal sin) was then imputed when Cain slew Able. Cain was inexcusable even though he lacked a formal written law. Cain violated a moral law of God and killed Abel. God had warned him to deal with his feelings against Abel, for, as he said, "sin croucheth at the door". Be careful of how you treat your brother! Cain was not careful. He went to the other extreme and murdered his brother. Cain also violated God's laws concerning worship and sacrifice, which came, directly from the mouth of God, just as God's law to Adam did. God destroyed Sodom because of the sins of men before the Law Of Moses. God destroyed the whole world because he charged our personal sins to our account, before the Law of Moses. Any word spoken by God is law. God spoke to men directly and moral laws were written on our hearts. We are without excuse.

We have to be careful, how we build a doctrine around Romans 5:13. Which of us would say that God was unjust for charging sin to Cains's account and thus judging him? We would most assuredly be incorrect. After all in addition to punishing Cain with a punishment that was more than he could bear, God destroyed the whole world because of the personal sins of men before the Law of Moses. Therefore, how can we say that "sin is not imputed when there is no law" means personal sins were not charged to men before the law of Moses.

Imputation implies that a debt is owed. The fact that the bank does not choose to collect on the debt does not mean that the debt is excused. Our debt was excused when Jesus died on the cross. Again the only sin that is left is the sin of not accepting Jesus. Grace and peace unto you, from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.