



# F.A.C.S. REPORT

"A Monthly Newsletter on the Relevance of the Christian Faith."

Vol. 18, No. 4

©Copyright, 1999

April, 1999

## What's Inside:

*"As covenant theology has declined within the church, Christians have been left with the shallowest possible understanding of who they are, to what they have been called, and the terms that underlie their salvation. . . ."*

*"Dead men walking were only attractive to Asaph since he had jettisoned his faith in the covenant keeping God of Israel. . . ."*

*"The reason that apathy, pessimism and slothfulness are so much a part of Christendom's culture can be directly linked to the poor, if not non-existent, appreciation that most Christians have for the Covenant. Christendom has largely given up on the concept of justice, because it has refused to believe in a covenant that will have positive and negative ramifications. . . ."*

## DEAD MEN WALKING

by Murray McLeod-Boyle

**W**hen we look throughout Christendom today we are confronted by despondency and apathy. It seems that for many Christians, evil is triumphing in every sphere, and that the tide is running against them so fast that they are in danger of being swept away. Others, casually sit on the sidelines bewildered, and at a loss to explain the fuss.

So, why is Christendom in such a poor state? It is because *Christians have become enamoured with dead men walking.*

"Dead men walking" is a phrase applied to those on death row. It signifies that whilst the person is alive physically, they are dead legally. As perpetrators of crime, these people are sentenced to death by the law, and although the date of execution be future, they are considered, *ipso facto*, dead.

Such is the state of the covenant breaker before God. These people exist having had the sentence of death pronounced over them by the great Law-Giver. Although it has not been evidenced physically, they are nonetheless, dead men. To illustrate this

point, let us look at a rose. A person enters the garden and snips a stem from a rose bush. At the precise moment that the stem was severed, death was inevitable. We may even declare that the stem is dead. The bud may continue to open, but this is a masquerade. On the inside, cells are dead and decaying, life has stopped, and this will soon be evident to all who pass by.

Adam serves as a human, covenant, example. In the day that Adam ate the forbidden fruit, he died (Gen. 2:15-17). At the exact moment that Adam's fellowship with God was severed, he was dead. Although physical death was not immediate, Adam's covenant rebellion ensured that it would soon become a reality.

By transgressing the terms of the covenant, Adam lost fellowship with God. Consequently, he was cast out from God's presence, land, and life. Without these, Adam was consigned to death, physical and spiritual. Like the rose, Adam had the appearance of life, but this was a mere facade. The reality was that every part of his

being had been subjected to death and was in the process of decay.

Hence, the covenant breaker, like a lovely bunch of freshly picked flowers, can seem alluring. Externally, one smells a beautiful fragrance and beholds a beautiful scene. On the inside, however, there is death and putrefaction.

Herein lies the predicament for many Christians. As covenant theology has declined within the church, Christians have been left with the shallowest possible understanding of who they are, to what they have been called, and the terms that underlie their salvation. *It is for this reason that many Christians are seduced by dead men walking.* Stripped of any covenantal comprehension, the Christian is effectively left without a compass or "yardstick." Unable to steer the right course, or measure according to the correct standard, the gaze of many begins to wander, until they find themselves envious of dead men.

Accordingly, the church falters in its mission, as its members find themselves increasingly unable to distinguish between



F.A.C.S. REPORT is published monthly by the FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT of CHRISTIAN STUDIES, a nondenominational educational organization. A free six month subscription is available upon request. Donations are invited, and those who send a donation of \$25 or more will receive a full year's subscription. Foreign subscriptions: a minimum donation of \$35, payable in Australian currency, is required for a year's subscription. Cheques should be made payable to F.A.C.S.

FOUNDATION for the ADVANCEMENT  
of CHRISTIAN STUDIES  
P.O. Box 547  
Ferny Hills, QLD 4055  
Australia

See us on the World Wide Web at  
<http://facs.aquasoft.com.au/facs>  
E-mail: [facs@aquasoft.com.au](mailto:facs@aquasoft.com.au)

©Copyright, 1999. All material published in F.A.C.S. REPORT remains the property of its author.

Permission to reprint material from F.A.C.S. REPORT in any format, apart from short quotations for review purposes, must be obtained in writing from the copyright owner.

life and death; between the aroma of life (2 Cor. 2:14-16) and dead men walking.

## Asaph's Error

In Psalm 73, we find that the current situation is not new. Asaph states:

<sup>1</sup> Surely God is good to Israel, To those who are pure in heart! <sup>2</sup> But as for me, my feet came close to stumbling; my steps had almost slipped. <sup>3</sup> **For I was envious of the arrogant, as I saw the prosperity of the wicked.** <sup>4</sup> For there are no pains in their death; And their body is fat. <sup>5</sup> They are not in trouble as other men; nor are they plagued like mankind. <sup>6</sup> Therefore pride is their necklace; the garment of violence covers them. <sup>7</sup> Their eye bulges from fatness; the imaginations of their heart run riot. <sup>8</sup> They mock, and wickedly speak of oppression; they speak from on high. <sup>9</sup> They have set their mouth against the heavens, and their tongue parades through the earth. <sup>10</sup> Therefore his people return to this place; And waters of abundance are drunk by them. <sup>11</sup> And they say, "How does God know? And is there knowledge with the Most High?" (NASB)

Fundamentally, the source of the problem, then and now, is the same — *dead men walking seem attractive*. All too often, the children of the covenant are lured by the *seeming* prosperity of the rebellious. By losing the

ability to discern covenantally, they begin to be attracted to numerous types of activities which are out of step with the will of God. Instead of seeking life, they become enamoured with death.

Asaph states, that he "was envious of the arrogant, as (he) saw the prosperity of the wicked." He notes that he had watched these people carefully. He understood their haughtiness, had contemplated their *seeming* ease of life, and had realised that they were insolent toward God.

In every way Asaph had made a careful study of these people; so much so that he could summarise by saying, "Behold, these are the wicked; and always at ease, they have increased in wealth." So intoxicated was Asaph with these people, that he found himself on the brink of ruination (v., 2). In his stupor, he came to despise righteousness, saying, "Surely in vain I have kept my heart pure, and washed my hands in innocence." In the eyes of this despondent soul, a righteous life was worthless when compared to the way of the rebellious.

If this situation was possible in Asaph's day, the question must be asked, how alluring are the wicked in our day?

Relatively speaking, we may say that they are just as attractive as ever, *but only if we make the same covenantal error that Asaph made!* Asaph had forgotten the covenant with God. He had failed to remember that the covenant, based on the Character of Him who imposed it, was established in righteousness (Jer. 9:23-24). He had failed to remember that this covenant unto righteousness carried with it the recompense of blessing and curse, *a recompense that would be realised in both time and eternity.*

Dead men walking were only attractive to Asaph since he had jettisoned his faith in the covenant keeping God of Israel. Once Asaph had jettisoned this belief, he also abandoned any hope of justice in the world. Consequently, he became envious of the covenant breakers, for they gained much through deceit. Moreover, they *seemed* to get away scot-free with all their wretched acts. In such a world the righteous lived in

hellish misery whilst the wicked prospered in quiet ease.

It is important for us to note this lesson. When God is believed to be an impersonal distant reality, rather than a personal, omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, Covenant keeping God, the whole world unravels.

The god of the deists and natural law theorists, was largely impotent, hence, reverence for him waned. Why? Because men quickly realised that if god was "watching from a distance," like an uninterested spectator, he neither gave thought to man, nor cared what man thought of him. Nor was this god about to concern himself with the affairs of man, or rouse himself out of his armchair in order to secure justice.

In contrast, belief in a Covenant keeping God, means belief in a God that cares. It means swift retribution against covenant breakers, and reward for those who seek God (Heb., 11:6). The orphan, the widow, and the fatherless, will have a champion who will step eagerly into the arena on their behalf. For in this world, the everywhere Present One sees the acts of men; the all Knowing One differentiates between right and wrong; whilst the all Powerful One will give recompense to each man's deeds. As these three are One, it means that God will act, and act now!

When God's covenant with man is understood a wonderful transformation takes place. This world is filled with light, not darkness; there is hope, not despair, there is purpose instead of chance; and the existence of dead men walking is repulsive!

This is exactly what Asaph discovered:

<sup>16</sup> When I pondered to understand this, It was troublesome in my sight.

<sup>17</sup> Until I came into the sanctuary of God; Then I perceived their end. <sup>18</sup>

Surely Thou dost set them in slippery places; Thou dost cast them down to destruction. <sup>19</sup> How they are destroyed in a moment! They are utterly swept away by sudden terrors!

<sup>20</sup> Like a dream when one awakes, O Lord, when aroused, Thou wilt despise their form.

The prosperity of the wicked was beyond Asaph, that was, until he was still and beheld the wonder of God. In the quietness of the sanctuary, with all the signs and symbols of covenant



salvation staring him in the face, he remembered Yahweh's covenantal faithfulness. Faced with the truth of being included in the covenant of life, Asaph saw vividly that those whom he had envied were as cut flowers. Yes, they may have been fat; they may have been prosperous, but they were ultimately dead men. Their fat only hid their inner decay. Their wild imaginations only served to hide their conscious rebellion, whilst their 'talking big' was only a poor attempt to justify themselves and drown out their own death screams.

When Asaph remembered the covenant, he was equipped with the right 'yard stick' with which to measure True Values. When he applied this 'yard stick' to those whom he had envied, he realised that the hand of Yahweh was against them. When their way of life was compared to that prescribed in the covenant, Asaph understood that they had been cast down to destruction with the full weight of God's retributive justice upon them. In the light of Yahweh's righteousness, these covenant rebels were utterly consumed. Their pathetic lives were exposed, not as care-free and pleasant, but as full of "sudden terrors" which plagued them at every turn (cf. Amos 5:18-20).

Therefore, the child of promise makes a grave error if he believes that dead men have anything to offer him. When the covenantal birthright is forgotten, the child of promise has started down the road to selling it for a mess of pottage. Esau did it; Asaph contemplated it; and many Christians today have failed to learn from their examples.

Here in a nutshell we have the diagnosis of the modern church. The reason that apathy, pessimism and slothfulness are so much a part of Christendom's culture can be directly linked to the poor, if not nonexistent, appreciation that most Christians have for the Covenant. *Christendom* has largely given up on the concept of justice, because it *has refused to believe in a covenant that will have positive and negative ramifications, here and now*. This is supported empirically by an examination of those denominations, typically Arminian, that

deny the covenant. In such places, belief in real, God ordained justice is abandoned. As a result they become hotbeds of pessimism and "social" justice. Here, Christians diligently deal out soup to dead men, confirming them in their rebellion, whilst they patiently wait to be raptured from this hellish world that God has seemingly forgotten.

### God's Justice in Time and Space

If Christians today were to put on their covenant spectacles, the allurements of dead men would dissolve before their eyes. For the first time, God's activity, both to curse and to bless, would be evident.

One deficiency in covenant understanding comes to us in *the myth of neutrality*. God's covenant with man manifests itself in either life or death. There is blessing for obedience, and curse for disobedience (Dt., 30:15-20). In this respect the covenant is like a coin — two sides to the one object.

Sadly, Christians, through covenant denial, have adopted an unbiblical approach in which they identify three covenantal groups. This aberration posits that it is possible for people to be covenantally neutral, and is best described as *the principle of the good, the bad and the ugly*. Tragically, this error in doctrine tears the heart out of the theology of recompense so clearly taught in the covenant. By establishing three groups of people, 'the myth of neutrality,' forces the theology of recompense to become an eschatological unknown.<sup>1</sup>

Hence, many Christians condemn themselves to living a life of misery because they deny that God will act here, now, today, to give reward to the faithful and pour out vengeance upon the rebellious.

#### A. Penalties: Natural and Positive.

Speaking of the punishment of sin, Berkhof states:

*The Bible abundantly testifies to the fact that God punishes sin in both this*

*life and in the life to come. . . . A rather common distinction applied to the punishments for sin, is that between natural and positive penalties. There are punishments which are the natural results of sin, and which men cannot escape, because they are the natural and necessary consequences of sin. . . . The slothful man comes to poverty, the drunkard brings ruin upon himself. . . . the fornicator contracts a loathsome and incurable disease, and the criminal is burdened with shame and . . . finds it extremely hard to start a new life. . . . But there are also positive penalties, and these are punishments in the more ordinary and legal sense of the word. They presuppose not merely natural laws of life, but a positive law of the great Lawgiver with added sanctions. They are not penalties which naturally result from the nature of the transgression, but penalties which are attached to the transgressions by divine enactments. They are superimposed by the divine law, which is of absolute authority. It is to this type of punishment that the Bible usually refers. This is particularly evident in the Old Testament. . . . And though many of the civil and religious regulations of this law were . . . intended for Israel only, *the fundamental principles which they embody also apply in the New Testament dispensation*. In a Biblical conception of the penalty of sin we shall have to take into account both the natural and necessary outcome of wilful opposition to God and the penalty legally affixed and adjusted to the offense by God.<sup>2</sup>*

The affirmation of God's present justice in accordance with His law is good. Berkhof adds to the present confusion, however, by stepping outside a covenant framework.

In particular, we need to be aware of the emphasis placed on nature or natural law. Unfortunately, writers of Berkhof's age had been lured by this false thought and consequently failed to drive the theological nail all the way home. In the above quotation we see that the great "Lawgiver" seems only to be concerned with "positive" penalties. Hence, in this interpretation, the righteousness of God only comes to the fore in laws to which He, by divine prerogative,

1. In this scheme there are tears, wheat and look-alikes, God being the only One who knows which is which.  
2. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1939), 255, 256. Italics added.



has attached a penalty. For the rest, we are at the whim of an unknown, indistinguishable, natural force which prowls around seeking out bad guys?!

This false dichotomy cannot be allowed to remain. In permitting the term “natural penalties” to stand, we must state categorically that it is God who has ordained all such punishment. This means that penalties, positive and natural, all flow from one source—our Sovereign, Covenantal, God. Therefore, whether a court imposes a sentence or a sentence be imposed supernaturally, it all comes from God’s sovereign hand because of a transgression of His covenant law (Rom., 13:1-5).

Scripture’s testimony at this point is clear.<sup>3</sup> In the Pentateuch a covenant, particularly God’s covenant with Israel, is spoken of as being “cut.”<sup>4</sup> Likewise, the same root is used of God’s prescribing certain punishments for covenant transgression, namely that the offender should be “cut off.”<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, the process of ‘cutting’, used in Scripture for both the establishment of a covenant and the punishment of a covenant transgressor is significant. The term “cut” is applied for at least two reasons. Firstly, in establishing a covenant, it was not uncommon for people to cut themselves in order to blend their blood.<sup>6</sup> This symbolically displayed the new binding relationship that had been entered into. Secondly, if two objects have been joined as one, then they can only be separated by a “cut,”

hence the ritual of severing an animal.

Therefore, the cutting of a covenant brings to the fore the blessedness of the relationship, but also warns of the penalty for transgression of the covenant terms.

Now the burning question is, what does it mean to be ‘cut off?’

Nowhere is this term explained. Consequently, answers to this question are many and varied. Therefore, to move forward we must look at the various places where this term is used. When this examination is completed and the information has been sifted, the only reasonable conclusion is that it constitutes a negative sanction directly imposed upon the rebel by the hand of God. Typically, we would even expect that it would involve the premature death of the individual concerned.<sup>7</sup>

Now that we have considered the Biblical evidence, we are able to see that ascribing certain penalties to some unknown act of nature is futile. Scripture shows conclusively that God is concerned with covenant rebellion and that He will actively pursue those who escape human detection or human liberality.<sup>8</sup>

These things stated, let us look at a modern example of God’s judgment being directly unleashed against covenant rebellion.

### **B. Homosexuality and AIDS.**

Why AIDS and homosexuality? For two very specific reasons: In the first instance, it is a very relevant topic in our day.<sup>9</sup> Secondly, the imminent nature of God’s retributive jus-

tice is nowhere taught more clearly than in Romans 1:18-32, where homosexuality is highlighted.

In the aforementioned passage, the Apostle opens his tirade against profligates, with the words, “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness ...” As clear as these words are, they are nonetheless a very bitter pill for some Christians to swallow.

Therefore, in order to escape this teaching people must either:

1. Deny the validity of this Scripture altogether (atheism, liberalism), or;
2. They must deny the direct (covenantal) link between action and recompense, and therefore, unwittingly, come to believe in blind fate.

The first option is of little concern for us. Option two, however, is a different story. In the second option we see epitomised the very lack of covenant understanding that robs Christians of any ability to discern. Consider the following secular statement that highlights the confusion that arises when the covenant is ignored: “But some people still believe that AIDS is the ‘wrath of God’ — that God has punished particular groups of people, like gay men, for sinning. Other religious people hold to the doctrine of ‘love the sinner, hate the sin’.”<sup>10</sup>

If we dismiss “God’s wrath” as an outmoded or irrelevant concept, then we immediately dismiss any notion of retributive justice based on the

3. It is a pity that the English versions obscure this by translating the term differently. In Genesis 15:18 the Hebrew reads, The day that **cut** Yahweh to Abram a covenant. The English translations read: NASB— On that day the Lord *made* a covenant with Abram. NIV— On that day the LORD *made* a covenant with Abram. KJV— In the same day the LORD *made* a covenant with Abram. RSV— On that day the Lord *made* a covenant with Abram. NKJV— On the same *day* the Lord *made* a covenant with Abram.
4. See: Gen., 15:18; Ex., 24:28; 34:10; Dt., 4:23; 5:2; 28:69 (29:1 Eng.) 29:11, 13, 24 (29:12, 14, 25 Eng.)
5. See: Gen., 9:11; 17:14; Ex., 12:15, 19; 30:33, 38; 31:14; Lev., 7:20, 21, 25, 27; 17:4, 9, 14; 18:29; 19:8.
6. R. J. Rushdoony, *Systematic Theology* (Vallecito, CA, 1994), I:374.
7. See: G.J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT, Ed. R.K. Harrison; Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988) 285.; M. McLeod-Boyle, *When Gay means Hurting*, FACS Report, Vol. 16; No. 4; April 1997. Also available at: <http://majesty.aquasoft.com.au/facs/files/Apr97.html>.
8. We must understand that Berkhof’s distinction between natural and positive penalties is not defective. It is his divorcing the natural penalty from the “Lawgiver” that creates the dilemma.
9. Certainly, a lot of the initial hysteria has subsided, but when the 12<sup>th</sup> World AIDS Conference (1998) announces that 30 million people are HIV positive, and that 12 million people have died from AIDS, it is still very applicable. “UNAIDS and WHO have estimated that there are currently 30.6 million people living with HIV/AIDS, of whom 5.8 million were newly infected during 1997 ... This amounts to 16 000 new infections per day. Since the beginning of the epidemic it is estimated that 12.9 million adults and children have developed AIDS; 11.7 million of them have died from AIDS.” World Health Organisation, *Weekly Epidemiological Record* (Vol., 72, No. 48. 28 November 1997, 357-364), 359.
10. Ewan Armstrong, *Understanding Social Issues: The Impact of AIDS* (Ed. Margaret Fagan; London; Aladdin Books, 1990), 29.



covenantal premise. This is very acceptable to many Christians because it supposedly shows God as all loving and compassionate. What the Christian "love doctors" fail to realise is that their doctrine turns God into nothing less than a despotic monster. Rather than being full of love and compassion, God becomes something akin to a psychotic sadomasochist who inflicts pain and suffering for no particular reason.

Remember, the Apostle states that "God's wrath is revealed from heaven," against whom? Anybody? Everybody? Somebody? No! God's wrath is "revealed against all ... men, who suppress the truth in unrighteousness." In short, the out pouring of God's wrath in our day comes to specific targets. God does not float around on the clouds, throwing curses overboard in some haphazard manner without any regard for whom they may fall upon.<sup>11</sup> Instead, God targets specific covenant infractions.

Therefore, in Paul's opening comment, he establishes three vital points:

1. He identifies that God's wrath is currently revealed from heaven;<sup>12</sup>
2. He identifies those upon whom God's wrath falls— suppressers of the truth; and,
3. He identifies the cause of the wrath, namely covenant transgression.

The question that arises is, what was suppressed in order that God's wrath should be revealed? The answer: they sought to suppress God Himself.

This, then, is the watershed which conclusively proves that God's action is grounded in the covenant. At the forefront of Paul's thought is the fact that these rebellious ones have actively denied any relationship with, or allegiance to, God. Did they know that they had a relationship

with God and that they were accountable to God? Yes, they did! Why? Because the knowledge of God, and His requirements of man,<sup>13</sup> had been made known to them by God Himself (v.,19). Both from within and from without (v., 20), these people were saturated with a divine knowledge that made them completely aware of their covenantal obligations. Rather than yielding to the covenant, they chose to willfully ignore it, and thereby plunged themselves into idolatry.

To this point, Paul has shown that God revealed His wrath against idolaters; against those who suppressed the truth about God, despite knowledge to the contrary. Now we must qualify one important issue: when Paul moves into verse 24 ff., is he defining idolatry, or is he pointing to a further judgment? Commonly, Christians understand Paul to be defining idolatry. This theory fits very well with 'the myth of neutrality', and the "love the sinner, hate the sin" approach, however, it is not supported by the text.

Paul's argument clearly indicates that homosexuality is itself a further judgment. In other words, homosexuality is not a form of idolatry, but rather a condemnation applied for continued and persistent idolatry.<sup>14</sup>

Paul begins verse 24 with an "inferential conjunction",<sup>15</sup> which can be best translated as "therefore." The effect that this conjunction has is to bring all the threads of Paul's thoughts together and to apply them. Hence, we read that, as a result of their idolatry, "God gave them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, that their bodies might be dishonored among them." Further, verse 26 begins with the preposition *dia*;, which, in the accusative, indicates the reason for something. With the use of *dia* at this point, Paul introduces a further judgment upon idolatry.

If we were to paraphrase Paul's argument it would result in something akin to:

<sup>18</sup> God's wrath is *presently* revealed from heaven against covenant rebels, for suppressing the truth; <sup>19</sup> this is because God had placed the knowledge of Himself in them and had explained it to them; <sup>20</sup> furthermore, these people have no excuse, because the created order testifies to the attributes of God constantly; <sup>21-23</sup> Knowing that they should worship God, they refused. Becoming fools, they turned the created order upside down and became idolaters of the worst kind; <sup>24</sup> As a consequence, God handed them over to judgment, which was that they would be governed by the unclean desires of their hearts,<sup>16</sup> and thereby degrade their bodies with each other; <sup>25</sup> Remember, this is because they rebelled against God and did not worship Him as they knew they ought; <sup>26</sup> As a further consequence of their idolatry, God handed them over to the passions of the animals they had begun to worship.

Thus, these idolaters were condemned, not only to be ruled by their desires, but to be ruled by desires that were base and nefarious. This includes overturning the created order for sexual experience, with the result that people became homosexuals instead of heterosexuals. However, for this perversion they reap in their own bodies a negative recompense.

The strong negative connotation of Paul's statement is heightened by the double use *paredōken*, translated as "gave them over." This verb has a judicial nuance to it, and is often used of a person either being handed to a court to be tried, or of a person being incarcerated, or punished; thus underscoring the tone of judgment so clarion in this passage.<sup>17</sup>

In essence then, we may say that idolatry is the crime, and the ruling of the body by base (sexual) desires, the

11. If God's wrath is not directed for a reason, then we are left with nothing less than fate. We are once more in the world of the deist and natural law theorist— a world without justice or hope!
12. As far as the Apostle is concerned it is a present activity. Not eschatological or teleological, but present. God's retributive justice in time and space is thus firmly established.
13. Cf. WSC Q & A 3; WLC Q & A 5; and Micah 6:8.
14. "In verse 24 the apostle deals with the divine retribution upon this apostasy. "Wherefore" indicates that the retribution finds its ground in the antecedent sin and is a just infliction for the sin committed." John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols., NICNT, Ed., F. F. Bruce, Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., (one volume edition 1968), 1959), I:43.
15. Walter Bauer, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
16. In other words rational, sober thought would cease: whim and fancy would reign.



punishment. Therefore, homosexuality, as one form of bodily degradation, is a hellish misery that is lived out in this life.

The story thus far is very sobering, yet it remains unfinished. In Romans 1:28-32, the Apostle concludes by telling us that God has also "given them over" to a depraved mind. This further judgment results in a basic recklessness. It is beyond the scope of this article to look at all the vices listed here, however, we are very interested in the consequence of this judgment. When all is said and done, these people are reckless for two reasons. Firstly, they know that God has condemned them for their actions, yet they continue to practice them. Secondly, not only are they content to continue their own wretched acts, but they are willing to stand on the sidelines and cheer on others who do the same.

In summary then, we see that the Apostle Paul clearly establishes that God does issue forth His judgment against covenant rebellion in our day. Not only does God reveal His wrath against basic idolaters, but he adds further sanctions to those who are hardened in their rebellion. In this sense the Apostle outlines three particular judgments:

a. The ruling of the body by desires that are unclean, so as to degrade the body;

b. The imposition of base desires, particularly in a sexual sense, and;

c. The imposition of a depraved mind, which will engage in things that are not proper.

When these three judgments are placed together, we see that there is a total condemnation of the person. This is because each judgment feeds the next, so as to trap the offender in a vicious circle. The desires of the heart, the passion of the flesh, and the rational thought of the mind, are all condemned to futility. Consequently, people in this position live life on the edge: knowing they stand on the precipice, their only thought is how to inch closer to the brink. Does this sound familiar? It should. It is the life of the homosexual in summary.

## Conclusion

It has been our purpose to try and encourage Christians to believe that their God is a covenantal God. That is to say, that God has, does, and will, deal with His creation in accordance with His covenant stipulations.

The church has too long cowered in the corner because it has lost this vital key which opens the door to its armoury. Christians have committed Asaph's error, and it is time that we stood in God's sanctuary and pondered the truth as he did. For only in

His light will we truly see that the Christian *lives a far superior life*, compared to *the mere existence* of dead men walking.

Belief in the covenant is vital to the Christian's faith. Consider, just for a moment, the issue of prayer. If we do not hold to the covenant, then prayer is shackled. For how can we cry to God for justice, if their is not a belief in one who will hear *and act*? Why ask God to rebuke error and evil, if *He has ordained only to do this in the eschaton*?

The truth is that most Christians implicitly believe in God's covenantal dealing with man, or else they would not pray, read Scripture, or sing praise. Our purpose has been to encourage God's people to explicitly believe in the covenant. To cause Christians to become self conscious, both in their subscription to, and application of, the covenant.

If Christians will, by God's grace, awaken to a full and self conscious belief in the covenant that man has with God, then Christendom shall be strong.

---

17. *paradindomi*: "b. hand over, turn over, give up a person (as a ...of police and courts 'hand over into (the) custody (of)'" Bauer, 614.; "1. This word is common in the passion story for the handing over of Jesus, e.g., by Judas in Mk. 14:10, by the Sanhedrin to Pilate in Mk. 15:1, by Pilate to the people's will in Lk. 23:25 and to the soldiers for execution in Mk. 15:15. There are parallels in other trials (cf. Mt. 10:17; Acts 12:4). 2. The word has a similar sense in the formula "to hand over to Satan" in 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Tim. 1:20. Paul probably adopted this phrase; the idea that Satan executes divine judgment is in accord with Jewish belief." (Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich, Gerhard, Editors. *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Abridged in One Volume*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.)