



## Scriptures and Doctrine :: Pleading the Blood?

**Pleading the Blood? - posted by murdog (), on: 2006/6/15 12:01**

SI members,

I hear different people when they pray, pleading the blood over people, homes, belongings, etc. Is this scriptural? If yes, could you please cite examples.

Murray

**Re: Pleading the Blood?, on: 2006/6/15 14:00**

Stever responds:

Scriptural Grounds for Pleading the Blood of Jesus

There are some Christians and denominations that attack this form of prayer. They ask where in Scripture is there proof that we can use this kind of prayer for either protection or deliverance when we really need it. There was no evidence that at the early apostles ever pled the blood to heal, to cast out demons or to get God's basic protection on them.

I believe that there are three things contained in the Blood of Jesus – forgiveness, deliverance and protection. Most Christians only know about the first one – forgiveness. They have no idea that there are two other things available to them that will enable them to live a victorious and overcoming life in Jesus while still living down here on this earth. I will briefly discuss each of these three things.

### 1. Forgiveness

As Christians, we all know that there is definitely forgiveness in the Blood of Jesus. This is the basic central message of true Christianity – that God the Father sent His one and only begotten Son Jesus Christ down to our earth in the flesh to physically die on a cross in order to give us total and permanent forgiveness for all of our sins.

Without Jesus dying and shedding His blood on that cross – there would be no forgiveness and no remission of any of our sins. Here are some extremely powerful verses from Scripture specifically telling us this:

"For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matthew 26:28)

"In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace." (Ephesians 1:7)

"But now in Christ Jesus you who were far off have been made near by the blood of Christ." (Ephesians 2:13)

"For the life of the flesh is in the blood ... for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul." (Leviticus 17:11)

Notice the emphasis on the word "blood" in those verses. There is no question that in these verses and others in the Bible that the blood that Jesus shed on the cross, which caused His physical death, is what leads to our salvation, the forgiveness of all of our sins and entrance into heaven when we die and cross over.

### 2. Deliverance

Now what then are the Scriptural grounds that will give us the legal right to be able to use His Blood when taking on any attacks that may come our way? As you will see in the following testimonies – you can Plead the Blood of Jesus against specific types of attacks such as attacks from demons, any kind of physical disease or illness, any kind of addictions to drugs or alcohol, etc.

Many Christians are not aware of this second component that is in the Blood of Jesus which entitles us to be able to use His Blood to go on the offensive against any adversity that may come our way.

Something else happened that day when Jesus died on the cross for all of our sins. The Bible tells us that Jesus also defeated Satan and all of the powers of darkness that day! Here are some specific Scripture verses proving this point for you:

"... that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." (Hebrews 2:14)

"He has delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Colossians 1:13)

"Having disarmed principalities and powers, He made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in it." (Colossians 2:15)

"For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil." (1 John 3:8)

"And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, and they did not love their lives to the death." (Revelations 12:11)

What defeated Satan and all the powers of him and his demons? The physical death of Jesus on the cross. And what did Jesus do when He died that day on the cross for us? He shed His Blood!

That is why Pleading the Blood of Jesus works so well in real life combat situations when it really is needed to defeat attacks that come against us from the dark side.

Many Christians are not aware of this fact about the Blood of Jesus – that the blood can also be used to engage with our enemies when they do try and launch an attack against us. I believe that all of the above Scripture verses definitely tell us that the blood that Jesus shed that day on the cross has totally defeated Satan and all of his dark powers.

The only thing remaining is for Christians to realize and grab a hold of this powerful truth and not to be afraid to use when they need it – especially when demons or other evil humans attempt to come against them with any unjust actions or attacks.

Here are four more powerful verses from Scripture showing that all Christians now have God's power and anointing at their disposal to use when they need it against the dark side:

"Behold, I give you the authority to trample on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you." (Luke 10:19)

Notice in that verse we have God's power over all the power of our enemies – not just against part of their powers. This means we have the ability to come out completely victorious in some of life's battles and struggles – but only if we learn how to use what is available to us.

"Then He called His twelve disciples together and gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases. He sent them to preach the kingdom of God and to heal the sick." (Luke 9:1)

Notice in this verse that Jesus gives the twelve apostles power over all demons – not just some of them. If we have God's power available to us to defeat all demons – then I believe that we also have God's power to defeat any and all humans that may try to come against us with any type of unjust action or attack.

"... but the people who know their God shall be strong, and carry out great exploits." (Daniel 11:32)

"Knowing their God" means that we have spent quality time in establishing a personal intimate relationship with God. If we do that, then this verse is telling us that God will strengthen and empower us when we need His power to be able to carry out great exploits and great adventures for Him.

"For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong on behalf of those whose heart is loyal to Him." (2 Chronicles 16:9)

This verse is telling us that God is actually looking for people that He can anoint with His power – but the implication appears to be that He really cannot find too many people who are willing to pay the price to be able to really walk with His anointing.

As you can see from the way all of the above verses are worded out, true Christianity is not a weak, wimpy or passive religion. As born-again believers, we all have the Holy Spirit literally living and dwelling on the inside of us. As a result of our bodies now becoming the temple in which He now lives in, His supernatural power is available to all of us in order to help us handle some of the storm clouds that this life can throw at us.

Learning how to properly Plead the Blood of Jesus for any deliverance or protection that you may need is just one part of your arsenal. I will be doing other articles in the future covering some of the other aspects on this part of our walk with the Lord.

### 3. Protection

As you will see in the next section, you can also Plead the Blood of Jesus on specific things like your body, your house, your car, your finances, etc. The goal is to Plead the Blood on those things in order to protect you before any kind of adversity should come your way.

If the above verses are showing us that we can Plead the Blood of Jesus on attacks that may have already come our way when we need God's deliverance and/or healing power to get us out of a dire predicament – then I believe it only stands to reason that we can also go one step further with the Blood of Jesus – and that is to use it for protection before any actual attacks could come our way.

In this case – you simply Plead the Blood of Jesus on whatever you want God's full protection on before any attacks could possibly come your way.

I believe that there is also something else in the Bible that gives us another clue that entitles us to be able to Plead the Blood for this specific purpose. In the Old Testament, God the Father had it arranged with His chosen people – the Jews – that in order for them to be able to enter into a covenant relationship with Him – they had to have some kind of "temporary covering" for their sins. Jesus had not come yet – so there was no full remission for any sins that had occurred back at that time

What God the Father had set up was the sacrifice of blemish free animals such as bulls, goats and lambs. Their blood had to be shed once per year on what was called the day of atonement. The shedding of these animals' blood was what gave the Jewish people a "temporary covering" for their sins so as to enable them to enter into a covenant relationship with God the Father.

That is why Jesus is called the "Lamb of God." He is an extension of the lambs used by His Father in the Old Testament to give the Jewish people the temporary covering for their sins. Once Jesus had shed His own blood on the cross – there was no more need for any more animal sacrifices. His death on the cross had completed and fulfilled what His Father started in the Old Testament with the sacrifice of these animals.

Now watch this analogy. In the shedding of the lamb's blood on the day of atonement – there was temporary forgiveness for the sins of the Jewish people. Then Jesus comes in the New Testament and the shedding of His blood now gives all believers complete and total forgiveness for all of their sins.

Now here is where I feel that something else occurred back in the Old Testament that may entitle us to be able to use the Blood of Jesus for protection. In the story of the Passover, God had sent His servant Moses to rescue the children of Israel out from underneath their bondage and captivity to the Egyptians. God had thrown ten whopper plagues at the Pharaoh in an effort to get him to release His people from his rule.

On one of those plagues – God tells Pharaoh that He is going to allow an angel of death to come through their camp to kill all of their firstborn children. However, before God sets all of this up to occur – He tells His people to shed the blood of a blemish free lamb and to put that shed blood on the doorposts and lintels of their houses.

God tells His people that the angel of death will bypass their house if he sees this shed blood put on their doorposts and lintels. This angel of death will thus not kill any of the Israelites' firstborn – but only if he sees the blood properly applied to the doorposts and lintels of their houses.

In other words, the blood of this blemish free lamb was being used for protection before this attack would come their way. Had each person not properly applied the blood on their doorposts – their firstborn children would have been killed along with the rest of the firstborn of the Egyptians.

Here is my argument on this. If the shed blood of the Old Testament lambs used for the temporary forgiveness and covering of sins eventually leads to the shedding of Jesus' blood for permanent and total forgiveness of all of our sins – can we also use that same analogy and say that the shed blood of the lamb used in the Passover for protection could also lead to the shed Blood of Jesus having protection in it?

I personally believe that the answer is yes, and that is why God the Father seems willing to honor any believer who will plead the blood on whatever he wants protection on before any attack can come their way – just like He did in the story of the Passover with His own chosen people.

Before I go into the specifics on how to Plead the Blood of Jesus – there is one more area that each Christian must make a decision on before God will give you His full protection.

#### Saved and Surrendered

In order to be able to Plead the Blood of Jesus for any kind of deliverance or protection that you may need – there are two requirements that must be met.

##### 1. Saved

You must be a saved and born again Christian. A non-believer cannot use the blood of Jesus. In the story of the Passover – only God's chosen people were allowed to apply the blood of the lamb on their doorposts to get His full protection on them.

It is the same in the New Testament. Only born again Christian believers can use the blood of Jesus. For those of you who are not saved and born again – there will be other articles on our site on what it means to become saved and exactly how to get saved if you decide that you want to turn from the kind of life that you have been living.

##### 2. The Full Surrender

For those of you who are already saved, there is now one more thing that you will all have to do to really get God's best to start to flow into your life – which will include getting His maximum protection on you and your life. And that is to be willing to make a full and complete surrender of your entire life over to God the Father.

You have to get both saved and surrendered in order to really be able to step from the dugout out on to the real playing field where the real walk with the Lord is at. God is wanting you to surrender four specific things to Him:

Your body

Your soul

Your spirit

Your entire life

The Bible tells us that we have three parts to our beings – body, soul and spirit. God wants all three parts of our being completely surrendered over to Him. The fourth thing that God will also want from you is for you to fully surrender your entire life over to Him. When I say entire life – I mean everything in your life.

If you are single – God will be choosing who your mate will be. He knows who is best for you – you do not. God will be choosing what your call or calls will be in Him as He knows what your true potential and capabilities are – you do not.

The Bible tells us that with the measure we use – will be the measure measured back to us. In other words, if you want God's best to flow into your life – then you have to give Him your best – and your best is a complete and full surrender of everything in your life over to Him. It's "your all" for "His all."

This right here is where many Christians are missing the boat with God. They are saved, but they are not walking in this full surrender with God the Father. As a result, God is not working full force in their lives. The only way to get God to start working full force in your life is to come under a complete and full surrender with Him.

Bottom line – God's knowledge and wisdom is perfect – yours is not! God can see into the future and knows exactly what is going to happen – you cannot. God knows you better than you can ever know yourself and as a result, He knows what your true potential and capabilities are – you do not.

Our powers are limited – but God's powers are not. The Bible tells us that God is all-powerful and that there is nothing that He cannot do. Nothing is impossible with God. Our faith is focused on Him, and Him alone. Even though our faith is nothing more than the size of a mustard seed, as long as it is focused on HIM and HIS power to do anything, we have all of the faith we need.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2006/6/15 14:06**

This is a great question. I have read a book on this subject of the blood and I believe Andrew Murray touches on this exact question of "pleading" the blood if I remember correctly. You can read the book online here:

**The Power of the Blood of Jesus by Andrew Murray**

<http://www.worldinvisible.com/library/murray/5f00.0572/5f00.0572.c.htm>

**Re: Pleading the Blood? - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/15 14:12**

Quote:

-----Is this scriptural? If yes, could you please cite examples.  
-----

No it is not scriptural and there are no scriptural examples. It is part of a pentecostal/charismatic notion that key words can automatically create protection. It is more in the nature of a magical incantation than a biblical pattern.

The key verse is 'when I see the blood I will pass over you'. This is God showing that 'the blood' is for his satisfaction and not some kind of spiritual insulation against evil powers.

Scripturally it means nothing. In practice it has become a way of Christians asking for God's protection. God is bigger than our words and will surely answer the heart cry but not because they used the magic words.

**Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2006/6/15 14:14**

The only concern I see is that loved ones forget that Christ is the Victory. So if people begin to get their hearts set on things, even wonderfully sacred things, GOD has put all things in Christ. We are in Christ and thus we have deliverance, victory, fellowship etc. Again, those are things or shadows, but He Himself is the substance of these.

Read Corinthians 1.30, it is a wonderful verse.

Also these are kind of helpful

1Jo 5:4 For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith  
1Jo 5:5 Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: Pleading the Blood?

Just my simple view, hope it helps :-D

### Re: Pleading the Blood? - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/15 14:55

murdog wrote:

Quote:  
-----I hear different people when they pray, pleading the blood over people,homes,belongings,etc. Is this scriptural? If yes, could you please cite examples.  
-----

Stever wrote:

Quote:  
-----Scriptural Grounds for Pleading the Blood of Jesus

There are some Christians and denominations that attack this form of prayer.  
-----

philologos wrote:

Quote:  
-----No it is not scriptural and there are no scriptural examples. It is part of a pentecostal/charismatic notion that key words can automatically create protection. It is more in the nature of a magical incantation than a biblical pattern.  
-----

This is funny :-o

Here we go:

### Re:, on: 2006/6/15 17:38

Stever's response:

Everyone has their own opinion about this. God is the one that knows our hearts. For years, when I was praying for salvation for loved ones and friends, I always asked that God would soften their hearts, open their eyes, and draw them to Him.

God answered my prayers, without ever letting me know that He provides a "New Heart", and that my prayer should have been for a "New Heart", and not a "soft Heart".

Pleading the blood is nothing more than another quiver that we have in our arsenal.

Some feel comfortable with it, and others do not. I am one who does feel comfortable with it and uses it often.

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S. I wonder if it has anything to do with Conservative and Liberal? Or--Baptized in the Holy Ghost (Spirit Filled) and Christian Brothers and Sisters that are not????

Stever wrote:Quote:

-----

Scriptural Grounds for Pleading the Blood of Jesus

There are some Christians and denominations that attack this form of prayer.  
-----

philologos wrote:Quote:

-----

No it is not scriptural and there are no scriptural examples. It is part of a pentecostal/charismatic notion that key words can automatically create protection. It is more in the nature of a magical incantation than a biblical pattern.

**Re: - posted by Nellie, on: 2006/6/15 18:23**

I have this Book, "The Power of the Blood of Jesus," and would encourage all that could do so, to print this, and read at your leisure.  
It is very good.  
Praise God for the Blood.  
God Bless  
Nellie

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/16 4:03**

Quote:  
-----Praise God for the Blood.  
-----

Amen, just don't try to use it as a weapon against the enemy. In scripture 'the blood' is a short hand term for 'the blood of the cross'; there was nothing 'magical' about Christ's physical blood. It is the worth of that life poured out in blood on the cross that reconciles us to God. To 'plead the blood' makes no more sense biblically than 'to plead the cross'. We do indeed 'plead the cross', Godwards, but NOT as a weapon of warfare Satan-wards.

Quote:  
-----I wonder if it has anything to do with Conservative and Liberal? Or--Baptized in the Holy Ghost (Spirit Filled) and Christian Brothers and Sisters that are not????  
-----

and for those who are still trying to 'find my box' I enjoy Pentecostal/Charismatic experience but not their theology! :-D

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/16 7:39**

Spirit of faith, come down, reveal the things of God,  
And make to us the Godhead known, and witness with the blood.  
Â'Tis Thine the blood to apply and give us eyes to see,  
Who did for every sinner die hath surely died for me.

No man can truly say that Jesus is the Lord,  
Unless Thou take the veil away and breathe the living Word.  
Then, only then, we feel our interest in His blood,  
And cry with joy unspeakable, Â"Thou art my Lord, my God!Â"

O that the world might know the all atoning Lamb!  
Spirit of faith, descend and show the virtue of His Name;  
The grace which all may find, the saving power, impart,  
And testify to all mankind, and speak in every heart.

*Charles Wesley*

This is a testimony; I don't claim it as *theology*.

Part of my childhood was in Africa, in an area where the gospel had been taken to oppose juju worship, in which sacrifices - say, a chicken, and its blood - were (are) left at little shrines, often under trees.

God gave me a dream, once (when I was still quite young), in which I knew that He was my God, and the gods amongst whom I had lived, had no power over me. Later in life, though, I was attacked spiritually (This has happened more than once.) and the only way I could break through (out of), the effect it had on me, was by the sense I was able to make of the meaning of the death of Christ, as the Lamb of God.

THIS (the death of Jesus Christ) is the sacrifice to end all sacrifices. THIS is the sacrifice which breaks the power of any other spiritual bond which is evil, or unholy, or Satanic, or through the willing practice of sin. It is *this* blood, applied to the stains on our souls, which is able to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. This is what the hymn which sings of the power in the blood, is about.

I agree that it is not a 'magic' formula which can be applied verbally without engaging with God, but, ***understanding*** the full scope of what Jesus was doing on the cross, is an essential part of victorious living in Christ. We have victory over sin because the Father sees His Son in us, and if we are walking in the light as He is in the light... 1 John 1:7.

So, to me, it has been most meaningful to mention the blood when I pray, not only for myself, but, in other situations. Personally, I believe it is part of the language which is understood by principalities and powers, and I have no trouble exercising my faith towards God, in the knowledge that He is the one who ordained that blood should be shed, for the cleansing of souls. The sacrifices under the Old Covenant, also had to do with first the Passover by the angel of death, and later, the consecration of places - the land, the temple, the nation.

It is important to KNOW that one has been cleansed from all unrighteousness, or, one can easily be taken over by the thought that *oneself* is responsible for the spiritual opposition one faces.... but this would be misapprehension of what's going on - unless one is *knowingly* harbouring a part of one's life to which the Lord has never been consciously invited. Then it may well continue to be troublesome, until one has capitulated to Him. By capitulating, I don't necessarily mean repenting. There are other needs which can interfere with our wholeness in God, which He can fix, if we ask Him to.

Stever said:

Quote:

-----the blood that Jesus shed on the cross, which **caused** His physical death,  
-----

I don't believe this. He did not bleed to death. The thieves did not bleed to death.

Also, when His side was pierced with the spear, blood and water came out *after* He had died. I realise this could be a red herring to this discussion, but, just wanted to state your assertion is not supported by scripture. This is not to detract from the efficacy of His death, in which there was indeed shedding of blood.

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/6/16 16:38**

Quote:

-----No it is not scriptural and there are no scriptural examples.  
-----

I believe there is basis in some aspect in Revelation 12:11, "For the Accuser of our brothers is cast down .. and they overcame Him because of the Blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony, and because they loved not their soul life even unto death."

That is, the Blood speaks to the accuser. He accuses, we testify to the Blood, The Spirit witnesses to the Blood, and the accuser is silenced.

Many can testify to this experience. It is not magical any more than calling on the Lord or any form of prayer or exercise of the spirit in quoting a verse or psalm or hymn, etc.

It is no more magical than the Lord saying, "It is written... begone Satan.."

Surely in some pentecostal circles this has been turned into a magical cure all and elixer and as most things are in those



circles, taken to wild extremes akin to making the sign of the cross to ward off vampires, but its misuse should not remove it from our arsenal of weapons of warfare as part of the sword of the Spirit.

"The Spirit answers to the Blood and tells me I am born of God"

How many spiritual facts and realities are for us to avail ourselves of and experience not by asking, but by declaring the divine facts and by speaking the truth. This is not magic, this is just testifying to the reality and relying on the Spirit to make it real in our experience as we go in faith.

For instance when we are under a sense of condemnation we can quote, "there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." As we do so, we are strengthened in our spirit.

It is more effective generally than throwing our ink bottle at the devil as Luther is known to have done.

Graftedbranch

**Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/6/16 16:49**

Quote:

-----I don't believe this. He did not bleed to death. The thieves did not bleed to death.  
-----

Amen Dorcas.

The blood did not flow out till they pierced His side after His death. Then flowed blood and water. He did bleed, of course, thorns in the brow, nails in the hands. lashes on the back. Of course He bled. But He laid down His own Life of His own accord and said, "Father, Into thy hands I commend My spirit".

Graftedbranch

**Re: By His Stripes we are healed!, on: 2006/6/17 4:33**

Stever posts again on this issue:

When I pray for a sick person, after I have anointed them with oil and lay hands on them---many times I pray the promises in God's Word.

During my prayer, I will mention the promise--"John, as it says in God's Word, by his stripes we are healed, tonight we claim this promise found in God's Word for you. By Jesus's stripes you, John, are healed, from the top of your head to the tips of your toes, you are fully healed and restored. We thank you Father for your healing of John tonight, in advance, and we bless you for it, and praise your Holy Name.

Thank you Lord, in Jesus Name, the Name above all names, Amen".

1 Peter 2:24

"24. Who his own self bore our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S. There is no "magic" or any other kind of thing like that involved with this type of prayer. As Spirit filled, born again believers, we have access to the throne room of heaven, and the Holy Spirit is the one that empowers us to pray with boldness.

ness for the sick and dying. We have also been empowered with the power of attorney to use the Name, the Name above all names to use when we pray, the Name of Jesus Christ.

Our belief is in His (God's) power to do anything. It has nothing to do with our own puny faith. If we include God's promises, from His Word, it sometimes provides understanding to the one we are praying for with the smallest amount of faith (that of a mustard seed) of the power that God really has, the God that we are talking to and praying to that keeps all of our prayers in heaven, in golden vials, forever!

Rev 5:8

" 8. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints."

**Re: Pleading the Blood?, on: 2006/6/17 14:30**

Stever responds:

Various verses that testify to the power of the blood. In the Old Testament it offered a protection, a covering for sin. The entire time, over 1,500 years all of these sacrifices of animals was only a picture of the one time sacrifice of God Himself, on the Cross, for our sins.

Exodus 12:17

7. And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.

Exodus 12:13

11. And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are: and when I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.

Leviticus 17:11

12. For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.

New Testament references to the power of Christ's blood in the life of the believer:

1 John 6:7

7. But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

Hebrews 9:6-14

6. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God.

7. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people:

8. The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing:

9. Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience;

10. Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.

11. But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

12. Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

13. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of

the flesh:

14. How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

Hebrews 13:20

20. Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,

Hebrews 13:20 (Amplified Bible)

20. Now may the God of peace, who brought again from among the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, by the blood the everlasting agreement (covenant, testament).

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/18 13:08**

bro Stever

Quote:

-----During my prayer, I will mention the promise--"John, as it says in God's Word, by his stripes we are healed, tonight we claim this promise found in God's Word for you. By Jesus's stripes you, John, are healed, from the top of your head to the tips of your toes, you are fully healed and restored. We thank you Father for your healing of John tonight, in advance, and we bless you for it, and praise your Holy Name.

the reference you used here for the healing of our bodies by His stripes is out of context. in isaiah 53 the word says Christ was wounded for our iniquities and sins, so His blood atoned for that and we're healed in spirit. the matter of being healed in body is contingent on faith and obedience to God's instruction in response to a petition for such. Christ was healing people left and right before He was crucified because He obeyed the Father thereby glorifying Him and also the ones who were healed believed in that power in some measure or enough to be healed.

another thing i'm led to speak about is what is the spirit in which we go out and do these things? it seems to me that those who received healing got it instantaneously. i wonder if sometimes such prayer for healing are not answered immediately because even while the idea is noble, the intent is not to glorify God, but to make someone feel better, a God-centered vs a man-centred (humanistic) approach? When Christ healed, it was for the Father's glory, when we go out and seek to do the same, are we doing this in the same Spirit Christ did? or are we doing it for acclaim or for the humanistic aspect for neither one will cut it. let us let God show us the spirit in which we so move lest we become deceived and move in any other spirit other than one of glorifying the Father.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/18 13:59**

Quote:

-----i wonder if sometimes such prayer for healing are not answered immediately because even while the idea is noble, the intent is not to glorify God,

Jesus had compassion on the people He healed. He simply wanted them to be well again. Of course, this brings glory to the Father, but, I don't think anyone goes so far as to pray for healing *not* for the glory of God.

Am I naive? Does God heal under these circumstances? My faith doesn't stretch to praying for healing on the off-chance God will hear me. I know Him. I don't want to offer to pray unless I sense the Holy Spirit's prompting, also bringing the necessary faith for that circumstance.

Quote:

-----the matter of being healed in body is contingent on faith and obedience to God's instruction in response to a petition for such.

Surely the instruction comes first, then we pray, then the person experiences the healing. Or, by 'petition for such' do you

u mean you ask for instruction before you are willing to pray? (Which is the same as I am saying?)

In general, I don't think of healing as dependent on anything except the faith of the Son of God, Whose Word is Life; Who is Life.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/18 14:25**

hey sis Dorcas

Quote:  
-----Jesus had compassion on the people He healed. He simply wanted them to be well again. Of course, this brings glory to the Father, but, I don't think anyone goes so far as to pray for healing not for the glory of God.  
-----

yes Christ had compassion for the people yet in spite of this He sought to do only the Father's will, or better yet His compassion was not preeminent to the will of the Father but was channeled in such a way that God the Father was glorified. i agree in that you're not likely to find anyone who prays for healing not for the glory of God as you said but while this may not be prayed out loud or even in one's heart, but the spirit in which one seeks such may confirm this. one may not say this but in so doing the individual is moving in a spirit which is not seeking God's glory, knowingly or not.

Quote:  
-----Am I naive? Does God heal under these circumstances? My faith doesn't stretch to praying for healing on the off-chance God will hear me. I know Him. I don't want to offer to pray unless I sense the Holy Spirit's prompting, also bringing the necessary faith for that circumstance.  
-----

i think not and you bring about a good point in that we must listen for the prompting of the Holy Spirit to pray for such things. some would argue that common sense should say we should simply pray anyway but we must remember that everyone in the world has common sense in some measure but we are a different breed who should conduct ourselves differently because we are driven by something more than common sense, Holy Spirit. if we are prompted by Him to so pray, we can be sure it is coming from heaven and the Lord will supply whatever is needed to see the work through be it faith, power or otherwise.

Quote:  
-----Surely the instruction comes first, then we pray, then the person experiences the healing. Or, by 'petition for such' do you mean you ask for instruction before you are willing to pray? (Which is the same as I am saying?)  
-----

indeed the instruction must come (should have switched the order or qualified that statement) whether it be to make the petition repeatedly or the instruction to go to the person and pray with them or declare the healing in Christ's name.

Quote:  
-----In general, I don't think of healing as dependent on anything except the faith of the Son of God, Whose Word is Life; Who is Life.  
-----

well i'm reminded of the time in Nazareth wherein Christ could do no miracle because the people there had no faith. or do we consider healing and miracles separate things? :-? either way, if even He being of perfect faith couldn't do anything there, that speaks to the working of miracles also being dependant in some measure on our own faith. yet at the same time Christ's own faith is required. or maybe you mean we ought to have Christ's Faith rather than a faith from ourselves?

**Re: By His stripes we are healed!, on: 2006/6/18 16:52**

Stever responds to Ironman:

If I am praying "improperly" by claiming the promise that all sickness is/was healed by the stripes of Jesus Christ, then the following sicknesses, that were healed by prayer, given by my wife and myself to the Lord, tell an entirely different story:

1. Necrotizing Pancreatitis in a 60 year friend that I went to College with many years ago. The "healing" that has his doctors shaking their heads to this day, 4 years later.
2. Terminal brain cancer of a 6 year old boy
3. Healing of a knee with excruciating pain that had taken place over a 2 year period---that was scheduled for a 2nd surgery 3 days later (the surgery never had to take place). It was healed the very next day.

There are many other healings, all performed by Christ through the power of prayer, by: 1) the anointing of oil, 2) laying on of hands, 3) and claiming the promise found in 1 Peter 2:24 in specific intercessory prayer for each person that states by his stripes we are healed!

"24. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

Also, in Isaiah 53:5 "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

There is a lot of misunderstanding in the body of Christ in regards to Christ's work on the cross, and in His death and resurrection from the dead. Hopefully, the following will shed light on this issue for all those who are interested. The power of the blood is awesome, and removes the blot of sin, as well as cures the sickness from the lives of believers in Jesus Christ:

"BY HIS STRIPES WE ARE HEALED"

BRUCE R. REICHENBACH\*

## I. SICKNESS AND SIN IN SCRIPTURE

Old Testament thought frequently links sickness, suffering and sin. Humans freely sin, and sin leads to punishment, which culminates appropriately in suffering. In the Genesis story of the fall the writer traces both the excruciating pain of childbirth and the man's painful toil in tilling the soil for a living to human disobedience of God's command regarding the central tree of the Garden (Gen 3:16-19). God punishes Miriam with leprosy when she complains about Moses' recent marriage and his failure to share power (Num 12:1-16), while those who gave a false report about Canaan die from a plague (14:33-38). Elisha's servant Gehazi greedily pursues Naaman's offer of payment for services rendered and is punished with leprosy (2 Kgs 5:20-27). Elijah instructs Jehoram that because of his idolatry and murder of his brothers he will suffer a "lingering disease of the bowels, until the disease causes your bowels to come out" (2 Chr 21:12-16).

The Levitical instructions regarding the offering for atonement provide hints of the broad extent to which ancient Israel viewed the connection between illness and sin. Not only did serious sins and unintentional sins demand atonement; it also was required for certain illnesses that made a person unclean—such as infectious skin diseases or unusual bodily discharges, as when a woman's menstrual period lasted longer than normal but that were not considered results of sin. After certification as clean, the healed were to request the priest to make a sin offering on their behalf.

This perceived connection of sickness and sin continues into the New Testament. Jesus tells the leper whom he heals to offer the atonement offering (Matt 8:4), and he commands the healed paralytic, who likewise went to the temple to offer the atonement offering, to "stop sinning or something worse may happen to you" (John 5:11). James, who holds that since some sickness results from sin, prayers of confession possess a concomitant healing power (Jas 5:13-16), makes the clearest connection.

At the same time it is unlikely that ancient Israel believed that every instance of pain, suffering, or dysfunction resulted from sin. Strong voices in both Testaments deny the universal linkage of suffering and sin. The book of Job stands as a monument to an opposing view. Though Job cannot understand the reason for his physical ills and suffering, he repeatedly resists his visitors' contention that his suffering results from his sin. He protests his innocence and calls on God as his witness. Jesus too denies the universal connection of serious sickness and sin. In their encounter with the blind beggar (John 9) Jesus' disciples query whether it was this man's sin or that of his parents that caused his blindness. Jesus rejects both options in favor of another reason. Even James, in his epistle, appears to reject a universal connection when he introduces the hypothetical "If he has sinned."

The Levitical laws for atonement did not require a sin offering for every illness, boil or swelling but only for illnesses that were prolonged (and hence possibly contagious) or when a person abnormally emitted fluids like blood that could spread contagion. One might conjecture that atonement applied to those diseases that were viewed as threats to the general health and welfare of the community.

Given this, it is probably safe to say that in general the ancient Hebrews believed that serious illness was more than a physical phenomenon. It had moral and spiritual dimensions that made it appropriate to beseech the Almighty for deliverance (Ps 91:1-10).

Since a function of God was to heal the sick (Exod 15:26) the role of healer, found in surrounding cultures, did not form a significant part of OT Hebrew culture (though this apparently changes in the Greek period). Priests provided diagnostics and administered purification laws and rituals but were not considered healers. Sin not only leads to illness but also can result in death. David's adultery with Bathsheba led to the illness and death of the child born from their union (2 Sam 12:15-18). In the NT Paul traces the entry of death into the world through the sin of the first human (Rom 5:12-17). The wages of sin are death, Paul claims (6:23). The linkage between sin, sickness, suffering and death forms a background motif for Isaiah in the Servant song of chaps. 52-53. For him there is no difficulty in moving between the two in prophetic poetic parallelism.

## II. SICKNESS, SUFFERING AND SIN IN THE AGE OF MEDICINE

The modern age greatly resists this linkage. Medical practitioners generally are not trained in the spiritual arts of healing. They rely on the physiological staples of drug therapy and surgery. Media accounts of horror stories where reliance on faith healing, though based on sincere religious conviction, leads to disastrous consequences bolster the correctness of this approach.

Yet the recent emphasis on holistic health therapy seeks to restore some measure of balance between the spiritual and physical dimensions of healing. It recognizes that many factors, including those beyond what can be treated with drugs or surgery, affect a person's health. Healing, in part, comes from within oneself rather than without. One's emotional state, family and social relations, and personal outlook on life can significantly influence one's health. The role of placebos here is informative. One study suggests that "in general, a placebo is between 30% and 60% as effective as the active medication with which it is compared, regardless of the power of the medication."

Whether or not this figure is wholly accurate it indicates that the psychological plays an important if not often a crucial role in the origin and treatment of illness. Similar things confirming the links between the psychological and the physiological can be suggested for certain dispositional traits. For example, anxiety or worry produces diverse physiological symptoms from rashes and hives to asthmatic attacks. Persons with type-A personality characteristics, who are aggressive and competitive, have higher productions of adrenaline and cortisone, which can lead to arteriosclerosis. Similarly it would seem that states of character—virtues or the lack thereof—might likewise be linked with emotional and physical health. Treating humans merely physiologically is inadequate, and treating human illness merely psychologically or spiritually is irresponsible. As with our argument in the previous section, the truth lies in the middle. Possessing both spiritual and physical dimensions, human illness must be addressed using appropriate measures from both directions.

The linkage, then, between sin and sickness should not be easily dismissed. While it would be perverse to assess the moral character of individuals based on their sufferings, it would be naïve to think that sin never brings painful consequences for the perpetrator or that immorality in a person's act or character might not underlie illness. Treatment of such an illness might begin by addressing the spiritual dimension of the ill.

## HEALING IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

We have seen that ancient Hebraic thought sees serious human sickness and suffering, even death itself, connected with sin. We might say that the human predicament includes both sin and suffering. What we seek is a cure for both the symptom (illness) and its cause (sin).

The Levitical sacrificial system did not provide healing for persons afflicted with infectious diseases (Leviticus 13). When diseased, persons were brought to the priest for examination. After sequential periods of isolation, if upon further inspection the ill continued to show signs of an infectious disease they were removed outside the camp until they were healed. If eventually the diseased thought healing had occurred, the priest was summoned to so certify. The priest when he visited the ill did not bring healing but only a certification that healing had occurred. If the diseased were healed they were then invited back into the camp, whereupon the priest atoned on their behalf by presenting the sin and the guilt offerings. The atonement provided forgiveness for the sin that occasioned the disease, thus allowing the person again to participate in communal life and its relationship with God. But though sacrifice atoned for the sin on behalf of the person now certified as healed, that sacrifice did not cure the ailment. The sacrificial system left the human predicament of sickness and death untouched. Humans need healing, which can extend beyond physical and mental symptoms, for as we have seen, serious sickness can have deeper roots. For healing to occur it often must assume a deeper, spiritual dimension. Though the word "atonement" is not mentioned in Isaiah 53, the concept underlies the passage. The Servant comes to address the human predicament in a way not before fully envisioned.

Since the Servant appears not to come from the Levitical tree, his mission extends far beyond mere certification of cleanness. The Servant takes on the role of healer or physician in its radical and culturally relevant dimensions. The writer of Isaiah 53 describes humans as afflicted with infirmities and pains. On one interpretation of the historical context of the passage the sufferers are the Israelites captive in Babylon. As unclean sinners they have been driven from the camp (Jerusalem) because of their sickness. Since they cannot cure themselves they need a deliverer, the Servant, who removes their illnesses to end their exile and restore them to their home, community and temple (the dwelling of Yahweh).

In a more particularized and less politicized sense, individual humans are sinners. The Servant is not like the priests, who merely certify uncleanness and cleanness. He actually bears the sins of those who have sinned, are afflicted, and can not find a cure. The Servant in this atonement role assumes the infirmities and sins and thereby elects a cure for the human predicament through his own suffering and death. He is a "man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering," stricken, smitten and afflicted, pierced and crushed, wounded and finally killed. Atonement comes through another's suffering and death.

The drama portrays more than a temporary reprieve. The self-sacrifice has finality. It is curative and finally restorative. In a way that the priests and their sacrifices could not accomplish, the Servant heals through his suffering, death and intercession. He is the Great Physician.

Indeed, Matthew quotes this passage in this very light. He understands Jesus' healing of the sick who come to him in droves as fulfilling the Servant passage (Matt 8:16-17).

Jesus comes as the promised healer of his people, one who can heal by forgiving sins (9:1-8). To the paralytic lowered through the roof Jesus says, "Take heart, son; your sins are forgiven." When questioned whether what he said was appropriate, Jesus notes: "Which is easier: to say 'Your sins are forgiven,' or to say, 'Get up and walk'?" Then to show he had the power to forgive sins he commanded the paralytic to get up and go home. For Matthew, Jesus carries out the dual healing ministry prophesied by Isaiah.

xxxxxxxxxx

Hope this makes it clear for all of those that made it this far.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: OOOOOHHHHHHH!!!! - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/18 17:27**

bro Stever

i get it now, the work of Christ on the cross cleanses us from sin and gives us access to the healing power of God once we're baptized into Him? i'm assuming this is the context in which you said the prayers.

praise God for Him glorifying Himself through you in those miraculous healings!

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/19 10:53**

Quote:

-----well i'm reminded of the time in Nazareth wherein Christ could do no miracle because the people there had no faith. or do we consider healing and miracles separate things? either way, if even He being of perfect faith couldn't do anything there, that speaks to the working of miracles also being dependant in some measure on our own faith. yet at the same time Christ's own faith is required. or maybe you mean we ought to have Christ's Faith rather than a faith from ourselves?

-----  
Ironman,

Thanks for these challenging questions. I have never thought about the lack of faith which prevented Jesus from doing healings and miracles, because there those who present themselves for prayer for healing are demonstrating a measure of faith and openness to receive, simply by coming forward. But, it is a valid point, that Jesus Himself would not force healing and miracles upon an unwilling population. We should take this to heart in our own ministries.

I've not given deep thought to the difference between a healing and a miracle, but I know some people believe healing is a speeding up of a natural process, whereas a miracle requires something new to be created to complete the transformation. I'm not sure it makes much difference if the prayer of faith is being offered in the right attitude towards God. It is HE who does whatever is needed. Our faith in His faith brings me (us) to the point of asking Him.

Recently, I've seen that it is His life which heals. He was raised from the dead by His Father. Before He died though, He said 'I am the Resurrection and the Life'. Yet, being dead, He could not raise Himself. That took faith that His Father would do it.

Probably, I should not say much more until I've thought some more. I know one thing, that the blood is for our cleansing. The life in the blood that He shed, was the life which was sacrificed for the remission of our sins.

Inasmuch as Christ had not died before He was able to give power to the disciples to heal and cast out demons, I feel there is something else at work through the Spirit, when we pray for healing. Yes, there may be a need for the confession of sin at the same time, but, I see the two as distinct, even though there may be a cause and effect sometimes.

I don't believe there is scriptural support for a mention of the blood when we pray for healing, although it is because of the blood that we can receive the Holy Spirit and be in a position to pray for healing.

The Lord showed me once, in a life-changing encounter, that He is COMPASSION and it is this compassion that heals. Compassion seems to be a function of His love operating through us. But, Love is not Compassion only.... it is much more. Nevertheless, His compassion was what moved Him to heal when He was on earth. We need His compassion to move us, perhaps, before we can begin to feel the overwhelming desire He has for each person to be whole, and to minister this wholeness in His Name.

I do believe in calling on the Name of Jesus for everything I feel led to trust is in His will. But, as I said in an earlier post, that's more because I believe it is part of the language understood by principalities and powers, not because I think it is 'magic' in its application.

I use it because I believe myself to be 'in Jesus'. (Acts 19) I believe God answers those He recognises in His Son. This is *my* faith.



**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/19 13:52**

sis Dorcas

Quote:

-----Thanks for these challenging questions. I have never thought about the lack of faith which prevented Jesus from doing healings and miracles, because there those who present themselves for prayer for healing are demonstrating a measure of faith and openness to receive, simply by coming forward. But, it is a valid point, that Jesus Himself would not force healing and miracles upon an unwilling population. We should take this to heart in our own ministries.

i guess this would underscore the fact that even our own faith is insufficient for the lofty purposes of God. the only solution is to leave that faith on the cross with everything else and take on Christ's Faith. i think it was bro Stever or someone else who's pretty pro KJV only who said that the translations should read the Faith of Christ (which is perfect Faith) rather than faith in Christ. it seems to me that there is a big difference between the 2 with the former being the right way.

Quote:

-----I've not given deep thought to the difference between a healing and a miracle, but I know some people believe healing is a speeding up of a natural process, whereas a miracle requires something new to be created to complete the transformation. I'm not sure it makes much difference if the prayer of faith is being offered in the right attitude towards God. It is HE who does whatever is needed. Our faith in His faith brings me (us) to the point of asking Him.

i would add that healing would also be the reversal of a situation which would otherwise lead to death. in looking at the example bro Stever gave, his friend with cancer seemed like he was done for. i agree in that i don't think that there is a difference between healing and miracles but the spirit in which we go after these things is key. perhaps while there may not be biblical support for pleading the blood for healing, the spirit in which this work is done is key or would perhaps cover any shortfalls in what we say?

Quote:

-----Inasmuch as Christ had not died before He was able to give power to the disciples to heal and cast out demons, I feel there is something else at work through the Spirit, when we pray for healing. Yes, there may be a need for the confession of sin at the same time, but, I see the two as distinct, even though there may be a cause and effect sometimes.

i thought the same thing myself that the 2 are distinct and yet intimately connected. i've not seen anywhere in scripture (not to say i've read all scripture!) where the disciples or anyone else pleaded the blood of Christ for healing. hands were laid, shadows passed over people, and handkerchiefs were passed around and people were told to get up, or be healed in His name and that was that.

**Re: Pleading the Blood? - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/6/19 17:34**

Interesting topic..

I remember what Ravenhill said about waking up and pleading the blood over his boys to begin their day. The old hymn says theres power in the blood!!

I plead the blood of Jesus everyday over my family....

Whether pentecostal or not I don't know.....maybe more mystical? I know theres awesome power in His blood...so I plead it!

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/19 18:35**

- (1) What does "the Blood" mean or represent?
- (2) What is "the Blood" that you are pleading?
- (3) What is the purpose of the pleading?
- (4) Why does the Blood need to be pleaded?

**Re: - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/6/19 18:41**

Quote:

-----1) What does "the Blood" mean or represent?  
-----

Maybe we should have asked Ravenhill the same question? ;-)

Look up the old hymnal of the Blood and see what it does.

**Re: Scriptural Grounds for pleading The Blood, on: 2006/6/19 19:41**

Scriptural Grounds for Pleading  
the Blood of Jesus

Logic posted:

- (1) What does "the Blood" mean or represent?
- (2) What is "the Blood" that you are pleading?
- (3) What is the purpose of the pleading?
- (4) Why does the Blood need to be pleaded?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Scriptural grounds for Pleading the Blood:

There are some Christians and denominations that attack this form of prayer. They ask where in Scripture is there proof that we can use this kind of prayer for either protection or deliverance when we really need it. There was no evidence that at the early apostles ever pled the blood to heal, to cast out demons or to get God's basic protection on them. I believe that there are three things contained in the Blood of Jesus – forgiveness, deliverance and protection. Most Christians only know about the first one – forgiveness. They have no idea that there are two other things available to them that will enable them to live a victorious and overcoming life in Jesus while still living down here on this earth. I will briefly discuss each of these three things.

#### 1. Forgiveness

As Christians, we all know that there is definitely forgiveness in the Blood of Jesus. This is the basic central message of true Christianity – that God the Father sent His one and only begotten Son Jesus Christ down to our earth in the flesh to physically die on a cross in order to give us total and permanent forgiveness for all of our sins.

Without Jesus dying and shedding His blood on that cross – there would be no forgiveness and no remission of any of our sins. Here are some extremely powerful verses from Scripture specifically telling us this:

• "For this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matthew 26:28)

• "In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace." (Ephesians 1:7)

• "But now in Christ Jesus you who were far off have been made near by the blood of Christ." (Ephesians 2:13)

• "For the life of the flesh is in the blood ... for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul." (Leviticus 17:11)

Notice the emphasis on the word "blood" in those verses. There is no question that in these verses and others in the Bible that the blood that Jesus shed on the cross, which caused His physical death, is what leads to our salvation, the forgiveness of all of our sins and entrance into heaven when we die and cross over.

## 2. Deliverance

Now what then are the Scriptural grounds that will give us the legal right to be able to use His Blood when taking on any attacks that may come our way? As you will see in the following testimonies – you can Plead the Blood of Jesus against specific types of attacks such as attacks from demons, any kind of physical disease or illness, any kind of addictions to drugs or alcohol, etc.

Many Christians are not aware of this second component that is in the Blood of Jesus which entitles us to be able to use His Blood to go on the offensive against any adversity that may come our way.

Something else happened that day when Jesus died on the cross for all of our sins. The Bible tells us that Jesus also defeated Satan and all of the powers of darkness that day! Here are some specific Scripture verses proving this point for you:

• "... that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil, and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." (Hebrews 2:14)

• "He has delivered us from the power of darkness and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love, in whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Colossians 1:13)

• "Having disarmed principalities and powers, He made a public spectacle of them, triumphing over them in it." (Colossians 2:15)

• "For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil." (1 John 3:8)

• "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, and they did not love their lives to the death." (Revelations 12:11)

What defeated Satan and all the powers of him and his demons? The physical death of Jesus on the cross. And what did Jesus do when He died that day on the cross for us, by laying down his life for us? He shed His Blood!

That is why Pleading the Blood of Jesus works so well in real life combat situations when it really is needed to defeat attacks that come against us from the dark side.

Many Christians are not aware of this fact about the Blood of Jesus – that the blood can also be used to engage with our enemies when they do try and launch an attack against us. I believe that all of the above Scripture verses definitely tell us that the blood that Jesus shed that day on the cross has totally defeated Satan and all of his dark powers.

The only thing remaining is for Christians to realize and grab a hold of this powerful truth and not to be afraid to use when they need it – especially when demons or other evil humans attempt to come against them with any unjust actions or attacks.

Here are four more powerful verses from Scripture showing that all Christians now have God's power and anointing at their disposal to use when they need it against the dark side:

"Behold, I give you the authority to trample on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you." (Luke 10:19)

Notice in that verse we have God's power over all the power of our enemies – not just against part of their powers. This means we have the ability to come out completely victorious in some of life's battles and struggles – but only if we learn how to use what is available to us.

"Then He called His twelve disciples together and gave them power and authority over all demons, and to cure diseases. He sent them to preach the kingdom of God and to heal the sick." (Luke 9:1)

Notice in this verse that Jesus gives the twelve apostles power over all demons – not just some of them. If we have Go

God's power available to us to defeat all demons – then I believe that we also have God's power to defeat any and all humans that may try to come against us with any type of unjust action or attack.

"... but the people who know their God shall be strong, and carry out great exploits." (Daniel 11:32)

"Knowing their God" means that we have spent quality time in establishing a personal intimate relationship with God. If we do that, then this verse is telling us that God will strengthen and empower us when we need His power to be able to carry out great exploits and great adventures for Him.

"For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth, to show Himself strong on behalf of those whose heart is loyal to Him." (2 Chronicles 16:9)

This verse is telling us that God is actually looking for people that He can anoint with His power – but the implication appears to be that He really cannot find too many people who are willing to pay the price to be able to really walk with His anointing.

As you can see from the way all of the above verses are worded out, true Christianity is not a weak, wimpy or passive religion. As born-again believers, we all have the Holy Spirit literally living and dwelling on the inside of us. As a result of our bodies now becoming the temple in which He now lives in, His supernatural power is available to all of us in order to help us handle some of the storm clouds that this life can throw at us.

Learning how to properly Plead the Blood of Jesus for any deliverance or protection that you may need is just one part of your arsenal. I will be doing other articles in the future covering some of the other aspects on this part of our walk with the Lord.

### 3. Protection

As you will see in the next section, you can also Plead the Blood of Jesus on specific things like your body, your house, your car, your finances, etc. The goal is to Plead the Blood on those things in order to protect you before any kind of adversity should come your way.

If the above verses are showing us that we can Plead the Blood of Jesus on attacks that may have already come our way when we need God's deliverance and/or healing power to get us out of a dire predicament – then I believe it only stands to reason that we can also go one step further with the Blood of Jesus – and that is to use it for protection before any actual attacks could come our way.

In this case – you simply Plead the Blood of Jesus on whatever you want God's full protection on before any attacks could possibly come your way.

I believe that there is also something else in the Bible that gives us another clue that entitles us to be able to Plead the Blood for this specific purpose. In the Old Testament, God the Father had it arranged with His chosen people – the Jews – that in order for them to be able to enter into a covenant relationship with Him – they had to have some kind of "temporary covering" for their sins. Jesus had not come yet – so there was no full remission for any sins that had occurred back at that time.

What God the Father had set up was the sacrifice of blemish free animals such as bulls, goats and lambs. Their blood had to be shed once per year on what was called the day of atonement. The shedding of these animals' blood was what gave the Jewish people a "temporary covering" for their sins so as to enable them to enter into a covenant relationship with God the Father.

That is why Jesus is called the "Lamb of God." He is an extension of the lambs used by His Father in the Old Testament to give the Jewish people the temporary covering for their sins. Once Jesus had shed His own blood on the cross – there was no more need for any more animal sacrifices. His death on the cross had completed and fulfilled what His Father started in the Old Testament with the sacrifice of these animals.

Now watch this analogy. In the shedding of the lamb's blood on the day of atonement – there was temporary forgiveness for the sins of the Jewish people. Then Jesus comes in the New Testament and the shedding of His blood now gives all believers complete and total forgiveness for all of their sins.

Now here is where I feel that something else occurred back in the Old Testament that may entitle us to be able to use the Blood of Jesus for protection. In the story of the Passover, God had sent His servant Moses to rescue the children of Israel out from underneath their bondage and captivity to the Egyptians. God had thrown ten gigantic plagues at the Pharaoh in an effort to get him to release His people from his rule.

On one of those plagues – God tells Pharaoh that He is going to allow an angel of death to come through their camp to kill all of their firstborn children. However, before God sets all of this up to occur – He tells His people to shed the blood of a blemish free lamb and to put that shed blood on the doorposts and lintels of their houses.

God tells His people that the angel of death will bypass their house if he sees this shed blood put on their doorposts and lintels. This angel of death will thus not kill any of the Israelites' firstborn – but only if he sees the blood properly applied to the doorposts and lintels of their houses.

In other words, the blood of this blemish free lamb was being used for protection before this attack would come their way. Had each person not properly applied the blood on their doorposts – their firstborn children would have been killed along with the rest of the firstborn of the Egyptians.

Here is my argument on this. If the shed blood of the Old Testament lambs used for the temporary forgiveness and covering of sins eventually leads to the shedding of Jesus' blood for permanent and total forgiveness of all of our sins – can we also use that same analogy and say that the shed blood of the lamb used in the Passover for protection could also lead to the shed Blood of Jesus having protection in it?

I personally believe that the answer is yes, and that is why God the Father seems willing to honor any believer who will plead the blood on whatever he wants protection on before any attack can come their way – just like He did in the story of the Passover with His own chosen people.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/20 0:10**

The Blood of Christ was what the Father required that we might be redeemed. The blood does not have life in it. It is Christ Himself that is the Life of the Believer. The Blood was a symbol of what was required of the flesh that needed to be saved. The Blood gave us the sacrifice of Christ Himself on our Cross, for every believer was on that Cross with Him, all the sin of the whole world past, present and future was on Him. So reckon yourselves to dead with Him. Rom 6:11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Our life is in Christ, not the blood. The blood is at the bottom of the Cross poured out on the altar of this earth, this world for the efficacy of cleansing it that Christ might rule on it when He comes back to rule on it, or the Father would have to completely destroy it before Christ could rule it. The blood is still seen by the Father all the way from the whipping post to the bottom of the Cross. It cries out to Him from the Ground. That is why Christ can be born again in the fleshly temple of believers. Born again in Spirit and being born again in Soul-mind, and will be born again on resurrection day.

Pleading the blood as you say is not in scripture. It is earthly as over the door posts of the passing over of the death angel. Christ is heavenly, His Life is our Life, we won't have blood either when it comes resurrection day as we will be just like Him, as far as we have been shown, that will be a body like His, flesh and bone, not flesh and blood.

Seek Christ and His righteousness and all things will be added unto us. There is life in Christ, not the Blood. 1 John 5:10-15 He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life. These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God. And this is the confidence that we have in him, that, if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us: And if we know that he hear us, whatsoever we ask, we know that we have the petitions that we desired of him. We don't ask in the name of His Blood. It is Christ that Satan flees from. It is Christ that heals us by His stripes, It is His Life that gives us life, not His death, that was the atonement that we might have life.

The life is not in the blood, it is Christ and His Body and Spirit, that we have life in. Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

Logic posted questions, answer's below.

(1) What does "the Blood" mean or represent?

A. Atonement

(2) What is "the Blood" that you are pleading?

B. The Blood of the Atonement, nothing else.

(3) What is the purpose of the pleading?

C. Unknown

(4) Why does the Blood need to be pleaded?

D. It does not.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Whu Did Jesus Die?, on: 2006/6/20 0:40**

Why did our Lord die?

1. The Presence of Sin . . .

When Adam and Eve disobeyed God in the Garden of Eden, sin invaded the human race.

"Wherefore, as by one man (Adam) sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, FOR THAT ALL HAVE SINNED:" Romans 5:12

". . . for there is no difference. FOR ALL HAVE SINNED, and come short of the glory of God;" Romans 3:22b-23

"If we say that we have not sinned, WE MAKE HIM A LIAR, and his word is not in us." 1 John 1:10

"If we say that we have no sin, WE DECEIVE OURSELVES, and the truth is not in us." 1 John 1:8

2. The Penalty of Sin . . .

"For the wages of sin is DEATH; . . ." Romans 6:23a

Not just physical death, but something far more serious — SPIRITUAL DEATH — in hell!

"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: WHICH IS THE SECOND DEATH." Revelation 21:8

The Payment of Sin . . .

To cover the sin of Adam and Eve, THE BLOOD of an innocent lamb was shed. (Gen. 3:21)

". . . John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold THE LAMB of God, which TAKETH AWAY THE SIN of the world." John 1:29

Friend, Jesus Christ shed His blood on the cross to pay the penalty for YOUR sin!

"Who his own self bare OUR SINS in his own body on the tree,. . ." 1 Peter 2:24

". . . Unto him that loved us, and washed us from OUR SINS in his own BLOOD," Revelation 1:5b  
What can wash away my sin?

NOTHING BUT THE BLOOD OF JESUS!

Not church membership, not sacraments, not baptism, not good works,

" . . . without shedding of BLOOD is no remission." Hebrews 9:22

"But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Romans 5:8-9

The Blood of Jesus Christ is powerful. It covers over our crimson stain of sin:

Isaiah 1:18.

The Blood of Christ is so very powerful that it protects us from the Angel of Death: "And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are:

and when I see the blood I will pass over you, and the Plague shall not be upon you to destroy you." Exodus 12:13

The death referred to here in Exodus was physical.

The Blood applied spiritually here to our confessed sins saves us from the Second Death: eternal separation from God.....

2 Thessalonians 1:9; Revelation 2:11; Rev. 20:6; Rev. 20:14; Rev. 21:8

When God's Word tells us that the Blood is a token, that is saying that the blood of an animal--- used in obedience to God's command--- signified a greater truth.

That truth is this : that someday God's own Son would be sacrificed for our sin, instead of an animal.....

that Jesus' Blood would cover over us in protection from death and sickness, just like at Passover.

But God would not do this automatically. He would have to be asked.

We would have to plead the Blood of Christ in our own personal circumstances, in order for the power to be released. "Ye have not because ye ask not" James 4:2 ;

1 John 3:22. Blood has a voice. Genesis 4:10

The Blood of Christ is not visible to us, but it is screaming red to demons.

They can not remain in the presence of the Blood of Jesus Christ.

The Blood is God's Trophy whereby the demons were defeated at the Cross of Calvary.

Colossians 2:13-- 15

"And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses.

Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross.

And having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

There, Jesus openly triumphed over them by dying a death not due Him, since in Him there was no sin, and therefore no cause for the death penalty.

## PLEADING THE BLOOD OF JESUS

The demons failed totally at Calvary, and lost their deed to our souls at Golgotha. The Blood of Jesus Christ, over His beloved, reminds them of their hollow abilities, made null and void on the day of Christ's martyrdom.

The demons are now powerless over our souls, because of the Blood of Jesus Christ. I Corinthians 2:7, 8

Christ did not have to die for our sins. He died willingly and lovingly. His mercy and lovingkindness endures forever. Psalm 136

## APPLYING THE BLOOD

The Old Testament is filled with examples of the blood of animals being used as a TOKEN of a greater truth.

The greater Truth is that the blood-sacrifice of Jesus on Calvary paid for the ransom of our souls, and also opened up a Fountain of Blood-protection from all the demons that daily rage against us:

"Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour."  
1 Peter 5:8 ; John 10:10.

Do we have our Blood-shield about us? Genesis 15:1

Is Christ's Blood applied to the Altar of our day, as well as to the altar of our tongue?

In Leviticus 8 we see Aaron, the high priest, slay the ram of Consecration and then Moses, their deliverer, sprinkles the blood upon the altar, their garments, and upon their right ear, thumb and toe.

This is a Token, that we too should ask to be covered with the Precious Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

"The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity ...it defileth the whole body,  
it is set on fire of hell." James 3:5,6

"But the tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison." James 3:8

"If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." James 1:26

"Death and life are in the power of the tongue" Proverbs 18:21

When we ask for the covering of Christ's Blood upon our tongue, speech and words, we ask to be guarded against using our tongue for evil, lies, anger, gossip and those many idle words we say:

"But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgement.

For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." Matt. 12: 36, 37

"Neither murmur ye as some of them  
also murmured, and were destroyed of the Destroyer .  
1 Corinthians 10:10

As we surrender to Christ's power within us by His Blood---from which the demons tremble--we take that unruly tongue and make it an altar of praise and gratitude:

"Take with you words, and turn to the LORD:  
say unto Him, 'Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously:  
so will we render the 'calves' of our lips" "as bullocks the offering of our lips"  
Hosea 14:2

"By Him therefore let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually  
( even when we don't feel like it ) that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His Name." Hebrews 13:15.

With His Blood-shield upon our mouths, the consequences will be well pleasing:

"I AM thy Shield, and thy exceeding great Reward." Genesis 15:1  
"But Thou O LORD, art a Shield for me" Psalm 3:3

Our eyes too need to be screened by the Blood of Jesus Christ--- all that we look upon--- TV, cyberspace, magazines, videos, movies, books etc.

We are told in the Book of Job to make a covenant with our eyes, our Blood-covenant:  
Job 31:1,7 ; 1 John 2:16 ; Psalm 101:3.

And not only the Altar of our tongue, and our eyes need to be covered over with His Precious Blood, but also our toe



"He that hasteth with his feet sinneth"

...and our thumb

and our ear ... all of these need to be filtered through His Precious Blood.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

In conclusion, I know that this post drives some brothers and sisters in Christ absolutely nuts, but it is still all true, and part of something that we will only begin to see and understand when we have become like HIM, at the resurrection. Now, we see through a glass darkly, but then, face to face!

"1 Cor 13:11-12 " 11. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. 12. For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known."

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/20 1:48**

There is no diminishing of the precious blood of Christ which was shed on the Cross, every drop of that precious perfect blood from a perfect body that had been ravaged beyond recognition, loses its efficacy unless we seek the life of Christ in us as our life. It is His life that we live, not His death. That perfect blood cries out to God the Father from the Ground at the base of the Cross still. When we sin it still cleanses us, because The Father still hears it screaming Father Forgive them for they know not what they do. Those that accept the blood shed at the Cross and the Truth of God that this is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased and believe are saved and becoming the son's of God being taught by the Holy Spirit how precious that Blood Shed Was and the Life it gives by the death of Christ for our redemption. It is Christ that gives us life, the Blood of Christ is the method of impartation of His Life in us. Pleading it makes a mockery of what it accomplished for every believer. Understanding the atonement and that it was the Blood of God the Father in His only Begotten Son that was the only sacrifice The Father could accept for the sin of the whole world, and all creation not understanding why the Blood had to be shed is the true meaning of the Shed blood of Christ. Pleading it for our own earthly wants and thought needs for protection from earthly circumstances and situations takes away from the true Power of The Blood that was to be shed.

Mar 8:33 But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

Rom 5:17 For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

Rom 6:4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

This is what the blood did. That we should walk in newness of Life which is Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

In Christ by the Blood of Christ: Phillip

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/20 3:06**

Quote:

-----It is His life that we live, not His death.

Phillip,

This is true, but I remember a time when I was trying to live the life, (and I believe God had given me His Spirit already), but, I had not understood that I could not skip from my old life to His new life, without **receiving** His death. For me this was the single most important piece of spiritual understanding which has facilitated everything since. Nothing *works pro*

perly in our salvation, until we have *understood* why we should embrace His death and be thankful for it. It is indeed well come.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/20 3:27**

Mine was a little different, I had to receive my own death on the Cross with Him, in that is receiving His death, I guess they are the same. I kept trying and trying until I knew I was dead, in Him and to sin. Now I choose do it out of Love for Him. I had to see myself as dead as He was and as dead to sin as He is that is in me.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/6/20 7:04**

Quote:

Christinyou wrote:

Logic posted questions, answer's below.

- (1) What does "the Blood" mean or represeant?  
A. Atonement
- (2) What is "the Blood" that you are pleading?  
B. The Blood of the Atonement, nothing else.
- (3) What is the purpose of the pleading?  
C. Unknown
- (4) Why does the Blood need to be pleaded?  
D. It does not.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

Jesus Christ is : 1) Our Passover 2) The Firstfruits of the Resurrection 3) Our Atonement  
4) the END OF THE LAW FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS, for all that believe in HIM!

1) 1 Cor 5:7 "11. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement."

2) Jesus Christ is the "Firstfruits of the Resurrection". He resurrected from the dead on Sunday, the 17th of Abib, on the day of Firstfruits. He is also the very first man, resurrected from the dead in a new, glorified, eternal body, and some day we will have one exactly like HIS.  
1 Cor 15:20-23 " But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming.

3) Romans 5:11 Christ is our atonement  
"11. And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement."

4) Jesus Christ is the END OF THE LAW FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS, for all that believe in HIM! Romans 10: 4. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.

Since Jesus Christ is our Passover, as found in God's Word (1 Cor 5:7), what does the Old Testament teach us about this feast, that was to be kept forever as a memorial to the LORD? This feast, that was so important, that God commanded them to make the 7th month "Abib" that Passover occurred in, their first month from then on, to the end of time? (Exodus 12:2)

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

What is the teaching of the Passover, as found in the Old and New Testament?

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/20 10:23**

Christinyou wrote:

Quote:

-----Our life is in Christ, not the blood.

The life is not in the blood, it is Christ and His Body and Spirit, that we have life in. Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

-----

I beg to differ on only one of your statements:

**Levi 17:11 For the life of the flesh is in the blood:** and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/20 13:52**

Graftedbranch's

Quote:

-----I believe there is basis in some aspect in Revelation 12:11, "For the Accuser of our brothers is cast down .. and they overcame Him because of the Blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony, and because they loved not their soul life even unto death."

That is, the Blood speaks to the accuser. He accuses, we testify to the Blood, The Spirit witnesses to the Blood, and the accuser is silenced.

-----

All these phrases are variations of the full phrase which is 'the blood of the cross' which is a reference to Christ's life poured out in death at Calvary.

I do not mean to be disrespectful but the physical blood of Christ had no special powers. Those who crucified him and pierced his side with the spear were almost certainly covered in it; as were those who whipped him, beat him and thrust a thorny crown on his head. His blood had no cleansing effect upon any of these people. The value of the blood is the value of the life and the blood of Christ is precious because that life was poured out at Calvary.

Quote:

-----Surely in some pentecostal circles this has been turned into a magical cure all and elixir and as most things are in those circles, taken to wild extremes akin to making the sign of the cross to ward off vampires, but its misuse should not remove it from our arsenal of weapons of warfare as part of the sword of the Spirit.

-----

The phrase is not part of our 'arsenal of weapons'; the truth of what happened at Calvary is.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/20 14:00**

Quote:

-----As you will see in the next section, you can also Plead the Blood of Jesus on specific things like your body, your house, your car, your finances, etc. The goal is to Plead the Blood on those things in order to protect you before any kind of adversity should come your way.

-----

This is really nonsense. We are drifting into the whole area of amulets and magic spells.

Quote:

-----I personally believe that the answer is yes, and that is why God the Father seems willing to honor any believer who will plead the blood on whatever he wants protection on before any attack can come their way -- just like He did in the story of the Passover with His own chosen people.

-----

They never did plead the blood at the Passover. They daubed it over their doorposts and a testimony that the people on the inside were 'eating the Lamb'.

Quote:

-----Ex. 12:7 And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.

-----

Our job is to feed on the Lamb not to invent pointless traditions. The Passover is particularly significant in that the blood was a sign to defend them... not from the devil but from God!!

The 'blood' is our defence against a righteous wrath not against Satanic hosts.

**Re: Pleading the blood, on: 2006/6/20 16:16**

philologos,

I am genuinely surprised to hear you take this line on this topic, since I think every one of us knows that all these truths must be applied by the Holy Spirit not only to our understanding but also to our inner lives.

I remember you pointed out in another thread (no idea which) that when the reference in Hebrews 2 to Jesus death refers to His 'tasting' it for us, that in Hebrew thought, this means *took the whole draught* of death for us.

Would it be true to say, then, that Paul's references to the shedding of His blood for the remission of sins, carries the same quality of total outpouring, even though the blood He actually shed was not His entire circulating volume, nor did it *use* His death?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/20 18:31**

Logic wrote: "I beg to differ on only one of your statements:

Levi 17:11 For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul."

This is the blood of animals atonement, on the altar in the temple. This is outward atonement not inward. The soul is not the Spirit of Christ. The Spirit of Christ is never called the soul. We are not born again of the soul of Christ which is just in the mind of man. Salvation by the Cross and by the Blood of Christ's Atonement is in Spirit, not the flesh. I don't see the spirit of any of the animals sacrificed not the altar in the temple being the salvation of Israel. The sacrifice of Christ is so much more. The Blood sprinkled God accepted for the Spirit of Christ, that was what God intended to put into the new believer after the Cross. Not only a New Spirit but the old spirit of Satan and all sin cast out by the by the New Spirit of Christ Born Again in the believer. Ephesians 2:2-3 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

No more sin for the believer, but we do still have trespasses against God. The sin nature is out and the God nature is in, "Christ in you the Hope of Glory". Now our trespasses are no longer sin to God because of Jesus Christ and His Shed Blood, our atonement. Now when we trespass we confess our sin which is not the sin nature of Satan our old father but our trespasses against God, and in confession we have forgiveness and repentance. The greatest thing is the cleansing of all unrighteous, by the confession, which is in Christ Jesus and no more the prince of the power of the air, with his nature keeping us in sins and trespasses. That is why John can say 1Jo 3:9 Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. Then in fulfilling this scripture he says, "1Jo 1:8 If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. 1Jo 3:5 And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin.

So we can say we no longer have the sin nature of our old man, which was Satan. We know have the sinless nature of our Father by Jesus Christ that is born again in us, because we believed God and not satan.

The life of the flesh is in the blood, but we are no longer in the flesh but in the spirit, that is if the Spirit of Christ dwell in you.

Eph 2:11 Wherefore remember, that ye in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;

Phl 3:3 For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.

1Pe 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

1Jo 4:2 Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:

1Jo 4:3 And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

2Jo 1:7 For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.

Is He come in the flesh? Yes, Jesus Christ is in the believer by His Spirit so we can say Abba Father, we are your son's by birth, not by creation. There is no blood here, except the blood left at the cross of our atonement.

Rom 8:9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.

That is why at resurrection we have been given the blessing of getting rid of our blood, for it cannot enter the Kingdom of our Dear Father and live in His House.

1Pe 3:18 For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit:

1Pe 4:1 Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin;

1Pe 4:2 That he no longer should live the rest of time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.

1Pe 4:6 For for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit.

1Jo 4:2 Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:

Is He come in your flesh? He has in mine. Amen.

Ephesians 2:1 And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;

Ephesians 2:4-6 But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

Quickened In Christ by the Blood of Christ: Phillip

**Re: Oh simplicity , simplicity! - posted by dohzman (), on: 2006/6/20 19:53**

The blood protected, when I plead something before God's throne I simply ask for mercy because of what Jesus has done on the cross. An example would be in an instant where I may be experiencing tremendous warfare, I go to the Lord and plead His Blood, in essence I am asking for His mercy and help for His names sake on account of what He has accomplished on the Cross. I believe the term originally was a cry for mercy and help. As believers we are hid in Christ, and in actual experience we need to often remind God to remember....the same way the psalmist did on many different promises(covenants). This is for our benefit not His. To cheapen the value of Christ's blood to protection of "things", especially since Jesus said to lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth where moth and rust corrupts and the thief comes and steals...., is really to place a high premium on earthly treasures which is not really scriptural. To plead the Blood of Jesus over people? I have to agree with philogos, it seems that many want to use the things of God as magic charms. Israel did that same thing with the brazen serpent keeping it in the temple and as part of their worship long after its intended use. They totally missed the point, even after Jesus made reference to it centuries later.

We Christians like to do the same today with our copy cat methods and formulas, Ron is right .... it's the eating of the Lamb that was the primary thing that worked with the blood on the posts, like Mary at Jesus feet that part will never be taken away. Now that's safe doctrine! :-)

Re:, on: 2006/6/21 0:19

A Previous post:

Interesting topic..

I remember what Ravenhill said about waking up and pleading the blood over his boys to begin their day. The old hymn says theres power in the blood!!

I plead the blood of Jesus everyday over my family....

Wether pentocastol or not I dont know.....maybe more mystical? I know theres awesome power in His blood...so I plead it!

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx  
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Philologos posted:

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----As you will see in the next section, you can also Plead the Blood of Jesus on specific things like your body, your house, your car, your finances, etc. The goal is to Plead the Blood on those things in order to protect you before any kind of adversity should come your way.

-----  
This is really nonsense. We are drifting into the whole area of amulets and magic spells.

Quote:

-----I personally believe that the answer is yes, and that is why God the Father seems willing to honor any believer who will plead the blood on whatever he wants protection on before any attack can come their way Â– just like He did in the story of the Passover with His own chosen people.

-----  
They never did plead the blood at the Passover. They daubed it over their doorposts and a testimony that the people on the inside were 'eating the Lamb'.

Quote:

-----Ex. 12:7 And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it.

-----  
Our job is to feed on the Lamb not to invent pointless traditions. The Passover is particularly significant in that the blood was a sign to defend them... not from the devil but from God!!

-----  
The 'blood' is our defence against a righteous wrath not against Satanic hosts.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's conclusion:

Here, we see the difference. Ravenhill pleaded the blood for those he loved.

Ron (Philologos) & others on this thread not only see no value in the blood, they consider it to be akin to amulets and magic spells and hocus pokus.

In conclusion, each of us must ask ourselves, have we personally found value in pleading the blood when praying for the sick, or the lost, or anything?

I have found that pleading the blood of Jesus Christ is very effective. However, my faith is grounded in the understanding that God can do anything. There is indeed power in the blood of Jesus Christ that I plead for others, as well as myself

The Old Testament overflowed with the blood of unblemished animals, as a picture of the final sacrifice---the final passover. Jesus Christ was nailed on the cross on Thursday, the 14th of Abib, on the day of Passover feast, celebrated every year at 9:00 A.M. in the morning, the 3rd hour, at the time of the morning sacrifice. He gave up the ghost at 3:00 P.M., the 9th hour, the time of the evening sacrifice. Jesus Christ, is a total fulfillment for all of the Passover sacrifices, that were set up by God Himself in the Book of Exodus!

There is no remission without the shedding of blood. The sacrifices in the Old Testament covered the sin of man, while the final sacrifice in the New Testament took away the entire sin of man, for those that believe.

We have not heard about the miracles of healing and restoration from those that criticize pleading the blood, that pray for others without it, and the miracles of healing and salvation that they have experienced, and witnessed with their own eyes.

That would be a good thing to hear.

God bless,

Stever :-D

#### Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/21 4:54

I feel the need to state clearly, that I do not like the phrase 'pleading the blood', I don't use the phrase and would not call the way I mention the blood when I do mention it in prayer 'pleading the blood'. Sometimes I use it as a way of referring to His death, at others, it would be a way of defining the power of His life. I think of Him as the Lamb, often.

philologos said

Quote:

-----The value of the blood is the value of the life and the blood of Christ is precious because that life was poured out at Calvary.

I'm not sure if there is a difference between His life given up, and His death, yet, I'm sure a preacher might divide between these terms of reference with precision, depending on how the Spirit led him to speak.

It seems to me that our record of the disciples and apostles were all before the Revelation of Jesus Christ to John. It is since his recording of the worship in heaven 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain', that Christians have picked up this terminology, to allude to the death of Christ, even though it must have been abundantly clear to those who believed He was the Messiah, that He was fulfilling the Old Covenant - if not before His death, certainly after He had expounded the scriptures to them after His resurrection.

The first apostles already had experience from His lifetime on earth, of all the deliverances and healings which they could now *still* 'perform', since they had been baptised in the Spirit. They were used to using His Name. They carried on using His Name. This was a culturally recognised way of identifying whom they followed, which is less familiar to western thinking today, but which, because of the way God's truth was embedded in that eastern culture, it is a way of thinking which we must adopt.

Surely all of us, by taking His Name, are taking His shed blood and the efficacy of His death to us personally, as a matter of history, into the benefit of which we each have stepped through the Spirit?

EDIT: John 10

11 "I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd gives His life for the sheep.

18 "No one takes it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. Th



is command I have received from My Father."

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/21 5:53**

Psalms 40:6 Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offering and sin offering has t thou not required.

Isaiah 1:11-15 To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the LORD: I am full of the burnt offerin gs of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats. When ye com e to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense i s an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, eve n the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am we ary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayer s, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.

Steve, do you truly think that when you bring up the subject of The Blood of Christ that He is pleased. He hates blood s hed and sacrifice but it was the only way He could get what He wanted and that was son's that would obey Him.

Do you really think the pleading of the blood makes God happy in what you ask. You want signs, wonders, miracles, pro tection from the enemy, salvation in pleading the blood. God says all you have to do is believe On the Name of Jesus C hrist and you will be saved. Then He is our righteousness, not by the help of pleading the blood but by the Christ that is in you that shed that blood for your life. It pleased God to bruise His Own Son for our iniquities, but the sky turned black and the temple curtain to the Holy of Holies was wrent. I don't think God is going to reward those that killed Him. Pleadi ng His blood just keeps it before the Presence of God. It is His Son's obedience to death of the Cross that pleases Him. I t is the life of Christ in us that makes us righteous, redeemed, wisdom and also sanctification, not pleading His blood. It i s Christ in us that is the Hope of Glory. Not the pleading of the blood. I think you would do better to plead the life of Chri st in you and live unto The Commandment of Love and obedience by His life that is in us. Not the pleading of the blood to get what you want.

Christ's death and the shed blood is the first thing we must see in our salvation and how much it cost to save us. We mu st go on to the life of Christ and asking anything that is His will and it will be given. Not the pleading of the blood.

Lets not cheapen the blood by using it to get what we want.

In the power of the Life of Christ in us: Phillip

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/21 9:50**

Quote:  
-----Would it be true to say, then, that Paul's references to the shedding of His blood for the remission of sins, carries the same quality o f total outpouring, even though the blood He actually shed was not His entire circulating volume, nor did it cause His death?  
-----

Yes, but you're missing the point. His perfect life poured out in His death was 'Godwards' not manwards, nor devilwards , nor demon-wards. God's word to the Israelites was 'when I see the blood I will pass over you'. Christ's death was pen al and substitutionary. His death was our propitiation and the propitiation is made to the offended party.

It is a variation on another theme. Modern evangelicalism speaks of 'having accepted Christ'. The real issue is that God has 'accepted Christ' as the perfect legal satisfaction for the sins or the world and is now both 'just and the justifier of him that believes on Christ'.

Isaiah's words capture the idea.

Quote:  
-----"And in that day thou shalt say, O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou co mfortedst me. Behold, God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: for the Lord JEHOVAH is my strength and my song; he also is become my sal vation." (Is 12:1-2 KJVS)  
-----



Christ's life poured out in death ie the blood of the cross was in order to turn away God's anger. It never had any other application.

I am not sure why you surmise that the 'entire circulating volume' was not poured out. This was always the way with sacrifices and slaughter for human consumption in the OT. This is why they were not allowed things 'strangled' because such a death did not allow the blood to drain away.

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/21 10:24**

This whole thing is just completely absurd and greivous...

Quote:  
-----Ron (Philologos) & others on this thread not only see no value in the blood, they consider it to be akin to amulets and magic spells and hocus pokus.  
-----

There is no scripture anywhere that makes even a hint of application to this idea of *pleading* ... The point of the matter is that there is no value in *pleading* it as such. What difference is there in this and in "naming and claiming", in "binding Satan" or any other presumption? They are but notions, whatever the intent and motivation for them ... These things leave that squirming, sinking sense of spirit to hear. IF one has the gift of healing or of prophecy (expressing Gods thought) what has become of the simplicity of the words expressed ... "Rise up and walk"?

That pages of explanation that are needed to defend or extrapolate this ... Isn't that telling in itself?

What has become of the simplicity of just praying and asking, of faith and trust that we would need such notions of pleading anything? Ought we not to be *appealing* to the Lord for those things which ...

Mat 6:27 Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit unto his stature?

Mat 6:28 And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

Mat 6:29 And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

Mat 6:30 Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to day is, and to morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

Mat 6:31 Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?

Mat 6:32 (For after all these things do the Gentiles seek:) for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things.

There is absolutely nothing inherent, nor any "power" in pleading such things. It is the equivalent of Christian Hocus-Pokus and absolutely unnecessary.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/21 10:30**

Quote:  
-----Ron (Philologos) & others on this thread not only see no value in the blood, they consider it to be akin to amulets and magic spells and hocus pokus.  
-----

Can you really believe this? This thread is not about 'the blood' it is about 'pleading the blood'. To say that I see no value in the blood is a gross misrepresentation. It is not the 'blood' which has no value but 'pleading the blood'.

Quote:  
-----We have not heard about the miracles of healing and restoration from those that criticize pleading the blood, that pray for others without it, and the miracles of healing and salvation that they have experienced, and witnessed with their own eyes.

That would be a good thing to hear.  
-----

If you think I am foolish enough to enter into such a competition you further misunderstand the nature of this conversation.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/21 11:01**

Stever responds to Philologos:

When we plead the blood, we are symbolically applying the blood. When we anoint ourselves and others with oil, we are physically applying oil to our bodies, which is symbolical in that the Holy Spirit is represented by the oil. We are following the example of what Paul tells us to do in the New Testament, as well as what took place in the Old Testament in regards to the sanctification of Priests.

When a priest was sanctified, the blood was applied to the right ear, the right thumb, and the right big toe. The reason was symbolic in that now the Priest would hear the word of God (blood applied to the right earlobe), perform the works of God (blood applied to the right thumb) and walk with God (blood applied to the right big toe). Also, oil was poured out over his head, symbolizing the Holy Spirit as being UPON him.

All of our Brothers and Sisters in Christ should find nothing akin to magic or "hoku Pokus" in pleading the blood, or even the anointing with oil that takes place when we are praying for others.

Consecration of the Priests—Aaron and his sons:

Exodus 29

1. And this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them to hallow them, to minister unto me in the priest's office: take one young bullock, and two rams without blemish,
2. And unleavened bread, and cakes unleavened tempered with oil, and wafers unleavened anointed with oil: of wheaten flour shalt thou make them.
3. And thou shalt put them into one basket, and bring them in the basket, with the bullock and the two rams.
4. And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water.
5. And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod, and the breastplate, and gird him with the curious girdle of the ephod:
6. And thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre.
7. Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him.
8. And thou shalt bring his sons, and put coats upon them.
9. And thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons, and put the bonnets on them: and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute: and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons.
10. And thou shalt cause a bullock to be brought before the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the bullock.
11. And thou shalt kill the bullock before the Lord, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.
12. And thou shalt take of the blood of the bullock, and put it upon the horns of the altar with thy finger, and pour all the blood beside the bottom of the altar.
13. And thou shalt take all the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul that is above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, and burn them upon the altar.
14. But the flesh of the bullock, and his skin, and his dung, shalt thou burn with fire without the camp: it is a sin offering.
15. Thou shalt also take one ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram.
16. And thou shalt slay the ram, and thou shalt take his blood, and sprinkle it round about upon the altar.
17. And thou shalt cut the ram in pieces, and wash the inwards of him, and his legs, and put them unto his pieces, and unto his head.
18. And thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar: it is a burnt offering unto the Lord: it is a sweet savour, an offering made by fire unto the Lord.
19. And thou shalt take the other ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram.
20. Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the TIP OF THE RIGHT EAR of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, AND UPON THE THUMB OF THEIR RIGHT HAND, AND UPON THE GREAT TOE OF THEIR RIGHT FOOT, AND SPRINKLE THE BLOOD UPON THE ALTAR ROUND ABOUT.
21. And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, AND SPRINKLE IT UPON AARON,

AND UPON HIS GARMENTS, AND UPON HIS SONS, AND UPON THE GARMENTS OF HIS SONS WITH HIM: AND HE SHALL BE HALLOWED, AND HIS GARMENTS, AND HIS SONS, AND HIS SONS' GARMENTS WITH HIM.

22. Also thou shalt take of the ram the fat and the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, and the right shoulder; for it is a ram of consecration:

23. And one loaf of bread, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer out of the basket of the unleavened bread that is before the Lord:

24. And thou shalt put all in the hands of Aaron, and in the hands of his sons; and shalt wave them for a wave offering before the Lord.

25. And thou shalt receive them of their hands, and burn them upon the altar for a burnt offering, for a sweet savour before the Lord: it is an offering made by fire unto the Lord.

Leviticus 8:13-36—the Atonement

13. And Moses brought Aaron's sons, and put coats upon them, and girded them with girdles, and put bonnets upon them; as the Lord commanded Moses.

14. And he brought the bullock for the sin offering: and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin offering.

15. And he slew it; and Moses took the blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar, and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar, and sanctified it, to make reconciliation upon it.

16. And he took all the fat that was upon the inwards, and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and Moses burned it upon the altar.

17. But the bullock, and his hide, his flesh, and his dung, he burnt with fire without the camp; as the Lord commanded Moses.

18. And he brought the ram for the burnt offering: and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram.

19. And he killed it; and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about.

20. And he cut the ram into pieces; and Moses burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat.

21. And he washed the inwards and the legs in water; and Moses burnt the whole ram upon the altar: it was a burnt sacrifice for a sweet savour, and an offering made by fire unto the Lord; as the Lord commanded Moses.

22. And he brought the other ram, the ram of consecration: and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram.

23. And he slew it; and Moses took of the blood of it, and put it upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot.

24. And he brought Aaron's sons, and Moses put of the blood upon the tip of their right ear, and upon the thumbs of their right hands, and upon the great toes of their right feet: and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about.

25. And he took the fat, and the rump, and all the fat that was upon the inwards, and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right shoulder:

26. And out of the basket of unleavened bread, that was before the Lord, he took one unleavened cake, and a cake of oiled bread, and one wafer, and put them on the fat, and upon the right shoulder:

27. And he put all upon Aaron's hands, and upon his sons' hands, and waved them for a wave offering before the Lord.

28. And Moses took them from off their hands, and burnt them on the altar upon the burnt offering: they were consecrations for a sweet savour: it is an offering made by fire unto the Lord.

29. And Moses took the breast, and waved it for a wave offering before the Lord: for of the ram of consecration it was Moses' part; as the Lord commanded Moses.

30. And Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which was upon the altar, and sprinkled it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him; and sanctified Aaron, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him.

31. And Moses said unto Aaron and to his sons, Boil the flesh at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: and there eat it with the bread that is in the basket of consecrations, as I commanded, saying, Aaron and his sons shall eat it.

32. And that which remaineth of the flesh and of the bread shall ye burn with fire.

33. And ye shall not go out of the door of the tabernacle of the congregation in seven days, until the days of your consecration be at an end: for seven days shall he consecrate you.

34. As he hath done this day, so the Lord hath commanded to do, to make an atonement for you.

35. Therefore shall ye abide at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation day and night seven days, and keep the charge of the Lord, that ye die not: for so I am commanded.

36. So Aaron and his sons did all things which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses.

xxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever concludes:

Of what "value" did applying the actual blood of sacrificed animals to the right earlobe, the right big finger, and the right big toe have here? Of what value did the anointing of Oil over the Priests head have here?

These were all commands of God.

xxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/21 13:29**

brethren  
bro Ron said:

Quote:  
-----Yes, but you're missing the point. His perfect life poured out in His death was 'Godwards' not manwards, nor devilwards, nor demon-wards. God's word to the Israelites was 'when I see the blood I will pass over you'. Christ's death was penal and substitutionary. His death was our propitiation and the propitiation is made to the offended party.  
-----

the word says that His blood was shed for the remission of sins and there is no mention of it being shed for anything else. the disciples (at least as far as I can tell, which may not be very far) never did plead the blood of Christ for anything other than God's mercy/forgiveness (to which it seems to me the blood primarily applies. However bro Stever did mention that in some cases (job being an exception) sin is tied to illness and forgiveness brings about healing. it seems to me though that these things are intimately related, the blood of Christ, which allows us to be cleansed and therefore go before the Father in all boldness and asking Him and receiving.

bro Stever said:

Quote:  
-----We have not heard about the miracles of healing and restoration from those that criticize pleading the blood, that pray for others without it, and the miracles of healing and salvation that they have experienced, and witnessed with their own eyes.  
-----

i've not seen this application in scripture, perhaps the healings and miracles you've seen and been involved in have more to do with obedience to what the Lord called you to do. it seems to me for the Lord to do such, there must be an obedience which goes beyond simply saying things, a depth of obedience which stems from the throne of God which is manifest in us to His glory.

**Christ's life poured out in death ie the blood of the cross was in order to turn away God's anger??, on: 2006/6/21 14:24**

Christ's life poured out in death ie the blood of the cross was in order to turn away God's anger??

Can you back this statement up with scripture?

Does John 3:16 teach this?

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/21 16:14

philologos said

Quote:  
-----I am not sure why you surmise that the 'entire circulating volume' was not poured out. This was always the way with sacrifices and slaughter for human consumption in the OT. This is why they were not allowed things 'strangled' because such a death did not allow the blood to drain away.  
-----

This is how I understand these things at this point in time.....

I have heard it preached, is one reason - that those being crucified died very slowly, usually, and not from loss of blood directly - more from exhaustion and dehydration. The hands and feet would not bleed enough to *cause* death.

The death of animals you describe, is effected by severing a large blood vessel. If this happened to the Lord when the spear was thrust into His side, it explains why blood was able to come out then - *after* He had died.

Then there is the fact that in order to speed up the dying process, it was *usual* to break the legs of the victims who had survived the day, as was done to the thieves. (John 19:26 - 37)

27 Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.

28 After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst.

If the Lord had shed *all* His blood and died because of blood loss, He would not have had the strength and mental competence to speak to John, to drink, to cry out, and to dismiss His spirit all so near the time He died.

I believe the shedding of His blood, both before and after His death are symbolic. His death - the FACT that He died is *not* symbolic. It is utterly real and essential to the restoration of our relationship with God, which is also not symbolic. It is utterly real and essential for our salvation.

He IS the Lamb who was slain from the foundation of the world. The *meaning* of His blood, shed for the remission of our sins, works because the Father has accepted His sacrifice once, for all.

The meaning of Christ taking the vinegar - the bad wine - is symbolic of His taking our sin and the sins of the whole world - it was 'the cup' He had to drink. We now are asked to take good bread and good wine to remember His death - His death by which we now can partake of His life, *if* we understand His death. (We do not eat His real Flesh, in the same way as at the Passover, and the priests, ate those sacrifices).

The fact that Jesus was in complete control of His body, right up until He died, is an example to all who would suffer for Him. I realise this last is drifting off topic, but He showed what a *man* could do, in resisting temptation in the most desperate hours of His life.

This is why I asked what I did about the comparason with His *tasting* death. It seems biblically reasonable to say that when He shed His blood - some blood - His life was as completely poured out, as in the way as He *completely* died, *completely* partook of death for us, and *completely* destroyed death - by a 'taste' of it.

Re: Christ's life poured out in death ie the blood of the cross was in order to - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/21 17:

bro freed

God's anger directed toward us for our sins, Christ's blood atones for us so we are covered by it and God doesn't see our sins. the reason why Christ's blood had to be shed was because nothing else would suffice.

as this pertains to John 3:16, God so loving the world that He gave His son so that whoever believes in Him will not die but have eternal life, God loved the world despite our sin and, the just penalty for sin would be eternity in hell. God's love was/is so great that He gave His son to atone for our sins, so averting the necessary punishment thereof and reconciling us to Him.

**God's anger, on: 2006/6/21 18:17**

Can you please provide some scriptures to back this up?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/21 21:22**

"Of what "value" did applying the actual blood of sacrificed animals to the right earlobe, the right big finger, and the right big toe have here? Of what value did the anointing of Oil over the Priests head have here?"

Steve, do you do this now? This is all outward and has nothing to do with the blood Jesus Shed at the Cross. Using the blood as a pleading to get what you want from God or as anything other than the only atonement God could accept for the sin of the World is hypocritical and makes a mockery of this taking away of sin. The blood does not cover our sin, that is what the blood of animals did. The blood of Christ took away sin and cleansed every person that believes in its atonement. The Blood is the life of the flesh and if you want to plead it you are using it to the flesh. It is no longer the blood we use to be what God has given us to be, it is Christ Himself that is what God sees and uses as His conformation in the believer, Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Pleading the blood is just a fleshly thing that puts another arrow in the hole in God's Heart every time it is used outside of The complete atonement for the whole world mentioned. Rom 8:1 therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. There is no spirit in the blood.

This is a pretty serious prayer of Paul for himself, why did he not ask the people to plead the blood for him. Rom 15:30 Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in prayers to God for me;

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: God's anger - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/21 22:40**

bro freed

Romans 6

**22 But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. 23 For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.**

it seems to me that death is recompense for sin. God is certainly not pleased with sin at all and is angered by it.

john 3

**34 For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. 35 The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand. 36 He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.**

it seems to me that herein the word says that if you are not in Christ, covered by His blood, the wrath of God will be upon you. the only thing which can turn God's anger away is Christ's blood.

rom 5

**6 For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly. 7 For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. 8 But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. 9 Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. 10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. 11 And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement. F17**

from 1 thess

**9 For God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, 10 Who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.**

bro it seems clear to me and i hope we all see this, the anger of God is directed to us for our sin (wnd we richly deserve i t) but being covered by the blood of Christ keeps us from experiencing said wrath. i for one am glad!

**Re: Leprosy, on: 2006/6/22 0:49**

Steve posts:

Leprosy:

We can see another "picture" here of applying the Blood to a person who has been healed of leprosy. The blood of the sacrificed animal is physically put upon the right earlobe, the right big finger, and the right big (great) toe, all symbolizing that he now hears God, Works for God, and Walks with God. Also, oil is placed on the cleansed lepers right earlobe, the right big finger, and the right big toe, symbolizing that the Holy Spirit is now upon and involved with his hearing, his works for God, and directing his walk with God. It says to me "now, that I have healed you, have a personal relationship with me- listen to me, work for me, and walk with me and.....go and sin no more!"

Leviticus 14:1-57

1. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying,
2. This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: He shall be brought unto the priest: 3. And the priest shall go forth out of the camp; and the priest shall look, and, behold, if the plague of leprosy be healed in the leper; 4. Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: 5. And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water: 6. As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water: 7. And he SHALL SPRINKLE UPON HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSSED FROM THE LEPROSY SEVEN TIMES, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field. 8. And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and wash himself in water, that he may be clean: and after that he shall come into the camp, and shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days. 9. But it shall be ON THE SEVENTH DAY, that he shall shave all his hair off his head and his beard and his eyebrows, even all his hair he shall shave off: and he shall wash his clothes, also he shall wash his flesh in water, and he shall be clean.
10. AND ON THE EIGHTH DAY he shall take two he lambs without blemish, and one ewe lamb of the first year without blemish, and three tenth deals of fine flour for a meat offering, MINGLED WITH OIL, AND ONE LOG OF OIL (Representing the Holy Spirit).
11. And the priest that maketh him clean shall present the man that is to be made clean, and those things, before the Lord, at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation: 12. And the priest shall take one he lamb, and offer him for a trespass offering, and the log of oil, and wave them for a wave offering before the Lord:
13. And he shall slay the lamb in the place where he shall kill the sin offering and the burnt offering, in the holy place: for as the sin offering is the priest's, so is the trespass offering: it is most holy: 14. And the priest shall take some of the blood of the trespass offering, and the priest shall put it upon the TIP OF THE RIGHT EAR OF HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSSED, AND UPON THE THUMB OF HIS RIGHT HAND, AND UPON THE GREAT TOE OF HIS RIGHT FOOT:
15. AND THE PRIEST SHALL TAKE SOME OF THE LOG OF OIL, AND POUR IT INTO THE PALM OF HIS OWN LEFT HAND: 16. AND THE PRIEST SHALL DIP HIS RIGHT FINGER IN THE OIL THAT IS IN HIS LEFT HAND, AND SHALL SPRINKLE OF THE OIL WITH HIS FINGER SEVEN TIMES BEFORE THE LORD: 17. AND OF THE REST OF THE OIL THAT IS IN HIS HAND SHALL THE PRIEST PUT UPON THE TIP OF THE RIGHT EAR OF HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSSED, AND UPON THE THUMB OF HIS RIGHT HAND, AND UPON THE GREAT TOE OF HIS RIGHT FOOT, UPON THE BLOOD OF THE TRESPASS OFFERING: 18. AND THE REMNANT OF THE OIL THAT IS IN THE PRIEST'S HAND HE SHALL POUR UPON THE HEAD OF HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSSED: AND THE PRIEST SHALL MAKE AN ATONEMENT FOR HIM BEFORE THE LORD. 19. And the priest shall offer the sin offering, and make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness; and afterward he shall kill the burnt offering: 20. And the priest shall offer the burnt offering and the meat offering upon the altar: and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and he shall be clean. 21. And if he be poor, and cannot get so much; then he shall take one lamb for a trespass offering to be waved, TO MAKE AN ATONEMENT FOR HIM, AND ONE TENTH DEAL OF FINE FLOUR



MINGLED WITH OIL FOR A MEAT OFFERING, AND A LOG OF OIL; 22. And two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get; and the one shall be a sin offering, and the other a burnt offering. 23. And he shall bring them on the eighth day for his cleansing unto the priest, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, before the Lord. 24. And the priest shall take the lamb of the trespass offering, and the log of oil, and the priest shall wave them for a wave offering before the Lord: (The "wave offering" was a picture of the cross) 25. And he shall kill the lamb of the trespass offering, and the priest shall take SOME OF THE BLOOD OF THE TRESPASS OFFERING, AND PUT IT UPON THE TIP OF THE RIGHT EAR OF HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSED, AND UPON THE THUMB OF HIS RIGHT HAND, AND UPON THE GREAT TOE OF HIS RIGHT FOOT: 26. AND THE PRIEST SHALL POUR OF THE OIL INTO THE PALM OF HIS OWN LEFT HAND: 27. AND THE PRIEST SHALL SPRINKLE WITH HIS RIGHT FINGER SOME OF THE OIL THAT IS IN HIS LEFT HAND SEVEN TIMES BEFORE THE LORD: 28. AND THE PRIEST SHALL PUT OF THE OIL THAT IS IN HIS HAND UPON THE TIP OF THE RIGHT EAR OF HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSED, AND UPON THE THUMB OF HIS RIGHT HAND, AND UPON THE GREAT TOE OF HIS RIGHT FOOT, UPON THE PLACE OF THE BLOOD OF THE TRESPASS OFFERING: 29. AND THE REST OF THE OIL THAT IS IN THE PRIEST'S HAND HE SHALL PUT UPON THE HEAD OF HIM THAT IS TO BE CLEANSED, TO MAKE AN ATONEMENT FOR HIM BEFORE THE LORD. 30. And he shall offer the one of the turtledoves, or of the young pigeons, such as he can get; 31. Even such as he is able to get, the one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering, with the meat offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed before the Lord. 32. This is the law of him in whom is the plague of leprosy, whose hand is not able to get that which pertaineth to his cleansing. 33. And the Lord spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, 34. When ye be come into the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession, and I put the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession; 35. And he that owneth the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, It seemeth to me there is as it were a plague in the house: 36. Then the priest shall command that they empty the house, before the priest go into it to see the plague, that all that is in the house be not made unclean: and afterward the priest shall go in to see the house: 37. And he shall look on the plague, and, behold, if the plague be in the walls of the house with hollow strakes, greenish or reddish, which in sight are lower than the wall; 38. Then the priest shall go out of the house to the door of the house, and shut up the house seven days: 39. And the priest shall come again the seventh day, and shall look: and, behold, if the plague be spread in the walls of the house; 40. Then the priest shall command that they take away the stones in which the plague is, and they shall cast them into an unclean place without the city: 41. And he shall cause the house to be scraped within round about, and they shall pour out the dust that they scrape off without the city into an unclean place: 42. And they shall take other stones, and put them in the place of those stones; and he shall take other mortar, and shall plaister the house. 43. And if the plague come again, and break out in the house, after that he hath taken away the stones, and after he hath scraped the house, and after it is plaistered; 44. Then the priest shall come and look, and, behold, if the plague be spread in the house, it is a fretting leprosy in the house; it is unclean. 45. And he shall break down the house, the stones of it, and the timber thereof, and all the mortar of the house; and he shall carry them forth out of the city into an unclean place. 46. Moreover he that goeth into the house all the while that it is shut up shall be unclean until the even. 47. And he that lieth in the house shall wash his clothes; and he that eateth in the house shall wash his clothes. 48. And if the priest shall come in, and look upon it, and, behold, the plague hath not spread in the house, after the house was plaistered: then the priest shall pronounce the house clean, because the plague is healed. 49. And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: 50. And he shall kill the one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water: 51. And he shall take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird, and in the running water, and sprinkle the house seven times: 52. And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird, and with the running water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar wood, and with the hyssop, and with the scarlet: 53. But he shall let go the living bird out of the city into the open fields, and make an atonement for the house: and it shall be clean. 54. This is the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and scall, 55. And for the leprosy of a garment, and of a house, 56. And for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright spot: 57. To teach when it is unclean, and when it is clean: this is the law of leprosy. XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

If those who have trouble understanding this APPLICATION of blood and oil, in this case after God has already healed the Leprosy, what would your position be in ancient Israel if this was required of you by God. How would you understand this cleansing and restoration then? How would you apply this Old Testament requirement to your own walk with God today? We have all been saved from sin by Jesus Christ, we have all been saved from the pits of hell by the works of Jesus Christ on the Cross.

Without the shedding of blood there is no remission for sin.



What is the application to you personally of this teaching of the blood and oil applied to the body?

Today, in 2006 do we all have the blood and oil applied in our own lives as born again Christians?

I wonder.

God bless,

Stever :-D

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

by Christinyou on 2006/6/21 16:22:19

"Of what "value" did applying the actual blood of sacrificed animals to the right earlobe, the right big finger, and the right big toe have here? Of what value did the anointing of Oil over the Priests head have here?"

Steve, do you do this now? This is all outward and has nothing to do with the blood Jesus Shed at the Cross. Using the blood as a pleading to get what you want from God or as anything other than the only atonement God could accept for the sin of the World is hypocritical and makes a mockery of this taking away of sin. The blood does not cover our sin, that is what the blood of animals did. The blood of Christ took away sin and cleansed every person that believes in its atonement. The Blood is the life of the flesh and if you want to plead it you are using it to the flesh. It is no longer the blood we use to be what God has given us to be, it is Christ Himself that is what God sees and uses as His conformation in the believer, Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Pleading the blood is just a fleshly thing that puts another arrow in the hole in God's Heart every time it is used outside of The complete atonement for the whole world mentioned. Rom 8:1 therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. There is no spirit in the blood.

This is a pretty serious prayer of Paul for himself, why did he not ask the people to plead the blood for him. Rom 15:30 Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in prayers to God for me;

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/22 2:53**

Steve, "Today, in 2006 do we all have the blood and oil applied in our own lives as born again Christians?"

How can you ask this question? The answer is a resounding YES!!!, But not by pleading them but by believing Christ's Atonement, and believing the Holy Spirit is Baptized us into One Spirit.

You cannot live in the physical life of the old testament and put the Spirit of Christ in the Levitical priest hood. Either you live in the Law and do all the Law or you live in Christ who has fulfilled the whole Law. You cannot commingle the old with the new for the old cannot hold the new wine it bursts.

We are new creatures in Christ Jesus, we are new wine skins with new wine, the Spirit of Christ in this tabernacle and we are the temple of the Holy Spirit. You cannot put the old in the new and make it work. The old is a wonderful learning lesson, but not a life changing experience being, Crucified with Christ, and having Christ in you the Hope of Glory. New Creature in a new container quickened to: Ephesians 2:5-6 Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

Christ is at the right hand of the Father, we are in Christ, then we are seated in heavenly places at the right hand of the Father in Christ Jesus. Hebrews 6:1-3 Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment. And this will we do, if God permit.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/22 3:46**

Hi freedd :-)

Here are some more scriptures for you (from the KJV).

John 3:36

He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Ephesians 5:2 - 6

2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour.

3 But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints;

4 Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

5 For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

6 Let no man deceive you with vain words: for **because of these things cometh** the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

Colossians 3

5 Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry:

**6 For which things' sake** the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:

Revelation 14

8 And there followed another angel, saying, Babylon is fallen, is fallen, that great city, because she made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.

9 And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, **If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand,**

**10 The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation;** and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb:

**11 And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night,** who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.

contd.

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/22 4:13

Hi again, freedd, I know this is long, but, it gives a good sense of the provocation the God of Israel endured, before settling His heart on Judah and making David king, who is a type of Christ, through whom all His wrath is turned away forever.

**Psalm 78** (I've tried to stick to the reasons for, and His wrath.)

7 That they might set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments:

8 And might not be as their fathers, **a stubborn and rebellious generation; a generation that set not their heart aright, and whose spirit was not steadfast with God.** {that...: Heb. that prepared not their heart}

9 The children of Ephraim, being armed, and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle.

10 **They kept not the covenant of God, and refused to walk in his law;**

11 **And forgat his works, and his wonders that he had shewed them.**

17 **And they sinned yet more against him by provoking the most High in the wilderness.**

18 And they tempted God in their heart by asking meat for their lust.

19 Yea, they spake against God; they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?

20 Behold, he smote the rock, that the waters gushed out, and the streams overflowed; can he give bread also? can he provide flesh for his people?

21 Therefore the LORD heard this, and was wroth: so a fire was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel;

22 **Because they believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation:**

29 So they did eat, and were well filled: for he gave them their own desire;

30 **They were not estranged from their lust** but while their meat was yet in their mouths,

31 The wrath of God came upon them, and slew the fattest of them, and smote down the chosen of Israel.

32 **For all this they sinned still, and believed not for his wondrous works.**

33 Therefore their days did he consume in vanity, and their years in trouble.

34 When he slew them, then they sought him: and they returned and enquired early after God.

35 And they remembered that God was their rock, and the high God their redeemer.

36 **Nevertheless they did flatter him with their mouth, and they lied unto him with their tongues.**

37 **For their heart was not right with him, neither were they steadfast in his covenant.**

38 But he, being full of compassion, forgave their iniquity, and destroyed them not: **yea, many a time turned he his anger away, and did not stir up all his wrath.**

39 For he remembered that they were but flesh; a wind that passeth away, and cometh not again.

40 **How oft did they provoke him in the wilderness, and grieve him in the desert!**

41 **Yea, they turned back and tempted God, and limited the Holy One of Israel.**

42 They remembered not his hand,

52 But made his own people to go forth like sheep, and guided them in the wilderness like a flock.

53 And he led them on safely, so that they feared not: but the sea overwhelmed their enemies.

54 And he brought them to the border of his sanctuary, even to this mountain, which his right hand had purchased.

55 He cast out the heathen also before them, and divided them an inheritance by line, and made the tribes of Israel to dwell well in their tents.

56 **Yet they tempted and provoked the most high God, and kept not his testimonies:**

57 **But turned back, and dealt unfaithfully like their fathers: they were turned aside like a deceitful bow.**

58 For they provoked him to anger with their high places, and moved him to jealousy with their graven images.

59 When God heard this, he was wroth, and greatly abhorred Israel:

60 So that he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh, the tent which he placed among men;

61 And delivered his strength into captivity, and his glory into the enemy's hand.

62 He gave his people over also unto the sword: and was wroth with his inheritance.

63 The fire consumed their young men; and their maidens were not given to marriage.

64 Their priests fell by the sword; and their widows made no lamentation.

65 Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, like a mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine.

66 And he smote his enemies in the hinder parts: he put them to a perpetual reproach.

67 Moreover he refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim:

68 But chose the tribe of Judah, the mount Zion which he loved.

69 And he built his sanctuary like high palaces, like the earth which he hath established for ever.

70 He chose David also his servant, and took him from the sheepfolds:

71 From following the ewes great with young he brought him to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance.

72 So he fed them according to the integrity of his heart; and guided them by the skilfulness of his hands.

**Forgiveness without blood!, on: 2006/6/22 12:46**

Forgiveness without blood!

Fasten your seat belt.

Under the law God forgave sin without blood.

Heb. 9:22; "And according to the Law, one may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness." NASB

So many people misquote Heb. 9:22 by saying; "without shedding of blood there is no forgiveness."

This is a false statement. Please see that it reads one may ALMOST say.

Now if I said one may ALMOST say that it never snows in Phoenix and then someone else quoted me as saying it never snows in Phoenix. They would be wrong. I have seen it snow in Phoenix. Now to say that it never snows in Phoenix is a complete lie.

Leviticus 5:11; "But if his means are insufficient for two turtledoves or two young pigeons, then for his offering for that which he has sinned, he shall bring the tenth of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering; he shall not put oil on it or place incense on it, for it is a sin offering." NASB

God allowed poor people under the law to bring fine flour as a sin offering. This flour from God's point of view accomplished as much as a blood sacrifice from a person who had more money.

Whatever the blood did the flour also did.

The conclusion is IF the blood turned away God's anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin also.

**Re: Pleading the blood? - Forgiveness without blood!, on: 2006/6/22 13:19**

freed said

Quote:

-----Under the law God forgave sin without blood.

-----

This is interesting, and draws two main comments from me.

First, the Lamb was slain from (or before) the foundation of the world. Is not this where the sins of those whom Jesus forgave when He ministered to them, had been dealt with?

But, the whole of creation waited for the Messiah, because the fulfillment in history of His death was also vital for forgiveness and the fulfillment of the law. Our sins had to be laid on Him, once and forever.

Of the flour, is this not symbolic of the Bread that He was to become - broken for us?

**Re: Forgiveness without blood! - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/22 14:26**

bro Freed

the quote from levticus makes a condition, that if the person can't get 2 pigeons/turtledoves then he can bring flour. both serve the same purpose indeed, however that was the old covenant which required the remission of sins in that way. in this new covenant, Christ died once for all sin hebrews 7:27

**27 Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did once, when he offered up himself.**

so indeed what was done at that time was valid, but for us who are in the new covenant, Christ paid the price in full and

His blood saves us from the wrath of God. i think this point has been well suported by scripture.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/22 14:29**

sis dorcass

Quote:  
-----First, the Lamb was slain from (or before) the foundation of the world. Is not this where the sins of those whom Jesus forgave when He ministered to them, had been dealt with?  
-----

this is heavy stuff...i think you're onto something here because the o.t. is a forshadowing of the n.t.

**Re: The Blood?, on: 2006/6/23 1:33**

Stever posts:

"For you know that it was not with perishable things such as silver or gold that you were redeemed from the empty way of life handed down to you from your forefathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, a lamb without blemish or defect. He was chosen before the creation of the world, but was revealed in these last times for your sake" (1 Pet. 1:18-20).

The Bible is just one story from beginning to end! This post is dedicated to the recital of God's love for man, a love story written in blood, if you will, which begins with Gen. 1:1 and ends with Rev. 22:21.

Many people have always been squeamish about the blood sacrifices in the Old Testament and wondered what they really meant. In fact, "Sixty Minutes" had a recent segment about an Episcopal Bishop, whose name escapes me now, who made the statement that he didn't know why God needed all that blood, or why Christ had to die for that matter. He looked straight into the camera and said, "Why couldn't God have just said, 'I forgive you?'" He's in deep septic water with his church, of course, and with some of the congregants as well. I thought, "Well, he's honest, but ignorant of God's plan for the ages."

Whatever this relationship we have with God entails, it is not casual, nor haphazard, and clearly, it has been sealed with blood and was the mystery "which from the beginning of the world has been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ" (Eph. 3:9).

Since discovering the history of the blood covenant ritual that God made with Abram, alluded to in Gen. 15: 9-12, I have finally understood at a cellular level what I knew had to be true, and that is that the blood was never for God's benefit, but was always for us.

I have been devouring the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy to try to "get a handle" on the significance of the blood sacrifices, and what God has shown me is the bedrock of our Christian experience, and the basis for our hope in the resurrection. The Lord reminded me that the story begins in Genesis, where the first account of the shedding of blood came after Adam and Eve's sin, when they realized that they were naked. The record states that "The LORD God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed them" (Gen. 3:21).

Did you realize that Adam and Eve were vegetarians before the fall? "Then God said, "I give you every seed-bearing plant on the face of the whole earth and every tree that has fruit with seed in it. They will be yours for food" (Gen. 1:29). So, the first example of spilling blood was done by God Himself, not for food, but in order to clothe His wayward children, who were naked and ashamed. I trust that none of you think this shame had anything to do with sex. Please, Lord, deliver us all from the Puritan belief that sex was the original sin.

Reproduction was a command, after all. No, they were ashamed because before the fall, they had been clothed with His glory and majesty, but afterwards, they saw what pitiful empty containers they really were. It would be rather like receiving a gift in a magnificently wrapped package (before the fall) only to open it and find it contained a pair of faded and torn work jeans (after the fall).

The next time blood appears is in the account of Abel's sacrifice. The Hebrew writer says of Adam and Eve's second

born, "By faith Abel offered God a better sacrifice than Cain did. By faith he was commended as a righteous man, when God spoke well of his offerings. And by faith he still speaks, even though he is dead" (Heb. 11:4).

Did you ever wonder how Abel knew to offer the firstfruits of his flock? Here's the account in Gen. 4: "In the course of time Cain brought some of the fruits of the soil as an offering to the LORD. But Abel brought fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock. The LORD looked with favor on Abel and his offering, but on Cain and his offering he did not look with favor. So Cain was very angry, and his face was downcast" (Gen. 4:3-5). Now the interesting thing to me here is that Abel's offering was exactly as prescribed in the book of Leviticus, one of the books of the law. The fellowship offering is described in Lev. 3:2-11, which explains how the fat was to be removed from the inner parts and even the fat from the tail, and burned as an offering made to the Lord by fire. God also had told Moses, "The first offspring of every womb belongs to me, including all the firstborn males of your livestock, whether from herd or flock" (Ex. 34:19).

Now, I ask you again, since Abel was the son of the first man on earth, born centuries before the law was given, how did he know to offer the fat portions of the firstborn of his flock to the Lord? There are only three possibilities: 1) God had told both Cain and Abel what He expected from them; 2) Able was more spiritually aware than Cain and intuited it; or 3) it was just dumb luck on Abel's part. Since the Hebrew writer says that Abel offered a more perfect sacrifice by faith, I have to go with choice one. Also, consider God's counseling session with Cain, who was angry because his sacrifice was not acceptable: "Then the LORD said to Cain, "Why are you angry? Why is your face downcast? If you do what is right, will you not be accepted? But if you do not do what is right, sin is crouching at your door; it desires to have you, but you must master it" (Gen. 4:6-7).

If these two sons of Adam did not have a clue what to do, then Cain certainly would have been justified in his anger, but if they were told what to offer to God, and Cain disobeyed, then his wrath was not reasonable. By this question to him, God seems to be saying that Cain had no right to be angry, for He asks, "If you do what is right, will you not be accepted?" All things considered, it seems to me that Cain acted like a rebellious teenager who got called on the carpet for his sins, and instead of taking the opportunity to correct his behavior, to straighten up and fly right, his jealousy and rage caused him to kill his own brother.

Cain's response is a perfect picture of what Paul describes in Romans 7:23: "but I see another law at work in the members of my body, waging war against the law of my mind and making me a prisoner of the law of sin at work within my members." It is also an excellent example of how everything in the Bible points forward to Christ, "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world" (Jn. 1:29).

The Psalmist declared, "Come and see what God has done, how awesome his works in man's behalf!" (Ps. 66:5). Without using our spiritual eyes, it is often difficult to see what God has done for us, and to understand that "He has made everything beautiful in its time. He has also set eternity in the hearts of men; yet they cannot fathom what God has done from beginning to end" (Eccl. 3:11). God has always had a plan, and as James stated to the brethren in Jerusalem, "Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world" (Acts. 15:18). We tend to think that because we don't know what is going on, chaos reigns, but this is just not true. Nor is what the Fundamentalists preach true, i.e., that God needs our faith in order to carry out His plans. Lenny has many translations of the Bible, but lately, he has been reading from the Emphatic Diaglott (word for word Greek translation).

Listen to this verse, "For what if some did not believe? Will their UNBELIEF annul the FIDELITY of God? By no means! but let God be true, though every man be false; even as it has been written, 'That thou mayest be justified in thy words, and mayest overcome in thy judgment'" (Rom. 3:3). God has had a plan since before the foundation of the world (I Sam. 2:8); He is working His plan; and nothing we do or don't do will ever deter Him from the works His hands have chosen to do. Since Paul told us that it was not Satan's wiles nor man's sinfulness, but it was God who consigned all men to disobedience (Rom. 11:32), then He had to have had a plan to deal with it or He would most certainly have been a negligent, truant parent who created children, put them at risk for Satan's lies, and then went away leaving them to fend for themselves. But since Paul tells us that the reason He consigned all men to disobedience was "that He may have mercy upon all" (RSV). No matter how black it looks sometimes, "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to His purpose" (Rom. 8:28).

Before the fall, Adam knew that he was "joined at the hip" with God, who was supreme, but one of the results of eating of the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil is that he and the rest of mankind came to believe that God can never get the job done without his help. The truth is that "There are different kinds of working, but the same God works all of them in all men" (I Cor.. 12:6). The sweet singer of Israel declared, "All mankind will fear; they will proclaim the works of God and ponder what he has done" (Ps. 64:9). Eating the fruit of that tree caused man to be driven from God's garden of rest and bounty, and put him on the endless treadmill of works: fear and poverty, physical, emotional,

and spiritual.

Since the Holy Spirit was given to lead us into all truth (Jn. 16:13), then we need only ask and it shall be given us what we need to know. Or to put it another way, when God stirs up the questions in our consciousness, He provides the answers that we need. Until I began this study of the animal sacrifices, for example, I did not know that the person asking forgiveness was the one who cut the animal's throat, thinking that this was the priest's job. This is generally the way it was done: "He is to lay his hand on the head of the burnt offering, and it will be accepted on his behalf to make atonement for him. He is to slaughter the young bull before the LORD, and then Aaron's sons the priests shall bring the blood and sprinkle it against the altar on all sides at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting" (Lev. 1:4-5. See also Lev. 3: 6-8; 12-16; 4:27-31). By laying his hands on the animal's head, he expressed identification between himself and the animal. With this action, the offeror was symbolically laying his own guilt on the animal and acknowledging that according to the blood covenant God made with Abram, it should have been the sinner's blood which was shed, not the animal's. This was one way that God personally involved the worshipper.

Along these same lines, our guide for the trip we took through Israel asked us if we knew why God commanded the Israelites to carry out the "death by stoning" sentence, prescribed by law for certain sins. When none of us knew, he said, "So the person making the judgment would have to carry out the execution himself. There was no executioner hired for the job. If you decided that a person had committed a crime worthy of death, then you had to pick up a stone and hurl it yourself and continue doing so until the person was dead." If you had to hurl the stones or cut the animal's throat, you would be very aware of the consequences of sin. It makes the story of Jesus and the woman caught in adultery very poignant. She had committed an offense worthy of death, according to the law, but Jesus wrote in the dirt and then said to her accusers, "If any one of you is without sin, let him be the first to throw a stone at her" (Jn. 8:7). God's work of atonement is always very personal for each one of us who must stand before the judgment seat, and it has always involved the shedding of blood.

The blood used for the work of atonement was holy unto the Lord (Ex. 30:10), "For the life of a creature is in the blood, and I have given it to you to make atonement for yourselves on the altar; it is the blood that makes atonement for one's life" (Lev. 17:11). The NIV study note on that verse explains, "Practically every sacrifice included the sprinkling or smearing of blood on the altar or within the tabernacle (v. 6: 1:5; 3:2; 4:6,25; 7:21) thus teaching that atonement involves the substitution of life for life. The blood of the OT sacrifice pointed forward to the blood of the Lamb of God, who obtained for His people 'eternal redemption' (Heb. 9:12). 'Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness' (Heb. 9:22)." Sometimes, we may think that there was no grace available for the Israelites under the Old Covenant, but this is most certainly not true. Every time a suppliant for forgiveness slit an animal's throat, he was reminded up close and personal by the blood flowing down the altar, that his own life was spared because of God's love and mercy available for him.

Now, if you are repulsed by the slaughter of so many animals, you may be comforted to know that except in the case of the burnt offering where the entire animal was consumed, the meat of the sin offering and also the fellowship offering was the priest's portion for himself and his family. The next time you chow down on a steak dinner, or lamb chops, or any other meat dish, remind yourself that somewhere, an animal had its throat cut so you could enjoy a tasty repast, and no sins were forgiven as a result of that slaughter either. Another study note offers this explanation: "The fellowship offering (Lev. 3; 7:11-34) was the only sacrifice of which the offeror might eat a part. Fellowship was involved because the offeror, on the basis of the sacrifice, had fellowship with God and with the priest, who also ate part of the offering (7:14-15, 31-34). This sacrifice, along with others, was offered by the thousands during the three annual festivals in Israel (See Ex. 23:14-17; Num. 29:39) because multitudes of people came to the temple to worship and share in a communal meal. During the monarchy, the animals offered by the people were usually supplemented by large numbers given by the king. At the dedication of the temple, Solomon offered 20,000 cattle and 120,000 sheep and goats as fellowship offerings over a period of 14 days (I Ki 8:63-65)" I feel sure that at times like that, and indeed, on Passover itself, where the communicants had to bring their Passover lamb to the tabernacle or temple to slaughter it (Ex. 29:11; Lev. 1:5; 3:2; 3:8, 13; 4:4; 17:5), that the whole courtyard and perhaps even the streets of the city of Jerusalem ran red with blood. As in the case of God and Abram walking through the blood between the pieces of the animals (Gen. 15: 9-12), the people participating in the sacrifices were reminded that it was the shed blood of the Passover lamb which took their place and gave its life that they might enjoy forgiveness and fellowship with God.

Jesus is our fellowship offering. He said to His followers, "I tell you the truth, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink. Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood remains in me, and I in him. Just as the living Father sent me and I live because of the Father, so the one who feeds on me will live because of me. This is the bread that came down from heaven. Your forefathers ate manna and died, but he who feeds on this bread will live forever" (John 6:53-58). I believe that this difficult passage refers back to the fellowship offering, of which Jesus was the fulfillment, and points forward to the sacrifice of His blood which would restore man's fellowship with God, which had been broken since Adam's sin. Many left Him after He uttered these statements recorded in J



John 6. His listeners knew very well that a fellowship offering involved killing the sacrifice and they were not interested in a dead leader, but rather in a live one who would deliver them from their Roman oppressors. Moreover, they were strictly forbidden to eat blood. (See Lev. 3:17; 7:26; 17:14; 19:26; Deut. 12:16; 12:23; 12:24; 15:23; I Sam. 14:34). To them, what Jesus was saying flew in the face of the law and the tradition of the fathers. Unlike Christ, once an animal was slain, its usefulness was over, never to rise again. This is why Paul asserts that it was not the death of Christ, but His life, which saves us. "For if, when we were God's enemies, we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son, how much more, having been reconciled, shall we be saved through his life!" (Rom. 5:10). Peter refers to this amazing phenomenon on the Day of Pentecost: "This man was handed over to you by God's set purpose and foreknowledge; and you, with the help of wicked men, put him to death by nailing him to the cross. But God raised him from the dead, freeing him from the agony of death, because it was impossible for death to keep its hold on him" (Acts 2:23-24). It was His resurrection from the dead that qualified Him to receive the praises of every creature under heaven, "To him who sits on the throne and to the Lamb be praise and honor and glory and power, for ever and ever!" (Rev. 5:13)

Another thing to bear in mind when considering all these animal sacrifices, is that the Levites had no part in the inheritance of the land promised to Abram. When Joshua was supervising the dividing up of the land which they had conquered, he told the Israelites, "The Levites, however, do not get a portion among you, because the priestly service of the LORD is their inheritance" (Josh. 18:7). Read the whole chapter of Num. 18 for God's explanation to Aaron on this, but here's a portion that makes it clear how God supplied the needs of the Levites: "Then the LORD said to Aaron, 'I myself have put you in charge of the offerings presented to me; all the holy offerings the Israelites give me I give to you and your sons as your portion and regular share. You are to have the part of the most holy offerings that is kept from the fire. From all the gifts they bring me as most holy offerings, whether grain or sin or guilt offerings, that part belongs to you and your sons. Eat it as something most holy; every male shall eat it. You must regard it as holy. 'This also is yours: whatever is set aside from the gifts of all the wave offerings of the Israelites. I give this to you and your sons and daughters as your regular share. Everyone in your household who is ceremonially clean may eat it. 'I give you all the finest olive oil and all the finest new wine and grain they give the LORD as the firstfruits of their harvest. All the land's firstfruits that they bring to the LORD will be yours. Everyone in your household who is ceremonially clean may eat it. 'Everything in Israel that is devoted to the LORD is yours'" (Num. 18:8-14). In Verses 21-29, we see that because the Levites had no inheritance in the land, they were to be given the tithes from the children of Israel as compensation for their service to the Lord, in the care of the Tabernacle and the daily ministrations of the priests with the sacrifices. They in turn, were to present to the Lord a tenth of all the best and holiest of the tithes which they received (vv. 26-28). That portion was to go to Aaron (v. 29), the high priest. He alone, as you know, could go once a year into the holy of holies to atone first for his sins and his sons' sins, and then for the sins of the people (Lev. 16:2-20). His sacred vestments, which he wore when he went into the most holy place, had bells sewn around the hem which could be heard when he walked (Ex. 28:33-34). "According to Jewish tradition, one end of a length of rope was tied to the high priest's ankle and the other end remained outside the tabernacle. If the bells on his robe stopped tinkling while he was in the Holy Place, the assumption that he died could be tested by pulling gently on the rope." (NIV study note on Ex. 28:35). Thus we understand that the high priest had a most sacred obligation to the children of Israel, and one which if done improperly, could cost him his life.

I said at the beginning of this journal that the Bible is a love story written in blood. The more I understand about the types and shadows of the Old Testament, and how they were all fulfilled in Christ, I see that the Bible is also like a quilt. My mother is an excellent quilter, having produced many gorgeous creations. If you've never seen this done, you would be amazed at how the tiny pieces of fabric are carefully and painstakingly sewn together in such a way that order springs out of chaos (the quilt pieces lying in a heap often don't look like anything but scraps waiting to be tossed out). When she is finished piecing them together, and quilting the entire covering, the assembled pieces create a beautiful finished picture. Only after the final stitch has been sewn can you grasp the beauty of the whole quilt. From any vantage point, front, back or sideways, you can see the pattern worked throughout the quilt and it's a tremendous example of how the whole becomes greater than sum of its parts. So it is with the Bible. The parts often seem disjointed, each story appearing different from the last, but when the Lord calls you to the third floor, Elwin Roach's expression which refers to being caught up in the Spirit, you begin to see the pattern which is laid out everywhere in Scripture. That pattern which runs from Genesis to Revelation, spells out the unconditional love of God for His creation. He is totally in charge of all aspects of our lives, which flow together into a seamless whole, reflecting His glory.

You may be interested or repulsed by the history of the blood sacrifices, but mostly, you may be wondering what it has to do with us today, in the year 2,000. I think the fact that we don't understand it, causes questions like the Episcopal Bishop asked, "Why can't God just say He forgives us?" In actual fact, that is exactly what He has been saying from the beginning of time if our spiritual eyes were only opened to see. Do you remember the two disciples who were walking on the Emmaus Road the day of Jesus' resurrection? (Lk. 24:13-27). The passage relates that they were walking along discussing the tremendous events of the past few days, when Jesus caught up to them and began walking with them. He asked them what they were discussing, and not recognizing Him, they began to tell Him about how their Lord, whom they had hoped would redeem Israel, politically speaking, was taken by the chief priests and rulers and crucified. They related how the women who went to the tomb that very morning reported that His body was gone and that "a vision of angels" (v.

23) had verified that He was alive. They said that some of their companions had gone to see for themselves, and sure enough, He was gone but they didn't see Him. At this point, Jesus reprimanded them saying, "How foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Did not the Christ have to suffer these things and then enter his glory?" And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself" (Lk. 24:25-27). How I would have loved to have been on that walk with those three. I have been hot on the trail of "what was said in all the Scriptures" concerning the Christ for many years, and God has been showing me a little at a time. It's a treasure hunt, one clue after another, opening up the richness of the written Word to me, and that's why I'm so grateful to my sister Mary Blattner for sending us the Video Tapes produced by Focus on the Family (End Note B). They have opened the door further for me to see some things that history has recorded which dovetail with what I knew of scriptures.

Concerning the daily sacrifices, Moses told them "This is what you are to offer on the altar regularly each day: two lambs a year old. Offer one in the morning and the other at twilight. With the first lamb offer a tenth of an ephah of fine flour mixed with a quarter of a hin of oil from pressed olives, and a quarter of a hin of wine as a drink offering. Sacrifice the other lamb at twilight with the same grain offering and its drink offering as in the morning, a pleasing aroma, an offering made to the LORD by fire. 'For the generations to come this burnt offering is to be made regularly at the entrance to the Tent of Meeting before the LORD. There I will meet you and speak to you; there also I will meet with the Israelites, and the place will be consecrated by my glory'" (Ex. 29:38-43). (See also Num. 28:3-4; I Chr. 16:40.) Between the time of Moses' commandments and Jesus' life, about 1500 years, the rabbis and scholars had sorted, sifted, qualified, quantified and amended the original instructions so that by AD 30, there were three daily sacrifices. At 3:00 PM, every afternoon, the priest slit the throat of the lamb as a burnt offering for the people. And at that very moment, the ninth hour (Mk. 15:34), as Jesus hung on the cross, He spoke His last, "It is finished" (Jn. 19:30) and gave up the ghost. Also, at that moment, the power of Almighty God fell upon the City and the Jewish law took its first hit. Listen to Matthew's account: "At that moment (of Jesus' death) the curtain of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom. The earth shook and the rocks split. The tombs broke open and the bodies of many holy people who had died were raised to life. They came out of the tombs, and after Jesus' resurrection they went into the holy city and appeared to many people. When the centurion and those with him who were guarding Jesus saw the earthquake and all that had happened, they were terrified, and exclaimed, 'Surely he was the Son of God!'" (Matt. 27:51-54). Anyone with his or her spiritual eyes open realizes that when the veil covering the Most Holy place was torn, it was the beginning of the end of the age. (The final blow fell in AD 70, when the Roman General Titus destroyed the temple and everything in it). Prior to that, once a year, only the High Priest could enter behind the veil, and then only with blood for himself and for the people. When you begin to study the typology of Christ's sacrifice and how it completely fulfilled and surpassed all that was portrayed in the Tabernacle and later, the temple sacrifices, you realize what the Hebrew writer was saying in Chapter 9: "He did not enter by means of the blood of goats and calves; but he entered the Most Holy Place once for all by his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. The blood of goats and bulls and the ashes of a heifer sprinkled on those who are ceremonially unclean sanctify them so that they are outwardly clean. How much more, then, will the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself unblemished to God, cleanse our consciences from acts that lead to death, so that we may serve the living God!" (Heb. 9:12-14). He goes on to say that the gifts and sacrifices offered under the old Covenant "were not able to clear the conscience of the worshiper" (v. 9) for the simple reason that the law was only a shadow of the good things to come, rather than the reality (Heb. 10:1). Sadly, too many Christians today are still operating under Old Covenant principals because they hang on to their sins and the accompanying guilt, having failed to see that their iniquities past, present and future, were truly nailed to the cross, to be remembered no more. God gave the Old Covenant to show us that we cannot keep the law, perfect though the psalmist declared it to be (Ps. 19:7), but even if we could, Paul said, it could never make us perfect (Heb. 7:19). The Hebrew writer expands on this by saying, "For this reason it (the law) can never, by the same sacrifices repeated endlessly year after year, make perfect those who draw near to worship. If it could, would they not have stopped being offered? For the worshipers would have been cleansed once for all, and would no longer have felt guilty for their sins. But those sacrifices are an annual reminder of sins, because it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins" (Heb. 10:1-4). Clearly, guilt comes from unforgiveness. If your sins are forgiven, as they most surely are, then why are you still carrying the guilt? To me, carrying guilt around is an affront to the power of God to remove sins. In the process of removing our guilt, Christ was the fulfillment of the scapegoat pictured in Lev. 16: 8-10, where the priest laid his hands on the goat's head, symbolically transferring the sins of the people of Israel to the animal, and then it was led out into the wilderness. On Christ, was laid all the sins of the world. "But he was pierced for our transgressions, he was crushed for our iniquities; the punishment that brought us peace was upon him, and by his wounds we are healed. We all, like sheep, have gone astray, each of us has turned to his own way; and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:5-6). Listen to this glorious statement made by John the Beloved, "He is the atoning sacrifice for our sins, and not only for ours but also for the sins of the whole world" (I Jn. 2:2). Think of it. Every time a sacrifice was made, from God killing an animal in order to clothe Adam, and Eve, to His blood covenant with Abram, (Gen. 15: 9-12), to the blood of the Passover Lamb brushed over the tops and sides of the doors to keep the angel of death from killing the firstborn

of the children of Israel who were in Egypt (Ex. 12:21-23), the blood has been a sign to us all of God's provision for forgiveness until the time when He would wipe away all the sins of the entire world with the blood of the perfect Passover Lamb.

I didn't know until we watched the videos, that the day Jesus made His triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Matt. 21:4-9; Mk. 11:7-10), was the very day when the lamb was selected for the Passover meal. This is another example of how Jesus' life was perfectly scripted by God to fulfill all the law and teachings of the prophets. God has been saying to us from the beginning that He understood our humanness, our sinfulness, our rebellion, and by His actions, He was pointing forward to the time when He would reconcile the whole world back to Himself. Paul's statement in II Corinthians always thrills me. He asserts "that God was reconciling the world to himself in Christ, not counting men's sins against them. And he has committed to us the message of reconciliation. We are therefore Christ's ambassadors, as though God were making his appeal through us. We implore you on Christ's behalf: Be reconciled to God" (II Cor. 5:19-20). Notice who is being reconciled to whom. Like so many truths, the professing church has it backwards, telling us that the death of Christ was to reconcile God to us. No, that's topsy turvy. The truth is that God has always been reconciled to us, but our sins have hidden His face from us, even as the sins of the world hid the face of God from Christ, causing Him to cry out from the cross, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me" (Matt. 27:46; Mk. 15:34). Now, if God was in Christ on that cross, as Paul says He was, then not only did He not forsake Christ, but He was right there on the cross suffering along with Him! So, why would Christ feel forsaken? Isaiah gives us the reason: "But your iniquities have separated you from your God; your sins have hidden his face from you, so that he will not hear" (Isa. 59:2). Though perfect in every way, Christ was weighted down with the sins of the entire world, and thus, could not see His father's face at that moment in the same way that our sins have hidden God's love from us until, at last, we "got it" in our spirits that they were paid for by the blood of God's Passover Lamb; they were blotted out; they are no more! This study has caused me to rejoice in the careful provision of our Father, who before time, knew that His only son would have to die for us (Rev. 13:8). It also has grieved me to know that much of Christendom believes that God is not much better than pagan deities, who demanded blood to satisfy their wrath. Again, to say it one more time, the blood was NOT for God's benefit. The blood was for us, a visual symbol of His provision and grace for us when our sins would otherwise have separated us from Him. Surviving our sins by sacrificing animals, we were carried forward until the time came for the love of God to take on flesh and dwell among us (Jn. 1:14). At this point in this writing, I would encourage you to read a very short piece by our dear friend Harry Fox, entitled, "Why did Christ Have to Die?" (See link at end). Harry has expressed a profound truth in short, simple language, which I believe will bless you as it did us.

I was talking to the Lord about this journal, which I have felt impressed to write. Lenny and I only write when we feel moved on by the Spirit, and that means that we don't have a regular schedule for mailing or web publishing. We have no interest in cluttering up your mailbox or your computer screen with trivia. So, I asked God, "What's the point of this journal?" He said this to me, "In times past, I revealed my mercy and grace in the blood of animals, until the time when I revealed myself in my only Son."

The Christ is the Alpha and the Omega (Rev. 1:8; 21:6; 22:13). His beginning was before the foundation of the world, and His "ending" (or final mission) will set the entire creation free to bless and serve the Lord God Almighty from everlasting to everlasting. I like the Phillip's Translation of Rom. 11:33-34, 36: "Frankly, I stand amazed at the unfathomable complexity of God's wisdom and God's knowledge. How could man ever understand his reasons for action, or explain His methods of working? For of him, and through him, and to him are all things, to whom be glory for ever. Amen." Jesus is the express image of the Father (II Cor. 4:4, 6), sent in the last days to usher in the kingdom of heaven on earth (Matt. 12:28). In one of His encounters with God, Moses pled with Him not to abandon His wicked and disobedient children. God replied that He would go with them to the promised land. Moses then expressed a sentiment that all of us share: "If your Presence does not go with us, do not send us up from here. How will anyone know that you are pleased with me and with your people unless you go with us?"

What else will distinguish me and your people from all the other people on the face of the earth?" And the LORD said to Moses, "I will do the very thing you have asked, because I am pleased with you and I know you by name" (Ex. 33:15-17). Take heart, dear ones, for God goes with us whenever we take the next step. He is pleased with us and He knows us by name. As it is written, so let it be done in our lives.

In conclusion:

"The heart of the matter (the blood sacrifice of Christ) has to do with our hostility toward God and the propitiation of the blood answering that. Our hostility goes back to Adam's and Eve's answer to the Lord's question, "Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you not to eat?" (Gen. 3:11). A careful reading of their response reveals an underlying accusation of God as responsible for what had happened. And of course, they were right; He was responsible, but they were not right in making it a matter of blame, accusation and alienation. It is this petulant resentment that the blood address

es. This alienation (death) has been passed on to us (notice that Paul says that it was death that was passed on to us , not sin, and out of that, death/alienation, we rebel/sin).

We are in prison, in bondage to this condition and a price must be paid to redeem us from it. The blood is not a payment to God and certainly not to the devil. It is paid to us as that which we need to free us from the chains of our alienation. On one hand, we are angry at God (those who dare admit it) and on the other hand, we feel horribly guilty about that anger. So, God has set us up. He now has the perfect context in which to show the depth of His love and commitment to us to fulfill His purpose in us. In effect, God says, "You're angry aren't you? You think I'm the one who should be suffering in stead of you? You want blood, don't you? Go ahead, take out all your anger, do what you really want to do to me." And they did. The fulness of time converged at that point and the totality of all human hostility was unleashed upon Christ, not God's anger, but man's anger, and as they shed His blood, He revealed the depth of the Father's love, which could only be fully understood when given expression at man's worst moment.

When we hear, "Father forgive them for they do not know what they do" (Luke 23:34), the very spirit of our alienation and hostility is broken and we are healed. As I've written before, Christ's prayer was not an attempt to convince God to forgive, but rather was the Son's agreement with the forgiveness that already flowed from the heart of the Father and that flow could not be interrupted even in the face of such infamy.

xxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

-----  
IRONMAN wrote:  
sis dorcas

Quote:

-----First, the Lamb was slain from (or before) the foundation of the world. Is not this where the sins of those whom Jesus forgave when He ministered to them, had been dealt with?  
-----

this is heavy stuff...i think you're onto something here because the o.t. is a forshadowing of the n.t.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/23 4:21**

Steve, all is good with your post. Blood is God's life, liquid life and it flows through all of His creation, but flesh and blood cannot enter the kingdom of God.

The only thing is, lets not cheapen the power in the Blood and what it did for us at the Cross. Pleading the blood is like name it and claim it and putting icing on it by using the precious blood of Christ to get what we want. God knows what we need before we even ask. Don't make Him sick by using a cheap parlor trick. Lets put the power in the Blood in its proper context, where it was shed for our salvation and life in Christ the Person, The Person is our salvation and new life.

If we carry this to its ultimate, when we were crucified with Christ our blood must have been mingled with His. Well I guess you can see where that would lead. Not where God would want the Blood of His Precious Son to be used.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/23 6:08

Quote:  
-----Of what "value" did applying the actual blood of sacrificed animals to the right earlobe, the right big finger, and the right big toe have here? Of what value did the anointing of Oil over the Priests head have here?

These were all commands of God.  
-----

They were indeed, and 'pleading the blood' isn't.

Re: Christ's life poured out in death ie the blood of the cross was in order to - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/23 6:26

Quote:  
-----Christ's life poured out in death ie the blood of the cross was in order to turn away God's anger??

Can you back this statement up with scripture?

Does John 3:16 teach this?  
-----

It is the meaning of the word 'propitiation'. Propitiation is the price paid to pay to for the offence and to make reconciliation possible.

Quote:  
-----"And say ye moreover, Behold, thy servant Jacob is behind us. For he said, I will appease him with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; peradventure he will accept of me." (Gen 32:20 KJVS)  
-----

The word translated here is 'kaphar' often translated 'to atone' in the KJV. This passage is a wonderful illustration of propitiation making reconciliation possible and is 2nd earliest use of the term in the scriptures.

As regards John 3:16 that verse is a simple statement of fact and purpose not an explanation as to how God effected the reconciliation. Paul takes up the theme of 'propitiation' in Romans...

Quote:  
-----"Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;" (Rom 3:25 KJVS)  
-----

God has set forth Christ as the price paid to remove the offence and this and this alone is the reason that God can be both 'just' and the 'justifier'.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/23 6:26

Quote:  
-----Today, in 2006 do we all have the blood and oil applied in our own lives as born again Christians?  
-----

It was the office of Moses (and later the High Priest) to apply the blood and the oil. As Wesley wrote

Quote:  
-----Spirit of faith, come down,  
reveal the things of God,  
and make to us the Godhead known,  
and witness with the blood.  
'Tis thine the blood to apply  
and give us eyes to see,  
who did for every sinner die  
hath surely died for me.  
-----

In this New Covenant it is the Mediator and High Priest who must apply the blood, not us.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/23 6:33**

Quote:  
-----I believe there is basis in some aspect in Revelation 12:11, "For the Accuser of our brothers is cast down .. and they overcame Him because of the Blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony, and because they loved not their soul life even unto death."

That is, the Blood speaks to the accuser. He accuses, we testify to the Blood, The Spirit witnesses to the Blood, and the accuser is silenced.

-----  
We have an Advocate who pleads our cause, Jesus Christ the Righteous and he is the propitiation... It is because of the death of Christ as the God-given and God-received propitiation that Satan can no longer exercise authority over the saints. The word of their testimony is not that they 'face' Satan in this overcoming life but that their confidence is in what God has already done in Christ.

I defeat Satan by 'resisting him' not by 'pleading the blood'. It is possible to resist him because of what Christ has done on the cross in which God's righteous demands were satisfied and Satan's stranglehold on the human race was broken.

**Re: Forgiveness without blood! - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/23 6:39**

Quote:  
-----God allowed poor people under the law to bring fine flour as a sin offering. This flour from God's point of view accomplished as much as a blood sacrifice from a person who had more money.

Whatever the blood did the flour also did.

The conclusion is IF the blood turned away God's anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin also.

-----  
You are mixing up the offerings. Flour was never a sin offering, it was part of the meal offerings and as such was a 'sweet savour' offering to God; the sin offering and the trespass offerings were not 'sweet savour' offerings'. The 'meal offering' has no reference to 'sin'.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/23 6:44**

Sorry, this is the sixth in a row, but I have been away over the weekend and catching up with other things at home...

Quote:  
-----We are in prison, in bondage to this condition and a price must be paid to redeem us from it. The blood is not a payment to God and certainly not to the devil. It is paid to us as that which we need to free us from the chains of our alienation.

the blood is paid 'to us'... this is crazy. The death of Christ was the payment of a debt, what did God ever owe me? The propitiation is a price paid... to whom.... me? of course not.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/23 8:04**

I said (p5)

Quote:  
-----I believe the shedding of His blood, both before and after His death are symbolic.

-----  
This sentence has been batting round in my head since I wrote it. I think I mean they are also symbolic, rather than *only* 'symbolic'.

It has dawned on me that while He was still alive, shedding blood which contained HIS LIFE, He was a 'living sacrifice'.

He was still alive when He cried 'It is finished'.

When He gave up the ghost, it was the confirmation of that 'finish'. That blood which had not flowed until His side was pierced *after* His death, *must be* part of the complete offering for sin which was acceptable to the Father, as it speaks of Christ's life completely laid down.

I feel there is other significance in the water which flowed from His side, with the blood,(as well as that from His head, ha

nds and feet, which speak of the truth in John 13), but probably these are off topic for this thread.

**flour is a sin offering!, on: 2006/6/23 8:20**

Philologos

I am NOT mixing up the offerings. It appears that you can not read. Look again at this verse.

Leviticus 5:11; "But if his means are insufficient for two turtledoves or two young pigeons, then for his offering for that which he has sinned, he shall bring the tenth of an ephah of fine flour for a SIN offering; he shall not put oil on it or place incense on it, for it is a SIN offering." NASB

Under the law, fine flour WAS accepted by God for a SIN offering.

I stand by my statement.

This flour from Gods point of view accomplished as much as a blood sacrifice from a person who had more money.

Whatever the blood did the flour also did.

The conclusion is IF the blood turned away Gods anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin also.

**Re: flour is a sin offering! - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/23 9:30**

Quote:

-----I am NOT mixing up the offerings. It appears that you can not read. Look again at this verse.  
-----

:-?

**Re: flour is a sin offering! - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/23 9:39**

Quote:

-----Whatever the blood did the flour also did. The conclusion is IF the blood turned away Gods anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin also.  
-----

This has a strong 'Gov't of God' feel to it. I say respectfully, that I think Finney misunderstood the atonement as we would know it. I am not saying that many of his teachings are not profitable, but his position on atonement I have to renounce when it departs from the scriptures.

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

I wish to share this quote from Spurgeon:

"This great fact, I say, is stamped on nature; it is an essential law of God's moral government, it is one of the fundamental principles which can neither be shaken nor denied. Never can there be any exception to it; it stands the same in every place throughout all ages—"Without shedding of blood there is no remission." It was so with the Jews; they had no remission without the shedding of blood. Some things under the Jewish law might be cleansed by water or by fire, but in no case where absolute sin was concerned was there ever purification without blood—teaching this doctrine, that blood, and blood alone, must be applied for the remission of sin. Indeed the very heathen seem to have an inkling of this fact. Do not I see their knives gory with the blood of victims? Have I not heard horrid tales of human immolations, of holocausts, of sacrifices; and what mean these, but that there lies deep in the human breast, deep as the very existence of man, this truth,—"that without shedding of blood there is no remission." And I assert once more, that even in the hearts and consciences of my hearers there is something which will never let them believe in remission apart from a shedding of blood.

d. This is the grand truth of Christianity, and it is a truth which I will endeavour now to fix upon your memory; and may God by his grace bless it to your souls. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." (C.H. Spurgeon)

**Re: flour is a sin offering! - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/23 10:18**

For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. (Hebrews 10:4)

Quote:

-----The conclusion is IF the blood turned away Gods anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin.  
-----

This is impossible. This is the way of Cain. Hebrews 10:4 gives us insight into all of the offerings with the simple statement, *For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.* These offerings were only temporal pictures of the true Sin Offering.

In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. (Hebrews 10:6)

These things were 'pictures' and had no value to turn away God's wrath whatsoever. It was because of the blood of Christ slain from before the foundation of the world that made anyones sins forgivable. It is the only way God was just in being the justifier of the ungodly.

... by which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. Every priest indeed stands day by day serving and often offering the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins, but he, when he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God;

**Re: - posted by murdog (), on: 2006/6/23 10:19**

SI members,

I have always felt that pleading the blood was an invention of man. Maybe a well intentioned invention, but an invention nonetheless. When Jesus taught his disciples to pray he never directed them to plead his blood. Paul doesn't plead the blood in his letters.

The blood is everything in regards to the remission of sin. I just don't think it needs to be used to protect our belongings, etc.

Murray

**Re: flour is a sin offering! - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/23 10:32**

freed wrote:

Quote:  
-----The conclusion is IF the blood turned away Gods anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin also.  
-----

What is your conclusion to this?

**Hebrews 10:4-12** For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

**:5** Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

**:6** In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.

**:7** Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.



:8 Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law;  
:9 Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.  
:10 By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.  
:11 And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins:  
:12 But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;

It was not the blood of bulls and goats that God looked at, but the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.**Rev. 13:8**

The blood of bulls and goats were for the children of Israel to see the full extent of the effect that sin has.

It was to show the children of Israel that there must be a better sacrifice that will take away sin once and for all and not need a sacrifice every year.

They knew that their sacrifices can never take away sins: it was only a reminder for them.

So what is your point with the flour?

**Re: What is your plea? I 'plead' the blood. - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/23 10:59**

Quote:

-----The blood is everything in regards to the remission of sin. I just don't think it needs to be used to protect our belongings,etc.  
-----

Please forgive me if this has been brought out already, but the original sense (as best I know) of "pleading the blood" stems from a courtroom scene in which the sinner is brought to give account of his/her sins. When asked how do you plea (guilty, not guilty,), the person would respond, "I plead the blood."

There have been a couple of Christian tunes to this effect, one of which was Ray Boltz's "One drop of blood." Error begets error. The song has a nice tune to it, but it misses the point all together. "One drop of blood" did NOT defeat the enemy. The life of Christ poured out (for the life of the flesh is in the blood) is what turned away God's wrath. The song would lead a person to believe that a blood sample from a pin prick device would have saved a person. This is nonsense.

Another Lyric comes to mind from "THE BLOOD OF CALVARY":

When the harvest has been gathered  
All my work is done  
When the last mile's been traveled  
And I've sung my final song  
If I'm called to give an answer  
At heaven's judgment seat  
Then let the blood of Calvary speak for me.

The concept is rooted in the fact that the blood of Christ 'speaketh' better things than that of Abel. And since the blood 'speaketh' (as it were) then "I plead the blood."

The problem is that these types of illustrations can be taken too far and pretty soon the original meaning is gone and a new doctrine has developed. Lots of false or questionable 'doctrines' get started this way.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/23 11:32**

plead has three Meanings:

**#1:** appeal or request earnestly

This is suplication, petition, and intercession.

There is no need to plead the blood here for the saint because God already sees it. There is no need to plead the blood for the unsaved, because they do not have it.

**#2:** offer as an excuse or plea

**#3:** enter a plea, as in courts of law

These two meanings for the word plead that one would give with the blood are of no use because the blood is only a cleansing agent, if you will, and a payment for a price or a debt.

If you took a shower, would you need to plead the soap? No, you would show the cleanness.

If you had a debt that was already paid, would you need to plead your payment? No, you would show the account.

We do not need to plead the blood because it is the blood of the Judge to whom we are pleading to.

If we were pleading to any other, like the devil, I might find a reason to plead the blood because of his unawareness of it.

Pleading the Blood for your body, your house, your car, your finances, etc.

These are not to be covered by the blood, but only your soul is to be.

Pleading the Blood for protection is only protection from God's wrath.

Let's only do what we see the Apostles do and not add anything to it.

**Re: flour is a sin offering! - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/24 1:39**

Quote:

-----It appears that you can not read.

Is this the spirit in which you intend to pursue this conversation? If so, it is going to be rather one sided.

**Re: The Blood, on: 2006/6/25 1:34**

Stever posts:

Every time in every church before we take the Holy Communion, we hear the pastor reading a passage from 1 Corinthians 11:24-25:

"24 and when He had given thanks, He broke it and said, 'Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me.'"

25 In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me.'"

When we read our Bible carefully (BOTH THE OLD & NEW TESTAMENT) we notice that since the fall of mankind, God initiated covenants with man. He made covenants with Noah (Genesis 6:18), with Abraham (Genesis 15:18, 17:2), with David (2 Samuel 23:5), with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah (Jeremiah 31:31-34). The last and yet the most powerful one is the New Covenant or an everlasting covenant (Isaiah 55:3, 1 Corinthians 11:25).

In its simplest definition, a "covenant" is an agreement between two parties. We seldom use the word "covenant" today, and only in regards to the marriage covenant, where it is lightly regarded and its true meaning not even understood.

In present society, THE WORD "COVENANT" IS A WORD THAT HAS LOST IT'S MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE. In Old Testament and Biblical times, the word "covenant" involved a promise, commitment, faithfulness and LOYALTY EVEN UNTO DEATH. A covenant is a UNION OF TWO PARTIES IN WHICH ALL ASSETS, TALENTS, DEBTS AND LIABILITIES ARE HELD MUTUALLY.

What is the definition of a covenant?

In English:

Mutual understanding between two or more parties each binding himself to fulfill specified obligations; a legal contract; a binding agreement; a written agreement.

Also means the conditional promises made to humanity by God, as revealed in Scripture.

In the Old Testament, The Hebrew Word BERIYTH is used 264 times.

- Beriyyh: implies the thought of cutting a covenant. The word is also defined as a covenant, pact or compact. These covenants are made between men, or between God or men (Jeremiah 34:18).

In the New Testament the Greek word Diatheke is used 23 times.

1. Diatheke: a disposition, arrangement, testament or will. This word signifies an UNEQUAL COVENANT, WHERE ONE DOES ALL THE GIVING AND THE OTHER DOES ALL THE TAKING.

2. Suntithemai: To put together, place together, make an arrangement. The animals were placed in a specific arrangement, having been cut down the backbone and the middle of the head, cutting the animal in two.

Genesis 15:7-18

Then He said to him, "I am the Lord, who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldeans, to give you this land to inherit it." And he said, "Lord GOD, how shall I know that I will inherit it?" So He said to him, "Bring Me a three-year-old heifer, a three-year-old female goat, a three-year-old ram, a turtledove, and a young pigeon." Then he brought all these to Him and cut them in two, down the middle, and placed each piece opposite the other; but he did not cut the birds in two.

And when the vultures came down on the carcasses, Abram drove them away.

Now when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and behold, horror and great darkness fell upon him. Then He said to Abram: "Know certainly that your descendants will be strangers in a land that is not theirs, and will serve them, and they will afflict them four hundred years. And also the nation whom they serve I will judge; afterward they shall come out with great possessions. Now as for you, you shall go to your fathers in peace; you shall be buried at a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall return here, for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet complete." And it came to pass, when the sun went down and it was dark, that behold, there appeared a smoking oven and a burning torch that passed between those pieces. On the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying: "To your descendants I have given this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the River Euphrates."

In this covenant above, we see that God initiated the first Blood Sacrifice Covenant with Abraham. In the modern day we hold a covenant with another person by his signature on a piece of paper which the person signs in front of a legal notary or a higher authority or by his 'word'.

Since God is the highest authority, He cannot take an oath to another supreme authority. He can only guarantee His promises by His own word and by shedding blood to seal His covenant.

In the ancient Hebrew or Hittite covenant the inferior party would walk between the bleeding pieces of cut animals taking an oath of loyalty to his superior partner. God established a covenant with Abraham in the terms that Abraham could understand, in accordance with the Hebrew covenant ritual.

In the Bible, we see in the Old and New Testaments, the Jewish ritual of making a covenant. There are 9 steps or conditions which where both parties must fulfill.

**OLD TESTAMENT**

1. Take Off Coat or Robe

Both parties will take off their robes to exchange. This means "I'm giving you all of myself. I pledge to you my life and whatever I have."

A robe usually represents the status of a person. God does not have a physical robe therefore He offers all of Himself unto Abraham. He said, "I am your shield, your exceedingly great reward" (Genesis 15:1). This means everything, whatever God has including His holiness and His righteousness.

## 2. Take Off Belt

A belt is used to hold the armour together. It means - "I'm giving you all my strength, support, protection, and ability to fight. Your battle will my battle. I'll fight for you, I'll defend and protect you. And you'll do the same for me."

In this case we know the lesser party will benefit from the stronger party. So with Abraham since God doesn't have a physical belt, God promised Abraham, "I will curse him who curses you," (Genesis 12:3) and "I am your shield" (Genesis 15:1).

In other words whoever comes against you comes against Me (God Himself).

## 3. Cut The Covenant

God selected the animals and instructed Abraham to cut them into halves and place them opposite one another. In this covenant, both covenant parties had to walk between the bloody halves of the animals with their backs to each other. After reaching the other end they will turn around, face each other and walk through the animals to where they started.

In doing this they are saying firstly, "We are dying to ourselves, giving up all our rights to the other party and beginning a new walk with the new covenant partner unto death."

Secondly they are saying, "May God do so unto me (like the animals) if I try to break the covenant."

Blood is very important to seal a covenant. There is life in the blood. Therefore sacrifice is life for life. To seal the covenant with blood means they hold the covenant until death. If one breaks the covenant let death come unto him.

When God made a covenant with Abraham we see in Genesis 15:12 that Abraham fell into deep sleep. And Genesis 15:17 says, "Behold, there appeared a smoking oven and a burning torch that passed between those pieces." It wasn't Abraham who walked through the bleeding pieces of sacrificial animal but it was God Himself.

In other words God was saying to Abraham, "I am making the covenant, doing all of the work, and you are a recipient of this covenant, with no responsibilities on your part".

The Lord was the Initiator of the covenant and He put Abraham to sleep. God did all of the work in this Covenant, not requiring anything from Abraham to establish the covenant. This dramatic act preshadows God's precious gift, Jesus, who condescended to die on a degrading cross for all mankind, thus doing all of the work for us to be saved.

We can see here that God:

- A. Initiates the covenant
- B. Gives the requirement
- C. Administers the outcome
- D. Himself is a Guarantor

## 4. Mix Blood

Both parties will cut their palms and bring them together to mix the blood as they swear allegiance to each other. This means their lives are intermingling to become one thus putting off their old natures and putting the nature of the blood covenant partner.

With Abraham God said in Genesis 17:10, "This is My covenant which you shall keep, between Me and you and your descendants after you: Every male child among you shall be circumcised".

Genesis 17:12

He who is eight days old among you shall be circumcised, every male child in your generations, he who is born in your house or brought with money from any stranger who is not your descendant.

Circumcision here is a sign of man entering covenant with God.

## 5. Exchange Names

Both parties will take each other's last name. In Hebrew God is called "YHWH". He took the "H" and He put it in Abram and Sarai's names. So Abram became Abraham and Sarai became Sarah. God now becomes known as the God of Abraham.

#### 6. Make a Scar

Both parties rub their blood together, they make a scar as a permanent testimony to the covenant. This is one of the reasons why God asked every male Hebrew to be circumcised so that there is a mark on their bodies (Genesis 17:10-14). The seal of circumcision of the Abrahamic covenant is fulfilled in the New Covenant circumcision of the heart (Romans 2:24-29).

#### 7. Covenant Terms

Both parties will stand before witnesses and give the terms of covenant. "All my wealth, assets, possessions are yours." At the same time they also exchange liabilities so when one faces a financial problem, he'll say, "I will use our money to settle it."

We see that the weaker party will benefit from the stronger party. With Abraham, God said that through Abraham's seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed (Genesis 12:3 and 17:16).

We know very well that all good things on this earth come from God. Abraham not only became a channel of blessing but more than that he is called the friend of God (James 2:23).

#### 8. Eat Covenant Meal

After doing all the above they close the covenant with a meal. Bread and wine are served.

#### 9. Plant A Memorial

Both parties will plant a tree sprinkled with the blood of the animal as a memorial to the covenant. All their children are included in the covenant. Later when their children come to an age of understanding about the covenant, they can choose to stay in it or reject it.

Abraham understood very well the meaning of the covenant he made with God. Therefore he knew God had the right to ask for Isaac as a burnt offering. By his willingness to sacrifice Isaac he showed that he was prepared to fulfill covenant terms. Abraham chose to obey God where later God the Father fulfilled His part of the covenant by sending His only begotten Son, Jesus, as a sacrificial offering for all human race.

From the Abrahamic Covenant and the word covenant in Greek, "diatheke" which means "an unequal covenant" we know very well that we as humans have nothing to give to God - in fact we are His creation and His possession. On the other hand, God is a supreme Being, the self sufficient, self existent One, the Eternal Being, the Almighty, the Creator. In other words God gives all that He has while we give Him nothing. Man can gain all the positive benefits from God. What can man give to God and what can God gain from men - the sin, the transgression, the rebellion, the self centeredness, the pride and the arrogance of the highest order, the wickedness, the diseases - and all the negative things you can think of.

Who in the right mind would want to enter into an agreement or covenant where he gets all the dirt - no one !!! Usually people enter into a covenant because they can benefit from it. The stronger party will enjoy the benefit of having the weaker party's manpower and the weaker party will get protection or finance. Example, the mafia - you work for me, you do all the dirty work and in return I protect you and your family.

I thank God, He is who He is. We all know He is powerful, He is awesome, He is wonderful, He is the prince of peace, He is our healer, He is our banner, He is our deliverer, He is our provider, He is our stronghold, He is our refuge, He is our everything. He can be and is everything for us because He is a God of love who gave Himself to us by giving His only begotten Son to us.

It is His nature and it is His heart to love.

It is His nature and it is His heart to give.

Therefore it is His nature and it is His heart to initiate covenants with man. The covenants are the greatest manifestation of God's love, grace and mercy.

In order for man to be in covenant relationship with God, He must reveal the covenant to man openly declaring the promises and terms where the heavens, the earth and all creation can witness it. All this was fulfilled in the New Testament by God sacrificing His only Son, Jesus Christ.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT

### 1. Exchange Robe

Isaiah 61:10

For He (Jesus) has clothed me with the garments of salvation. He (Jesus) has covered me with the robe of righteousness.

Jesus, who is the Son of God, fully righteous, takes on all our unrighteousness. We can take on His robe of righteousness.

Isaiah 64:6a

But we are all like an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are like filthy rags.

2 Corinthians 5:21

For He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.

### 2. Exchange Belt

We know very well we cannot protect God but God can protect us and He took on our weaknesses.

Colossians 2:9-10

"9. For in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily

10. and you are complete in Him who is the head of all principality and power.

Philippians 4:13

I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.

Isaiah 53:4

Surely He has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed Him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted.

### 3. Cut Covenant

Jesus gives His own body as the sacrifice broken for us.

Isaiah 52:14

His appearance was so disfigured beyond that of any man and His form marred beyond human likeness.

God knows that animals are corruptible, only He and His Son, Jesus, are incorruptible, "eternal". God has to sacrifice Jesus, the eternal Being, so we all can have eternal life. John 3:16 For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whoever believes in Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

### 4. Mix Blood

Jesus who is fully the Son of God must come to earth as the Son of Man so that His blood could be shed for mankind. When we receive Jesus as our Saviour, we are one with Him. We know that He is holy, righteous and perfect. Thus, in Jesus we can put off our old nature and put on the new nature of Jesus.

Ephesians 4:22-24

22 That you put off, concerning your former conduct, the old man which grows corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, 23 and be renewed in the spirit of your mind, 24 and that you put on the new man which was created according to God, in true righteousness and holiness.

### 5. Exchange Names

Jesus who is fully Son of God took the name Son of Man.

John 3:13

No one has ascended to heaven but He who came down from heaven, that is, the Son of Man who is in heaven.

We take on His name.

Acts 11:26

And when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. So it was that for a whole year they assembled with the church

and taught a great many people. And the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch.

Galatians 3:26

For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.

#### 6. Make a Scar

Jesus bears the scar in His hands, the scars of crucifixion. When Jesus had risen, Jesus showed Thomas His scarred hands.

John 20:25 & 27

25 Thomas declared, unless I see the nail marks in His hands and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into His side, I will not believe. 27 He said to Thomas, "Put your finger here, see My hands. Reach out your hands and put it into My side. Stop doubting and believe."

God doesn't require us to be circumcised as the Jews as it was done by Jesus.

Colossians 2:11 & 14

11 In Him you were also circumcised, with the circumcision made without your hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ.

14 having wiped out the handwriting requirements that were against us, which was contrary to us. And He has taken it out of the way, having nailed it to the cross.

#### 7. Terms of Covenant

John 1:11-13

11 He came to His own, and His own did not receive Him. 12 But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, to those who believe in His name: 13 who were born, not of blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor the will of man, but of God

Man must willingly receive what he has been freely given and respond to what God has done by repentance, faith and obedience.

#### 8. Eat Covenant Meal

In the Old Testament, God did not sit with Abraham and eat the covenant meal, but in the New Testament, Jesus instituted the Lord's Supper as the New Covenant.

1 Corinthians 11:23-26

"23. For I received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you: that the Lord Jesus on the same night in which He was betrayed took bread; 24. and when He had given thanks, He broke it and said, "Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me." 25. In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me."

26. For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death till He comes. Jesus was not only the blood sacrifice, He was also the covenant meal. John 6:51 "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever; and the bread that I shall give is My flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world."

Man must accept by faith what Christ did for him and live by obedience to Him.

John 6:54 & 56

54 "Whoever eats of My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day."

56 "He who eats My flesh, and drinks My blood abides in Me, and I in Him."

Eating and drinking is to be understood spiritually. The expression is used figuratively of partaking of the benefits of the death of Christ. To believe in Christ is to partake of Christ.

#### 9. Plant A Memorial

In the Old Testament, God and Abraham didn't plant a tree as a memorial to the covenant. God fulfilled this in the New Covenant when Jesus was crucified on the cross and His blood was poured out. The cross is the memorial tree of the New Covenant. Every time we and our descendants look at the cross we are all reminded of God's covenant.

1 Peter 2:24

Who Himself bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, having died to sins, might live for righteousness - by whose stripes you were healed.

John 19:17-18

17 And He, bearing His cross, went out to a place called the Place of a Skull, which is called in Hebrew, Golgotha,

18 where they crucified Him, and two others with Him, one on either side, and Jesus in the center.

After reading about The Blood Covenant, we see the significance of the shedding of blood by Jesus. We also see how much God honors His covenant which He initiated. We see in the Old Testament and the culture of Jews that they believed if one party breaks the covenant, let death come upon him (just like the cut animals). Because Jesus fulfilled God's promise by shedding His blood, Jesus boldly exclaimed, "I am the way, the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through Me." (John 14:6).

Also, we must never forget that- "there is no remission without the shedding of blood" - Hebrews 9:22

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re:, on: 2006/6/25 3:41**

Someone posted (maybe Freed):

Quote:

-----  
Whatever the blood did the flour also did. The conclusion is IF the blood turned away God's anger towards sin then the flour also would have turned away his anger from sin also.  
-----

Stever responds:

This is incorrect. Sin Sacrifice: Fine Flour, bull, lamb, goat, dove or pigeon

Trespass offering: Ram

Both of these sacrifices were mandatory if you were a Jew. The rest were voluntary.

The Sacrifices consisted of:

Mandatory:

- 1) The Sin Sacrifice- for our sin nature, inherited from Adam
- 2) The Trespass Offering- for any unknown sin that we might have committed, as well as specific sin that we were aware of.

Voluntary- a "Sweet Savor to the Lord":

- 3) The Burnt Offering
- 4) The Meat (Meal) Offering
- 5) The Peace Offering

The flour was never offered by itself, but always part of an offering. The Sin offering consisted of Meal, along with a bull, lamb, goat, dove or a pigeon.

The Burnt offering often included the meal offering along with it. The meal (meat) offering was never offered by itself.



God bless,

Stever :-D

**God accepted fine flour for a sin offering, on: 2006/6/25 6:52**

This is from Matthew Henry Complete Commentary.

Please use ANY Commentary you wish.

Law of the Sin-Offering. B. C. 1490.

1 And if a soul sin, and hear the voice of swearing, and is a witness, whether he hath seen or known of it; if he do not utter it, then he shall bear his iniquity. 2 Or if a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things, and if it be hidden from him; he also shall be unclean, and guilty. 3 Or if he touch the uncleanness of man, whatsoever uncleanness it be that a man shall be defiled withal, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth of it, then he shall be guilty. 4 Or if a soul swear, pronouncing with his lips to do evil, or to do good, whatsoever it be that a man shall pronounce with an oath, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth of it, then he shall be guilty in one of these. 5 And it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that thing: 6 And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the LORD for his sin in which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin.

I. The offences here supposed are, 1. A man's concealing the truth when he was sworn as a witness to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Judges among the Jews had power to adjure not only the witnesses, as with us, but the person suspected (contrary to a rule of our law, that no man is bound to accuse himself), as appears by the high priest adjuring our Saviour, who thereupon answered, though before he stood silent, Matthew 26:63,64. Now (Leviticus 5:1), If a soul sin (that is, a person, for the soul is the man), if he hear the voice of swearing (that is, if he be adjured to testify what he knows, by an oath of the Lord upon him, 1 Kings 8:31), if in such a case, for fear of offending one that either has been his friend or may be his enemy, he refuses to give evidence, or gives it but in part, he shall bear his iniquity. And that is a heavy burden, which, if some course be not taken to get it removed, will sink a man to the lowest hell. He that heareth cursing (that is, that is thus adjured) and betrayeth it not (that is, stifles his evidence, and does not utter it), he is a partner with the sinner, and hateth his own soul; see Proverbs 29:24. Let all that are called out at any time to bear testimony think of this law, and be free and open in their evidence, and take heed of prevaricating. An oath of the Lord is a sacred thing, and not to be dallied with. 2. A man's touching any thing that was ceremonially unclean, Leviticus 5:2, 3. If a man, polluted by such touch, came into the sanctuary inconsiderately, or if he neglected to wash himself according to the law, then he was to look upon himself as under guilt, and must bring his offering. Though his touching the unclean thing contracted only a ceremonial defilement, yet his neglect to wash himself according to the law was such an instance either of carelessness or contempt as contracted a moral guilt. If at first it be hidden from him, yet when he knows it he shall be guilty. Note, As soon as ever God by his Spirit convinces our consciences of any sin or duty we must immediately set in with the conviction, and prosecute it, as those that are not ashamed to own our former mistake. 3. Rash swearing. If a man binds himself by an oath that he will do or not do such a thing, and the performance of his oath afterwards proves either unlawful or impracticable, by which he is discharged from the obligation, yet he must bring an offering to atone for his folly in swearing so rashly, as David that he would kill Nabal. And then it was that he must say before the angel that it was an error, Ecclesiastes 5:6. He shall be guilty in one of these (Leviticus 5:4), guilty if he do not perform his oath, and yet, if the matter of it were evil, guilty if he do. Such wretched dilemmas as these do some men bring themselves into by their own rashness and folly; go which way they will their consciences are wounded, sin stares them in the face, so sadly are they snared in the words of their mouth. A more sad dilemma this is than that of the lepers, "If we sit still, we die; if we stir, we die." Wisdom and watchfulness beforehand would prevent these straits.

II. Now in these cases, 1. The offender must confess his sin and bring his offering (Leviticus 5:5,6); and the offering was not accepted unless it was accompanied with a penitential confession and a humble prayer for pardon. Observe, The confession must be particular, that he hath sinned in that thing; such was David's confession (Psalms 51:4), I have done this evil; and Achan's (Joshua 7:20), Thus and thus have I done. Deceit lies in generals; many will own in general they have sinned, for that all must own, so that it is not any particular reproach to them; but that they have sinned in this thing they stand too much upon their honour to acknowledge: but the way to be well assured of pardon, and to be well armed against sin for the future, is to be particular in our penitent confessions. 2. The priest must make atonement for him. As the atonement was not accepted without his repentance, so his repentance would not justify him without the atonement.

nt. Thus, in our reconciliation to God, Christ's part and ours are both needful.

7 And if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass, which he hath committed, two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, unto the LORD; one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering. 8 And he shall bring them unto the priest, who shall offer that which is for the sin offering first, and wring off his head from his neck, but shall not divide it asunder: 9 And he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin offering upon the side of the altar; and the rest of the blood shall be wrung out at the bottom of the altar: it is a sin offering. 10 And he shall offer the second for a burnt offering, according to the manner: and the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him. 11 But if he be not able to bring two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, then he that sinned shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering; he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon: for it is a sin offering. 12 Then shall he bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take his handful of it, even a memorial thereof, and burn it on the altar, according to the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: it is a sin offering. 13 And the priest shall make an atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in one of these, and it shall be forgiven him: and the remnant shall be the priest's, as a meat offering.

Provision is here made for the poor of God's people, and the pacifying of their consciences under the sense of guilt. Those that were not able to bring a lamb might bring for a sin-offering a pair of turtle-doves or two young pigeons; nay, if any were so extremely poor that they were not able to procure these so often as they would have occasion, they might bring a pottle of fine flour, and this should be accepted. Thus the expense of the sin-offering was brought lower than that of any other offering, to teach us that no man's poverty shall ever be a bar in the way of his pardon. The poorest of all may have atonement made for them, if it be not their own fault. Thus the poor are evangelized; and no man shall say that he had not wherewithal to bear the charges of a journey to heaven. Now,

I. If the sinner brought two doves, one was to be offered for a sin-offering and the other for a burnt-offering, Leviticus 5:7. Observe, 1. Before he offered the burnt-offering, which was for the honour and praise of God, he must offer the sin-offering, to make atonement. We must first see to it that our peace be made with God, and then we may expect that our services for his glory will be accepted. The sin-offering must make way for the burnt-offering. 2. After the sin-offering, which made atonement, came the burnt-offering, as an acknowledgment of the great mercy of God in appointing and accepting the atonement.

II. If he brought fine flour, a handful of it was to be offered, but without either oil or frankincense (Leviticus 5:11), not only because this would make it too costly for the poor, for whose comfort this sacrifice was appointed, but because it was as a sin-offering, and therefore, to show the loathsomeness of the sin for which it was offered, it must not be made grateful either to the taste by oil or to the smell by frankincense. The unsavouriness of the offering was to intimate that the sinner must never relish his sin again as he had done. God by these sacrifices did speak, 1. Comfort to those that had offended, that they might not despair, nor pine away in their iniquity; but, peace being thus made for them with God, they might have peace in him. 2. Caution likewise not to offend any more, remembering what an expensive troublesome thing it was to make atonement.

#### Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/25 9:11

From Matthew Henry:

Quote:  
-----Thus the expense of the sin-offering was brought lower than that of any other offering, to teach us that no man's poverty shall ever be a bar in the way of his pardon. The poorest of all may have atonement made for them, if it be not their own fault. Thus the poor are evangelized; and no man shall say that he had not wherewithal to bear the charges of a journey to heaven.  
-----

I don't think anyone is disputing the scripture here, but, there is a significant difference between the Old and the New Covenant, in that Jesus Christ was the Lamb of God who **takes away** the sin of the world.

Under the Old Covenant, sin was **covered** but not removed as it is now.

Whereas this offering sufficed a poor person for certain limited sins as defined, he would also have benefitted every year from the Day of Atonement, which was vital to his works-based 'salvation'.

EDIT: the point of a sin-offering was to remind the man of his sinfulness and to enable him to keep a short account with God and his conscience.

One might also note that the Lord of Glory gave His life for us all, for all our sinfulness and sins, and should there be any

whose pretensions make them feel the need of a better sacrifice than the poor man's, how can they refuse the Son of God Himself? It is a great mercy that the poor man may also call on the Name of the Lord and be saved. There is no difference. This helps to highlight the *gift* of faith and salvation in Christ, as well as to remove any obstacle which wealth or works might present in the mind of the sinner.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/26 2:07

Quote:  
-----A covenant is a UNION OF TWO PARTIES IN WHICH ALL ASSETS, TALENTS, DEBTS AND LIABILITIES ARE HELD MUTUALLY.  
-----

That would have to be a very specific kind of covenant and is certainly not the usual kind of covenant. Most ancient covenants had a major and a minor partner with the major partner sometimes imposing a covenant upon the minor.

Pleading for an end ... - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/26 10:19

Quote:  
-----  
Quote:  
-----Please forgive me if this has been brought out already, but the original sense (as best I know) of "pleading the blood" stems from a courtroom scene in which the sinner is brought to give account of his/her sins. When asked how do you plea (guilty, not guilty,), the person would respond, "I plead the blood."  
-----  
-----

Think this well speaks to the matter as did the rest of Roberts post, I recall this usage as well, note that it is defensive...

Still am finding this deeply grievous and highly unnecessary. That the whole of the Old Testament needs to be brought forth and the new wrangled out of it's context to buttress this idea that it has some sort of protection or is an arrow in the quiver ... Yes, of course all the types and shadows, yes the importance, it is the Lord who shed *His Blood* but to stop right there and just dwell a minute .... Is there not something unimaginable in presuming upon the Lord Himself by way of his "*pleading*" which as it is **used** is not really a "plea" of anything, it is an assumption and a taking of that which is not ours to take and *apply* to whatever whim or fancy we wish. My God! What pray tell does this sound like to the ears of the unsaved?

Has it occurred to some of us that this precious blood, that ought not to have ever been shed ... That our Lord was Crucified...  
Led to the slaughter...

*And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many.*  
Mar 14:24

*After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.* 1Co 11:25

The most indicting of all;

**Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done so despite unto the Spirit of grace?** Heb 10:29

It does equate to that, but little concern it seems having figured out a way around it with endless extrapolations that support in no way anything remotely scriptural or even warranted. the biggest question of all is ... Why? Why is it even presumed necessary? Not a single solitary disciple ever came close to such usage in scripture. I must pour out my grief here..

A part of that is due to our modern day assumptions and flippant reasonings, the carelessness and sloppy understanding of just Who Jesus Christ is. Again, this verse now so logged in my heart;

Act 19:17 *And this became known to all the residents of Ephesus, both Jews and Greeks. And fear fell upon them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was extolled.*

"Esteemed"

We have the Benny Hinn's of the world weaving all kinds of fables and formulas, magic cantations by way of the Lord's shed blood... The ghastly T-Shirts mimicking the Budweiser tag-line "*This Bloods for you*"

Where does it end? And to those supporting all this, do you really care that it has come to bringing reproach upon the Lord Himself? Does it seem as necessary now?

Oh, I am not as angry as this may sound, just deeply grieved. It is things like this that drove me out of our modern day Christendom and it's 'church'.

Where is the Lord's honor ...

**Re: - posted by Nellie, on: 2006/6/26 10:22**

It is only by the Blood of Jesus Christ that we are going to make it to Heaven.

The Bible says, But if we walk in the light as He is the Light, we have fellowship one with another, and the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin. 1 John 1:7.

There can never be too much emphasis put on the Blood of Jesus, whether we are pleading or claiming His Precious Blood.

God help us all to understand more about Jesus' Blood.

God Bless you today.

**Re: Pleading for an end ... - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/26 11:19**

brethren

i think bro Mike summed it up here:

Quote:  
-----It does equate to that, but little concern it seems having figured out a way around it with endless extrapolations that support in no way anything remotely scriptural or even warranted. the biggest question of all is ... Why? Why is it even presumed necessary? Not a single solitary disciple ever came close to such usage in scripture. I must pour out my grief here...  
-----

indeed there is no mention of any disciple or anyone else pleading the blood in any instance. it seems that whole practice stemmed from the mentioned courtroom scene. it seems to me there really is no basis from pleading the blood because the only instance in which the blood is spilled is for the remission of sins. of course we can't deny that this gives us access to the throne of God but it doesn't seem the blood can be applied to anything else but our sin.

Lord set us straight.AMEN.

Re: Pleading for an end ... - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/26 11:39

Quote:

-----The ghastly T-Shirts mimicking the Budweiser tag-line "This Bloods for you"

Yes. I recall even a Christian song using this line, perhaps in a different way. It was "This Blood" (I think) by Carmen. I feel soon after that that certain Christian music took a bad turn and profaned even the name of our Lord. I caught the usage of the concept of 'plea' and the blood in another hymn just last Saturday.

NOTHING BUT THE BLOOD  
(1876 Robert Lowry)

What can wash away my sin?  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus;  
What can make me whole again?  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

Refrain

Oh! precious is the flow  
That makes me white as snow;  
No other fount I know,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

For my pardon, this I see,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus;  
For my cleansing this my plea,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

Refrain

Nothing can for sin atone,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus;  
Naught of good that I have done,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

Refrain

This is all my hope and peace,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus;  
This is all my righteousness,  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

Refrain

Now by this I'll overcome—  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus,  
Now by this I'll reach my home—  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

Refrain

Glory! Glory! This I sing—  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus,  
All my praise for this I bring—  
Nothing but the blood of Jesus.

Refrain

\*\*\*\*\*

I don't think the intention of the writer was to convey the abuses we see today. I am just trying to search out the root of how this concept 'sprung up.' I agree with Mike and Ron B. that the blood is 'God-ward' and is not to be thought of as some sort of magical formula. *When I see the blood I will pass over you...*

**Re: - posted by murdog (), on: 2006/6/26 13:18**

SI members,

Paul would have never plead the blood over his possessions, he didn't care about "stuff". As long as he had food and clothing he was content with that.

The disciples experienced much more physical harm (violence, stoning, death) and I am pretty sure they were walking in God's will. Why wasn't the blood keeping them safe and free from all problems.

These men were dead to self, they weren't concerned with their needs, their stuff or their comfort. We could take a lesson.

As for having God's protection around you, look at Job. "Have YOU not put a hedge around him and his household and everything he has." God supplies the protection. Job never called it forth.

God knows when a sparrow hits the ground, surely you are more valuable than that!

Let us pray in accordance to the word.

Amen.

Murray

**Re: There is power in the BLOOD, on: 2006/6/28 1:52**

Stever posts from the Book of Revelation of Jesus Christ:

Nothing but the Blood of Jesus!!!!!!!!!!!!

Revelation, Chapter 1

5. And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and WASHED US FROM OUR SINS IN HIS OWN BLOOD,

6. And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen  
.

Revelation Chapter 5

7. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne.

8. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints.

9. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by THY BLOOD out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

10. And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.

Revelation Chapter 7

14. And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and MADE THEM WHITE in the BLOOD OF THE LAMB. 15. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple: and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them.

Revelation Chapter 12

10. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night.

11. And they overcame him by the BLOOD OF THE LAMB, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death.

Revelations Chapter 19

12. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself.

13. And he was clothed with a vesture DIPPED IN BLOOD: and his name is called The Word of God.

14. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.

15. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.

16. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

I pray that this will open eyes, and soften hearts, and open ears to the power of the blood of the Lamb!

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/28 16:16**

Quote:

-----Nothing but the Blood of Jesus!!!!!!!!!!!!

-----

which means the substitutionary and penal death of Christ in payment for the sins of the world is the only basis upon which God can pour out His life giving Spirit.

I sing these hymns all the time but I know they are referring to Calvary and what was accomplished there.

**Re: Pleading the Blood? - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/6/28 17:55**

I still plead the BLOOD over my family....

I don't plead over my material things but family... the Blood does signify protection.

**there is power in the blood indeed. - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/28 18:15**

bro Stever

Quote:

-----Revelation, Chapter 1

5. And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and WASHED US FROM OUR SINS IN HIS OWN BLOOD,

6. And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

-----

the blood takes away our sins so we can be kings and priests before our Lord!

Quote:

-----Revelation Chapter 5

7. And he came and took the book out of the right hand of him that sat upon the throne.

8. And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints.



9. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by THY BLOOD out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;  
10. And hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.

-----

that seems to me to speak of the propitiation on our behalf that Christ paid so we could be reconciled to the Father.

Quote:  
-----Revelations Chapter 19  
12. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself.  
13. And he was clothed with a vesture DIPPED IN BLOOD: and his name is called The Word of God.  
14. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean.  
15. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.  
16. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

-----

is His vesture dipped in His own blood or is it that of His enemies? i still don't see where the blood of Christ can be applied in any other place but the taking away of our sin. After all therein lies our reconcillation to the Father and our access to His throne for whatever we need/desire in Christ's name.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/28 18:38**

bro brent

Quote:  
-----I still plead the BLOOD over my family....I dont plead over my material things but family... the Blood does signify protection.  
-----

i'm unsure if the blood is meant to be used even in this way. the word says the blood was shed for the remission of sins, nothing more beyond that i'm aware of. when you do this though is it in this context of asking the Lord to cleanse the sins of your family or something else? it seems to me that by having our sins taken away, the enemy has nothing to attack us with which seems to me this is where the protection comes from.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/28 19:41**

brentw wrote:

Quote:  
-----I still plead the BLOOD over my family....  
-----

Is your family saved?

If they are, you have no need to plead the blood over them, because God sees it already.

If they aren't saved, pleading the blood the blood is futile because they don't have it on them.

Quote:  
-----the Blood does signify protection.  
-----

This is wrong, the blood signifies satisfaction of a debt which is death.

Also from Gods' wrath.



Re:, on: 2006/6/28 21:48

Stever responds to Logic and Philologos:

Ravenhill pleaded the blood over his family. I suppose you think he was dead wrong as well?

God bless,

Stever :-D

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----

Logic wrote:

brentw wrote:

Quote:

-----I still plead the BLOOD over my family....

-----

Is your family saved?

If they are, you have no need to plead the blood over them, because God sees it already.

If they aren't saved, pleading the blood the blood is futile because the don't have it on them.

Quote:

-----the Blood does signify protection.

-----

This is wrong, the blood signifies satisfaction of a debt which is death.

Also from Gods' wrath.

-----

Philologos posted:

Quote:

-----

Nothing but the Blood of Jesus!!!!!!!!!!!!

-----

which means the substitutionary and penal death of Christ in payment for the sins of the world is the only basis upon which God can pour out His life giving Spirit.

I sing these hymns all the time but I know they are referring to Calvary and what was accomplished there.

-----  
His/yours

Ron B

www.biblebase.com

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/28 22:40**

Stever wrote:

Quote:

-----Ravenhill pleaded the blood over his family. I suppose you think he was dead wrong as well?  
-----

Don't rely on another man for defence, tell me how my offence is in error from the scripture.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/28 22:48**

Ravenhill has been wrong before. if there is no basis for such a practice (and i don't think there is) then he's wrong and so is everyone else who practises such and so we need to get right.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/29 1:33**

Quote:

-----  
IRONMAN wrote:

Ravenhill has been wrong before. if there is no basis for such a practice (and i don't think there is) then he's wrong and so is everyone else who practises such and so we need to get right.  
-----

xxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote from Logic:

"Don't rely on another man for defence, tell me how my offence is in error from the scripture."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds to Logic and Ironman:

I'll try this once again--

The phrase 'pleading the blood' is often used by Christians.

What does it mean to plead the blood of Jesus?

Pleading the blood simply means applying the blood to our life and circumstances just like the Israelites applied it to their door posts and were protected from the destroyer (Exodus 12).

Pleading the blood is simply the taking hold of the authority and power available to us by the death and resurrection of Jesus.

How do we plead the blood of Jesus?

Revelation 12:10-11 "10. And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before our God day and night. 11. And THEY OVERCAME HIM BY THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB, AND BY THE WORD OF THE IR TESTIMONY; and they loved not their lives unto the death."

Jesus has shed His blood and made it available for every believer to use. Our mouths play the same role as the bunch of hyssop the Israelites used. We are to use our mouths to apply the blood. Knowing about the blood is not sufficient, speaking about the power of the blood is also necessary.

Speaking with our mouths is important in enforcing our victory (Romans 10:10).

We plead the blood by confessing the salvation and deliverance the blood has brought us.

Lets us use a simple illustration to drive home this point.

Imagine the world as a big courtroom.

God is the Judge sitting on the throne (Hebrews 12:23)

Jesus is your advocate, standing beside you to argue your case (1 John 2:1) He reminds the Judge that He died and shed His blood for you.

The devil, satan, is your accuser bringing charges and even attacks against you (Revelation 12:10, Zechariah 3:1)

When an accusation is brought against a person in a law court the defendant, if innocent, can greatly increase His or her chances of being acquitted by producing a reliable witness.

Here lies the power of pleading the blood.

Although we were not physically there when Jesus died, His shed blood bears witness to the fact that He died, rose again and defeated the powers of darkness (Colossians 2: 15). All witnesses need to speak. Remember the blood is living and speaks (Hebrews 12: 24). When we actively plead (speak out) the blood into the negative circumstances and attacks satan brings against us, we are bringing a powerful witness to speak on our behalf (1 John 5:8).

Pleading or speaking the blood causes the blood of Jesus to speak out on our behalf and stops the attacks of satan. Any time you sense the hosts of darkness coming against you plead the blood of Jesus against.

You can use whatever words the Holy Spirit lays on your heart to do this. A good example is below.

"Your forces of darkness attacking my home and life, I command you to stop in Jesus name. I hold the blood of Jesus against you. The blood of Jesus has defeated you. The blood of Jesus has set me free. The blood of Jesus avails for me. I plead the blood of Jesus over my home, my life and my family. I protect them from your attacks. I walk in the freedom Jesus' death has brought me. Amen"

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

Hebrews 13:12 "20. Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, THROUGH THE BLOOD OF THE EVERLASTING COVENANT,"

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/6/29 7:36**

The physical blood of even Jesus is not needed anymore it was shed on the altar once and need not and will not ever be shed again. Christ went to the Cross once and once only. Quit putting Him back on the Cross and using the precious blood to plead anything.

About Satan, If you stay away from the things of Satan even to acknowledge that he has any power over the Christian is saying the Blood failed. If the Blood of Christ is to be used in the way you profess It makes a mockery of His Life that God the Father gave that we might be saved. It is His life that gives us life not the blood of His death. The only thing the blood is to be used for is to remember it was shed of you and every time you take communion we are honoring Him by remembering it, not using it to get what we think is power in the blood. The power in the blood is the Life of Christ in us. We don't plead the Body of Christ but we are to remember it also everytime only in remembrance of Him and His death that we might have life. Pleading the Blood is a pure church religious works use and wrongly used to protect and get what they want.

Jhn 16:24 Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full. Not in His Blood. He is our life.

He is our propitiation. He sits at the right hand of God the Father and we sit with Him. Jesus Christ is our all. If you change Plead to remember I am sure God the Father would be remembrance of what Christ did on the Cross just to get sons for our Father.

The blood over the door posts is long gone. Israel was told to remember what had happen not plead that blood of goats to get what they wanted.

As we remember what His Blood did, knowing it is His Life in us that pleases the Father and nothing else we do, especially pleading the Blood or anything else that takes away for His Person, the resurrected living Christ born again in the Believer.

He is our Armour against the ruler and powers that are in charge of the non believers, not us.

This is the proper protection of all that believe. Rom 13:12 The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.

2Cr 6:7 By the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and on the left,

Eph 6:11 Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

Eph 6:13 Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.

Armour of Light, Armour of righteousness on the right and the left, The whole Armour of God, Who casts off the works of darkness, You do, by Christ who is the Armour.

Because of the Blood of Christ we are in Christ.

Phillip

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/29 8:39**

Quote:

-----Ravenhill pleaded the blood over his family. I suppose you think he was dead wrong as well?  
-----

I am not sure why he would have done this. Was it a common practice that was done or did it happen on one or perhaps a few occasions? God did not tell me to step out of the boat, but we don't have "walk on water" techniques being used.

There are many things that are done that have went on without being questioned that came about as a one time directive from God. I do not know in this case, I am speaking in general terms. This is a common practice in our circles. It is similar to the practice of just sweepingly 'rebuking' the devil. God has given us instructions on how to do things and we try to do what worked once or flat 'make up' some other thing to try to accomplish the same end. The angel stirred the water and the first person in was healed. The second person received no such healing. I think there is a great lesson here.

Again, the idea at first seems to be rooted in our deferring to the finished work of the cross as our 'plea.' "For my pardon this my plea, nothing but the blood of Jesus." As I have thought about it more I recall also a passage of scripture that used to be quoted to 'stop bleeding.'

And when I passed by thee, and saw thee polluted in thine own blood, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live; yea, I said unto thee when thou wast in thy blood, Live. (Ezekiel 16:6)

The origin of this concept is likely as simple as the Lord quickening the passage to a persons heart, using His prerogative when quoting the scriptures, and applying it to a specific 'one time' situation. What happens is that folk then try to keep using that as if it were a perpetual solution to help when anyone was seriously bleeding (cut, hemorrhage, etc.). Now we have the scriptures being used in an almost superstitious way and the result is that the passage (Ezekiel 16:6) is relegated to 'wives fable' status and the context is lost.

This is why the scripture says, "TODAY if you will hear His voice." To take what God quickened to our hearts yesterday for a specific situation and try to carry it into today or share what God did as if it were some new 'method' is to keep the manna stored up as did Israel. God specifically told the people not to do that. Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. This is a *daily communion* with God and an ongoing attitude of submission to His direction. The indictment upon man is that God is not inquired of in specific situations when these methods are formed based on what God did at some point in the past, hence, Proverbs 3:5,6 are out the window. Why should we pray and seek God, we have the scriptures? Why pray and get direction from God when we know He has done this certain thing this certain way before. Some things are certainly scriptural to do at all times, but never to the exclusion of our inquiring of the LORD when we need specific direction for a situation. Commandments are an exception to this. Sin is *sin* no matter how much we pray.

Hope that makes some sense...

**Re: Consider - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/6/29 9:59**

Stever,

I wonder, and please note the non-accusatory sentiment here... But do you ever truly consider others expressions here that might be contradictory to your own? Hope to broaden that to the other side as well ... What I mean is even after giving my 2 cents worth earlier there is still some more thought given to this, other considerations, things that I may not have taken into account.

One of those is in that this usage I am aware is 'done' by a variety of those we may esteem and taken to other extremes by those who would fall into the category of this days ... mechanisms, that realm of Christendom that can only unfortunately be noted for it's cheapening of the noble Name we profess.

Quote:

-----There are many things that are done that have went on without being questioned...  
-----

Would take off on Robert's comment there and ask again, why? It is the same as to the reasoning you give here;

Quote:

-----The phrase 'pleading the blood' is often used by Christians.  
-----

To be honest I figured at some point or other the similar phraseology would come into play;

Quote:

-----"Your forces of darkness attacking my home and life, I command you to stop in Jesus name. I hold the blood of Jesus against you. The blood of Jesus has defeated you. The blood of Jesus has set me free. The blood of Jesus avails for me. I plead the blood of Jesus over my home, my life and my family. I protect them from your attacks. I walk in the freedom Jesus' death has brought me. Amen"  
-----

"I"

Brother, I think there is more of an honest attempt here to get at the bottom of things, by and large, so take that sentiment as well, please.

"I bind ... you Satan"

"I plead the blood ..."

"I command .. etc. etc."

"I rebuke you \_\_\_\_"

This is also speaking as much in general as specific, but to draw it back to the question Robert raised... Do we consider without question *why* we do the things we do? Do they have any real scriptural warrant even in association? And more importantly, are they necessary or just pragmatic? Just honest questioning and considering...

When it comes to these types of things, I just wonder at the reasoning behind them and the flip-side or the outcome ... Not to make more than it should out of it but just a thought to consider;

Act 19:13 Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.

Act 19:14 And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests, which did so.

Act 19:15 And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?

Act 19:16 And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.

Act 19:17 And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified.

What comes to mind in this matter as well as the other usages of these common phraseologies is to look back through the scriptures directly at all the confrontations of either Satan or demons, anything of that realm in specific and recognize how and to whom it\they\him were addressed.

Does any of our manners of application have any similarities to how either the Lord Himself answered or the disciples?

Just as well, forgetting who now brought it to the fore, but Ephesians well spells out what our Armour is and it also came readily to my mind when this all first started.

What *need* is there in these extras? What harm is there that is being overlooked because it may seem expedient?

Quote:

-----And THEY OVERCAME HIM BY THE BLOOD OF THE LAMB, AND BY THE WORD OF THEIR TESTIMONY  
-----

**Rev 12:11 - they**--emphatic in the Greek. "They" in particular. They and they alone. They were the persons who overcame.

**overcame**-- (Rom\_8:33-34, Rom\_8:37; Rom\_16:20).

**him**-- (1Jo\_2:14-15). It is the same victory (a peculiarly Johannine phrase) over Satan and the world which the Gospel of John describes in the life of Jesus, his Epistle in the life of each believer, and his Apocalypse in the life of the Church.

**by, &c.**--Greek (dia to haima; accusative, not genitive case, as English Version would require, compare Heb\_9:12), "on account of (on the ground of) the blood of the Lamb"; "because of"; on account of and by virtue of its having been shed. Had that blood not been shed, Satan's accusations would have been unanswerable; as it is, that blood meets every charge. SCHOTTGEN mentions the Rabbinical tradition that Satan accuses men all days of the year, except the day of atonement. TITTMANN takes the Greek "dia," as it often means, out of regard to the blood of the Lamb; this was the impelling cause which induced them to undertake the contest for the sake of it; but the view given above is good Greek, and more in accordance with the general sense of Scripture.

**by the word of their testimony**--Greek, "on account of the word of their testimony." On the ground of their faithful testimony, even unto death, they are constituted victors. Their testimony evinced their victory over him by virtue of the blood of the Lamb. Hereby they confess themselves worshippers of the slain Lamb and overcome the beast, Satan's representative; an anticipation of Rev\_15:2, "them that had gotten the victory over the beast" (compare Rev\_13:15-16).

**unto**--Greek, "achri," "even as far as." They carried their not-love of life as far as even unto death.

*Robert Jamieson, A.R. Fausset and David Brown Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*

Last thought. Where do we find the disciples having discourses with the powers of darkness? Even the Lord Himself (W

ho we are not) from my recollection either answered the devil by way of scripture or by flat dismissal.

"Get behind Me"  
"Come out of him"  
"Be silent"

And the disciples? How again did they respond in these matters?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/6/29 12:00**

Quote:  
-----And the disciples? How again did they respond in these matters?  
-----

I think we are starting to get to the bottom of this. I notice in Mike's post that there is truly something at work here that we need to consider: can all the 'rebuking' and 'pleading the blood' in the world take the place of *submit yourselves therefor unto God resist the devil and he will flee from you* (James)? Is what we have here really a 'substitute' for the clear direction of the Lord in how we are to handle the enemy in our lives? That is not to say that there are times when a demon or devil may need to be cast out; but again, those require *individual discernment* and real submission to God. There is a whole teaching in this truth as it is a common thread throughout the whole of scripture. Submission and obedience to God is the key to victory over our enemies. This is 'our' part or responsibility.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/29 12:25**

bro Stever

Quote:  
-----I'll try this once again--  
The phrase 'pleading the blood' is often used by Christians.

What does it mean to plead the blood of Jesus?

Pleading the blood simply means applying the blood to our life and circumstances just like the Israelites applied it to their door posts and were protected from the destroyer (Exodus 12).  
-----

but bro, that was the blood of a lamb and we are talking of the blood of The Lamb. the 2 are different. the first has nothing to do with sin while the second has to do with the remission of sin. the first protected from the angel of death whom God sent, the second takes away our sin so that we don't receive the wage of death inasmuch as eternal damnation.

i don't plead the blood of Christ on my family, i ask the Lord to watch over us and He does. there seems to me to be no evidence for speaking the blood of Christ in such a way because there is no need for such. the blood is for the remission of sins which does give us access to the throne of God.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/29 12:34**

brethren

Quote:  
-----And the disciples? How again did they respond in these matters?  
-----

i'm reminded of how even the archangel michael in the dispute over mooses' body didn't bring an accusation against satan but simply said "satan the Lord rebuke you" he didn't even say "rebuke you in the name of Christ"

perhaps something to consider?

**Re: - posted by brentw (), on: 2006/6/29 12:53**

Yes, my family is saved!

We dont see eye to eye and thats ok...

I will continue to plead the Blood and if I'm wrong...I'm wrong...but if not praise God for His providence.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/29 13:02**

Quote:

IRONMAN wrote:  
brethren

Quote:

-----And the disciples? How again did they respond in these matters?  
-----

i'm reminded of how even the archangel michael in the dispute over moses' body didn't bring an accusation against satan but simply said "satan the Lord rebuke you" he didn't even say "rebuke you in the name of Christ"

perhaps something to consider?  
-----

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds to Ironman:

Jesus Christ has given BELIEVERS (Not Angels) the power of attorney in using HIS Name. The teaching of Ephesians on this matter is as follows:

Ephesians 2:

- Â“10. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.
11. Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;
12. That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:
13. But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.
14. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us;
15. Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace;
16. And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby:
17. And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.
18. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.
19. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellowcitizens with the saints, and of the household of God;
20. And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone;
21. In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord:
22. In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit.Â”

Ephesians 3

- Â“1. For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,
2. If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward:
3. How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words,
4. Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ)



5. Which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit;
6. That the Gentiles should be fellowheirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel:
7. Whereof I was made a minister, according to the gift of the grace of God given unto me by the effectual working of his power.
8. Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ;
9. And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:
10. To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God,
11. According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord:
12. In whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.
13. Wherefore I desire that ye faint not at my tribulations for you, which is your glory.
14. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,
15. Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named,
16. That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man;
17. That Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love,
18. May be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height;
19. And to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.
20. Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us,
21. Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen.Â”

Ephesians 4:

1. I Therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,
2. With all lowliness and meekness, with longsuffering, forbearing one another in love;
3. Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.
4. There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;
5. One Lord, one faith, one baptism,
6. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.
7. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.
8. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.
9. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?
10. He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)
11. And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers;
12. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:
13. Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:
14. That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;
15. But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ:
16. From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.
17. This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind,
18. Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart:
19. Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.
20. But ye have not so learned Christ;
21. If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus:
22. That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;
23. And be renewed in the spirit of your mind;
24. And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.
25. Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another.
26. Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath:
27. Neither give place to the devil.

28. Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.
29. Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.
30. And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.
31. Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice:
32. And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.Â”

Ephesians 6

Â”10. Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

11. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.
12. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.
13. Wherefore take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand.
14. Stand therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness;
15. And your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace;
16. Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.
17. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God:
18. Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints;
19. And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel,
20. For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.
21. But that ye also may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things:
22. Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose, that ye might know our affairs, and that he might comfort your hearts.
23. Peace be to the brethren, and love with faith, from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.
24. Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.Â”

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/29 16:25**

Stever wrote:

Quote:  
-----Pleading the blood simply means applying the blood to our life and circumstances just like the Israelites applied it to their door posts and were protected from the destroyer (Exodus 12).  
-----

First of all, we don't apply the blood, God does.

Jesus is our High priest and is the only one qualified to apply it and He already has.

Quote:  
-----Pleading the blood is simply the taking hold of the authority and power available to us by the death and resurrection of Jesus.  
-----

How is Pleading the blood (that which cleanses us from sin) taking hold of authority?

Why would you need to take hold of what we already have?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/6/29 17:23

bro Stever

i still don't see where we are to use the blood of Christ for anything other than cleansing of sin. perhaps in some regards we've used this power of attorney and turned around and taken the Lord's name/blood in vain?

Re: The Blood Covenant, on: 2006/6/29 22:17

Stever's response to Logic and Ironman:

The following is from my own study of the Blood Covenant, found in Scripture. Also, some of the documentation is from the book by Dr. H. Clay Trumbull, as well as a taped Bible Study series by Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones entitled "The Blood Covenant". I have been involved in this study for the past 5 years and this post is a culmination of that study.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Christian believers today, in 2006 have no understanding of the **Blood Covenants that have been part of civilization from the very beginning**. Dr. H. Clay Trumbull in his book "The Blood Covenant", published in the late 1800's (and available on Amazon.com) documents the fact that all people groups throughout the world took part in the blood covenant ritual. It seems strange that a primitive rite like the blood covenant, with its world wide sweep, and its manifold applications to the history of sacrifice, should have received so little attention from serious Bible students.

The word "Blood Covenant" is found throughout Scripture. The Bible itself is two Covenants (Blood Covenants) The Old Testament (Blood Covenant) and the New Testament (Blood Covenant).

**Throughout The Old Testament the Hebrew word Barius (Covenant) is found 264 times. The word Barius is translated by Strong's as follows:**

Strong's Number: 1285

Transliterated: briyth

Phonetic: ber-eeth'

Text: from 1262 (in the sense of **cutting**); a compact (**because made by passing between pieces of flesh**): -confederacy, feder, covenant, league.

**The word Covenant is found 17 times in the New Testament, and the Greek word Diatheke is translated as follows by Strong's:**

Strong's Number: 1242

Transliterated: diatheke

Phonetic: dee-ath-ay'-kay

Text: from 1303; properly, a disposition, i.e. (specially) a contract (**especially a devisory will**): --**COVENANT, testament.**

-----  
The Blood Covenant ritual was a specific ritual, celebrated over and over throughout the Bible. It was so common there is no specific mention of the entire procedure in one place, only a "picture" of parts of it here and there. That is why it is so important to read the book by H. Clay Trumbull- The Blood Covenant.

The blood covenant ritual was performed when two people, always men, wanted to become one. This covenant not only united the two men together for eternity, it also united their families. All of the children were automatically included, but when they reached maturity they were able to choose if they wanted to stay in the covenant, or leave it. Once the ritual was completed they usually prepared a memorial to indicate the place where their covenant took place. The memorial could be a stone heap- a stone pillar, an altar, planting a tree or a grove of trees.

In ancient Israel NO PRISONS WERE TO BE FOUND? Why? Because it was always the duty of the blood covenant bro

ther to dispense justice on whoever killed his blood brother, or anyone in his blood brothers household. Toward the end of the book of Numbers, the Torah offers instructions regarding the establishment of cities of refuge. These six cities, three on each side of the Jordan river (see Numbers 35:9-15), were to be safe havens for anyone who accidentally committed a homicide. While accidental homicide may sound like an unusual category, consider the simple example of someone whose ax head inadvertently flies off the handle, striking another person in the head. In the ancient world, where the proximity of people and an absence of protective workplace legislation often resulted in injury, it apparently was necessary to shield those responsible for accidental deaths. That person that sought refuge could only be released when the High Priest died. At that time the Blood Brother of the one he killed was not allowed to kill him.

**The Blood Covenant Ritual. This is the complete ritual**, although only bits and pieces can be found throughout the Bible, a little here, a little there:

First the animals were sacrificed and then cut right down the middle (the middle of the backbone & the head) and spread apart so the two men could actually face each other, each standing on the inside half of the animal, with pools of blood in the midst of them. Then they would pledge all of their assets and liabilities to each other. If one man was a millionaire, now both were. They also pledged their weapons to each other, meaning that each would defend the other, as well as the others entire family to the death. The Hebrews carried their weapons on their belt (girdle)- during this ritual they each traded belts. They also traded robes, one man put his robe on the other and vice-versa. This symbolized that each took on the other's nature. After all of this, then each man walked in a figure eight around the animal and through the sea of blood (indicating infinity) and back to the opposite side that he was on before, indicating that this blood covenant had no end, and would continue forever.

Then there was a blood covenant meal consisting of bread and wine, as well as an entire meal of the sacrificial animals. The bread represented the flesh of the other- each man would give the other a bite of the bread. Then, each man gave the other a drink of wine- indicating that the blood of each would flow into the other. Then, the actual cutting of their own skin, usually in the area where the wrist and hand come together. Each would cut himself, and then both hands would be placed together and the blood from both of them would symbolically now be in each of them. Then, each man would put dirt into the cut on his hand, making it a noticeable scar. Then, after this was over each swore before God the blessings and cursings-the blessing indicating all of the blessings that would take place if each kept his part. The cursings, if one or the other of the blood brothers ever broke the covenant.

-----  
Bible references:

David & Jonathan:

There is mention of this blood covenant relationship when we see that Jonathan loved David as himself. In 1st Samuel 1:18 "1. And it came to pass, when he had made an end of speaking unto Saul, that the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul.

2. And Saul took him that day, and would let him go no more home to his father's house.

3. Then Jonathan and David made a covenant, because he loved him as his own soul.

4. And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was upon him, and gave it to David, and his garments, even to his sword, and to his bow, and to his girdle (belt)."

-----  
It is further described in 1st Samuel 20:38-42, if we know what we are looking for. Here we see that the covenant relationship was sworn before the Lord (Jehovah) and between Jonathan and David as a covenant, between each of them, as well as all of their seed, forever:

38. And Jonathan cried after the lad, Make speed, haste, stay not. And Jonathan's lad gathered up the arrows, and came to his master.

39. But the lad knew not any thing: only Jonathan and David knew the matter.

40. And Jonathan gave his artillery unto his lad, and said unto him, Go, carry them to the city.

41. And as soon as the lad was gone, David arose out of a place toward the south, and fell on his face to the ground, and bowed himself three times: and they kissed one another, and wept one with another, until David exceeded.

42. And Jonathan said to David, Go in peace, forasmuch as we have sworn both of us in the NAME OF THE LORD, saying, The Lord be between me and thee, and BETWEEN MY SEED AND THY SEED FOR EVER. And he arose and departed: and Jonathan went into the city.

-----  
David even created a song for his blood brother Jonathan- this is only part of in 2 Samuel 1:25-27:"25. How are the mighty fallen in the midst of the battle! O Jonathan, thou wast slain in thine high places. 26. I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan: very pleasant hast thou been unto me: thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women. 27. How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!"  
-----

Further references of the Blood Covenant relationship between David & Jonathan:

After David had been King for many years, he was concerned with Jonathans "issue" (children). Once he found out about Crown Prince Mephibosheth, who had been in hiding in Lodebar (a desert outpost) for many years, hiding from David and hoping some day to become King. Once David found out about him, he restored all of the lands and gold of his Grandfather Saul, and gave him a set of silver crutches, and he sat at the Kings table till the end of his life. He did all of this to honor his blood covenant relationship with Jonathan:

1. And David said, Is there yet any that is left of the house of Saul, that I may shew him kindness for Jonathan's sake? 2. And there was of the house of Saul a servant whose name was Ziba. And when they had called him unto David, the king said unto him, Art thou Ziba? And he said, Thy servant is he.

3. And the king said, Is there not yet any of the house of Saul, that I may shew the kindness of God unto him? And Ziba said unto the king, Jonathan hath yet a son, which is lame on his feet.

4. And the king said unto him, Where is he? And Ziba said unto the king, Behold, he is in the house of Machir, the son of Ammiel, in Lodebar.

5. Then king David sent, and fetched him out of the house of Machir, the son of Ammiel, from Lodebar.

6. Now when Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, the son of Saul, was come unto David, he fell on his face, and did reverence. And David said, Mephibosheth. And he answered, Behold thy servant!

7. And David said unto him, Fear not: for I will surely shew thee kindness for Jonathan thy father's sake, and will restore thee all the land of Saul thy father; and thou shalt eat bread at my table continually.

8. And he bowed himself, and said, What is thy servant, that thou shouldest look upon such a dead dog as I am?

9. Then the king called to Ziba, Saul's servant, and said unto him, I have given unto thy master's son all that pertained to Saul and to all his house.

10. Thou therefore, and thy sons, and thy servants, shall till the land for him, and thou shalt bring in the fruits, that thy master's son may have food to eat: but Mephibosheth thy master's son shall eat bread alway at my table. Now Ziba had fifteen sons and twenty servants.

11. Then said Ziba unto the king, According to all that my lord the king hath commanded his servant, so shall thy servant do. As for Mephibosheth, said the king, he shall eat at my table, as one of the king's sons.

12. And Mephibosheth had a young son, whose name was Micha. And all that dwelt in the house of Ziba were servants unto Mephibosheth.

13. So Mephibosheth dwelt in Jerusalem: for he did eat continually at the king's table; and was lame on both his feet.

-----  
Another Biblical reference to a blood covenant, this time between Jacob and Laban:

Here we see where Jacob and his father-in-law Laban entered into a blood covenant relationship, just after Laban caught up with him and his daughters:

43. And Laban answered and said unto Jacob, These daughters are my daughters, and these children are my children, and these cattle are my cattle, and all that thou seest is mine: and what can I do this day unto these my daughters, or unto their children which they have born?

44. Now therefore come thou, let us make a COVENANT, I AND THOU; and let it be for a witness between me and thee.

45. AND JACOB TOOK A STONE, AND SET IT UP FOR A PILLAR.

46. AND JACOB SAID UNTO HIS BRETHREN, GATHER STONES; AND THEY TOOK STONES, AND MADE AN HEAP: AND THEY DID EAT THERE UPON THE HEAP.

47. And Laban called it Jegarsahadutha: but Jacob called it Galeed.

48. And Laban said, This heap is a witness between me and thee this day. Therefore was the name of it called Galeed;

49. And Mizpah; for he said, The Lord watch between me and thee, when we are absent one from another.

50. If thou shalt afflict my daughters, or if thou shalt take other wives beside my daughters, no man is with us; see, God is witness betwixt me and thee.

51. And laban said to jacob, behold this heap, and behold this pillar, which i have cast betwixt me and thee:

52. This heap be witness, and this pillar be witness, that i will not pass over this heap to thee, and that thou shalt not pass over this heap and this pillar unto me, for harm.

53. The god of abraham, and the god of nahor, the god of their father, judge betwixt us. And jacob sware by the fear of his father isaac.

54. Then jacob offered sacrifice upon the mount, and called his brethren to eat bread: and they did eat bread, and tarried all night in the mount.

55. And early in the morning Laban rose up, and kissed his sons and his daughters, and blessed them: and Laban departed, and returned unto his place.

-----  
Here we can see that they set up a memorial- a stone pillar -to memorialize their new blood covenant relationship.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

### **What is the Abrahamic Covenant?**

Answer: A covenant is an agreement between two parties. There are two types of covenants: conditional and unconditional. A conditional or bilateral covenant is an agreement that is binding on both parties for its fulfillment. Both parties agree to fulfill certain conditions. If either party fails to meet their responsibilities, the covenant is broken and neither party has to fulfill the expectations of the covenant. An unconditional or unilateral covenant is an agreement between two parties, but only one of the two parties has to do something. Nothing is required of the other party.

**The Abrahamic Covenant is an unconditional covenant. God made promises to Abraham that required nothing of Abraham. Genesis 15:18-21 describes a part of the Abrahamic Covenant, specifically dealing with the dimensions of the land God promised to Abraham and his descendants.**

The actual Abrahamic Covenant is found in Genesis 12:1-3. The ceremony recorded in Genesis 15 indicates the unconditional nature of the covenant. The only time that both parties of a covenant would pass between the pieces of animals was when the fulfillment of the covenant was dependent upon both parties keeping commitments. Concerning the significance of God alone moving between the halves of the animals, it is to be noted that it is a smoking furnace and a flaming torch, representing God, not Abraham, which passed between the pieces. Such an act, it would seem should be shared by both parties, but in this case it is doubtless to be explained by the fact that the covenant is principally a promise by God. He is the one who binds Himself. God caused a sleep to fall upon Abraham so that he would not be able to pass between the two halves of the animals.

Fulfillment of the covenant fell to God alone.

God determined to call out a special people for Himself through whom He would bring blessing to all the nations.

The Abrahamic Covenant is paramount to a proper understanding of the kingdom concept and is foundational to Old Testament theology.

(1) The Abrahamic Covenant is described in Genesis 12:1-3 and is an unconditional covenant. There are no conditions attached to it (no "if" clauses, suggesting its fulfillment is dependent on man).

(2) It is also a literal covenant in which the promises should be understood literally. The land that is promised should be understood in its literal or normal interpretation—it is not a figure of heaven.

(3) It is also an everlasting covenant. THE PROMISES THAT GOD MADE TO ISRAEL ARE ETERNAL.

There are three main features to the Abrahamic Covenant. 1. The promise of land (Genesis 12:1). God called Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees to a land that He would give him (Genesis 12:1). This promise is reiterated in Genesis 13:14-18 where it is confirmed by a shoe covenant; its dimensions are given in Genesis 15:18-21 (precluding any notion of this being fulfilled in heaven). The land aspect of the Abrahamic Covenant is also expanded in Deuteronomy 30:1-10, which is the Palestinian Covenant.

2. The promise of descendants (Genesis 12:2). God promised Abraham that He would make a great nation out of him. Abraham, who was 75 years old and childless (Genesis 12:4), was promised many descendants. This promise is amplified in Genesis 17:6 where God promised that nations and kings would descend from the aged patriarch. This promise (which is expanded in the Davidic Covenant of 2 Samuel 7:12-16) would eventuate in the Davidic throne with Messiah's kingdom rule over the Hebrew people.

3. The promise of blessing and redemption (Genesis 12:3). God promised to bless Abraham and the families of the earth through him. This promise is amplified in the New Covenant (Jeremiah 31:31-34; cf. Hebrews 8:6-13) and has to do with "Israel's spiritual blessing and redemption." Jeremiah 31:34 anticipates the forgiveness of sin. The unconditional and eternal nature of the covenant is seen in that the covenant is reaffirmed to Isaac (Genesis 21:12; 26:3-4). The "I will" promises suggest the unconditional aspect of the covenant. The covenant is further confirmed to Jacob (Genesis 28:14-15). It is noteworthy that God reaffirmed these promises amid the sins of the patriarchs, which fact further emphasizes the unconditional nature of the Abrahamic Covenant.

God's method of fulfilling the Abrahamic Covenant is literal, inasmuch as God partially fulfilled the covenant in history. God blessed Abraham by giving him the land (Genesis 13:14-17); God blessed him spiritually (Genesis 13:8, 18; 14:22, 23; 21:22); God gave him numerous descendants (Genesis 22:17; 49:3-28). The important element of the Abrahamic Covenant, however, demands a future fulfillment with Messiah's kingdom rule. (1) Israel as a nation will possess the land in the future. Numerous Old Testament passages anticipate the future blessing of Israel and her possession of the land as promised to Abraham. Ezekiel envisions a future day when Israel is restored to the land (Ezekiel 20:33-37, 40-42; 36:1-37:28). (2) Israel as a nation will be converted, forgiven, and restored (Romans 11:25-27). (3) Israel will repent and receive the forgiveness of God in the future (Zechariah 12:10-14). The Abrahamic Covenant finds its ultimate fulfillment in connection with the return of Messiah to rescue and bless His people Israel. It is through the nation Israel that God promised in Genesis 12:1-3 to bless the nations of the world. That ultimate blessing will issue in the forgive

ness of sins and Messiah's glorious kingdom reign on earth.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

**The New Testament (New Blood Covenant) is a one sided covenant, like that of the Abrahamic blood covenant.**

Christ is the one that did all of the work, and sacrifices His Own Self, and shed His own blood, and has the scars in His own hands, and is the one that has done all of the giving, and all of the work. All that the beneficiary of this covenant (you and me, brothers and sisters in Christ) have to do is to believe in HIM, and in the work that HE (Christ) did at the cross and at the resurrection!

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

God bless,

Stever :-D

p.s. The symbolic covenant of blood-friendship was between God and Abraham's seed; and in that seed were all the nations of the earth to have a blessing. God had called on Abraham to surrender to him his only son, in proof of his unfailing love; and, when Abraham had stood that test of his faith, God had spared to him the proffered offering. It now remained for God to transcend Abraham's proof of friendship, and to spare not his own and only Son (Romans 8:32), but to make him a sacrificial offering, by means of which the covenant of blood-friendship, between God and the true seed of Abraham, might become reality instead of a symbol. Abraham had given to God of his own blood, by the rite of circumcision, in token of his desire for interunion with God. God was now to give his blood, in the blood of his Son, for the re-vivifying of the sons of Abraham in "THE BLOOD OF THE ETERNAL COVENANT" (Heb 13:20).

Then, in the fullness of time, there came down into this world He who from the beginning was one with God, and who now became one with man. Becoming a sharer of the nature of those who were subject to death, and who longed for life, Jesus Christ was here among men as the fulfillment of type and prophecy; to meet and to satisfy the holiest and the uttermost yearnings of the human soul after eternal life, in communion and union with God. "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us....full of grace and truth." "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." "He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were begotten, not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." .

in the primitive rite of blood-covenanting, men drank of each other's blood, in order that they might have a common life; and they ate together of a mutually prepared feast, in order that they might evidence and nourish common life. In the outreaching of men Godward, for the privileges of a diving-human inter-union, they poured out the substitute blood of a chosen victim in sacrifice, and they partook of the flesh of that sacrificial victim, in symbolism of sharing the life and the nourishment of Deity. This symbolism was made a reality in Jesus Christ. He was the Seed of Abraham; the fulfillment of the promise, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." . He was the true Paschal Lamb; the "Lamb without blemish and without spot" ; "The Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" . The blood which He (Christ) yielded, was Life itself . The body which he laid on the altar was the Peace Offering of Completion".

"Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith:  
Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,  
But a body didst thou prepare for me;  
In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst not pleasure;  
Then said I, Lo, I am come  
(In the roll of the book it is written of me)  
To do thy will, O God.

Saying above, (the which are offered according to the Law); then hath he said, Lo I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second ."

He was here, in the body of his blood and flesh, for the yielding of his blood and the sharing of his flesh, in order to make partakers of his nature whosoever would seek a diving-human inter-union and a divine-human inter-communion, through the sacrifice made by himself, "once for all".



"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

"These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernum"- toward the close of the second year of public ministry. The fact that he did speak thus, so long before he had instituted the Memorial Supper, has been a puzzle to many commentators who were UNFAMILIAR WITH THE PRIMITIVE RITE OF BLOOD-COVENANTING, AND WITH THE WORLD-WIDE SERIES OF SUBSTITUTE FORMS OF COMMUNION WHICH HAD GROWN OUT OF THE SUGGESTIONS, AND OUT OF THE PERVERSIONS, OF THE ROOT SYMBOLISM OF THAT RITE. But in the light of all these customs, the words of Jesus have a clearer meaning. It was as though he (Jesus) had said: "MEN EVERYWHERE LONG FOR LIFE. THEY SEEK A SHARE IN THE LIFE OF GOD. THEY GIVE OF THEIR OWN BLOOD, OR OF SUBSTITUTE BLOOD, AND THEY TASTE OF SUBSTITUTE BLOOD, OR THEY RECEIVE ITS TOUCH, IN EVIDENCE OF THEIR DESIRE FOR ONENESS OF NATURE WITH GOD. THEY CRAVE COMMUNION WITH GOD, AND THEY EAT OF THE FLESH OF THE SACRIFICES ACCORDINGLY. ALL THAT THEY THUS REACH OUT AFTER, I SUPPLY. IN ME IS LIFE. IF THEY WILL BECOME PARTAKERS OF MY LIFE, OF MY NATURE, THEY SHALL BE SHARERS OF THE LIFE OF GOD". Then He adds, in assurance of the fact that it was a profound spiritual truth which was enunciating; "it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are the spirit, and are life." The divine-human inter-union and the divine-human inter-communion are spiritual, and they are spiritually wrought; or they are nothing.

The words of Jesus on this subject were not understood by those who heard him. "The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" . But this was not because the Jews had never heard of eating the flesh of a sacrificial victim, and of drinking blood in a sacred covenant; It was, rather, because they did not realize that Jesus was to be the crowning sacrifice for the human race; nor did they comprehend his right and power to make those who were one with him through faith thereby one with God in spiritual nature. "Many," even "of his disciples, when they heard these words of his said "This is a hard saying; who can hear it" Nor are questioners at this point lacking among HIS DISCIPLES TODAY!

#### **Re: The Blood Covenant, on: 2006/6/30 10:34**

Stever continues on the Blood Covenant:

From the book by Dr. H. Clay Trumbull "The Blood Covenant Ritual", Pages 272-278----a reprint of the 1885 edition that can be found at [www.amazon.com](http://www.amazon.com)

The symbolic covenant of blood-friendship was between God and Abraham's seed; and in that seed were all the nations of the earth to have a blessing. God had called on Abraham to surrender to him his only son, in proof of his unfailing love; and, when Abraham had stood that test of his faith, God had spared to him the proffered offering. It now remained for God to transcend Abraham's proof of friendship, and to spare not his own and only Son (Romans 8:32), but to make him a sacrificial offering, by means of which the covenant of blood-friendship, between God and the true seed of Abraham, might become reality instead of a symbol. Abraham had given to God of his own blood, by the rite of circumcision, in token of his desire for interunion with God. God was now to give his blood, in the blood of his Son, for the re-vivifying of the sons of Abraham in "THE BLOOD OF THE ETERNAL COVENANT" (Heb 13:20).

Then, in the fullness of time, there came down into this world He who from the beginning was one with God, and who now became one with man. Becoming a sharer of the nature of those who were subject to death, and who longed for life, Jesus Christ was here among men as the fulfillment of type and prophecy; to meet and to satisfy the holiest and the uttermost yearnings of the human soul after eternal life, in communion and union with God. "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us....full of grace and truth." "In him was life, and the life was the light of men." "He came unto his own, and they that were his own received him not. But as many as received him to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were begotten, not of bloods, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." .

In the primitive rite of blood-covenanting, men drank of each other's blood, in order that they might have a common life; and they ate together of a mutually prepared feast, in order that they might evidence and nourish common life. In the out

reaching of men Godward, for the privileges of a divine-human inter-union, they poured out the substitute blood of a chosen victim in sacrifice, and they partook of the flesh of that sacrificial victim, in symbolism of sharing the life and the nourishment of Deity. This symbolism was made a reality in Jesus Christ. He was the Seed of Abraham; the fulfillment of the promise, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." . He was the true Paschal Lamb; the "Lamb without blemish and without spot" ; "The Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world" . The blood which He (Christ) yielded, was Life itself . The body which he laid on the altar was the Peace Offering of Completion".

"Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith:  
Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,  
But a body didst thou prepare for me;  
In whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst not pleasure;  
Then said I, Lo, I am come  
(In the roll of the book it is written of me)  
To do thy will, O God.

Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offering and sacrifices for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to the Law); then hath he said, Lo I am come to do thy will. He taketh away the first , that he may establish the second ."

He was here, in the body of his blood and flesh, for the yielding of his blood and the sharing of his flesh, in order to make partakers of his nature whosoever would seek a divine-human inter-union and a divine-human inter-communion, through the sacrifice made by himself, "once for all".

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live forever."

"These things said he in the synagogue, as he taught in Capernaum"- toward the close of the second year of public ministry. The fact that he did speak thus, so long before he had instituted the Memorial Supper, **has been a puzzle to many commentators who were UNFAMILIAR WITH THE PRIMITIVE RITE OF BLOOD-COVENANTING, AND WITH THE WORLD-WIDE SERIES OF SUBSTITUTE FORMS OF COMMUNION WHICH HAD GROWN OUT OF THE SUGGESTIONS, AND OUT OF THE PERVERSIONS, OF THE ROOT SYMBOLISM OF THAT RITE.** But in the light of all these customs, the words of Jesus have a clearer meaning. It was as though he (Jesus) had said: **"MEN EVERYWHERE LONG FOR LIFE. THEY SEEK A SHARE IN THE LIFE OF GOD. THEY GIVE OF THEIR OWN BLOOD, OR OF SUBSTITUTE BLOOD, AND THEY TASTE OF SUBSTITUTE BLOOD, OR THEY RECEIVE ITS TOUCH, IN EVIDENCE OF THEIR DESIRE FOR ONENESS OF NATURE WITH GOD. THEY CRAVE COMMUNION WITH GOD, AND THEY EAT OF THE FLESH OF THE SACRIFICES ACCORDINGLY. ALL THAT THEY THUS REACH OUT AFTER, I SUPPLY . IN ME IS LIFE. IF THEY WILL BECOME PARTAKERS OF MY LIFE, OF MY NATURE, THEY SHALL BE SHARERS OF THE LIFE OF GOD".**

Then He adds, in assurance of the fact that it was a profound spiritual truth which was enunciating; "it is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken unto you are the spirit, and are life." The divine-human inter-union and the divine-human inter-communion are spiritual, and they are spiritually wrought; or they are nothing.

**The words of Jesus on this subject were not understood by those who heard him. "The Jews therefore strove one with another, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" . But this was not because the Jews had never heard of eating the flesh of a sacrificial victim, and of drinking blood in a sacred covenant; it was, rather, because they did not realize that Jesus was to be the crowning sacrifice for the human race; nor did they comprehend his right and power to make those who were one with him through faith thereby one with God in spiritual nature. "Many," even "of his disciples, when they heard these words of his said "This is a hard saying; who can hear it" Nor are questioners at this point (who are reading this now on Sermonindex) lacking among HIS DISCIPLES TODAY!**

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/30 11:01**

Stever

Are these your own thoughts or quotations? Is a courtesy among students to acknowledge the source of quotations where possible. What you have written, of course, has nothing whatever to do with 'pleading the blood'.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/30 11:05**

Stever wrote:

Quote:  
-----Christian believers today, in 2006 have no understanding of the **Blood Covenants that have been part of civilization from the very beginning.**  
-----

I don't care about pagan blood Covenants. I totally understand Gods' blood Covenant.

We are not talking about Gods' blood Covenant, we are talking about **pleading the blood of the Covenant**, which is a totally different thing all together.

when you plead the blood, all you are doing is pleading not guilty in other words.

So then, how does pleading the blood for unsaved people make sense if they are guilty, or pleading the blood for saved people help any more than if God sees the Blood already?

You also mentioned that pleading the blood is for protection, how does pleading not guilty protect you?

I've asked several other questions and made comments that you did not refute yet (makes me think you have no answer for them) please answer them one by one to persuade me to the truth if I am wrong.

Truly, I don't want to be wrong, I love the truth!

**Re:, on: 2006/6/30 11:37**

Stever responds to Logic:

In Egypt, the physical blood of slain animals was physically applied at the doorways by the Israelites, creating the symbol of the cross. (Passover----Jesus is our Passover)

The physical blood was applied by the Priests- on the altar, and the horns of the altar, on the Torah, and on their clothing, and on the Mercy Seat.

The blood of Christ is applied by the believer symbolically in prayer. We are Priests that have direct access to heaven, and have been provided with the Power of Attorney by Jesus Christ to use His name. We can apply the blood (symbolically) to those that we pray for, and to situations that we pray about.

There is power in the blood. I have posted Scriptural reference about the power of the blood on my previous posts. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds

3. For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh:

4. (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;)

5. Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;

6. And having in a readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.

7. Do ye look on things after the outward appearance? If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that, as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.

8. For though I should boast somewhat more of our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for

your destruction, I should not be ashamed:

There is nothing in the Bible that says WE CANNOT APPLY THE BLOOD SYMBOLICALLY, which is what I have done for the past 7 years. I have seen continuous answer to prayer on a daily basis. I have seen the "tearing down of strongholds" by pleading the blood, the healing of incurable diseases, and many wonderful things during this time.

If God took offense to my pleading the blood of Christ He would surely not answer my prayers. At the very least, He would correct me in this regard. He never has. Many people plead the blood of Christ. It is only that recently, in the past 50 years, mention of the "blood" is an offence to many Christians, and most seminaries.

xxxxxxx

Logic posted:

Quote: "I don't care about pagan blood Covenants. I totally understand God's blood Covenant."

Stever's response:

It is the blood of Jesus Christ that binds us (Believers) to the almighty. Believers have a Blood Covenant Relationship with God Himself!

In conclusion, Logic, it is my understanding from your various posts on this matter that you do not understand the Blood Covenant in general, or in the Believers Blood Covenant relationship with the creator in regards to the Blood of Jesus Christ.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Logic- read my last post, before this one.

Quote:

Logic wrote:

Stever wrote:

Quote: -----Christian believers today, in 2006 have no understanding of the **Blood Covenants that have been part of civilization from the very beginning.**

I don't care about pagan blood Covenants. I totally understand God's blood Covenant.

We are not talking about God's blood Covenant, we are talking about pleading the blood of the Covenant, which is a totally different thing all together.

When you plead the blood, all you are doing is pleading not guilty in other words.

So then, how does pleading the blood for unsaved people make sense if they are guilty, or pleading the blood for saved people help any more than if God sees the Blood already?

You also mentioned that pleading the blood is for protection, how does pleading not guilty protect you?

I've asked several other questions and made comments that you did not refute yet (makes me think you have no answer for them) please answer them one by one to persuade me to the truth if I am wrong.

Truly, I don't want to be wrong, I love the truth!

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/30 11:54

Stever wrote:

Quote:

-----The blood of Christ is applied by the believer symbolically in prayer.  
-----

We don't apply the blood, God does.

Where do you get that the blood of Christ is applied by the believer in prayer?

Quote:

-----We can apply the blood (symbolically) to those that we pray for, and to situations that we pray about.  
-----

How does pleading the blood help those who do not have the blood?

How does pleading the blood help in situations?

How is Pleading the blood (that which cleanses us from sin) taking hold of authority?

Why would you need to take hold of what we already have?

when God sees the blood in the first place, what is the need to plead it?  
He is the one you are pleading to.

**PLEASE**, I beg you, answer each question.  
I want to know, seriously.

without using the whole page, being toooooo wordy.  
I am sorry, I don't read posts that are more than 2 maybe 3 paragraphs, if I do, I skim over them.

Re:, on: 2006/6/30 12:21

I have answered your questions, Logic.

If you find no value in pleading the blood of Jesus Christ, then by all means DO NOT.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

-----

Logic wrote:

Stever wrote:

Quote:

-----The blood of Christ is applied by the believer symbolically in prayer.  
-----

We don't apply the blood, God does.

Where do you get that the blood of Christ is applied by the believer in prayer?

Quote:

-----We can apply the blood (symbolically) to those that we pray for, and to situations that we pray about.  
-----

How does pleading the blood help those who do not have the blood?

How does pleading the blood help in situations?

How is Pleading the blood (that which cleanses us from sin) taking hold of authority?

Why would you need to take hold of what we already have?

when God sees the blood in the first place, what is the need to plead it?  
He is the one you are pleading to.

**PLEASE**, I beg you, answer each question.  
I want to know, seriously.

without using the whole page, being toooooo wordy.  
I am sorry, I don't read posts that are more than 2 maybe 3 paragraphs, if I do, I skim over them.  
-----

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/30 13:02**

Stever wrote:

Quote:

-----I have answered your questions, Logic.

If you find no value in pleading the blood of Jesus Christ, then by all means DO NOT.

Logic wrote:

Quote:

-----PLEASE, I beg you, answer each question.

I want to know, seriously.  
-----

Have mercy on me please. Do you not care that I want to know?  
My questions tell you why I see no value in pleading the blood,  
if you tell me the answers I will then the value in pleading the blood.

I am asking as a friend, don't take the easy out and just quite on me.

If Stever will not answer, some one please answer my 5 easy questions in my last post.

**Re:, on: 2006/6/30 15:55**

Stever responds to logic:

If you can find scripture proof text of why I should not, or why I can not, then we have something to discuss. Otherwise, it is nothing more than he-said, she-said.

I find value in doing this. Like I have posted previously:

1. In Egypt, the ancient Israelites placed to physical blood of the sacrificed lamb on the doorway, and on the lintel. With the blood in the basin, at the foot of the doorway, the blood created a cross.
2. In Israel, the Priest placed the blood on the altar, on the horns of the altar, on the Mercy seat, on the Torah, on their priestly robes, and elsewhere.
3. Today, we are priests that have also been supplied with Name, the Name above all names by the power of attorney provided by Jesus Christ to all believers. We also have the authority to plead the supernatural blood of Jesus Christ on anyone or anything that we are praying for.

In 1999 I asked my pastor if they would play the song "Amazing Grace". He said that I would have to talk with the music minister. This young man was attending Biola University and studying to be a pastor. When I talked to him he said that h

e really wasn't interested in playing this old song, eventhough it was my favorite. The reason? Because it was the position of Biola that all of the songs with reference to sin, as well as the blood got in peoples way, and they wanted to bring more people into the Church.

What a sad thing to happen- the blood of Christ, and the sin that we have all inherited from Adam should no longer be mentioned in order to bring new people into the Church? How will they ever be saved? The revelation that we have all sinned and broken the law is what drives us to Christ!

Shortly after this event I became baptized in the Holy Ghost and filled with the Holy Spirit. At this time God's Word came alive to me.

The Church today has no understanding and places no value on the shed blood of Jesus Christ, the Seed of the Woman. The father always supplies the blood type of the child. Christ's father was the Holy Ghost, and Jesus Christ carried the blood of God in His veins. That is why he never sinned, because He did not have the blood of Adam in His veins. He was tempted, just as we are, but never sinned by thought or by deed. He was the sinless one. Mary provided Him with the Body, and God provided Him with His Blood. He is our sinless substitute, and no other.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/6/30 16:42**

Quote:  
-----1. In Egypt, the ancient Israelites placed to physical blood of the sacrificed lamb on the doorway, and on the lintel. With the blood in the basin, at the foot of the doorway, the blood created a cross.  
-----

Where do you get the idea of "blood in a basin at the foot of the doorway"? Ex 12:22  
and how does a horizontal and two verticals make a 'cross'? Ex12:7

Quote:  
-----We also have the authority to plead the supernatural blood of Jesus Christ on anyone or anything that we are praying for.  
-----

Are you just making this up as you go along?

Quote:  
----- The father always supplies the blood type of the child. Christ's father was the Holy Ghost, and Jesus Christ carried the blood of God in His veins. That is why he never sinned, because He did not have the blood of Adam in His veins.  
-----

You think that sin is genetic?!

**Re: The Passover in Egypt, on: 2006/6/30 20:25**

Stever responds to Philologos:

Exodus 12:21-23

21. Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the passover.

22. And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the **BASON**, and strike the LINTEL (The top of the doorway) and THE TWO SIDE POSTS with the BLOOD that is in the **BASON**; and none of you shall go out at the door

or of his house until the morning. 23. For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you.

Here we see a picture of the cross. In ancient Egypt the Jews lived in homes with a **BASON**, right in the middle of the doorway. Here we see that the lamb is sacrificed in the doorway, his throat is slit, over the basin, and the blood drains into the basin. Hyssop is used to dip into the blood and to paint it on the Lintel (the top of the doorway), as well as on the two side posts of the doorway. Blood is sitting in the **BASON**, in the bottom of the doorway, in the middle of it. Blood is applied on the left and right side of the doorway. Blood is applied at the very top of the doorway, on the lintel. This has created a picture of the Cross!

Dr. H. Clay Trubull in his book "Threshold Covenant", published originally in 1898 we find reference to this ancient custom of sacrifice, with specific reference to Egypt:

In early times the threshold had a special sanctity; and that of the Temple was a marked spot, indicating specific taboos (see I Sam. v. 4 et seq.; comp. Zeph. i. 9). There were special keepers (A. V. "porters") of the threshold (II. Kings xxii. 4; I Chron. ix. 22; II Chron. xxiii. 4; Jer. xxxv. 4). There is a wide-spread custom of making family sacrifices at the threshold in addition to those at the hearth. Herodotus reports this of the Egyptians (ii. 48). Trumbull suggests that there is a specific reference to the threshold in Ex. xii. 22 (LXX.), in connection with the institution of the Passover. Even to the present day it is considered unlucky to tread on the threshold. He suggests also that the word "pesach", or "passover," means a "leaping over" the threshold, after it has been sanctified with the blood of the threshold-covenant. The threshold of Dagon's temple was evidently sacred in this way; and it has been suggested by Cheyne that I Kings xviii. 20-21 should be rendered "How long will ye leap over both thresholds?" (that is, worship both Baal and Yhwh).

Bibliography: H. Clay Trumbull, Threshold Covenant, Philadelphia, 1896

It is my understanding, from the works of Trumbull, as well as those of Dr. Floyd Nolen Jones, that the basin was located in the doorways of ancient Egypt, Phillistia, and Israel, and other nations. This was because of the sacrifices that took place there, in the doorway.

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S. The Threshold Covenant can also be found at <http://www.amazon.com>

## BASON

Re:, on: 2006/6/30 21:13

Philologos posted:

The father always supplies the blood type of the child. Christ's father was the Holy Ghost, and Jesus Christ carried the blood of God in His veins. That is why he never sinned, because He did not have the blood of Adam in His veins.

-----

You think that sin is genetic?!

xx

Stever responds:

You bet I do. We are all born sinners, on our way to hell. Each of us has inherited the sin nature passed down to us by Adam's blood.

The Bible tells us of our "condition", through the eyes of God:



Isaiah 64:6

“6. But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.”

Romans 3:10

“10. As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one.”

Philologos, who do you know that has NEVER sinned by THOUGHT OR DEED, EVER? There is only one, Jesus Christ, the God man. Everyone else is hopelessly lost without Him.

How does the 1st and 2nd Adam mentioned in Romans make any sense whatsoever, without this understanding that we are all sinners who have inherited sin from Adam (Adams blood)?

Romans 5:14-21 " 14. 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. 15. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. 16. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

17. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

18. Therefore (IN CONCLUSION) as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the RIGHTEOUSNESS OF ONE (Jesus Christ) the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

19. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. 20. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

21. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

xxxxxxx

Also, 1 Cor 15:22

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

and 1 Cor 15:45-50

"45. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. 46. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual.

47. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. 48. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. 49. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. 50. Now this I say, brethren, that FLESH AND BLOOD CANNOT INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD; NEITHER DO THOSE WHICH ARE OF THE FLESH INHERIT THE KINGDOM OF GOD."

Here is another one, telling us that Adam knew that he was sinning, while Eve was truly deceived:

1 Timothy 2

13. For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

14. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.

xxxxxxxxxx

We all have the blood of Adam running through our veins, our hope is the blood of Christ Jesus. Our redemption is found in Him, and no where else.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/6/30 22:10

Hi Stever,

You said this (in slightly different words)

Quote:  
-----The father always supplies the blood type of the child. Christ's father was the Holy Ghost, and Jesus Christ carried the blood of God in His veins.  
-----  
in FOC's 'Literalism without Context' thread, and I responded, (fyi).

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic\\_id=10731&forum=36&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=10731&forum=36&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0)) [https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic\\_id=10731&forum=36&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=10731&forum=36&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0)

Perhaps you could reply there, not to divert this topic too far? Thanks.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/6/30 22:24

Stever wrote:

Quote:  
-----If you can find scripture proof text of why I should not, or why I can not, then we have something to discuss. Otherwise, it is nothing more than he-said, she-said.  
-----

How can I find scripture proof text for these valid question?

They are the most basic and simple questions that anybody can answer that aprooves the thing that the questions are to wards.

- 1: How does pleading the blood help those who do not have the blood?
- 2: How does pleading the blood help in situations?
- 3: How is Pleading the blood (that which cleanses us from sin) taking hold of authority?
- 4: Why would you need to take hold of what we already have?
- 5: when God sees the blood in the first place, what is the need to plead it?  
He is the one you are pleading to.

Re:, on: 2006/6/30 22:57

Stever responds to Dorcas:

To correct my error (heard from a sermon of many years ago), God actually provided **HIS OWN BLOOD, that indwelt Christ**. Since He is God, He can do anything- He is the true "Miracle Worker". He is outside of time and space and is responsible for the daily miracles we all see- the healing of the sick, the restoration of vision to the blind, and probably the most important of all is the redeeming of fallen man to Himself.

The teaching is found in Acts 20:28 where it tells us specifically that God has purchased the Church with HIS OWN BLOOD (not part Mary's blood and part His blood, but by ALL HIS OWN BLOOD):

"28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, **which he hath purchased with HIS OWN BLOOD.**"

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Adrian Rodgers from his sermon--"Power In The Blood":**

"What I am trying to say, it is the father that determines the blood and the blood that flows through the veins of the Lord Jesus Christ was blood that was contributed by God, Almighty. And you see, that blood that was in Jesus was divine blood, it was sacred blood, it was the blood of God; the blood of God you say, wait a minute pastor, God is a spirit and God doesn't have blood. He did when JESUS was here on this earth and if you will read in Acts the 20TH chapter Paul is talking to those Ephesian elders, I think about verse 28 and he says you take care that you feed the church of God which he has purchased with his blood, ***with his blood . The church was purchased with the blood of God. It's sacred blood and because it is sacred blood, it is saving blood! You see, had that blood not been sacred blood it could have saved no one because Jesus Christ had to be innocent in order to die for our sin!***"

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX  
by dorcas on 2006/6/30 17:10:05

Hi Stever,

You said this (in slightly different words)

Quote:

-----  
The father always supplies the blood type of the child. Christ's father was the Holy Ghost, and Jesus Christ carried the blood of God in His veins.

-----  
in FOC's 'Literalism without Context' thread, and I responded, (fyi).

[https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic\\_id=10731&forum=36&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=10731&forum=36&start=30&viewmode=flat&order=0)

Perhaps you could reply there, not to divert this topic too far? Thanks.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 0:48**

Logic posted:

2: How does pleading the blood help in situations?

3: How is Pleading the blood (that which cleanses us from sin) taking hold of authority?

4: Why would you need to take hold of what we already have?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Stever responds:

His blood gives power over the devil. It's the blood that Satan fears. Revelation 12:11 says, "And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb . . ." The devil doesn't want you to learn about the blood. He hates it!

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S. Do you believe that the devil is alive and well on planet earth today?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 3:53**

Quote:  
-----Here we see a picture of the cross. In ancient Egypt the Jews lived in homes with a BASON, right in the middle of the doorway. Here we see that the lamb is sacrificed in the doorway, his throat is slit, over the basin, and the blood drains into the basin. Hyssop is used to dip into the blood and to paint it on the Lintel (the top of the doorway), as well as on the two side posts of the doorway. Blood is sitting in the BASON, in the bottom of the doorway, in the middle of it. Blood is applied on the left and right side of the doorway. Blood is applied at the very top of the doorway, on the lintel. This has created a picture of the Cross!  
-----

So you really mean this illustrates the cross rather than it being a picture of the cross. The shape is all wrong for it to be a picture. So this whole idea is built upon the speculation that Israelite homes were ordered like ordinary Egyptian homes. So this idea is speculation based on speculation... that Israelites had such a bason... that the blood of the passover lamb was poured into it... etc. Sheer speculation.

A careful reading of the text will show that the bason held the blood of the lamb but that not every household sacrificed a lamb. (Ex 12:4) The blood, indeed was to be splashed on the upper lintel and the vertical doorposts, but many households would have had no bason and no blood in the bason. Many of these smaller households would have had blood on the doorposts and lintel but no bason.

Let me make it plain that I believe passionately in 'blood covenant'. What I do not believe in is this wild conjecture and the pentecostal/charismatic ritual of 'pleading the blood'.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 3:57**

Quote:  
-----You bet I do. We are all born sinners, on our way to hell. Each of us has inherited the sin nature passed down to us by Adam's blood.  
-----

You are mixing together truth and error. I believe in congenital sin, but none of the remainder of this sentence has no biblical basis.

Nowhere does it say that the consequence of congenital sin is hell.  
Nowhere does it say that we 'inherit the sin nature'  
Nowhere does it say that the sin nature was in Adam's blood.

You are concluding that what bible students refer to as the 'transmission' of congenital sin is in the male bloodline. There is no biblical proof for this theory.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 8:29**

Stever's response to Philologos:

The Bible screams at us, from one end to the other, that man is hopelessly fallen and in need of a Savior.

All of mankind has the DNA of Adam in our veins, and we all require The Savior. Adam sinned, and brought mankind down with him. Christ was born sinless, and became the sinless substitute for man, and provides redemption for those that believe in Him.

Today we (all humans) are on a journey, going in ONE OF TWO DIRECTIONS. 1) Those that believe in Jesus Christ and the work that He did at Calvary--that believe in His shed blood, death and resurrection--are on their way to heaven and eternal life. 2) Those that do not believe in Jesus Christ, but in their own works, are on their way to hell and eternal judgment.

There are no other choices, there are no other directions to be traveled by man.

We each have a choice and the only reason we are born and have life is to have the opportunity to make THIS CHOICE.

I am in agreement with Joshua in this matter--

" 15. And if it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve; whether the gods which your fathers served that were on the other side of the flood, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell: BUT AS FOR ME AND MY HOUSE, WE WILL SERVE THE LORD.

Philologos, you are sadly mistaken.

God bless,

Stever :-D

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----You bet I do. We are all born sinners, on our way to hell. Each of us has inherited the sin nature passed down to us by Adam's blood.

You are mixing together truth and error. I believe in congenital sin, but none of the remainder of this sentence has no biblical basis.

Nowhere does it say that the consequence of congenital sin is hell.

Nowhere does it say that we 'inherit the sin nature'

Nowhere does it say that the sin nature was in Adam's blood.

You are concluding that what bible students refer to as the 'transmission' of congenital sin is in the male bloodline. There is no biblical proof for this theory.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 8:59**

Stever responds to Philologos:

Scripture tells me that each Israelite home had a BASON. If they didn't the instructions would have addressed this issue in specific detail because their lives depended upon it:

Exodus

22. And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the BASON, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood that is in the BASON; and none of you shall go out at the door of his house until the morning.

23. For the Lord will pass through to smite the Egyptians; and when he seeth the blood upon the lintel, and on the two side posts, the Lord will pass over the door, and will not suffer the destroyer to come in unto your houses to smite you.

24. And ye shall observe this thing for an ordinance to thee and to thy sons for ever.

25. And it shall come to pass, when ye be come to the land which the Lord will give you, according as he hath promised, that ye shall keep this service.

26. And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service?

27. That ye shall say, It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians, and delivered our houses. And the people bowed the head and worshipped.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Philologos, you are the one guilty of conjecture when you put your own understanding into the Bible, specifically:

"So you really mean this illustrates the cross rather than it being a picture of the cross. The shape is all wrong for it to be a picture. So this whole idea is built upon the speculation that Israelite homes were ordered like ordinary Egyptian homes. So this idea is speculation based on speculation... that Israelites had such a bason... that the blood of the passover lamb was poured into it... etc. Sheer speculation"

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God commanded all of the Israelites to put the shed blood into the BASON. There is no wiggle room here. Their lives depended upon it.

The works of Trumbull and others have found historical evidence that such basins existed in the homes of people living in the countries of Egypt, Philistia, and other countries in the Middle East at that time, and also in Israel later.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Philologos, are you aware that the encampment of the Israelites was that of the shape of the Cross of Jesus Christ?

Numbers 2

Encampment in the Wilderness

The Hebrews, and later the Israelites, had a slightly different way of looking at things.

If you or I were told to camp on the east side of something, we would probably mentally draw a line from north to south, and figure that anywhere on the east side of that line would be camping on the east.

Not so the Hebrews. Told to camp on the east side of the tabernacle and its surrounding Levites, They mentally drew two lines from east to west, the width of the tabernacle plus the Levites. Anything east of the tabernacle between those two lines would be east. North of the north line would be the north-east, or south of the south line would be southeast, and thus not where God commanded.

So when the three combined tribes under Judah camped to the east of the tabernacle, they spread out in a narrow band directly east of the tabernacle, and the three who camped to the west did the same, and the north, and south.

If one looks at the numbers in each camp, figures the approximate space required for each family or tent, etc. one can with some accuracy determine the general layout of the entire encampment.

As it turns out, when drawn out on paper, the whole encampment ends up in the shape of a cross, bottom to the east.

Here are the numbers of people in each of the 4 camps (the numbers are for the males only, and do not include women and children).

.....N  
.....157,600  
E 186,400....Levites...108,100 W  
.....151,450  
.....S

When Balaam went up on the mount to try and curse the Israelites, this is what he saw--a Cross. Their encampment was a picture of the Savior to come, the Seed of the Woman, who would have his heel bruised! Crucifixion is the only form of captial punishment that incurs terrific bruising of the heel. On the cross, the victim is suffocating to death. In order to breath, he has to push with his heel into the cross, in order to push his body upward, to continue to breath.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----Here we see a picture of the cross. In ancient Egypt the Jews lived in homes with a BASON, right in the middle of the doorway. Here we see that the lamb is sacrificed in the doorway, his throat is slit, over the basin, and the blood drains into the basin. Hyssop is used to dip into the blood and to paint it on the Lintel (the top of the doorway), as well as on the two side posts of the doorway. Blood is sitting in the BASON, in the bottom of the doorway, in the middle of it. Blood is applied on the left and right side of the doorway. Blood is applied at the very top of the doorway, on the lintel. This has created a picture of the Cross!

So you really mean this illustrates the cross rather than it being a picture of the cross. The shape is all wrong for it to be a picture. So this whole idea is built upon the speculation that Israelite homes were ordered like ordinary Egyptian homes. So this idea is speculation based on speculation... that Israelites had such a bason... that the blood of the passover lamb was poured into it... etc. Sheer speculation.

A careful reading of the text will show that the bason held the blood of the lamb but that not every household sacrificed a lamb. (Ex 12:4) The blood, indeed was to be splashed on the upper lintel and the vertical doorposts, but many households would have had no bason and no blood in the bason. Many of these smaller households would have had blood on the doorposts and lintel but no bason.

Let me make it plain that I believe passionately in 'blood covenant'. What I do not believe in is this wild conjecture and the pentecostal/charismatic ritual of 'pleading the blood'.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 9:13**

Quote:

-----The Bible screams at us, from one end to the other, that man is hopelessly fallen and in need of a Savior.

The Bible never screams at anyone.

Quote:

-----All of mankind has the DNA of Adam in our veins, and we all require The Savior.

You are making SIN a physical condition. Things that happen to one individual do not automatically pass on to his descendants. I have a full set of ribs, for example. :-)

The word used in Romans 5:12 and translated 'passed upon all men' is ( ) *dierchomai* which pass 'to pass through'. The hyperlink here will show you how the word is used biblically. You are presuming that it means 'passed down to' but that would be an entirely different word. You are teaching that Adam's sin passed down to all men, subsequently, generation by generation. The bible does not describe the transmission of 'original/congenital sin' in this way. The word used means that it passed 'through' all men instantly... at the time of Adam's disobedience. I did not die spiritually, consequently to Adam's sin; I died simultaneously. It was a death in the spirit NOT in his DNA. Physical death became the experience of all but spiritual death did not BECOME our experience; it always was our experience.

If you think that SIN is the DNA I can understand why you think the DNA characteristics of Christ's blood might cure the problem. Christ, of course, received his DNA from Mary. The Catholics got themselves into this theological mess and extricated themselves by inventing the 'immaculate conception'; the notion that Mary was without sin at the time of Christ's conception. O what a tangled web we weave when we build human speculations into divine revelation!

Quote:

-----Philologos, you are sadly mistaken.

I may be mistaken, but I am not sad. :-D

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 9:20**

Philologos posted:

"If you think that SIN in is the DNA I can understand why you think the DNA characteristics of Christ's blood might cure the problem. Christ, of course, received his DNA from Mary. "

Stever's response:

God's Word tells me us that Christ carried God's blood in His veins, not Mary's. Christ redeems fallen man with His own Blood, that had nothing to do with Mary:

Acts 20:27-28

" 27. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, **which he hath purchased with his own blood.**"

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2006/7/1 9:22**

Brother Stever did you take the time to read Ex12:4??? You might want to do that :-)

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 9:24**

Philologos posted:

You are making SIN a physical condition. Things that happen to one individual do not automatically pass on to his descendants. I have a full set of ribs, for example.

Stever responds:

So you are equating the creation of Eve out of one of Adam's ribs by God to be equal with, or have anything to do with sin?

Are you drawing at straws here, or what?

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 9:30**

Quote:

-----  
dohzman wrote:

Brother Stever did you take the time to read Ex12:4??? You might want to do that :-)

-----

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

Exodus 12:4

4. And if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb.



xxxxxxxxxxxxx

The lamb had to be taken into the home for four days. Some of the homes did not have enough room, either because of size, or perhaps because of the number of people residing therein.

However, it says nothing about the smaller homes not having a bason.

In any event, at the time of the passover, all of the people in the smaller home were undoubtedly in the larger home that housed the lamb. That lamb would have been slain in the doorway of the house where he had dwelled inside of for 4 days, with his blood going into the bason, and the blood applied onto the doorway and the lintel.

There is no Scriptural support that the blood was applied to any other home other than the one that the lamb occupied for the 4 days required by Scripture.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 9:38**

Quote:

-----Scripture tells me that each Israelite home had a BASON. If they didn't the instructions would have addressed this issue in specific detail because their lives depended upon it:  
-----

!?! If you read the whole chapter you will discover that the instructions you have quoted FOLLOW those where households are instructed to combine according to the needs of appetite. A small household shared the lamb of another household and so they did not conduct a slaughter nor reserve the blood. Consequently any basin they had would have been unused.

Quote:

-----God commanded all of the Israelites to put the shed blood into the BASON. There is no wiggle room here. Their lives depended upon it.  
-----

Their lives depended on God seeing the blood that was daubed over their doorways which indicated that the inhabitants were inside feeding on the lamb; Ex 12:7

Quote:

-----The works of Trumbull and others have found historical evidence that such basins existed in the homes of people living in the countries of Egypt, Philistia, and other countries in the Middle East at that time, and also in Israel later.  
-----

I have a basin in my home too, but that doesn't mean I store blood in it.

Quote:

-----Philologos, are you aware that the encampment of the Israelites was that of the shape of the Cross of Jesus Christ?  
-----

I am aware that ancient middle eastern cultures usually had E at the top of their maps. In fact literal Bible compass points would be Sun Rising, Sunset, Left and Right. which if you imagine it will always have you facing East. (which is part of the reason we still speak of 'orientation' meaning east-facing when we usually mean turning the map to have North at the top) When man was driven from the face of God in Eden he went Eastwards and the cherubim guards were placed on the Eastern boundary to prevent man's return. This symbolism was continued in the pattern of the Tabernacle which had the worshipper returning from the East and heading West to approach the cherubim embroidered on the Veil. When N

adab and Abihu broke through with their strange fire the cherubim warriors stopped them in their tracks with their flaming swords.

Quote:  
-----If one looks at the numbers in each camp, figures the approximate space required for each family or tent, etc. one can with some accuracy determine the general layout of the entire encampment.

As it turns out, when drawn out on paper, the whole encampment ends up in the shape of a cross, bottom to the east.

boy, what an imagination Balaam would have needed to see the shape of a cross from those numbers!

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2006/7/1 9:42**

I do enjoy these threads, reading everyone's posts and referencing backwards to their books and websites is like digging for raw gold. I love it! :-)

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 9:42**

Quote:  
-----Acts 20:27-28  
" 27. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.  
28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

because 'the life is in the blood'. Christ's blood was God's blood because Christ was God. This is a great proof of the triune God but God is a spirit, and spirits have no blood.

It has usually been the position of Christian thinkers to recognise that Christ's body (and hence his blood) was of 'Mary's substance'. If Christ's DNA is not from Mary He is not part of our race but an entirely new one. Consequently he would be disqualified from acting as our priest according to Hebrews.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 9:44**

Quote:  
-----So you are equating the creation of Eve out of one of Adam's ribs by God to be equal with, or have anything to do with sin?

Are you drawing at straws here, or what?

I have no idea what either of these questions means.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 9:47**

Hi Stever,

Your quote from Adrian Rodgers is helpful in explaining where you heard this idea: "What I am trying to say, **it is the father that determines the blood** and the blood that flows through the veins of the Lord Jesus Christ was blood that was contributed by God, Almighty.."

Quote:  
-----God's Word tells me us that Christ carried God's blood in His veins, not Mary's. Christ redeems fallen man with His own Blood, that had nothing to do with Mary:

(NKJV)Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity  
Between you and the woman,

And between your seed and **her Seed**;  
He shall bruise your head,  
And you shall bruise His heel."

Everything about a human being is determined by both parents. Neither one does more than the other from a genetic point of view.

The father's contribution of an X or Y chromosome (in the first and every subsequently developed body cell), determines the male or female component of a child, but this of itself has nothing to do with blood group.

In Jesus' case, the Seed of the woman contributed the other 50%, but  $50\% \times 2 = 100\%$  of Jesus Christ, the Son of man.

This does not make Jesus half God half man, but rather whole God whole man, because each child is 'one flesh' with **both** its parents.

Yes, the blood of Jesus was the blood of God, but it must also have been the blood of man. This is a physical attribute, not a spiritual one. Sin is a spiritual attribute. The life which is in the blood, is the life of the flesh.

You might like to do a word search on Son of man - referring to Jesus - to see how human He was. He was the Word made Flesh. The whole of His Flesh was also God. That's why the verse in Acts can refer to His blood as the blood of God. But, unless it was the blood of man also, there would be no meaningful substitute for our death, would there?

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/7/1 9:54**

Stever,

I take it that you can not answer my questions regarding Pleading the blood of Jesus.

why then, do you hold onto your position.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 10:13**

Dear Dorcas:

God is the Creator, who created everything out of nothing. God is outside of time and space. God can do anything.

God's Word tells us that His blood was in the veins of Christ.

We have a choice. We can either believe God, Or, we can try to make sense out of the matter by our human understanding of how things work.

I would rather trust God than man, who is outside of time and space and is capable of doing anything- things that defy human understanding and the laws of nature that He created Himself.

When you or I pray for a dying person, with incurable brain cancer, with 2 weeks left to live, and God heals him in one instant as a result of prayer---does that make sense to the Doctor, who shakes his head? Eventhough the Doctor was standing there during our prayer vigil, he still trusts in the laws of science that he learned in College and Medical School. He (the Doctor) has no understanding of God, unless of course he is a Christian. However, I know many Christians who have no understanding of God's supernatural power to heal, of God's power to intervene in human events to do whatever he wants to do.

I will choose God, and His power any day!

I will choose the Spirit Breathed Word of God, provided to us by Paul, in regards to this matter:

Acts 20:28

28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

-----  
dorcac wrote:

Hi Stever,

.....snipped.....

Everything about a human being is determined by both parents. Neither one does more than the other from a genetic point of view.

The father's contribution of an X or Y chromosome (in the first and every subsequently developed body cell), determines the male or female component of a child, but this of itself has nothing to do with blood group.

In Jesus' case, the Seed of the woman contributed the other 50%, but  $50\% \times 2 = 100\%$  of Jesus Christ, the Son of man.

This does not make Jesus half God half man, but rather whole God whole man, because each child is 'one flesh' with **both** its parents.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 10:14**

Stever responds to logic:

How old are you?

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----  
Logic wrote:

Stever,

I take it that you can not answer my questions regarding Pleading the blood of Jesus.

why then, do you hold onto your position.  
-----

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 10:23**

Stever responds to Philologos:

Your position on this matter does the following:

1. It refutes Scripture, and replaces it with fallen man's understanding.

God's word says: " 28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

Your position is in disagreement with God's word.

Why, may I ask, do you put it upon yourself to do this thing?

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

-----

philologos wrote:

Quote:  
-----Acts 20:27-28  
" 27. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.  
28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."  
-----

because 'the life is in the blood'. Christ's blood was God's blood because Christ was God. This is a great proof of the tri-une God but God is a spirit, and spirits have no blood.

It has usually been the position of Christian thinkers to recognise that Christ's body (and hence his blood) was of 'Mary's substance'. If Christ's DNA is not from Mary He is not part of our race but an entirely new one. Consequently he would be disqualified from acting as our priest according to Hebrews.  
-----

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 10:28**

Dorcas posted:

Jesus' case, the Seed of the woman contributed the other 50%, but  $50\% \times 2 = 100\%$  of Jesus Christ, the Son of man.

This does not make Jesus half God half man, but rather whole God whole man, because each child is 'one flesh' with **both** its parents.

Stever's response:

You miss the whole point here. WOMEN DO NOT HAVE SEED! MEN ARE THE ONLY ONES THAT HAVE SEED. The seed of the Woman is Jesus, who was fathered by the Holy Ghost, and prophesized in the Book of Genesis.

Mary was only a vessel to bring about this one and only virgin birth.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2006/7/1 10:33**

Stever--- The quote you refer to in Revelation has to do with redemption, in the same way Israel was redeemed from Egypt at the passover, we all passed from dead unto life, but that's not all that scripture says, by the word of thier testimony, hyper charismatic and penecostal movements have made this to mean what we speak, that's false, It's what we DO in this life, our actions, our deeds of righteousness. And they loved not thier lives unto death, the cross and real physical death in some cases. We have life eternal in Heaven.

I do have to agree with you though about the demonic hating the Blood of Jesus, I've observed that first hand. Never really had any scriptural support for it though.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 10:45**

Philogos posted:

Quote:  
-----

The works of Trumbull and others have found historical evidence that such basins existed in the homes of people living in the countries of Egypt, Philistia, and other countries in the Middle East at that time, and also in Israel later.  
-----

I have a basin in my home too, but that doesn't mean I store blood in it.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response:

Trying to be coy, you miss the whole point. Is the Bason in the middle of your doorway, located on the threshold of your door?

Of course not. The reason Basons were installed there in antiquity was because of animal sacrifices that took place in the doorways of peoples homes.

I quoted Trumbull to you, that documents this.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 10:58**

Philologos posted:

They lives depended on God seeing the blood that was daubed over their doorways which indicated that the inhabitants were inside feeding on the lamb; Ex 12:7

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

There is no Scriptural support for your position. The lamb was sacrificed in the doorway of the home that it had occupied for 4 days. There is no scripture that states the blood was applied to any other doorways.

Again, more conjecture on your part to try and prove a point. Please, use Scripture and or history to support your position.

God bless,

Stever

P.S. the lamb was taken into the home on the 10th of Abib, the 7th month, and lived in the home for 4 days until the sacrifice on the 14th. The families became very acquainted with this animal over this time- it could not leave their house! It had to be without spot or blemish, and it was examined for 4 days.

This corresponds with Christ, and his triumphant entry into Jerusalem on the 10th of Abib. For 4 days the Scribes and Pharisees, and the people examined him. On the 14th of Abib, on the day of Passover, Christ was Crucified for all the sins of the world.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 11:21**

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----So you are equating the creation of Eve out of one of Adam's ribs by God to be equal with, or have anything to do with sin?

Are you drawing at straws here, or what?

-----

I have no idea what either of these questions means.

-----

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds:

I guess you do not remember your own post Philologos, specifically:

Quote:

-----  
The Bible screams at us, from one end to the other, that man is hopelessly fallen and in need of a Savior.  
-----

The Bible never screams at anyone.

Quote:

-----  
All of mankind has the DNA of Adam in our veins, and we all require The Savior.  
-----

You are making SIN a physical condition. Things that happen to one individual do not automatically pass on to his descendants. I have a full set of ribs, for example.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stevens continues his response to Philologos:

My response was to your mistaken comparison for the creation of Eve out of Adam's rib having anything to do with sin.

If I lose an arm, and I have another child, that child will not be born without an arm.

However, that Child will be born with my DNA in it.

Adam was created, and all of us after him are generated. Adam's sin nature, that he created by sinning against God has been passed on to all of us.

The Living Bible, which I sometimes use for reference has this to say about the matter of Adam and the condition of the human race after him, and the new life that Christ offers all of those that believe:

Romans Chapter 5:

12. When Adam sinned, SIN ENTERED THE ENTIRE HUMAN RACE. His sin spread death throughout all the world, so everything began to grow old and die, for all sinned.

13. because although, of course, people were sinning from the time of Adam until Moses, God did not in those days judge them guilty of death for breaking his laws--because he had not yet given his laws to them, nor told them what he wanted them to do.

14. So when their bodies died it was not for their own sins since they themselves had never disobeyed God's special law against eating the forbidden fruit, as Adam had. What a contrast between Adam and Christ who was yet to come!

15. And what a difference between man's sin and God's forgiveness! For this one man, Adam, brought death to many through his sin. But this one man, Jesus Christ, brought forgiveness to many through God's mercy.

16. Adam's one sin brought the penalty of death to many, while Christ freely takes away many sins and gives glorious life instead.

17. The sin of this one man, Adam, caused death to be king over all, but all who will take God's gift of forgiveness and acquittal are kings of life because of this one man, Jesus Christ.

18. Yes, Adam's sin brought punishment to all, but Christ's righteousness makes men right with God, so that they can live.

19. Adam caused many to be sinners because he disobeyed God, and Christ caused many to be made acceptable to God because he obeyed.

20. The Ten Commandments were given so that all could see the extent of their failure to obey God's laws. But the more

e we see our sinfulness, the more we see God's abounding grace forgiving us.

21. Before, sin ruled over all men and brought them to death, but now God's kindness rules instead, giving us right standing with God and resulting in eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 11:22

Quote:  
-----WOMEN DO NOT HAVE SEED!  
-----  
(NKJV) Isaiah 7:14  
"Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Immanuel.

Hi Stever,

Please could you explain what makes you say women don't have 'seed'?

Matthew 1  
20 But while he thought about these things, behold, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, "Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take to you Mary your wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit.

21 "And she will bring forth a Son, and you shall call His name JESUS, for He will save His people from their sins."

22 So all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying:

23 "Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and bear a Son, and they shall call His name Immanuel," which is translated, "God with us."

Luke 1  
30 Then the angel said to her, "Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God.

31 "And behold, you will conceive in your womb and bring forth a Son, and shall call His name JESUS.

32 "He will be great, and **will be called the Son of the Highest**; and the Lord God will give Him the throne of **His father David**.

33 "And **He will reign over the house of Jacob forever**, and of His kingdom there will be no end."

34 Then Mary said to the angel, "How can this be, since I do not know a man?"

35 And the angel answered and said to her, " Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Highest will overshadow you; therefore, also, **that Holy One who is to be born will be called the Son of God**.

John 1:14  
And **the Word became flesh** and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, **the glory as of the only begotten of the Father**, full of grace and truth.

**1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.**



## 2 He was in the beginning with God.

I look forward to your explanation of how it was Mary had a baby, if women do not have 'seed'.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 11:37**

Hi Stever,

You might have missed this post by philologos, which is on p13 of this thread, and is the reason he said what he did about (*his*) ribs.

You will find it is *completely* compatible with the passage in Romans 5 which you quote, and that in previous threads, he has expounded Romans 5 compatibly with the Living Bible, too.

Quote:  
-----The word used in Romans 5:12 and translated 'passed upon all men' is dierchomai which pass 'to pass through'. The hyperlink here will show you how the word is used biblically. You are presuming that it means 'passed down to' but that would be an entirely different word. You are teaching that Adam's sin passed down to all men, subsequently, generation by generation. The bible does not describe the transmission of 'original/congenital sin' in this way. The word used means that it passed 'through' all men instantly... at the time of Adam's disobedience. I did not die spiritually, consequently to Adam's sin; **I died simultaneously**. It was a death in the spirit NOT in his DNA. Physical death became the experience of all but spiritual death did not BECOME our experience; it always was our experience.

If you think that SIN is in the DNA I can understand why you think the DNA characteristics of Christ's blood might cure the problem. Christ, of course, received his DNA from Mary.

-----  
You do understand, don't you, that the whole human race was 'in Adam' before he had ever had children?

**Re:, on: 2006/7/1 11:45**

Quote:  
-----  
dorcass wrote:

Quote:  
-----WOMEN DO NOT HAVE SEED!  
-----

(NKJV) Isaiah 7:14

"Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Immanuel.

Hi Stever,

Please could you explain what makes you say women don't have 'seed'?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response to Dorcas:

Men have seed, and women have eggs. Women require the seed of men to have children.

The reference here is to a virgin, who will conceive without a man.

The reference here is to the Messiah, the Seed of the Woman, Jesus Christ, who will be born of a virgin by immaculate conception.

Now, take out your NIV and consider the same verse you quoted:

Genesis 3:15

"an I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers"

We can see the intent of Origen and other infidels when we look at the above changing of God's word. The intent of Origen was to empower man, any man, to fulfill the prophecy.

Genesis 3:15 in the KJV states:

15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed;

The "seed" referred to here is Jesus Christ, and is specific to entail a virgin birth by immaculate conception, for the restoration of fallen man back to Himself.

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: To the question at hand - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/7/1 12:08**

Interesting to find this up front this morning...

A couple of notes first.

Stever, please try and use the "quote" function or at least a better way of doing these out takes, it is very confusing and gives an impression often times that another members quote is theirs when it is not. It is simple to use the 'QUOTE' button on top of the thread, click on it and cut and paste an out take into the box and then click "OK". Just as well you can type out the HTML language by copying the same format you will see in the preview window; It is quote in front of the text followed by quote at the end of the text. (The word 'quote' goes in between the parenthesis, I cannot type it that way for illustration without it shrinking it down to that which is seen when the post is previewed or posted).

To the matter at hand. None of this has anything to do with *pleading the blood*, still ... Had written the following earlier.

~~~~~

Have had a change of mind on this matter or better, another perspective, a paradigm shift of thought.

Stever, with all the respect I can muster to one more aged than myself there is a stubbornness in your opinion that is unrelenting, but so are a great many of us still stubborn, entrenched in positions and opinions, particulars and overstating, re-directing from the matter at hand to draw attention to even that which may be even warranted, true and of a great help. But often those are matters altogether on their own and do not buttress by a weight of evidence to the one aspect, that which is the question at hand. It's a diversion.

But we do it all the time here and not all of it is particularly due to improper motives. I am fairly well convinced that our expressions can be mangled in this form of communication here, that great attempt to articulate tremendous spiritual thought through fallible and yet increasingly (hopefully) enlarged hearts and renewed minds. How many times the thought later comes "That is not what I had hoped to express." Hence the often pleading here for clarification and correction before launching forth on presumptions, to ask and answer questions and to just admit that which seems most difficult strangely for some, 'I was wrong'.

That this great, sinister matter of pride be smitten out of us all. There is a great pride in our opinion and it is often revealed in a relentless, constant defending over positions that if were so true could be left on their own merits in the simplicity of fact. To have to bring in reams of rebuttal for support makes them conspicuous, not to mention this mentality that makes saints think they are in a constant court of law, of contention and argument rather than of fellowship to help each other along the way. It's not a verdict to be won.

Probably a lot of opinion in this as well, do correct it as is needed. Just could but pray we might be more forthcoming in our shortcomings and answer questions directly more than diverting to another question, another aspect. Enough of the ramble of preamble...

Seems to me if anyone is *pleading the precious blood* of Jesus, it would be God Himself. I am still struck by the ease and often times flippant and careless ways of which profound truths are recapitulated through lips of saints without forethought or consideration, prayerfulness, again the matter of "without questioning" why we do and say the things we do and say. How often are matters aped unequivocally, taken for granted they are so? When challenged, the defense is raised as a reaction and the Berean mindset is more often stated than practiced in a real effort to get to the bottom of things and relinquish an opinion if need be, scurrying around to support a premise when the premise is what ought to be put to the test.

In My Name

*Whatever you ask in my name, this I will do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.* Joh 14:13

I must wonder if we are as concerned about this as we ought to be, *that the Father may be glorified in the Son.*

The things spoken in *His* Name, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. In this present case it certainly seems to me this is more than idle words being pronounced, there is something quite presumptuous especially in this modern day religiosity that has mingled and muddled, cheapened so much ... It does seem to be a bit of both though in this phraseology, some with no intentional propensity and a great deal of it just without thought or concern whatsoever. Both are unchecked regardless, I wonder if anyone has bothered to make this truly a matter of prayer. It is either a big deal or it is not a big deal. Are we making too much of it? Or is it probing to a deeper concern?

My concerns are almost always towards a fear of misrepresentation of the Lord, of mixing my still mixed thoughts with those that the Lord is concerned about, has spoken or would have us to truly understand and teach or lead others into. I do not know if right now there is a greater travesty being done in the *Name of the Lord* than having that Name ... Might I interject something of a confession here. Since coming out of that which is predominantly this misrepresentation I have found it often strangely difficult to even speak, let alone print this Name above every Name.

Jesus Christ

Doing so just sent chills through me.

It staggered me the other day, I do not recall where exactly, perhaps John, but I found seeing this mighty and all encompassing Name ...

isolated, as if printed on a solitary page, everything around it, blank, no other words ... It sent me to praying and put my mind to silence for a great while, the chattering, churning aspect, to just think of Him and on Him. How profound and worthy He is, *never man spake like this man*, the greatest understatement of all time. How we forget *Who* He in fact *is*. That He dwells among us where two or three are gathered, that would mean, right here, right now. It is so beyond us most often or having become so familiar that it just slides on by without consideration ... That the One and *same* Holy Spirit ...

Perhaps it is just me and the extra peculiarities that I find peculiar even, am puzzled by ... I will put it this way, I am surely the strangest Christian I know, seemingly out of sorts with so much, unorthodoxically 'orthodox'?, a bemusement to myself ... My, what the Lord has done and continues to do.

The incredible things of God ... are they not all ... *incredible*? The Lord Himself ... it is hard to speak that noble Name anymore, this era's misrepresentation, it's carelessness, it's making everything so common as to mean little and more pronounced it is the church, the saints, if they could be truly described as such, that is where the trouble lies. I have no problem, actually a non-reaction generally from those who do not know the Lord and speak ... along the same line of thought the Lord Himself made mention;

Mar 3:28 Verily I say unto you, All sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme:

Those that take the Lord's Name in vain .. surely they have their own problems to deal with, but how overlooked it is with those who ought to know better. It is that which grieves more. I was in a meeting at work this past week that was a discussion of some upcoming work, a preliminary to a larger meeting to take place soon with a number of individuals. Sparring the details, this particular individual termed it as a "*Come to Jesus meeting*". He prefaced the remark with a caveat of uncertainty of whether it was even appropriate or not to coin it in such fashion and at one point even mentioned that it might be a 'cool thing' depending on one's perspective ... I was frankly non-pulsed by it, found no insult or grievance as such, no need to 'set him right' or any such thing. It did leave me wondering a bit, just how much he may know after all, something to bring up at an opportune time. The point I was left with was that sometimes even those who may not know the Lord can have more of an understanding than the saints that let loose all kinds of spurious and unchecked expressions.

This matter of *pleading* ... the blood. The paradigm that dawned on me again from God's perspective;

All of Hebrews 9...

*And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom. Mat 26:27-29*

*Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. 1Co 11:27*

*But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. Eph 2:13*

It seems these share more in common from God's perspective...

*And he said, What hast thou done? the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground. Gen 4:10*

*The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified his Son Jesus; whom ye delivered up, and denied him in the presence of Pilate, when he was determined to let him go. But ye denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you; And killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses. Act 3:13 -15*

*But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot: 1Pe 1:19*

*And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.  
Col 1:20*

To us  
His blood is precious  
His Name is precious

*Mal 1:14 But cursed be the deceiver, who hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a blemished thing; for I am a great King, saith Jehovah of hosts, and *my name is terrible among the Gentiles*.*

Is it anymore? What of the saints? What of this generation of Christendom, flying past everything without pause long enough to consider ...

That there is nothing of substance in naming and proclaiming, of binding anything, I claim, I demand this, that and the other, I plead ...

Forgive me, I realize again that for some there is not the intention of this sort undergirding this matter of *pleading*, but is it not still a *presumption*? Has it not in this day been turned into just more glib clichs, the same sentiment of;

*Act 10:15 And a voice came unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, make not thou common.*

#### **Re: Pleading the Blood, on: 2006/7/1 12:39**

Stever responds to crsschk in regards to pleading the blood.

**It truly seems that everyone has their own opinion on this matter.** The post has shifted to other subjects: The Blood covenant; The Passover; and the Seed of the Woman; as well as the encampment of the Israelites, and a comparison to the original passover, to the final passover of Jesus Christ's shed blood, death and resurrection from the dead.

A little off subject, to say the least. But by the number of people who have followed this thread, it seems to have aroused interest to those that have taken the time to follow it.

I take it by the response from crsschk, that this thread is nearing its end.

I would like to post a defense of pleading the blood by Joyce Meyers. I do not agree with everything Joyce has to say and teach, but I do agree with her on this one.

Here goes:

### Pleading the Blood

Uncompromisingly righteous and just are You, O Lord, when I complain against and contend with You. You let me plead and reason the case with You: Why does the way of the wicked prosper? Why are all they at ease and thriving who deal very treacherously and deceitfully? Jeremiah 12:1

I want to say something about the phrase "pleading the blood", because some people think it is wrong to teach people to plead the blood of Jesus.

A woman came to me one night after a meeting in which she had heard me use the phrase "pleading the blood". She told me that it was wrong to plead the blood, that we are not beggars but children of God and therefore we should "apply" or "put" the blood, not "plead" it.

If the word "plead" were only a beggar's term, then she would be correct, because we are God's children and certainly not beggars. But "plead" used in this sense is a legal term and has nothing to do with begging.

You and I have a legal right to use the blood of Jesus, just as we have a legal right to use the name of Jesus. It has been given to us, and we have a right to use it.

First, let's look at the word "plead" in Webster's II New Riverside University Dictionary. This is what it says in part: "To appeal earnestly,...To put forward a plea of a specific nature in a court of law,...To address a court as a lawyer or advocate,...To assert or urge as defense, vindication, or excuse,...To present as an answer to a charge, indictment, or declaration made against one".

Let me say here that Satan certainly wants to accuse us; as a matter of fact, he is called the accuser of our brethren (Re v. 12:10). Our only defense is the blood of Jesus. We cannot offer our own righteousness or perfect record of good behavior, but we can offer the blood of Jesus. In truth, we dare not offer anything but the blood!

When you try to pray, the devil may attempt to accuse you, reminding you of past sins and mistakes. There is no point in arguing with him, or trying to defend yourself. Sometimes I simply say to him, "Oh, thank you, Mr. Devil, for reminding me of my sins; now I can remember again how precious Jesus' blood is that has already cleansed me from them". Or when the devil brings up some sin, if it is one that I have not yet repented of, it just reminds me to do so-and therefore he loses once again.

The devil is a legalist to the maximum degree, and you and I had better use all our legal rights in dealing with him. We have a legal right to the blood of Jesus, and when we plead the blood we are exercising that legal right, not begging in the sense that most people understand the term in a nonlegal sense.

A study of the Greek words translated "beg", "beggar", or "beggarly" in Vine's Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words reveals that the verb form means "to ask...intensively,...to ask earnestly, to importune, continue asking". A milder form of this same verb is translated simply "to ask".

When I pray, I don't consider myself begging, but I am pleading my case before God and telling Him that I am expecting His help and intervention. Jeremiah considered himself to be pleading his case before God as he prayed in Jeremiah 12:1. When I pray, using the name of Jesus, or pleading the blood of Jesus, I am merely exercising my legal rights. I am setting forth my case that Jesus has shed His blood and died for me; therefore Satan has no right to rule me, accuse me, condemn me or do anything else to me or to anything that belongs to me.

Whatever phrasing you decide to use is up to you, but the main point is: "use" the blood. Pray it, or put it, or apply it, or appropriate it or plead it-but for your own sake, do something with it!

This quote can be found at:

<http://theswap.com/BBS/DCForumID11/469.html#4>

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S. This is the 1828 definition of Plead, from Noah Webster's Dictionary of the English language:

PLEAD, v.t. To discuss, defend and attempt to maintain by arguments or reasons offered to the tribunal or person who has the power of determining; as, to plead a cause before a court or jury. In this sense, argue is more generally used by lawyers.

1. To allege or adduce in proof, support or vindication. The law of nations may be pleaded in favor of the rights of embassadors.

2. To offer in excuse.

I will neither plead my age nor sickness in excuse of faults.

3. To allege and offer in a legal plea or defense, or for repelling a demand in law; as, to plead usury; to plead a statute of limitations.

4. ***In Scripture, to plead the cause of the righteous, as God, is to avenge or vindicate them against enemies, or to redress their grievances. Is.51.***

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 15:00

Hi Stever,

I hope you don't mind, I couldn't wait any longer for you to edit your last post on p15. You wrote it like this:

dorcas wrote:

Quote:

-----WOMEN DO NOT HAVE SEED!  
-----

(NKJV) Isaiah 7:14

"Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Immanuel.

Hi Stever,

Please could you explain what makes you say women don't have 'seed'?

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever's response to Dorcas:

Men have seed, and women have eggs. Women require the seed of men to have children.

The reference here is to a virgin, who will conceive without a man.

The reference here is to the Messiah, the Seed of the Woman, Jesus Christ, who will be born of a virgin by immaculate conception.

Now, take out your NIV and consider the same verse you quoted:

Genesis 3:15

"an I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers"

We can see the intent of Origen and other infidels when we look at the above changing of God's word. The intent of Origen

en was to empower man, any man, to fulfill the prophecy.

Genesis 3:15 in the KJV states:

15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed;

The "seed" referred to here is Jesus Christ, and is specific to entail a virgin birth by immaculate conception, for the restoration of fallen man back to Himself.

God bless,

Stever

---

Bond Servant

So, for those reading this properly for the first time, let me clarify, the quote 'WOMEN DON'T HAVE SEED!' was all that I had extracted from a longer part of one of your previous posts, (top of p15) which says:

Quote:

-----Stever's response:

You miss the whole point here. WOMEN DO NOT HAVE SEED! MEN ARE THE ONLY ONES THAT HAVE SEED. The seed of the Woman is Jesus, who was fathered by the Holy Ghost, and prophesized in the Book of Genesis.

Mary was only a vessel to bring about this one and only virgin birth.

God bless,

-----  
I then quoted Isaiah 7:14 and said:

Quote:

-----Hi Stever,

Please could you explain what makes you say women don't have 'seed'?

-----  
Above in blue, you see Stever's response.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 16:14**

Hi Stever,

I don't know if you noticed MikeB commented on the confusion which arises when the main text of a response is written in the quote format... that's why I tried to lay it out more clearly.

In your response you said:

Quote:

-----Men have seed, and women have eggs. Women require the seed of men to have children.  
-----

My response:

And if I may be so bold, **men need the seed of women to have children.**

The fact that the female reproductive cell has become known as an 'egg', because of what can be observed of similarities between it and the process in other egg-bearing creatures, does not detract from the **fact** that it is as much a 'seed' as the male reproductive cell - which incidentally bears far *less* resemblance to 'a seed', than the female cell does to 'an egg'. They are equal both in DNA *and* chromosomal influence on the fertilised egg (zygote), which forms when they ... let's

call it - 'join'.

It would be far more remarkable for Genesis 1 to refer solely to 'seed', and Genesis 3 to suddenly call the 'seed' of the woman 'an egg', than it is for the record to use the same very clear, simple, comprehensible terminology in both references to reproduction .... don't you think?

The rest of your response is baffling, in that it is presented in Roman Catholic terminology - 'immaculate conception' - which apart from the first sentence in your post at the top of this screen page, is the first time this has been overtly stated as your doctrinal stance - or, borrowed by you - in an attempt to appear to present a balanced discussion.

If I may say most directly, it appears disingenuous to state:

Quote:  
-----We can see the intent of Origen and other infidels when we look at the above changing of God's word. The intent of Origen was to empower man, any man, to fulfill the prophecy.  
-----

as if this somehow clears up your previous assertion that the blood of Jesus Christ was God's 'own blood', such that I felt compelled to draw attention to the *humanity* of Jesus Christ, by referring to the Seed of the woman (The woman was Eve at the time.) when God first made the promise of a Saviour.

(It is slightly concerning that you refer to God's word to the serpent as 'the prophecy', rather than the 'word of God'. Although there were many prophets who foretold the coming of Christ, I would not put the Creator in their category, rather, I would put them in His.)

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 16:16**

The humanity of Jesus Christ has nothing to do with a *human father*, as you appear to be implying imperfectly. The humanity of Jesus Christ has everything to do with the creative power of God through the Holy Spirit, and the human mother God the Father chose for His Son.

It is worth mentioning here, that Mary did go on to have normal married relations with Joseph, and bore other children to him.

John 7:5

For even His brothers did not believe in Him.

Notice the unbelieving humanity of the children of Mary and Joseph?..... If there was one thing designed to draw a comment from Jesus about certain people, it was their faith or lack of it. He Himself did not doubt. He believed all the time, unswervingly, in the power He could exercise at His Father's instruction.

Matthew 13

55 "Is this not the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary? And His brothers James, Joses, Simon, and Judas?

56 "And His sisters, are they not all with us? Where then did this get all these things?"

Note in these verses in Matthew, that the context of the comments of those quoted, is again the humanity of the Lord's brothers and sisters. His humanity was remarkable to them, because of His teaching: v 54 'And when He had come to His own country, He taught them in their synagogue, so that they were **astonished** and said...' (See above.).... because He seemed to them much more than an *ordinary* man.



**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 16:34**

Stever, you also said:

Quote:

-----Now, take out your NIV and consider the same verse you quoted:

Genesis 3:15

"an I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers"

-----  
Unless we know whether the word 'offspring' is plural and not singular, the NIV doesn't materially alter the pronouncement by God, that a 'man' would overcome Satan....

Rather surprisingly, you don't quote the rest of verse 15 which says:

"..He shall bruise your head,  
And you shall bruise His heel."

This is even more surprising since you yourself referred to the bruising of His heel on the cross, earlier this afternoon, in a long post on p13.... Gen 3:15 is the first mention of it in the Bible.

Quote:

-----When Balaam went up on the mount to try and curse the Israelites, this is what he saw--a Cross. Their encampment was a picture of the Savior to come, the Seed of the Woman, who would have his heel bruised! Crucifixion is the only form of capital punishment that incurs terrific bruising of the heel. On the cross, the victim is suffocating to death. In order to breathe, he has to push with his heel into the cross, in order to push his body upward, to continue to breathe.

-----  
However, I see this could be taken as human interpretation, as while it is physically true, it doesn't acknowledge the form of words quoted by John, from the Old Testament, (which make the reference of God the Father to the bruising of His heel, even more meaningful).

John 13:18

"I do not speak concerning all of you. I know whom I have chosen; but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, 'He who eats bread with Me has lifted up his heel against Me.' (Psa 41:9)

**Re: Pleading the blood - posted by lyndon, on: 2006/7/1 16:48**

Stever

I would just like to point out the article by Joyce Meyer is more of a defence on using the word plead rather than apply or something else. This is not what most of the brothers and sisters who have been part of this thread were commenting on.

As far as I can see, and I have been following this thread from the beginning, the point of contention is the practice of pleading the blood for all sorts of things. Such as protection, healing etc... As I have seen in scripture the blood is primarily Godward, even in exodus the blood was for God to look upon. Or the angel of death, unless you want to claim that the angel of death was some sort of demon or something.

Scripturally you'll find that shedding of the blood of Christ was for the remission of sin. It was so that God could look upon us and be justified in justifying us. It was not to give us power over the devil and demons and sickness. Though that power may be given to some as a consequence of God having applied the blood to their lives.

Just one question for you on a somewhat related topic, but do you generally end your prayers with 'in Jesus name'? If so, why?

Lyndon

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/7/1 17:08

Quote:  
-----I take it by the response from crsschk, that this thread is nearing its end.  
-----

That's interesting ... could but pray for if anything an end to this "using" of all this as it has now gone from bad to worse.

This is a terrible article and for what it's worth think there are some things from Joyce that have been a help to many ...

Now it's "Rights" ? and even more enforcement of the big "I" ..

Quote:  
-----A woman came to me one night after a meeting in which she had heard me use the phrase "pleading the blood". She told me that it was wrong to plead the blood, that we are not beggars but children of God and therefore we should "apply" or "put" the blood, not "plead" it.  
-----

Apply, put, plead, use... this is just awful

Quote:  
-----You and I have a legal right to use the blood of Jesus, just as we have a legal right to use the name of Jesus. It has been given to us, and we have a right to use it.  
-----

This sentiment of cockiness that has pervaded the landscape of the church, this prideful presuming upon so much ... Where does this idea come from?

Quote:  
-----Whatever phrasing you decide to use is up to you, but the main point is: "use" the blood. Pray it, or put it, or apply it, or appropriate it or plead it-but for your own sake, do something with it!  
-----

Yes, for the Lord's sake, leave it alone. It's not yours ...

Oh, this is horrible

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/1 17:11

Hello again Stever. I refer to your first post above.

After MikeB's eloquent comments on the need to fully apprehend the way we should take the Name of Jesus Christ as we are exhorted in scripture, you said:

Quote:  
-----It truly seems that everyone has their own opinion on this matter.  
-----

**This simply is not true!**

I am not going to rehearse the course of the whole thread for new readers, but they will find that it is you who has held out for the phrase 'pleading the blood', against *all* the scriptural evidence which was brought to bear on your inability to answer this basic challenge: that the apostles did not 'plead the blood', nor did they exhort others to do so.

There have been some excellent posts in this thread, but the list of topics you mention above, were all in response to those you refused to concede in the light of scripture.

Also, it appears you ignored the explanation given by philologos on Rom 5:12, only to present the same chapter a little later, as if you were bringing something new to the conversation.

And you appear to have missed what might have been his prophetic allusion (p13), with regard to your later post to me that

oday:

Quote:

-----The Catholics got themselves into this theological mess and extricated themselves by inventing the 'immaculate conception'; the notion that Mary was without sin at the time of Christ's conception. O what a tangled web we weave when we build human speculations into divine revelation!

-----  
It is not only about receiving the written word of God as the word of God, but also about allowing the Holy Spirit to teach us how to understand spiritual truth which may appear to defy humanly-discerned explanation.

You said:

Quote:

-----I take it by the response from crsschk, that this thread is nearing its end.

-----  
I didn't get that in what he said.

Quote:

-----This is the 1828 definition of Plead, from Noah Webster's Dictionary of the English language:

-----  
Since joining SI, I've discovered the great truth in philologos' observation that we cannot take our theology from a dictionary. (He said this early in the thread 'Matt 5:32')

Quote:

-----From Webster's dictionary:

In Scripture, to plead the cause of the righteous, as God, is to avenge or vindicate them against enemies, or to redress their grievances. Is.51.

-----  
This is slightly alarming, since I don't find any permission to 'avenge' against enemies... quite the reverse in the New Testament.... nor of 'vindication of the righteous'. **God does both these functions - not us.**

I think **this** is Mike's point - that God in us - that is *Christ in us* - gives us permission to bear and use His Name. This covers everything, if we are walking in the Spirit with Him.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 17:23**

Quote:

-----Mary was only a vessel to bring about this one and only virgin birth.

-----  
Was Christ of the substance of Mary?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/1 17:26**

Quote:

-----Romans Chapter 5:

12. When Adam sinned, SIN ENTERED THE ENTIRE HUMAN RACE. His sin spread death throughout all the world, so everything began to grow old and die, for all sinned.

-----  
Have you never noticed that while Eve's transgression did not have an immediate effect on Adam, Adam's transgression had an immediate effect on Eve and on the rest of creation? Adam's sin made Eve a sinner but Eve's sin did not make Adam a sinner. Have you thought why this might be?

edit: Eve could not possibly have received her 'sinnerhood' by inheritance.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/1 19:13**

Where does it say that the blood of Jesus Christ defeated Satan? The Blood of Jesus Christ Justified God the Father to take away our sins, just like the blood of animals covered sin and the goat took them into the wilderness where nobody ever saw them again. The Blood of Christ did this once and took away sin forever never to be offered again on the altar.

It is the Word of God that defeats Satan, Jesus proved it in the wilderness. If Jesus is the Word of God and it is the Word that kills Satan's grasp upon the believer, why do we need to use the blood pleading? It is absurd, It is Christ in us that defeats Satan, not the blood. The Blood took away our sin forever, once never to be used again, how do we know, because all it takes to be saved is to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and you will be saved, and God will do the rest because He is the only One that can provide the curriculum to do so, By the Spirit of Christ in you and taking the old man spirit of Satan and defeating him completely. Seek the things above not the blood that is still on the ground at the base of the Cross. Christ is our victory.

Mat 12:20 A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory.

1Cr 15:54 So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.

1Cr 15:55 O death, where thy sting? O grave, where thy victory?

1Cr 15:57 But thanks to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

1Jo 5:4 For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, our faith.

Rev 15:2 And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire: and them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, over the number of his name, stand on the sea of glass, having the harps of God.

No blood here. Christ has gotten our victory over the beast, that is Satan, over even his image, over his 666, stand fast in the sea of glass where with Christ has set you free.

Galatians 5:1-7 Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, who soever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love. Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?

The same goes for the Blood of Christ which signifies His death, we are dead to the Law and dead to sin because of the Blood not in the blood our using it as our ambassadorship to God in Jesus Christ. I have never seen anyone use the blood of a dead president to make him have the whole power of the United States Behind Him, it takes a live President to do that. We don't serve a dead Jesus and we cannot use His blood for anything, except to remember Him, but we can use a Risen Savior that is birthed in us and by His Name all of the kingdom of Satan trembles, he is already defeated. Christ won the victory for us and in us.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/7/1 23:17**

Lets get back on the subject, Pleading the blood.

Do we plead the very thing that God provided for Himself and already sees?

What does the blood of Christ do?

It satisfies God.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/2 2:32

Hi Linn,

Read this site and give me your opinion, Please.

Your seed of the woman and the seed of the man is explained very carefully. Then it shows that the ovum or seed of the woman is the eternal part of Mary that made Jesus' life eternal and that the seed of Adam is the carrier of the sin life unto death that God the Father bypassed by the Holy Spirit conception of Mary. Thus Jesus Christ was all Eternal God and sinless man, together being the only sacrifice God the Father could accept for eternal life imparted to believers. So no immaculate conception of Mary but conception of the immaculate ovum which never lost its eternal life ability as the seed of Adam did and death passed unto all men through the first Adam and unto life by the second Adam, born of eternal seed of the woman and the Seed of God by the Holy Spirit.

Truthfully I set out to prove you wrong, and the Holy Spirit, in my masculine superiority proved your feminine equality superior. Thanks for the lesson.

<http://custance.org/old/incarnation/4ch1.html>

In Christ: Phillip

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/2 6:58

Quote:  
-----Truthfully I set out to prove you wrong, and the Holy Spirit, in my masculine superiority proved your feminine equality superior. Thanks for the lesson.  
-----

Hi Phillip,

I'm laughing! Thanks you for your honesty!

Actually, it's surprising how many myths have survived the twentieth century, in the received wisdom which seems to be passed down to men, on the finer details of reproduction.

Often it is very subtle, and having said that, often it is very blatant, also. Despite Stever's gentle dig at science in a post yesterday, the fact is, *real* 'science' can be simply defined as the exploration and description of God's creation. What we learn from it tells about the nature and thinking of God, and this is the instruction we desperately need - to straighten out our own thinking.

I haven't read the website yet, but I will return to this and post a further response to your question. Already, if you have understood the point philologos was making in his last post on the previous screen page, I see a problem, but I *will* read the site you've linked, and respond later...

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/2 8:48

Two short comments on things Joyce Meyers said....

Quote:  
-----I am setting forth my case that Jesus has shed His blood and died for me; **therefore Satan has no right** to rule me, accuse me, condemn me or do anything else to me **or to anything that belongs to me**.  
-----

We are naive if we think we can out-manoeuvre God in what happens to us, by using any form of words in a ritualistic way.

God Himself will decide what permissions He gives to Satan.

Job 1:12

And the LORD said unto Satan, Behold, all that he hath in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand.

Our part is to remain faithful to Jesus Christ, to believe in Him, to trust His grace and word which will come to us in the h

our (literally) of our need of them, to stand steadfast in the truth wherewith we have been made free from all bondage to sin.

We know from church history, and

1 Peter 1

13 Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, **and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you** at the revelation of Jesus Christ;

14 As obedient children, **not** fashioning yourselves **according to the former lusts in your ignorance**:

15 But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;

16 Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.

and

Revelation 2:10

Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: **be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.**

.. that being faithful may require our physical lives to be lost. This is not a reflection on our standing before God, which one might deduce from the reasoning put forward by Joyce Meyers.

Quote:

-----When you try to pray, the devil may attempt to accuse you, reminding you of past sins and mistakes.... Or when the devil brings up some sin, if it is one that I have not yet repented of, it just reminds me to do so...  
-----

This strikes me as the heart of the matter. It is by faith that we receive forgiveness, but, we do know we are forgiven, because Jesus died **FOR** us. This is what we must understand.

'..the devil brings up some sin, if it is one that I have not yet repented of, it just reminds me to do so ..'

Do we really need this kind of help from the enemy?

Don't we know when we have distanced ourselves from God by stepping out of obedience to the Spirit?

Don't we notice we are not having fellowship with Him any more?

Of course, we do go on living, until we find ourselves compelled to give full attention to returning with all our heart into His light and presence, but, this is part of our living *relationship* with Him.

Returning is not based merely on a form of words which we trust. This would be just as legalistic a 'work', as believing one's salvation depends on any other repetitious activity - whether penance, prayers, Bible study, missions or service to the community.

I was slightly concerned to see 'repentance' almost fall into this 'works' category, by the way it was mentioned in passing, like another form of words rather than an attitude of heart which leads to permanent changes, as we receive forgiveness for the sin, healing from its effects, and liberty from its burden.

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/2 9:23

Phillip, you asked:

Quote:

-----Where does it say that the blood of Jesus Christ defeated Satan?

I think these verses from Hebrews 2 and 12 give support to what you're trying to say in your first post on this page, but, they do not even mention blood. They mention the death of Jesus and the destruction of the devil.

9 But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor, that He, by the grace of God, might taste death for everyone.

10 For it was fitting for Him, for whom all things and by whom all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.

11 For both He who sanctifies and those who are being sanctified all of one, for which reason He is not ashamed to call them brethren,...

14 Inasmuch then as the children have partaken of flesh and blood, He Himself likewise shared in the same, **that through death He might destroy him who had the power of death, that is, the devil,**

15 **and release those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.**

Hebrews 12

But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels,

23 to the general assembly and church of the firstborn registered in heaven, to God the Judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect,

24 to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than Abel.

25 See that you do not refuse Him who speaks. For if they did not escape who refused Him who spoke on earth, much more if we turn away from Him who from heaven,

One thing to notice in verse 23, is the phrase 'just men' (made perfect, (or made complete)). There is no uncertainty about our standing with God, according to whoever wrote Hebrews.

Verse 24 - we come 'to Jesus' and 'to the blood of sprinkling that speaks better things than that of Abel'.

no more offering for sin.

19 Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,

20 By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, **through the veil, that is to say, his flesh;**

21 And having an high priest over the house of God;

22 Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, **having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.**

23 Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; (for **he is faithful that promised**;) )

Verse 25 - 'See that you do not refuse **Him** who speaks'

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/2 9:36**

Stever,

I've been thinking about the prayers you think were answered because you 'pleaded the blood' of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I remember reading a book about how to pray for certain types of emotional difficulty in which the author had some experience. There was one in particular which I recognised, and I realised that what God had done in answer to her prayer was far beyond what she had prayed for.

This gave her a distorted impression of the connection between her prayer and God's response.

I wonder if this is what has happened to you....? You are convinced, you think, that mentioning the blood in a certain way, has been the key to gaining God's attention and blessing.

May it be that God has honoured *your faith towards Him*, simply?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/2 12:42**

Quote:

Eve could not possibly have received her 'sinnerhood' by inheritance.

Eve ate of the fruit also, She died, but she did not pass death on to all mankind, Adam did. It was through her seed that Jesus Christ would bruise the head of the devil, not Adams, But Gods Seed would bring forth very God and an all sinless body by non sinless seed, Jesus Christ.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2006/7/2 12:56**

Hey Bro.--- I feel a check by your statements above but need to read your web reference first before I respond any further.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/2 14:35**

Hi Phillip,

I've read the introduction and first chapter of the online book, and I don't have any dispute with what is presented as scientific fact, because it does explain why Eve herself died, and how the death of every offspring is directly a result of Adam's death.

In so saying, I would like to reserve time to think more, when I've read more (or the rest) of Custance's thesis.

What he has not touched on so far, is how this death, which is a physical fact, is also related to the entrance of sin to the human nature - which is a spiritual fact. I am interested to see if he deals with this, because, as we overcome *sin*, through Christ, we do not overcome *physical* mortality, but, we do regain spiritual *immortality* in the resurrected body.

I have a comment about Eve not being as deeply damaged by eating the fruit as Adam. It is now known that the X chromosome is connected to the production of antibody to challenge infecting organisms. Now, I'm not suggesting sin was an 'infecting organism', but, that the female has two X chromosomes is one of the reasons she survives physically, when some males die.

Every year, more male children are born than female, but more males die. This is not to suggest that more males are conceived - because this is not known - but, once they are born, female children do better.

I can see that the sin of disobedience in itself - that Eve and Adam fell for the serpent's invitation to try this method of becoming like gods - is pretty much identical to his own action in the heavenlies, when he set himself up as an object of worship, and succeeded in drawing a sizable proportion of angels after him. I also know that if we sin willingly, we seem to



lock ourselves into a mindset which is impossible to undo without God's help. Interesting that Custance's point on immortality, is that their bodies would have been capable of living forever. He does not tackle the issue of Adam's sin (or Eve's).

Phillip, it was an interesting read. I shall go back for more. Thank you for bringing it to our attention.

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/7/2 14:53**

sis dorcass

Quote:

-----May it be that God has honoured your faith towards Him, simply?  
-----

i think this is key here, that it's not so much what words we say as it is the spirit in which we come before God. The Lord had me make mention of it earlier on in this discussion. it's come up again so it seems to me He's trying to show us something here about how we approach Him in prayer.

**Re:, on: 2006/7/2 19:06**

Quote:

-----  
**philologos wrote:**

Quote:

-----  
Acts 20:27-28

" 27. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

28. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

-----  
because 'the life is in the blood'. Christ's blood was God's blood because Christ was God. This is a great proof of the tri-une God but God is a spirit, and spirits have no blood.

It has usually been the position of Christian thinkers to recognise that Christ's body (and hence his blood) was of 'Mary's substance'. If Christ's DNA is not from Mary He is not part of our race but an entirely new one. Consequently he would be disqualified from acting as our priest according to Hebrews.

-----  
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

### **Stever's response to Philologos:**

Professor James Orr provides my understanding to the answer to your post above as follows:

"Without shedding of blood is no remission." --Hebrews 9:22.

Where, however, among the sons of men can blood be found rich enough to pay the tremendous debt of sin, precious enough to satisfy divine justice, strong enough to cancel sin's appalling guilt, pure enough to usher in the reign of righteousness, overcoming enough to crush the devil and divine enough to redeem the elect of God?

God has made of one blood, we read, all the nations of the earth. By God's creation men's blood is one in composition. By sin's ruination, men's blood is one in pollution. Through the veins of humanity flows a poisoned bloodstream. The life of the flesh is in the blood. The life of man is totally depraved, therefore his blood is but human depravity in solution. Such blood calls for judgment rather than appeasement. Its shedding can only bring God's wrath and not God's mercy.

Although this is true, yet wonder of wonders amongst the race of sinners and in the house of David, a house as much cursed with sin as that of any other human family, there has been opened up a fountain for sin and for all uncleanness.

What sacred fountain yonder springs  
Up from the throne of God,  
And all new covenant blessings brings?  
'Tis Jesus' precious blood.

What mighty sum paid all my debt  
When I a bondman stood,  
And has my soul at freedom set?  
'This Jesus' precious blood.

What stream is that which sweeps away  
My sins just like a flood,  
Nor lets one guilty blemish stay?  
'This Jesus' precious blood.

What voice is that which speaks for me  
In heaven's high court for good,  
And from the curse has made me free?  
'This Jesus' precious blood.

What theme, my soul, shall best employ  
Thy harp before thy God,  
And made all heaven to ring with joy?  
'This Jesus' precious blood.

1 John 1:7 "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

Jesus His Son, the union in the one Person is clearly marked by the contrast 'Jesus' 'His Son.' Here the human name Jesus brings out the possibility of the communication of Christ's blood, and the divine name brings out the all-sufficing efficacy.

1. The blood of the Lord Jesus Christ has all the essentials necessary for the accomplishment of the great work of reconciliation. HIS BLOOD IS INNOCENT BLOOD as opposed to GUILTY BLOOD.

"I have betrayed innocent blood." --Matthew 27:4.

2. His Blood is PRECIOUS BLOOD as opposed to CORRUPTIBLE BLOOD.

"With the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." --1 Peter 1:19.

3. His Blood is INCORRUPTIBLE BLOOD as opposed to CORRUPTIBLE BLOOD.

"Ye were not redeemed with CORRUPTIBLE THINGS... But with the PRECIOUS BLOOD OF CHRIST." --1 Peter 1:18-19.

4. His Blood is DIVINE BLOOD as opposed to HUMAN BLOOD.

"The church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." --Acts 20:28.

5. His Blood is SUPERNATURAL BLOOD as opposed to NATURAL BLOOD.

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His Own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us." --Hebrews 9:12.

6. His Blood is VOLUNTARY=SHED BLOOD as opposed to ACCIDENTLY SPILLED BLOOD.

"No man taketh it from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of My Father." --John 10:18. "For this is My blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." --Matthew 26:28.

7. His Blood is CLEANSING BLOOD as opposed to CONGEALED BLOOD.

"The blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin." --1 John 1:7.

8. His Blood is LIVING BLOOD as opposed to LOST BLOOD.

"Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that Great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant." --Hebrews 13:20.

9. His Blood is PEACE-SPEAKING Blood as opposed to ENMITY-ARROUSING BLOOD.

"The blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." --Hebrews 12:24.

10. His Blood is JUSTIFYING BLOOD as opposed to the BLOOD OF JUDGMENT.

"Being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." --Romans 5:9.

Christ's Blood could only have these great attributes if He was Virgin-born... The supernatural blood necessitates the supernatural birth.

It is an established physiological fact that the mother's blood is neither the source nor supply of the blood in the unborn infant's veins. It is the contribution of the male which leads to the development of the blood. Without that vital contribution no blood could be produced because the female of herself does not produce the elements essential for the production of this new blood. Gray's Anatomy, a recognised medical authority, states: "The fetal and maternal blood currents do not intermingle, being separated from each other by the delicate walls of the villi."

Woman was so constructed that in the production of her child none of her blood would enter the veins of her offspring. This brings us back to Genesis and there we read: "And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man." --Genesis 2:21-22. The word used in verse 22 for the making of the woman is literally "built." God built, or constructed, woman and she was constructed in such a manner that when she was producing a child, that child's blood would be a new creation and not formed by the mother's bloodstream. Why did God so build, or construct, the woman? Simply because He was anticipating the Virgin Birth and making ready the woman for the great incarnation of God in human flesh.

Satan used the woman as the instrument to ruin the race, but God who is always ahead of the devil, forestalled him and had already constructed the woman so that she would be the instrument to produce the Redeemer of the race. If the woman had not been constructed in this manner and the production of blood in the unborn infant not so ordered, then Christ's blood would have been common with the whole race and valueless to redeem. The Virgin Birth of Christ, which took place with no male contribution which would originate the infant's blood in the usual way, but by a supernatural act of God thus originating supernatural blood, is absolutely essential to the work of redemption. By such a birth and by such a birth alone could blood be produced-- precious, incorruptible, supernatural and divine, to redeem the fallen sons of Adam's accursed race.

As I view the almighty wisdom of God in the production of such blood the words of the angelic announcement of the Virgin Birth come with fresh authority to my heart. "For with God nothing shall be impossible." --Luke 1:37.

Dr. De Haan of the Radio Bible Class, in his great message "The Chemistry of the Blood" commenting on this tremendous truth, states:

"Not only is this a scientific fact, but it is plainly taught in Scripture that Jesus partook of human flesh without Adam's blood. In Hebrews 2:14 we read: 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.' You will notice that the 'children', that is, the human children, are said to be partakers of flesh and blood, and then, speaking of Jesus, this verse says that He Himself likewise 'took part of the same.' The word 'took part' as applying to Christ is an entirely different word from 'partakers' as applied to the children. In the margin of my Bible, I r

read that the word translated 'took part' implies 'taking part in something outside one's self.' The Greek word for partakers in 'koynoncho' and means 'to share fully,' so that all of Adam's children share fully in Adam's flesh and blood. When we read that Jesus 'took part of the same' the word is 'metecho' which means 'to take part but not all.' The children take both flesh and blood of Adam but Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception."

**I therefore believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ because His supernatural Blood necessitates His supernatural birth.**

Professor James Orr--

The critics speak of the discrepancies of the narratives. Much more remarkable, it seems to me, are their agreements and the subtle harmonies that pervade them. The agreements, if we study them carefully, prove to be far more numerous than may at first strike us. Here, e.g., is a list of twelve points, which lie really on the surface of the narratives, yet give very nearly the gist of the whole story.

Â• (1) Jesus was born in the last days of Herod.

o Matthew 2:1-- "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king..."

o Matthew 2:13-- "Arise, and take the young Child and His mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young Child to destroy Him."

Â• (2) He was conceived by the Holy Ghost.

o Matthew 1:18-- "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise... she was found with Child of the Holy Ghost."

o Matthew 1:20-- "The angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

o Luke 1:35-- "And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

Â• (3) His mother was a virgin.

o Matthew 1:18-- "When as His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together..."

o Matthew 1:20-- "Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

o Matthew 1:23-- "Behold, a virgin shall be with Child, and shall bring forth a Son, and they shall call His Name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

o Luke 1:27-- "To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary."

o Luke 1:34-- "Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?"

Â• (4) She was betrothed to Joseph.

o Matthew 1:18-- "When as His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph..."

o Luke 1:27-- "To a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph..."

o Luke 2:5-- "To be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with Child."

Â• (5) Joseph was of the house and lineage of David.

o Matthew 1:16-- "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, Who is called Christ."

o Matthew 1:20-- "Joseph, thou son of David..."

o Luke 1:27-- "to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David..."

o Luke 2:4-- "And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; (because he was of the house and lineage of David)."

Â• (6) Jesus was born at Bethlehem.

o Matthew 2:1-- "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king..."

o Luke 2:4,6-- "And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem.. And so it was, that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered."

Â• (7) By divine direction He was called Jesus.

o Matthew 1:21-- "And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His Name JESUS..."

o Luke 1:31-- "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call His Name JESUS."

Â• (8) He was declared to be a Saviour.

o Matthew 1:21-- "He shall save His people from their sins."

o Luke 2:11-- "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the LORD."

Â• (9) Joseph knew beforehand of Mary's condition and its cause.

o Matthew 1:18-20-- "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as His mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with Child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things,

behold, the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."

o Luke 2:5-- "To be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with Child."

Â• (10) Nevertheless he took Mary to wife, and assumed full parental responsibility for her child-- was from the first in loco parentis to Jesus.

o Matthew 1:20-- "But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife..."

o Matthew 1:24-25-- "Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the LORD had bidden him, and took unto him his wife: And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn Son: and he called His Name JESUS."

o Luke 2:5-- "To be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, being great with Child."

Â• (11) The annunciation and birth were attended by revelations and visions.

o Matthew 1:20-- "the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a dream...", etc.

o Luke 1:27-28-- "And the angel came in unto her, and said...", etc.

Â• (12) After the birth of Jesus, Joseph and Mary dwelt in Nazareth.

o Matthew 2:23-- "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene."

o Luke 2:39-- "And when they had performed all things according to the Law of the LORD, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

**Re:, on: 2006/7/2 20:03**

Stever's response to **Dorcas**:

Specifically, I stated: Women do not have seed, Men have seed:

THE VIRGIN BIRTH WAS PROPHESED

A. THROUGH MOSES...

1. In the promise made to the serpent (Satan) - Gen 3:15

a. The first Messianic prophecy found in Scripture

b. "He shall bruise your head; and you shall bruise His heel"

2. Note that it says "her seed"

a. The reference to the seed of a woman is unique

b. The normal expression is the seed of man - e.g., Romans 1:3

Â• "3. Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh;Â"

Throughout the Old Testament, the Â"seedÂ" is always referred to the Father who provided the seed and sired the son or daughter, and never referred to the mother who birthed the child.

While not overwhelming proof, it is a subtle hint for what was to come!

B. THROUGH ISAIAH...

1. In the promise made to the House of David - Isa 7:13-14

a. Though Ahaz rejected a sign, God chose to give one anyway to his descendants

b. A virgin (Heb., almah) shall conceive and bear a son

2. Concerning almah, which some contend simply means "a young woman"

a. "As a matter of fact there is no place among the seven occurrences of 'almah' in the Old Testament where the word is clearly used of a woman who was not a virgin."

- J. Gresham Machen, The Virgin Birth of Christ

-- A young woman bearing a child is not a sign; but a virgin bearing a child, whose name was to be called Immanuel ("God with us")

...now that is a sign!

C. THROUGH JEREMIAH...

1. In the promise made to Judah - Jer 31:22
  - a. The Lord would create a new thing in the earth
  - b. "A woman shall encompass a man"
2. The phrase has been variously interpreted; even so...

- a. "The fathers saw in these words a prophecy of the miraculous conception of our Lord by the Virgin" - Barnes
- b. Any other explanation would not likely involve God creating a new thing!
  - This prophecy may also be a subtle reference to what was to come!

II. THE VIRGIN BIRTH WAS PROCLAIMED

A. BY MATTHEW...

1. In his account of the birth of Jesus - Mt 1:18-25
  - a. Mary was found with child, conceived of the Holy Spirit
  - b. In fulfillment of the prophecy found in the book of Isaiah
2. Concerning parthenos, used by Matthew in his account
  - a. It is the Greek word for "virgin"
  - b. Leaving no doubt that the prophecy in Isaiah referred to a virgin
  - Matthew, an early disciple and one of the 12 apostles, proclaimed the virgin birth!

B. BY LUKE...

1. In his account of the birth of Jesus - Lk 1:26-38
  - a. He also calls Mary a virgin (parthenos)
  - b. She was to have a child without the benefit of a man
2. Note the words of the angel Gabriel
  - a. "For with God nothing is impossible"
  - b. If one believes in God, the concept of a virgin birth is not an impossibility
  - Luke, a physician and notable historian, proclaimed the virgin birth!

C. BY PAUL...

1. In his epistle to the Galatians - Ga 4:4
  - a. Writing of the coming of the Son of God
  - b. Of whom he says was "born of a woman"
2. Note how careful Paul is in his epistles
  - a. He proclaims Jesus to be the seed of Abraham and David

b. He never ascribes the sonship of Jesus to any earthly father, only to God

c. Yet he has no hesitation ascribing His birth to a woman!

-- Paul, an apostle of Christ, by implication certainly proclaimed the virgin birth!

**It is an established physiological fact that the mother's blood is neither the source nor supply of the blood in the unborn infant's veins. It is the contribution of the male which leads to the development of the blood. Without that vital contribution no blood could be produced because the female of herself does not produce the elements essential for the production of this new blood. Gray's Anatomy, a recognised medical authority, states: "The fetal and maternal blood currents do not intermingle, being separated from each other by the delicate walls of the villi."**

**Woman was so constructed that in the production of her child none of her blood would enter the veins of her offspring. This brings us back to Genesis and there we read: "And the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which the LORD God had taken from man, made He a woman, and brought her unto the man." --Genesis 2:21-22. The word used in verse 22 for the making of the woman is literally "builted." God builted, or constructed, woman and she was constructed in such a manner that when she was producing a child, that child's blood would be a new creation and not formed by the mother's bloodstream. Why did God so build, or construct, the woman? Simply because He was anticipating the Virgin Birth and making ready the woman for the great incarnation of God in human flesh.**

Satan used the woman as the instrument to ruin the race, but God who is always ahead of the devil, forestalled him and had already constructed the woman so that she would be the instrument to produce the Redeemer of the race. If the woman had not been constructed in this manner and the production of blood in the unborn infant not so ordered, than Christ's blood would have been common with the whole race and valueless to redeem. The Virgin Birth of Christ, which took place with no male contribution which would originate the infant's blood in the usual way, but by a supernatural act of God thus originating supernatural blood, is absolutely essential to the work of redemption. By such a birth and by such a birth alone could blood be produced-- precious, incorruptible, supernatural and divine, to redeem the fallen sons of Adam's accursed race.

As I view the almighty wisdom of God in the production of such blood the words of the angelic announcement of the Virgin Birth come with fresh authority to my heart. "For with God nothing shall be impossible." --Luke 1:37.

**Dr. De Haan of the Radio Bible Class, in his great message "The Chemistry of the Blood" commenting on this tremendous truth, states:**

**"Not only is this a scientific fact, but it is plainly taught in Scripture that Jesus partook of human flesh without Adam's blood. In Hebrews 2:14 we read: 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same.' You will notice that the 'children', that is, the human children, are said to be partakers of flesh and blood, and then, speaking of Jesus, this verse says that He Himself likewise 'took part of the same.' The word 'took part' as applying to Christ is an entirely different word from 'partakers' as applied to the children. In the margin of my Bible, I read that the word translated 'took part' implies 'taking part in something outside one's self.' The Greek word for partakers is 'koinoncho' and means 'to share fully,' so that all of Adam's children share fully in Adam's flesh and blood. When we read that Jesus 'took part of the same' the word is 'metecho' which means 'to take part but not all.' The children take both flesh and blood of Adam but Christ took only part, that is, the flesh part, whereas the blood was the result of supernatural conception."**

## CONCLUSION

1. There is certainly more in the Scriptures that implies the virgin birth of Christ...

a. Such expressions as "begotten of God" - e.g., Jn 1:14,18; 3:16

b. The many references to Jesus as "the Son of God" - e.g., Lk 1:35; Mt 16:16

2. Skeptics have offered alternative explanations of the conception, such as...
  - a. A relationship with a secret lover
  - b. A rape by a Roman soldier
  - c. Sexual relationships with her fianc e, Joseph
  - d. Jesus was conceived as a result of normal relations between Mary and Joseph after marriage-- Each of these imply that the virgin birth stories in Matthew and Luke were simple fables, invented decades after Jesus' conception, without any grounding in fact
3. It is important to believe in the virgin birth of Christ; otherwise we claim that...
  - a. The New Testament narratives to be false and unreliable
  - b. We are more knowledgeable than Matthew, Luke, or Paul
4. Who are you willing to believe...?
  - a. The views of skeptics and opponents, who seek to undermine faith in Jesus?
  - b. The opinions of theologians and professors, who publish for the sake of tenure and profit?
  - c. The inspired apostles and writers of the New Testament, who suffered for their testimony?

I am content to place my faith in Matthew and Luke, and to heed such warnings as this by Paul:

"...Guard what was committed to your trust, avoiding the profane and idle babblings and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge -- by professing it some have strayed concerning the faith. Grace be with you. Amen." - 1 Ti 6:20-21

Committed to our trust is the wonderful truth that Jesus Christ was born of a virgin...!

I therefore believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ because His supernatural Blood necessitates His supernatural birth.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Re:, on: 2006/7/2 21:33

Stever responds to Dorcas:

**About the NIV and other newer versions that purposely eliminate the first Prophecy in the Bible of the Messiah to come, the Seed of the Woman:**

Origen, in his efforts to strip Jesus Christ of His Virgin Birth, changed Genesis 3:15. The KJV keeps the original.

Lets see the result of Origen's intentional bastardization of Scripture:

KJV



15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

NIV

15 And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers; he will crush **your head, and you will strike his heel.**"

The verse as rendered in the KJV shows Jesus as the true fulfillment of mankind's only hope as revealed in the Old Testament prophecies— that He is the promised "seed of the woman" (Gen.3:15). This prophetic application of the verse is completely missed in the other translations.

The NIV on the otherhand has totally destroyed the Prophecy of the one and only redeemer of Mankind. How? By changing seed to offspring. The seed can only be one thing- the Messiah. Why? Because women are never referred to as having "seed" in the Bible--Men are always mentioned as having "seed". Instead of seed, the word has been changed to offspring. So, any one of the children born from the mother of humanity would now qualify to be "her offspring", thus totally eliminating who this "redeemer" is going to be, other than that it is a man (he). This is exactly what the Pope would want! The False Prophet and the Antichrist will like it just as well.

Second, the prophecy has been changed from a specific death, crucifixion, the only form of capital punishment that bruises the heel to an enigma--of being "struck" in the heel. What is that all about, anyway. Again, the Pope, the false prophet, and the Antichrist are elated.

However, Christ is pictured by the KJV translators as especially being the fulfillment of the continuation of the Genesis 3:15 promise as given to Abraham:

And in thy (Abraham) seed (singular! Greek = spermati {spermati}, LXX - cp. Gal. 3:16) shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice. (Gen. 22:18, KJV)

But we are not left at the mercy of some mere man or modern Greek or Hebrew authority to divulge that the word "seed" in the above verse is not speaking of the Jewish nation but is in the singular and as such is a unmistakable reference to Messiah. The Holy Spirit reveals this truth to him in English elsewhere in Scripture.

Now to Abraham and his seed (spermati = spermati - singular in Greek) were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds (spermasin = spermasin - plural as does the root sperma, = sperma; see the LXX), as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed (spermati - singular), which is Christ. (Galatians 3:16, KJV)

All of the rich setting and overview that has preceded is completely lost in the modern reading of Hebrews 2:16.

Equally alarming, the reading as found in the NKJV et al. introduces a conspicuous error into the Word of God— namely, that God does not give aid to angels.

This contradicts Daniel 10 wherein the prophet for whom the Book is named was told by an angel that he had been dispatched from the throne of Heaven to come to strengthen him. Nevertheless, the heavenly messenger had been withstood for a period of 21 days by the demon prince who oversaw the kingdom of Persia. It was not until God dispatched the archangel Michael to come to the aid of the angelic messenger that he was able to successfully battle through and reach Daniel.

Thus, the internal evidence of other Scripture lays bare this inaccurate rendering of the Word of God and shows all translations which so follow as being erroneous and inferior. The Monarch of Books, the true English rendering of the Holy Writ as preserved in the 1611 King James Bible, is thereby demonstrated to be conspicuously superior and preeminent.

First Peter 2:2

As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: (KJV)

Like newborn babes, long for the pure spiritual milk, that by it you may grow up to salvation. (RSV; NIV is simil

ar)

**Comment:** This perversion teaches (1) that salvation occurs over a period of time and (2) that it is by works. Salvation is a free gift and the Word teaches that we neither "grow up" to it, "work for it", nor "obtain it gradually". Deliverance from sin comes by faith in Christ Jesus, i.e.:

**ACTS 16:31** ... Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved ... (KJV)

(3) The phrase "of the word" has been omitted, leaving us to wonder what "spiritual milk" is. The King James tells us the answer.

**First Peter 4:1**

Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind ... (KJV)

Therefore since Christ has suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves also with the same purpose (NAS; NIV is similar).

**Comment:** Why did Christ Jesus suffer? For us! Note its complete removal from the text. Is not this "doctrinal"?

**Acts 9:6**

The following comparison is a clear capsule specimen depicting the character and degree of the alterations that have been made upon the Holy Scripture.

(speaking of the conversion of Saul on the Damascus Road)

"And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." (KJV)

"Now get up and go into the city, and you will be told what you must do." (NIV; NAS etc., is similar)

**Comment:** Surely by now the reader has seen enough that any elucidation on our part is superfluous. We therefore with some reluctance mention that without the above underlined words, one cannot be certain if Saul were converted.

If these words are allowed to stand as faithfully recorded in the King James Bible, Saul—fully aware of the identity of the person with whom he is speaking—acknowledges Jesus as his Lord. That the verse likewise teaches the fear of the risen glorified Christ, as well as His boundless grace, is also manifestly evident.

**Psalms 8:4-5**

Lastly, a dramatic example depicting the serious inconsistencies found in the other translations may be seen in the following:

What is man, that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour. (KJV)

**HEB 2:6-7**

But one in a certain place testified, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour ... (KJV)

Now compare the KJV above to the newer versions:

**PSA 8:4-5**

What is man, that Thou dost take thought of him? And the son of man, that Thou dost care for him? Yet Thou hast made him a little lower than God, And dost crown him with glory and majesty! (NAS, et. al.).

**HEB 2:6-7**

But one has testified somewhere, saying, "What is man, that thou rememberest him? or the son of man that thou art concerned about him? Thou hast made him for a little while lower than the angels; thou hast crowned him with glory and honor ..." (NAS)

**Comment:** The highly touted NAS has rendered the Hebrew word "Elohim" as "God" in the eighth Psalm, creati

ng within itself a conspicuous contradiction in the Hebrews 2 quotation of that O.T. passage. The "weak" Hebrew word (which can mean God, angels, judges, magistrates etc.) is protected by the "strong" Greek word "aggelos" which can only be translated "angels".

The KJB is faithful to the LORD and to its readers by correctly rendering both passages as "angels".

The NAS reading in the 8th Psalm is not merely wrong, it fails to comprehend the immeasurable chasm existing between the Creator and the creature. It is humanistic, insulting to GOD and as such represents a blasphemous heretical translation having ignored God's New Testament Greek shelter and defense mechanism.

#### ORIGEN'S BELIEFS

Origen is the one who started the mess, that was carried forward by Westcott & Hort and the Revision Committee. All of the newer Bible Versions rely on their work, which goes directly back to Origen:

The following is a composite gleaned from many sources depicting the beliefs of Origen. Let us examine them to see if he was in fact a "great early Father of the Church" as we are often told.

This Greek philosopher had been taught by the founder of Neo-Platonism (Ammonius Saccas 170-243 A.D.). Neo-Platonism is a strange combination of Aristotelian logic and

Oriental cult teachings. It conceives the world as being an emanation from "the one" — the impersonal one (not the personal "Abba" of the Bible) with whom the soul is capable of being reunited while in some sort of trance or ecstasy.

As a follower of that philosophy, Origen attempted to amalgamate its views to Christianity. The problem with Origen, as with many who profess Christianity today, was that he tried to take "the best" of the world system (that which he had learned in school - his old philosophic views etc.) and incorporate them into Christianity; but they do not mix. It will be noted that many of Origen's beliefs coincide with Roman Catholic and Jehovah's Witness doctrine, both of which are "Christian" cults.

Origen believed:

1.in soul sleep (that the soul "sleeps" in the grave until the resurrection). However, the Bible teaches that to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord (II Cor.5:8);

2.in baptismal regeneration (belief that one is saved by water baptism). Although Satan was the originator, Origen is the first man we can find who was a strong proponent of this doctrine;

3.in universal salvation, i.e., the ultimate reconciliation of all things including Satan and the demons;

4.that the Father was God with a capital "G" and Jesus was God with a little "g" — that Jesus was only a created being. Thus, Origen was not Christian in the most basic of all doctrine, namely the person of the Lord Jesus the Christ;

5.to become sinless, one had to go to purgatory. This doctrine is nowhere to be found in Scripture;

6.in transubstantiation (that at communion the bread and wine actually turn to the body and blood of Christ); and

7.in transmigration and reincarnation of the soul. (The resurrection of Jesus corrects that error as He came back to life as the same Jesus. Hebrews 9:27 says "And it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." Thus the Bible teaches there is no reincarnation.);

8.and would not concede that any intelligent person could believe that the temptations of Jesus as recorded in the Scriptures actually happened;

9.the Scriptures were not literal (Origen was the "father of allegories");

10.neither in an actual "Adam" nor the fall of man and that Genesis 1-3 was not literal or historical;

11.the correct intepretation of Matthew 19 was that a man of God should be castrated and thereby proceded t  
o emasculate himself;

12.and taught eternal life was not a gift, rather that one must seize hold on and retain it (but Eph.2:8 says "By fai  
th are ye saved through grace; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God.");

13.that "Christ enters no man until he grasps mentally the doctrine of the consummation of the ages" (that woul  
d eliminate about 99% at most typical Christian gatherings);

14.or intimated that non baptized infants were hell bound; and

15.the redeemed would not experience a physical resurrection (yet I Cor.15 teaches the physical resurrection, a  
s do many other Scriptures). Moreover,around 200 A.D.Alexandrian "Christians" taught that Mary was the seco  
nd person of the Trinity ("Quarterly Journal of Prophecy" , p. 329).

Origen is often depicted as a "man of God", especially because he "died for his beliefs". That is certainly a com  
mendable character trait, but Mussolini, Karl Marx and Hitler also died for their beliefs. That does not mean the  
y were Christians. Many people have believed in a cause enough to give their lives for it, but it does not follow t  
hat they were Christian. Origen's beliefs clearly show that he was a religious gnostic Greek philosopher and no  
t truly a born again son of God.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

-----  
dorcac wrote:

Stever, you also said:

Quote:

-----Now, take out your NIV and consider the same verse you quoted:

Genesis 3:15

"an I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and hers"

-----  
Unless we know whether the word 'offspring' is plural and not singular, the NIV doesn't materially alter the pronouncement by God, that a 'man' would  
overcome Satan....

Rather surprisingly, you don't quote the rest of verse 15 which says:

"..He shall bruise your head,  
And you shall bruise His heel."

This is even more surprising since you yourself referred to the bruising of His heel on the cross, earlier this afternoon, in a long post on p13.... Gen 3:1  
5 is the first mention of it in the Bible.

Quote:

-----When Balaam went up on the mount to try and curse the Israelites, this is what he saw--a Cross. Their encampment was a picture o  
f the Savior to come, the Seed of the Woman, who would have his heel bruised! Crucifixion is the only form of captial punishment that incurs terrific bru  
ising of the heel. On the cross, the victim is suffocating to death. In order to breath, he has to push with his heel into the cross, in order to push his bod  
y upward, to continue to breath.

-----  
However, I see this could be taken as human interpretation, as while it is physically true, it doesn't acknowledge the form of words quoted by John, fro  
m the Old Testament, (which make the reference of God the Father to the bruising of His heel, even more meaningful).

John 13:18

"I do not speak concerning all of you. I know whom I have chosen; but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, 'He who eats bread with Me has lifted up his  
heel against Me.' (Psa 41:9)

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/3 8:37**

Hi Stever,

I'm going to try to cut to the chase here, without totally dissecting your posts on this page.

The word 'seed' which is used in the Bible, probably has a history which philologos could expound fully - a task I'm not going to attempt.

From my *reading* of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), and to desendants of th e people in question, in a general way. In this sense, women *do* have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), o r eggs (English).

You said:

Quote:  
-----Specifically, I stated: Women do not have seed, Men have seed:  
-----

But, you then posted a thread and added the content here, where it says in section A (THROUGH MOSES):

Quote:  
-----2. Note that it says "her seed"  
-----

This is not only a reference to her children (both male and female) but also to her reproductive capability to supply one h alf of the genetic data required for a child to be conceived. That unit of supply is a 'seed', as much as a man's is (a seed ). But the word 'seed' is misleading in that it implies a completeness, as when planting a seed which will spring up into a specific plant.

**The seed of a man cannot do this without being joined to the seed of woman. That's because in preparation for joining with each other, BOTH seeds LOSE half their genetic data, in a process which is called, mysteriously, 'm aturation'.**

If you would concede this point, there are many other things to discuss apart from whether you *like* the word 'seeds' for o va (singular = ovum), or not.

Let me state clearly, I believe in the Virgin Birth. It poses me no crisis of faith whatsoever. While I accept that Christ wa s the promised Seed who would bruise the serpent's head, this is not the only reference to promised seed which is of sig nificance in scripture. And, Christ was not only in Abraham, He was also in Noah, and, as a desendent of Eve, He was al so in Adam, (from before Eve had been made from the same bone and flesh).

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/3 10:48**

Hi Stever,

In the post where **you quoted James Orr**, it would be helpful if you go back, and add " ... " for his comments, to separat e them from yours, as you introduce him twice. **Where do his words end both times, please?**

I'm not sure who said this:

Quote:  
-----If the woman had not been constructed in this manner and the production of blood in the unborn infant not so ordered, than Christ's blood would have been common with the whole race and valueless to redeem.  
-----

This is guesswork. If Christ had not *human* blood, then His blood would not have qualified to be shed for the remission of our sins.

But, it is a physiological truth that within the developing fetus its unique blood forms according to the genetic data it recei ved from its parents - without circulating round the mother's body. I am very familiar with this fact, and of course I realise , **this is the same for everyone - not just for Jesus.**

The difference for Jesus, is that His physical father was God. Jesus did not cease to be the Word, when He became Flesh. This is the difference, rather than to make too much of whether His blood was 'supernatural'. If it was, then we are all supernatural, because we are all descended from Adam, and look how he began. Do we say that a woman who could not conceive, now can have *supernatural* children because her infertility was supernaturally healed by God in answer to prayer?

There is a sense in which the unborn child is a seed within the fruit (the parents) of the previous generation (the grandparents). The blood of the unborn infant *never* mingles with the mother by design, although it can, and when it does, this is always pathological for at least one - the mother or the baby. I'm not sure one can say God designed this for anything other than pragmatic reasons - which may include the best way to provide a Son who would die for us. It was not purely to separate *His* blood from His mother's, as every developing fetus needs this facility. EDIT: because we are made like *Him*.

It is a fallacy to think of blood as separate from flesh. Flesh has no life apart from blood. Neither does bone or nerve, which are the other types of differentiated cell within the human body. When 'flesh' is used to describe a body in the Bible, it is *assumed* there is a skeleton, and a nerve and blood supply. The lumen of the narrowest blood vessels (capillaries) is only seven thousandths of a millimetre, and there is no living cell in the body which does not have a blood supply. There are dead cells, such as superficial skin, which do not have a blood supply, but no body cell stays alive without a blood supply.

In other words, blood is completely integrated into the life support system. In fact, every body cell has a life cycle, and a system of constant replacement of those which have died, is always in progress. If Jesus was a normal man physiologically, then the baby body He was born with, experienced all the changes that ours do, including losing baby hair and milk teeth. His conception was only the start of the development of the Body which the Father had prepared for Him.

Hebrews 10:5

Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me:

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/3 11:02**

I think James Orr also said this:

Quote:  
-----By such a birth and by such a birth alone could blood be produced-- precious, incorruptible, supernatural and divine, to redeem the fallen sons of Adam's accursed race.  
-----

1 Peter 1

18 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with **corruptible things, as silver and gold**, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;

19 But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:

20 Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,

21 Who by him do believe in God, that raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory; that your faith and hope might be in God.

22 Seeing ye have purified your souls in **obeying the truth through the Spirit**

Stever,

Very specifically, these verses do not say Christ's blood was incorruptible. They say it was precious.

Do we need to *discuss* what Peter means by calling 'silver and gold' 'corruptible'?

James Orr said:

Quote:

-----God has made of one blood, we read, , all the nations of the earth. By God's creation men's blood is one in composition. **By sin's r  
uinution, men's blood is one in pollution. Through the veins of humanity flows a poisoned bloodstream.**  
-----

The two sentences in bold are pure guesswork, unless you can find scripture references to support them?

In that post where you quote James Orr, you also compare the blood of Christ from scripture references, with the blood of fallen man without scripture references.

**Do you have scriptures for your descriptions of the blood of fallen man?**

Since my beginning to read the link which Phillip posted on the previous page, I see that the spiritual nature of sin is a crucial factor in this discussion. The paper by Custance makes a clear separation between sin and death. I think this is also a scriptural separation.

philologos has pointed out that Eve could not have inherited sin, and this is obvious. It is not clear to me that sin can be inherited at all - which makes this discussion about the physical attributes of Christ's blood, even less satisfactory, except that He was neither dead in spirit nor sinful, and both these attributes are essential for our Saviour, for Him to have been raised from the dead after overcoming both sin and death.

The significance of 'the life is in the blood', is about the need for shedding of blood for the remission of sins. The death of Jesus Christ, we learn in Hebrews, is about destroying the devil and his power to hold people in bondage through fear of death, all life long. These are two separate and distinct accomplishments by the sacrifice of His life.

Re:, on: 2006/7/3 11:11

Quote:

-----  
dorcass wrote:  
Hi Stever,

I'm going to try to cut to the chase here, without totally dissecting your posts on this page.

The word 'seed' which is used in the Bible, **probably has a history** which philologos could expound fully - a task I'm not going to attempt.

From my *reading* of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), and to descendants of the people in question, in a general way. In this sense, women *do* have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), or eggs (English).  
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Stever responds to Dorcas:

You do not understand what I mean about the USE of the word seed. The use of the word is always applied to men having seed, except in this one and only verse in the Bible in Genesis 3:15

I would like to hear what Philologos can **probably come up with!** This subject has been an issue ever since Westcott and Hort used the works of Origen, rather than the received text, and created the problem.

Your statement above is confusing. You say:

"From my *reading* of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), and to descendants of the people in question, in a general way. In this sense, women *do* have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), or eggs (English)."  
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

What exact "Scripture" are you referring to in your study? Please proof text by Scriptural reference what exact "Scripture" you are referring to.

In conclusion, I will not concede on any issue in regards to my post on the "seed of the woman". This has been an ongoing battle between the conservative and liberal Church since 1881 when their work was published. Actually, the liberal Church of England was in total support of their work, and funded it as well.

The chain of events, since the publication in 1881 goes something like this:

1881 Bishop Ellicott submits the Revised Version to the Southern Convocation.

May 12th - Westcott and Hort's "The New Testament in the Original Greek" Vol. I published (Text and short Introduction).

May 17th - the Revised Version is published in England, selling two million copies within four days. It fails however to gain lasting popular appeal.

Sept. 4th - Westcott and Hort's "The New Testament in the Original Greek" Vol.II published (Introduction and Appendix).

Oct. - first of Dean Burgon's three articles in the Quarterly Review AGAINST the Revised Version appears.

1882 May - Ellicott publishes pamphlet in reply to Burgon, defending the Westcott and Hort Greek text.

1883 Burgon publishes *The Revision REVISED*, including a reply to Ellicott.

1890 May 1st - Westcott consecrated Bishop of Durham.

1892 Nov. 30th - death of Hort.

1901 July 27th - death of Westcott.

1908 The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia discusses the Westcott-Hort theory: "Conscious agreement with it or conscious disagreement and qualification mark all work in this field since 1881."

This is still almost literally true today 125 years later.

God bless,

Stever :-D

[illegible]

by dorcas on 2006/7/3 3:37:43

Hi Stever,

I'm going to try to cut to the chase here, without totally dissecting your posts on this page.

The word 'seed' which is used in the Bible, probably has a history which philologos could expound fully - a task I'm not going to attempt.

From my reading of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), and to descendants of the people in question, in a general way. In this sense, women do have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), or eggs (English).

You said:

Quote:

Specifically, I stated: Women do not have seed, Men have seed:

But, you then posted a thread and added the content here, where it says in section A (THROUGH MOSES):

Quote:

2. Note that it says "her seed"

This is not only a reference to her children (both male and female) but also to her reproductive capability to supply one half of the genetic data required for a child to be conceived. That unit of supply is a 'seed', as much as a man's is (a seed). But the word 'seed' is misleading in that it implies a completeness, as when planting a seed which will spring up into a specific plant.

The seed of a man cannot do this without being joined to the seed of woman. That's because in preparation for joining with each other, BOTH seeds LOSE half their genetic data, in a process which is called, mysteriously, 'maturation'.

If you would concede this point, there are many other things to discuss apart from whether you like the word 'seeds' for ova (singular = ovum), or not.

Let me state clearly, I believe in the Virgin Birth. It poses me no crisis of faith whatsoever. While I accept that Christ was the promised Seed who would bruise the serpent's head, this is not the only reference to promised seed which is of significance in scripture. And, Christ was not only in Abraham, He was also in Noah, and, as a desendent of Eve, He was also in Adam, (from before Eve had been made from the same bone and flesh).



**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/3 14:30**

Quote:  
-----To correct my error (heard from a sermon of many years ago), God actually provided HIS OWN BLOOD, that indwelt Christ. Since He is God, He can do anything- He is the true "Miracle Worker".  
-----

I have been away for the weekend so others may have already commented on this but we are into deep waters here. The simple question is what did Christ receive from Mary? and the simple answer is 'his humanity'. If Christ's humanity did not come from Mary then He is not a member of our race but the beginning of a new one. However the scripture states quite plainly that Christ is the son of a woman;{quote

-----  
Gal. 4:4 (KJVS) But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law,

-----  
... and in our present case of the tribe of Judah.

Quote:  
-----Heb. 7:14 (KJVS) For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood.  
-----

If Christ was not of the bloodline of Judah what is the point of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke? We know that Joseph's blood was not in Him.

Christ was born of Mary. Unless God used Mary as a surrogate mother Christ must have partaken of her physical humanity and hence the orthodox view has always been that He was of the substance of Mary. If He is not of the substance of Mary He has not essential link with the human race and cannot be our kinsman redeemer. (goel)

Stever, where do you stand on these things. Was Mary a surrogate mother or did she 'conceive in her womb'? If she conceived in her womb, Christ is human and on the tribe of Judah.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/3 14:41**

Christinyou's

Quote:  
-----Eve ate of the fruit also, She died, but she did not pass death on to all mankind, Adam did. It was through her seed that Jesus Christ would bruise the head of the devil, not Adams, But Gods Seed would bring forth very God and an all sinless body by non sinless seed, Jesus Christ.  
-----

If you read the account of the banishment from the Garden you will see that it is the man who is constantly held accountable for what happened and its consequences. The last verse of Gen 3 says 'so he drove out the man'. Of course the woman went with him and shared his fate but a reading of Gen 3 in an older version will show you that 'thee' and 'thou' are the dominant pronouns. Sin came in through the man; this is Paul's testimony too. Rom 5:12 NOT the woman. The penalties that fell on the earth came as a result of 'Man' not because of a biological link but because of his role in the creation.

The presumption that Adam passed down 'sinnerhood' by begetting children leaves Eve isolated from the whole race, as she was taken from Adam before Sin entered. Sin, however, as Paul tells us 'passed through' to all and this took place at the moment that the sentence 'dying thou shalt die' was enacted. I did not 'die spiritually' when I was born naturally. I 'died spiritually' when Adam disobeyed.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/3 14:44**

Quote:  
-----I therefore believe in the Virgin Birth of Christ because His supernatural Blood necessitates His supernatural birth.  
-----

Stever is this your statement or James Orr's.

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/3 14:55

Hi Stever,

I do know that the Bible usually refers to 'seed' in connection with men. And, I do know that the reference in Genesis 3:15, so early in scripture, establishes as FACT that women do have 'seed', and, that this is the only mention of women's seed, in scripture. I also accept this was a reference *specifically* to Christ.... That is, that the Child whom Mary bore, was the Seed whom God had promised would bruise the serpent's head. I'm sure you know there were other promised seeds, who fulfilled other roles.

Up till now you have stated categorically that 'WOMEN DO NOT HAVE SEED' - while at the same time trying to establish the importance of retaining the more faithful translation 'Seed' (of the woman - Eve) for Gen 3:15. So far, it has sound as if you are contradicting yourself - or that you don't read your own posts. While you are holding out for an acknowledgement from me, that 'seed' is usually called in connection with men, I would also like you to concede that there is a sense in which it is the offspring (singular) who is the 'seed', in a separate use of the same word. In this respect, Eve's 'seed' (Seed) becomes Christ, although we know she did not bear Him. This is what I mean here:

You said:

Quote:

-----Your statement above is confusing. You say:

"From my reading of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), **and to descendants of the people in question**, in a general way. In this sense, women do have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), or eggs (English). "

What exact "Scripture" are you referring to in your study? Please proof text by Scriptural reference what exact "Scripture" you are referring to.

I think I've covered this in my reply, by acknowledging the woman's seed is only mentioned once specifically, and then by implication when Mary bears Jesus.

Do you want me to do a Bible study on "mothers", to prove they are accommodated as 'seed' bearers, of import to God? For instance, off the top of my head, there are an interesting two in the genealogy of Christ Himself, .... Ruth, the Moabitess, and Rahab the harlot. Please let me know, or take a look for yourself.

(The Seed which Christ *became* is a whole nuther Bible study...)

Quote:

-----This subject has been an issue ever since Westcott and Hort used the works of Origen, rather than the received text, and created the problem.

Stever, seriously, I am not disagreeing with scripture. I agree with your point about the meaning of Gen 3:15. My pointing out that all women have seed, is no more revolutionary than your pointing out that the Bible only mentions them specifically, once.

Have you ever done a word search on 'offspring', and noticed that it appears elsewhere in scripture, even in Young's Literal Translation? This might be a reason some translators favour the word. As I've indicated already, 'offspring' could be singular or plural, and I don't know which it is, in Genesis. Do you?

Moving on, then, my fuller reply in my previous three posts is a *serious attempt* to dislodge your seeming conviction that Christ's blood was derived only from His Father, and that His mother contributed no part to it, as this is, frankly, *impossible*.

The author you quote is theorising, based on erroneous thinking - whether on erroneous information or simply speculation - after learning that a baby's blood never passes through its mother's blood vessels. While this comes as a surprise when one first learns of it, it is not unique to humans, so common is the principle in nature.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/3 15:14

Quote:  
-----The word 'seed' which is used in the Bible, probably has a history which philologos could expound fully - a task I'm not going to attempt.??From my reading of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), and to descendants of the people in question, in a general way. In this sense, women do have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), or eggs (English).  
-----

The problem we are having here is that different languages have different idioms. God has clearly used the idioms of Hebrew in promises which were quite deliberately ambiguous. The Hebrew word 'zera' is first used in

Quote:  
-----Gen. 1:11 (KJVS) And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.  
-----

That is its most natural use but it is also used of 'offspring' and when this is so it is not dealing in biological intricacies of 'egg' and 'seed' but simply indicating posterity.

The threat issued to Satan in Gen 3:15

Quote:  
-----Gen. 3:15 (KJVS) And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.  
-----

is at this earliest stage a simple statement about the woman's posterity. In the strictest sense Eve's seed was Cain, Abel, Seth and others. Christ was 'Mary's seed'

To illustrate that we are not talking about biological niceties we only have to look at Matthew's genealogy in chapter 1. The repeated word 'begot' is the Greek word 'gennaO' and 'beget' is its most natural translation. However in

Quote:  
-----Matt. 1:16 (KJVS) And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.  
Matt. 1:20 (KJVS) But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. )  
-----

the same word has been translated 'born' and 'conceived'. If you would like to examine more verses where 'gennaO' is used you will find that it is being used as 'beget, conceive, born' in fact, almost any aspect of conception and birth is accommodated by this word. The more specific word for 'conceive' is found in

Quote:  
-----Luke 1:31 (KJVS) And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.  
-----

and is a word which means to 'catch' or 'take hold' of something. This is our sense of 'conceive' in the reproductive process.

As regards 'seed' it used of the progeny of either man or woman, and of the man's sperm, and of plant seed. If you try to pin down a word with several meanings into just one meaning we end up in distorting the scripture rather than supporting it. If you want to look up all OT references to 'zera' 'seed'...Gen 1:11-12,29; 3:15; 4:25; 7:3; 9:9; 12:7; 13:15-16; 15:3, 5,13,18; 16:10; 17:7-10,12,19; 19:32,34; 21:12-13; 22:17-18; 24:7,60; 26:3-4,24; 28:4,13-14; 32:12; 35:12; 38:8-9; 46:6-7; 47:19,23-24; 48:4,11,19; Ex 16:31; 28:43; 30:21; 32:13; 33:1; Lev 11:37-38; 15:16-18,32; 18:21; 20:2-4; 21:15,17,21; 22:3-4; 26:16; 27:16,30; Num 5:28; 11:7; 14:24; 16:40; 18:19; 20:5; 24:7; 25:13; Deut 1:8; 4:37; 10:15; 11:9-10; 14:22; 22:9; 28:38,46,59; 30:6,19; 31:21; 34:4; Josh 24:3; Ruth 4:12; 1Sam 2:20; 8:15; 20:42; 24:21; 2Sam 4:8; 7:12; 22:51; 1Kings 2:33; 11:14,39; 18:32; 2Kings 5:27; 11:1; 17:20; 25:25; 1Chr 16:13; 17:11; 2Chr 20:7; 22:10; Ezra 2:59; 9:2; Neh 7:61; 9:2,8; Esth 6:13; 9:27-28,31; 10:3; Job 5:25; 21:8; 39:12; Psa 18:50; 21:10; 22:23,30; 25:13; 37:25-26,28; 69:36; 89:4, 29,36; 102:28; 105:6; 106:27; 112:2; 126:6; Prov 11:21; Eccl 11:6; Is 1:4; 5:10; 6:13; 14:20; 17:11; 23:3; 30:23; 41:8; 43:5; 44:3; 45:19,25; 48:19; 53:10; 54:3; 55:10; 57:3-4; 59:21; 61:9; 65:9,23; 66:22; Jer 2:21; 7:15; 22:28,30; 23:8; 29:32; 30:10; 31:27,36-37; 33:22,26; 35:7,9; 36:31; 41:1; 46:27; 49:10; Ezek 17:5,13; 20:5; 43:19; 44:22; Dan 1:3; 9:1; Amos 9:13; Hag 2:19; Zech 8:12; Mal 2:3,15

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/3 16:32**

philologos,

Thank you for hearing my request for an exposition on 'seed'. :-)

Stever,

There was something I meant to say, which picks up on points from two of my earlier posts.

I said:

Quote:

-----Let me state clearly, I believe in the Virgin Birth. It poses me no crisis of faith whatsoever...

then we are all supernatural, because we are all descended from Adam, and look how he began.

-----  
What I mean is... that if God could create the dust from which He formed Adam, then breathe into him to create a living soul, then put him in such a deep sleep that he was unaware of losing the rib for Eve to be formed..... it did not require extra-special power on God's part to create a single human reproductive cell to join with Mary's, that enabled her to bear Jesus, and it doesn't require extra-special faith for me to believe that He could do that, or that He did do that.

In Adam, was the potential to generate hundreds of thousands of reproductive cells, each of which was capable of joining with a reproductive cell from Eve (who also would have had thousands). Only one of each is required to join together. That God created a specific cell for a specific purpose is awesome...., but surely well within His creative power.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/3 22:19**

There is spiritual seed and there is physical seed. God can manipulate the seed any way He wants. The seed of oak tree, the seed of Mary being Christ. Both Spirit and Physical are in God, Proof being creation of Adam and out of Adam, Eve. Adam had seed to plant just like Eve had seed to receive from the planter. When seed conceives from the planter and the receiver, seed is born of a woman a living thing, if you will a reproduction of the planter and receiver.

Mary the receiver and God being the planter by the Holy Spirit, from this conception Christ was born a reproduction of Man from Mary and All God from the Father. Thus Jesus Christ all man and all God. The only difference in this Man was no seed of Adam. Thus back to the seed of Mary being able to reproduce perfect seeds that have no sin, or else the man part of Jesus Christ would carry the fallen seed of man, which Jesus was not. Thus the statement sin was passed to all man by Adam is correct. 1 Corinthians 15:47-49 The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.

Thus the Seed of Mary or the Seed of a woman is Incorruptable seed or the Incorruptable seed of the Father could not produce the image of the heavenly. This does not make woman heavenly, for she still dies out of or in Christ. But Her seed is Incorruptable, it is the seed of Adam that carries the poison of sin and death of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. "He Ate", and physically and spiritually Adam took on physical and spiritual corruption. 1 Corinthians 15:50 Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

After "he ate", Adam's seed was corrupted, Eve's was not, or Christ could not have been perfect man and Perfect God at the same time born of a woman.

"yet her desire will be for her husband"

In Christ: Phillip

Re:, on: 2006/7/3 22:39

Stever responds to Philologos:

I posted this once before, in regards to the specific reference of the "seed of the woman in Genesis 3:15:

Genesis 3:15 And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise His heel."

In regards to Genesis 3:15 above we find:

- This was the curse upon the serpent.
- This was the first clear prophecy of a coming redeemer.
- The use of "He" reveals that only one person is meant.
- The word "seed" speaks of offspring or descendant.
- ONLY ONE DESCENDANT OF EVE WAS BORN OF A WOMAN AND NOT A MAN.
- The word "enmity" speaks of warfare.
- Satan's seed is fallen man.
- Bruising the head speaks of crushing one's authority.
- Christ's heel was bruised when He was crucified.
- Satan's head was crushed when Jesus was crucified.

The New Testament clarifies this further:

Gal 4:4 But when the fullness of the time had come, God sent forth His Son, born of a woman, born under the law,

Rom 16:19-20 And the God of peace will crush Satan under your feet shortly.

Some Notes (from above, plus one more):

- 1- This was the curse upon the serpent.
- 2- This was the first clear prophecy of a coming redeemer.
- 3- The use of "He" reveals that one person is meant.
- 4- The word "seed" speaks of offspring or descendant.
- 5- Only one descendant of Eve was born of a woman and not a man.
- 6- The word "enmity" speaks of warfare.
- 7- Satan's seed is fallen man.
- 8- Bruising the head speaks of crushing one's authority.
- 9- Christ's heel was bruised when He was crucified.
- 10- Satan's head was crushed when Jesus was crucified.
- 11- Ancient Rabbinic Judaism regarded this passage as Messianic (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and the so-called Jerusalem Targum).

And also the following:

12- Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: "And it shall be that when the sons of the woman study the Torah diligently and obey its injunctions, they will direct themselves to smite you on the head and slay you; but when the sons of the woman forsake the commandments of the Torah and do not obey its injunctions, you will direct yourself to bite them on the heel and afflict them. However, there will be a remedy for the sons of the woman, but for you, serpent, there will be no remedy. They shall make peace with one another in the end, in the very end of days, in the days of the King Messiah."

**My point on this issue of the seed of the woman is that this is a specific prophecy of the Messiah to Come, Jesus Christ, who would undo what Adam had done.**

-----  
**It is my personal understanding that Adam was God's regent on this earth. When Adam sinned, all of mankind was judged a sinner as well, at that very moment --all present & future generations of man.**

**When we read in Hebrews that Christ is the 2nd Adam, then everything makes sense**

**The first Adam sinned, and brought the entire human race into sin (including Eve, as well as us in the future). When Christ came to this earth, as the "seed of the woman", the "Messiah" and when He paid the price for Adam's sin, that is now "our" sin, we all became saved at that very moment- all of mankind back to Adam and forward to the end of time--for all of those before the Cross, that believed in the Seed of the Woman and the Messiah to come, and for all of us after the Cross, that believe in Jesus Christ, the Messiah, the Seed of the woman. Now all of us who believe in Jesus Christ are saved and will receive eternal life. And we are/were all saved at the very moment that Christ paid the price on the Cross, and shouted "it is finished"--Tetelestai !.**

The Greek word 'tetelestai' has the following meaning:

Literally translated the word tetelestai means, "It is finished." The word occurs in John 19:28 and 19:30 and these are the only two places in the New Testament where it occurs. In 19:28 it is translated, "After this, when Jesus knew that all things were now completed, in order that the scripture might be fulfilled, he said, 'I thirst.'" Two verses later, he utters the word himself: "Then when he received the sour wine Jesus said, 'It is finished,' and he bowed his head and gave up his spirit."

The word tetelestai was also written on business documents or receipts in New Testament times to show indicating that a bill had been paid in full. The Greek-English lexicon by Moulton and Milligan says this:

"Receipts are often introduced by the phrase tetelestai, usually written in an abbreviated manner..." (p. 630). The connection between receipts and what Christ accomplished would have been quite clear to John's Greek-speaking reader ship; it would be unmistakable that Jesus Christ had died to pay for their sins.

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

**However, we (saved Christians) still have the sin nature that we have inherited from Adam. However, we (saved Christians) still have the sin nature that we have inherited from Adam. That is evident when we sin by thought or deed. When we look at another woman in lust, when we get angry with our brother, etc. etc. etc. we have committed SIN. Any man who says that he never sins, by thought or deed, after being saved is a liar, and the truth is not in him. We will not be perfect, like Christ, until the rapture. Now, today, even though we are saved, we still see through the glass darkly, but when we see him face to face at the rapture we will be like him!**

**How do we know that? The Bible tells us that "flesh and blood cannot inherit eternal life"**

**" Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."**

**The teaching about Jesus Christ being the 2nd Adam is found in Romans:**

{Romans 5:12-21-the 2nd Adam, who is Jesus Christ!

12. Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:

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

14. 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.

15. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

16. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

17. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

18. Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

19. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

20. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

21. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Col 2:13-15 states that Christ is now in control, and has blotted out our sin and has broken Satans power over man by paying the price for sin:

"13. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

14. Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

15. And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it."

In conclusion, Genesis 3:15 is a prophecy of the Messiah, and is specific to Jesus Christ. This first prophecy in the bible can be found in the King James Bible. It cannot be found in the NIV and other newer versions.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----The word 'seed' which is used in the Bible, probably has a history which philologos could expound fully - a task I'm not going to attempt.??From my reading of scripture, the word 'seed' refers to both reproductive cells (sperm and ova), and to descendants of the people in question, in a general way. In this sense, women do have 'seed' whether you call them that, or ova (Latin), or eggs (English).

The problem we are having here is that different languages have different idioms. God has clearly used the idioms of Hebrew in promises which were quite deliberately ambiguous. The Hebrew word 'zera' is first used in

Quote:

-----Gen. 1:11 (KJVS) And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so.

That is its most natural use but it is also used of 'offspring' and when this is so it is not dealing in biological intricacies of 'egg' and 'seed' but simply indicating posterity.

The threat issued to Satan in Gen 3:15

Quote:

-----Gen. 3:15 (KJVS) And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

is at this earliest stage a simple statement about the woman's posterity. In the strictest sense Eve's seed was Cain, Abel, Seth and others. Christ was 'Mary's seed'

To illustrate that we are not talking about biological niceties we only have to look at Matthew's genealogy in chapter 1. The repeated word 'begot' is the Greek word 'gennaO' and 'beget' is its most natural translation. However in

Quote:

-----Matt. 1:16 (KJVS) And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.

Matt. 1:20 (KJVS) But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. )

the same word has been translated 'born' and 'conceived'. If you would like to examine more verses where 'gennaO' is used you will find that it is being used as 'beget, conceive, born' in fact, almost any aspect of conception and birth is accommodated by this word. The more specific word for 'conceive' is found in

Quote:

-----Luke 1:31 (KJVS) And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS.

and is a word which means to 'catch' or 'take hold' of something. This is our sense of 'conceive' in the reproductive process.

As regards 'seed' it used of the progeny of either man or woman, and of the man's sperm, and of plant seed. If you try to pin down a word with several meanings into just one meaning we end up in distorting the scripture rather than supporting it. If you want to look up all OT references to 'zera' 'seed'...Gen 1:11-12,29; 3:15; 4:25; 7:3; 9:9; 12:7; 13:15-16; 15:3, 5,13,18; 16:10; 17:7-10,12,19; 19:32,34; 21:12-13; 22:17-18; 24:7,60; 26:3-4,24; 28:4,13-14; 32:12; 35:12; 38:8-9; 46:6-7; 47:19,23-24; 48:4,11,19; Ex 16:31; 28:43; 30:21; 32:13; 33:1; Lev 11:37-38; 15:16-18,32; 18:21; 20:2-4; 21:15,17,21; 22:3-4; 26:16; 27:16,30; Num 5:28; 11:7; 14:24; 16:40; 18:19; 20:5; 24:7; 25:13; Deut 1:8; 4:37; 10:15; 11:9-10; 14:22; 22:9; 28:38,46,59; 30:6,19; 31:21; 34:4; Josh 24:3; Ruth 4:12; 1Sam 2:20; 8:15; 20:42; 24:21; 2Sam 4:8; 7:12; 22:51; 1Kings 2:33; 11:14,39; 18:32; 2Kings 5:27; 11:1; 17:20; 25:25; 1Chr 16:13; 17:11; 2Chr 20:7; 22:10; Ezra 2:59; 9:2; Neh 7:6; 9:2,8; Esth 6:13; 9:27-28,31; 10:3; Job 5:25; 21:8; 39:12; Psa 18:50; 21:10; 22:23,30; 25:13; 37:25-26,28; 69:36; 89:4, 29,36; 102:28; 105:6; 106:27; 112:2; 126:6; Prov 11:21; Eccl 11:6; Is 1:4; 5:10; 6:13; 14:20; 17:11; 23:3; 30:23; 41:8; 43:5; 44:3; 45:19,25; 48:19; 53:10; 54:3; 55:10; 57:3-4; 59:21; 61:9; 65:9,23; 66:22; Jer 2:21; 7:15; 22:28,30; 23:8; 29:32; 30:10; 31:27,36-37; 33:22,26; 35:7,9; 36:31; 41:1; 46:27; 49:10; Ezek 17:5,13; 20:5; 43:19; 44:22; Dan 1:3; 9:1; Amos 9:13; Hag 2:19; Zech 8:12; Mal 2:3,15

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/3 23:07**

"" ONLY ONE DESCENDANT OF EVE WAS BORN OF A WOMAN AND NOT A MAN. ""

Either God changed the seed of Mary to be the pre-sin seed of Eve, or the seed of Woman, God from the beginning knowing that Christ must come from a woman and her seed must be Incorruptable. For all corruption comes through Adams seed, the first Adam, 1 Corinthians 15:21-22 For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

"for since by man" in Hebrew does not include woman.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/4 4:18**

Christinyou's

Quote:

-----Thus the statement sin was passed to all man by Adam is correct.

I am not unhappy with this statement as it stands although I would prefer 'passed to all men IN Adam'. However, we are back to the issue of 'transmission' and I see no biblical warrant for the statement that Sin is in the male sperm.

1Tim 2:14 shows that there was a difference in Adam's transgression and Eve's. But Adam as the head and source of our race affects all of his progeny, even Eve although her transgression was earlier than his.

The tenses used in Rom 5:12 are Aorist which is best translated perhaps as a simple past tense but must be distinguished from the Perfect and Imperfect tenses.

eg. A process is better suited to the Imperfect tense as in

Quote:

-----"for before the coming of certain from James, with the nations he was eating, and when they came, he was withdrawing and separating himself, fearing those of the circumcision," (Gal 2:12 YNG)

Here Young's Literal has captured the 'process'.

The Aorist tense would not be used for a process but for a completed event and

Quote:

-----"because of this, even as through one man the sin did enter into the world, and through the sin the death; and thus to all men the death did pass through, for that all did sin;" (Rom 5:12 YNG)

Again Youngs has captured the nuance of the Aorist tense. There was one 'entrance of sin into the world' and one transmission of 'death' which passed through to all men. As in Adam all die. I died in Adam. So in Christ shall all be made alive. In taking me out of Adam and putting me into Christ God regenerated me and gave me a new heredity.(1Cor 15:22)



Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/4 6:13

Stever's

Quote:

-----7- Satan's seed is fallen man.

-----  
but not woman?

Quote:

-----My point on this issue of the seed of the woman is that this is a specific prophecy of the Messiah to Come, Jesus Christ, who would undo what Adam had done.

-----  
no problems with this

Quote:

-----It is my personal understanding that Adam was God's regent on this earth. When Adam sinned, all of mankind was judged a sinner as well, at that very moment --all present & future generations of man.

-----  
This is the forensic aspect of what took place. Man, however, was not only judged a sinner but became one. Rom 5:12 is not referring to the forensic guilt of the race but to a dynamic change which spread instantly through the whole race.

Quote:

-----The first Adam sinned, and brought the entire human race into sin (including Eve, as well as us in the future).

-----  
This is the point which I am still challenging. You say that sin has passed to all men through man's seed but Eve was already a separate entity at the time of Adam's sin. How did Adam's condition transmit to Eve. It could not have been hereditary in the sense of passing through generations.

Quote:

-----However, we (saved Christians) still have the sin nature that we have inherited from Adam. However, we (saved Christians) still have the sin nature that we have inherited from Adam.

-----  
This is a matter which we have discussed at length in other topics. I do not believe that we can be in Adam AND in Christ at the same time. It is either/or.

Re:, on: 2006/7/4 9:21

Stever responds to Philologos:

The understanding of this concept has to do with the fact that Adam was God's "representative" on the earth. Once Adam sinned, then all of mankind sinned.

Once Christ came and overcame sin--He is now God's "representative" for all of mankind. Christ has taken care of the sin problem for ALL MEN/WOMEN. The only difference here, is that it is only applied (salvation) for those that believe in HIM. Salvation is available for all, because the debt has been paid. Salvation can only be applied by those that believe in Christ, the "Seed of the Woman", The Messiah.

Romans Chapter 5 reveals this mystery:

Romans5:

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

15. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

16. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

17. **FOR IF BY ONES OFFENCE DEATH REIGNED BY ONE; MUCH MORE THEY WHICH RECEIVE ABUNDANCE OF GRACE AND OF THE GIFT OF RIGHTEOUSNESS SHALL REIGN IN LIFE BY ONE, JESUS CHRIST.)**

**18. THEREFORE AS BY THE OFFENCE OF ONE JUDGMENT CAME UPON ALL MEN TO CONDEMNATION; EVEN SO BY THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF ONE THE FREE GIFT CAME UPON ALL MEN UNTO JUSTIFICATION OF LIFE.**

19. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

20. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound:

21. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

Also, of note, 1 Corinthians tells us that Eve was made for Adam, and Adam was not made for Eve:

8. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man.

9. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man.

The Living Bible has this to say:

“8. The first man didn't come from woman, but the first woman came out of man.

9. And Adam, the first man, was not made for Eve's benefit, but Eve was made for Adam.”

In conclusion, from what I understand of this matter, Adam was God's representative on the earth. When he sinned, all were in sin.

God's answer to this problem was to send His Son down to this earth, to pay the debt for all of mankind. He did this by living a sinless life, and dying on the cross for the sins of mankind, not just his own sin, because He had no sin. He was our once and for all sinless substitute.

God bless,

Stever :-D

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----

It is my personal understanding that Adam was God's regent on this earth. When Adam sinned, all of mankind was judged a sinner as well, at that very moment --all present & future generations of man.

-----

This is the forensic aspect of what took place. Man, however, was not only judged a sinner but became one. Rom 5:12 is not referring to the forensic guilt of the race but to a dynamic change which spread instantly through the whole race.

Quote:

-----

The first Adam sinned, and brought the entire human race into sin (including Eve, as well as us in the future).

-----

This is the point which I am still challenging. You say that sin has passed to all men through man's seed but Eve was already a separate entity at the time of Adam's sin. How did Adam's condition transmit to Eve. It could not have been hereditary in the sense of passing through generations.

**Re:Other Promised Seeds, on: 2006/7/4 9:35**

Stever's response to Dorcas (statement found below my post):

I am having difficulty with your statement below. Specifically what **other "promised seeds"** are you referring to, that can be found in the Bible, that were prophesized by God Himself in the Old Testament?

Who are you referring to--Isaac, or???

Please provide Biblical proof text for your statement below.

God bless,

Stever

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----

dorcas wrote:

Hi Stever,

I do know that the Bible usually refers to 'seed' in connection with men. And, I do know that the reference in Genesis 3:15, so early in scripture, establishes as FACT that women do have 'seed', and, that this is the only mention of women's seed, in scripture. I also accept this was a reference *specifically* to Christ.... That is, that the Child whom Mary bore, was the Seed whom God had promised would bruise the serpent's head. **I'm sure you know there were other promised seeds, who fulfilled other roles.**

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/4 14:47**

Stever said:

Quote:

-----I am having difficulty with your statement below. Specifically what other "promised seeds" are you referring to, that can be found in the Bible, that were prophesized by God Himself in the Old Testament?

Who are you referring to--Isaac, or???

Please provide Biblical proof text for your statement below.

-----

Isaac is the main one, if you insist on God Himself being the person who does the speaking.

But, in view of how the Hebrews responded to the news that God wanted to show them how close He wanted to be to them, by letting them see Him talk with Moses, it's not surprising there is no further word from God Himself directly to man.

Here are some chapter and verse. I am leaving you to read each story in full for yourself, and decide from the text and other relevant cross-references, what God intended to achieve by each one. I don't offer these in anything other than direct answer to your request above.

Genesis 11:30

But Sarai was barren; she had no child.

Genesis 12:7

And the LORD appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the LORD, who appeared unto him.

Genesis 15

2 And Abram said, Lord GOD, what wilt thou give me, **seeing I go childless,**

4 And, behold, the word of the LORD unto him, saying, This shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.

Genesis 18

9 And they said unto him, Where Sarah thy wife? And he said, Behold, in the tent.

10 And he said, I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life: and, lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son. And Sarah heard in the tent door, which behind him.

11 Now Abraham and Sarah old well stricken in age; it ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women.

12 Therefore Sarah laughed within herself, saying, After I am waxed old shall I have pleasure, my lord being old also?

13 And the LORD said unto Abraham, **Wherefore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a surety bear a child, which am old?**

14 **Is any thing too hard for the LORD? At the time appointed I will return unto thee, according to the time of life, and Sarah shall have a son.**

Romans 9

6 Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they not all Israel, which are of Israel:

7 Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, all children: but, **In Isaac shall thy seed be called.**

8 That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.

9 For this the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sara shall have a son.

10 And not only; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, by our father Isaac;

11 (For being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)

25 As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved.

26 And it shall come to pass, in the place where it was said unto them, Ye not my people; **there shall they be called the children of the living God.**

And God said unto Abraham, Let it not be grievous in thy sight because of the lad, and because of thy bondwoman; in all that Sarah hath said unto thee, hearken unto her voice; **for in Isaac shall thy seed be called.**

Hebrews 11:18

Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called:

In verse 11, see Paul's comment about the children not yet born. It was by this principle that we were all still in Adam when he sinned. The whole human race *began* to **be** (descended) from Adam - after he had sinned.

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/4 14:56**

Here are the others, but God Himself did not announce them.

Judges 13

2 And there was a certain man of Zorah, of the family of the Danites, whose name Manoah; and his wife barren, and bare not.

3 And the angel of the LORD appeared unto the woman, and said unto her, Behold now, thou barren, and bearest not:

but thou shalt conceive, and bear a son.

2 Kings 4

16 And he said, About this season, according to the time of life, thou shalt embrace a son. And she said, Nay, my lord, man of God, do not lie unto thine handmaid.

17 And **the woman conceived, and bare a son at that season that Elisha had said** unto her, according to the time of life.

Stever, there are two other barren, women of the Old Testament, who prayed, and God opened their wombs. The first is Rachel (Gen 30) and the next, Hannah, whom Eli blessed.

1 Samuel 1

1 Now there was a certain man of Ramathaimzophim, of mount Ephraim, and his name Elkanah, the son of Jeroham, the son of Elihu, the son of Tohu, the son of Zuph, an Ephrathite:

2 And he had two wives; the name of the one Hannah, and the name of the other Peninnah: and Peninnah had children, but Hannah had no children.

5 But unto Hannah he gave a worthy portion; for he loved Hannah: but the LORD had shut up her womb.

17 Then Eli answered and said, **Go in peace: and the God of Israel grant thy petition that thou hast asked of him.**

18 And she said, Let thine handmaid find grace in thy sight. So the woman went her way, and did eat, and her countenance was no more .

20 Wherefore it came to pass, when the time was come about after Hannah had conceived, that she bare a son, and called his name Samuel, , Because I have asked him of the LORD.

Lastly, but not in the Old Testament, there is the promise of John the Baptist. However, we must remember what a gap there was between the last recorded prophet and John the Baptist, and that he was only 6 months older than Jesus.

It was still the 'Old Testament' as far as Israel was concerned, and until the New 'Testament' had been brought into effect.

Luke 1

11 And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense.

12 And when Zacharias saw , he was troubled, and fear fell upon him.

13 But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John.

14 And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth.

15 For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb.

16 And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God.

17 And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

18 And Zacharias said unto the angel, Whereby shall I know this? for I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in year s.

19 And the angel answering said unto him, I am Gabriel, that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to shew thee these glad tidings.

24 And after those days his wife Elisabeth conceived

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/4 16:39**

Stever's

Quote:  
-----In conclusion, from what I understand of this matter, Adam was God's representative on the earth. When he sinned, all were in sin .  
-----

That still doesn't explain the transmission. I am still anxious for you to clarify what you think Christ received from Mary. Was Christ of the substance of Mary? and if so how do you persist in your view that Christ's blood was a direct provision from God?

**Re:, on: 2006/7/4 18:46**

Stever responds to Philologos:

At the beginning, after Adam's sin, God required a sinless animal to be sacrificed on an altar, and the blood to be poured out, to symbolize the "covering" of their sin, until the time of the sinless sacrifice, the seed of the woman, that would finally take away the sin of the world

The sacrifice consisted of:

- 1.Sacrificing a male firstborn lamb or ram.
- 2.Taking it before the altar, and leaning on the head of the animal, thus symbolically passing the sins from the sinner & his entire family to the substitute, and then slitting its throat.
- 4.Sacrificing the animal on the altar by burning the flesh and the inward parts
- 5.applying the blood to the altar

The animal skins would then be used to make clothing, tents, etc.

Genesis 3:21 Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them."

Genesis 4:3-7 that Abel's blood sacrifice was acceptable to the Lord, while Cain's SACRIFICE OF SOMETHING ELSE was not:

Adam lived to be 930 years old. He was 130 years old when he sired Seth, 235 years old when Enos was born, 325 years old when Cainan was born, 395 years when Methuselah was born, 395 years old when Mahaleleel was born, 450 years when Jared was born, 874 years old when Jared was born. He died **126** years before Noah was born. (Adam died in 930 A.M. (3017 B.C.) and Noah was born in 1056 AM (2948 B.C.)-

Adam had 930 years to share the Gospel with his children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, and great great grandchildren, while he was in the fields with them. To share with them about God in the garden, and their sin, and in THE PROPHECY, GIVEN TO THEM BY GOD of the "Seed of the Woman", the Messiah to come, and what was required of them in the meantime- a blood sacrifice, the shedding of blood, of a sinless animal to cover sin until Messiah came.

The problem is, some of them believed, and some didn't. The same problem we have today!

God did not require a human sacrifice of the first born. The human was a sinner, and his polluted, tainted, sinful blood could never cover sin until the seed of the woman arrived. However all of the FALSE RELIGIONS AND CULTS that existed in early antiquity sacrificed their firstborn Sons on the altar—the altar of Molech and other False religions/cults.

God required the blood of a sinless substitute, who was not "in" sin. God required specific "clean" animals to be sacrificed, and the blood of that sacrifice to cover sin—until Messiah, who would "take away the sin of the

World with His own sanctified Blood!

We see the requirements for this sacrifice and covering of sin, when we read in Genesis 3 & 4 the following:

Genesis 3:21 Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins, and clothed them.Â”

Genesis 4:3-7 that AbelÂ’s blood sacrifice was acceptable to the Lord, while Cains SACRIFICE OF SOMETHING ELSE was not:

Â”3. And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord. 4. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

5. But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. 6. And the Lord said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? 7. If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him. Â”

Later on, we read that Noah brought the animals into the ark 2 X 2. However, if we look closer we will see that he brought in the clean animals, used for sacrifice and food 7 X 7. The ark rested on dry land on the 17th day of Abib-the very same day that Jesus resurrected from the dead! 10 months later, when the land was finally dry, in the 2nd month and 27th day we find that Noah prepared SACRIFICES to the Lord.

Genesis 8:

4. And the ark rested in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month, upon the mountains of Ararat. 13. And it came to pass in the six hundredth and first year, in the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth: and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and looked, and, behold, the face of the ground was dry.

14. And in the second month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, was the earth dried.

20. And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar.

21. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart.

If we look in the book of Job, supposedly one of the oldest books in the Bible, we find Job making sacrifices for his children and his family continually.

-----  
**It (the Church) was NOT purchased with mans blood, but with the very blood of God.**

**Mary provided the body, that was impregnated by God through the power of the Holy Spirit.**

Hebrews 10:5 . Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not,

-----  
**but a body hast thou prepared me:**

As well as in Genesis 3:15Â—where a virgin would conceive.

Mary was overpowered by the Holy Ghost and she became pregnant with Jesus Christ, the Messiah, the "Seed of the Woman."

Luke 1: 35. And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God.Â”

ChristÂ’s blood is cleansing- all of manÂ’s blood that has ever existed from the beginning of the world until the end of the world can do NONE OF THESE THINGS, EVEN IF IT WAS ALL ADDED TOGETHER. IT IS TAINTED WITH SIN!:

The All in One Cleansing of the Blood of Jesus

1. It has a virtue to cleanse. It does not actually cleanse all, but only those that believe. There is a sufficiency in it to cleanse all, and there is an efficacy in it to cleanse those that have recourse to it. As when we say a medicine purges such a humour, we understand it is of the virtue and quality of the medicine, not that it purges unless it be taken in, or otherwise applied to the distempered person.

2. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth, not has cleansed, or shall cleanse. This notes a CONTINUED ACT. There is a perpetual pleading of it for us, a continual flowing of it to us. It is a fountain set open for sin, Zech. xiii. 1. There is a constant streaming of virtue from this blood, as there is of corruption from our nature. IT WAS SHED BUT ONCE, IT IS APPLIED OFTEN, AND THE VIRTUE OF IT IS AS DURABLE AS THE PERSON WHOSE BLOOD IT IS- JESUS CHRIST'S BLOOD!

3. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth. The apostle joins nothing with this blood. It has the sole and the sovereign virtue. There is no need of tainted merits, unbloody sacrifices, and terrifying purgatories. The whole of cleansing is ascribed to this blood, NOT ANYTHING TO OUR OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS OR WORKS. IT ADMITS NO PARTNER WITH IT, NOT THE BLOOD OF MARTYRS NOR THE INTERCESSIONS OF SAINTS.

4. The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from ALL sin. It is an UNIVERSAL REMEDY. Whatsoever has the nature of sin, sins against the law and sins against the gospel. It absolves from the guilt of sin, and shelters from the wrath of God. The distinction of venial and mortal sins has no footing here; no sin but is mortal without it, no sin so venial but needs it. This blood purges not some sort of sins, and leaves the rest to be expiated by a purgatory fire. This expression of the apostle, of all sin, is water enough to quench all the flames of purgatory that Rome has kindled; what sins are not expiated by it are left not to a temporary, but an eternal death; not to a refining, but a consuming fire. So that we see these words are an antidote against fears arising by reason of our infirmities, a cordial against faintings, an encouragement to a holy walk with God. It is a short but a full panegyric of the virtue of the blood of Christ.

1. In regard of the effect of the blood of Jesus: cleansing.

2. In regard of the cause of its efficacy. It is the blood of Jesus, a saviour; the blood of Christ, one appointed, anointed by God to be a Jesus, The Messiah, the "seed of the woman"; the blood of the Son of God, of one in a special relation to the Father, as his only begotten, beloved Son.

3. In regard of the extensiveness of it:

ALL SIN, FROM ADAM UNTIL THE END OF TIME. No guilt so high but it can master, no stain so deep but it can purge; being the blood of the Son of God, and therefore of infinite virtue, it has as much force to demolish mountains of guilt as level mole-hills of iniquity.

The blood of Christ was (1) sacred blood. It was the blood of perfect man - the God Man. (Jn. 1:1,14), the lamb of God (Jn. 1:29). Since Christ alone was perfect God and perfect Man (Phil. 2:5-8), He alone was qualified to give HIS BLOOD AS THE ATONEMENT FOR SIN.

Christ's blood was also (2) SINLESS BLOOD. His blood was like a lamb without spot or blemish (1 Pet. 1:18-19). All other human blood has been TAINTED BY THE CORRUPTION OF SIN RESULTING FROM ADAM'S FALL (Rom. 5:12, 1 Cor. 15:22), but the blood of Christ contained none of the sinful corruption which permeated all other humanity. When Judas Iscariot betrayed the Lord Jesus he knew that he was betraying "INNOCENT BLOOD" (Matt. 27:4).

The consequence of man's sin is both spiritual and physical death (Rom. 6:23; Heb. 9:27). It was through the blood of Adam (man) that original sin was and is transmitted, not the woman (1 Tim. 2:14). All human beings, with one exception, are the ultimate product of Adam's sinful seed. CHRIST IS THE ONLY INDIVIDUAL IN SCRIPTURE WHO IS DESIGNATED AS THE SEED OF THE WOMAN (Gen. 3:15). The BLOODLINE THUS RUNS THROUGH THE MALE, NOT THE FEMALE, IN DIVINE REVELATION.

All the blood in the human embryo is formed by itself and solely through the contribution of the male parent (No blood ever passes in the embryo from the mother to child). Our Saviour, however, did not have a human father as progenitor; he was born of a virgin (Isa. 7:14). The blood that flowed in Christ's veins was thus contributed by a Holy God (Matt. 1:22-23), resulting in a "Virgin Birth" and a Saviour with a sinless human nature. Dr. A.W. Pink rightly stated in his commentary that "in becoming man, Christ did not partake of the foul poison which sin has introduced into the human constitution. He



s humanity was not contaminated by the virus of the fall."

Christ's blood was also (3) **SUBSTITUTIONARY BLOOD** (II Cor. 5:21; I Pet. 2:24; Isa. 53-5,6), that is, it was offered in our place, in our stead. A substitute is an individual who takes someone's place when they are either unable to appear or unqualified to act.

The blood of Christ was (4) **SACRIFICIAL BLOOD** (Jn 3:16) for it cost the Father something - it cost Him everything, the sacrifice of His only Begotten Son. At Calvary, God separated Himself from His Son, in order that we might never be separated from Him.

The blood of Jesus was (5) **SUFFICIENT BLOOD** (Rom. 3:24-25). The Father set forth His Son to be a "PROPITIATION" (satisfaction) for our sins. This blood was shed once for all (Heb. 1:3; 10:12). In the blood sacrifice of Christ, poured out from a sinless nature, the righteous nature and demands of a holy God were perfectly satisfied. At Calvary, righteousness and peace truly kissed each other (Ps. 85:10). The songwriter was never more correct than when he wrote "Jesus paid it all, all to Him I owe; sin hath left a crimson stain, He washed it white as snow." In view of Christ's sufficient, completed atoning sacrifice through His blood, the repeated sacrifice of the Roman Mass is the depth of religious blasphemy. Christ truly "has redeemed us once for all."

What a blessing to know that Christ's blood is also (6) **SHIELDING BLOOD**. In Eph. 6:18, the believer is exhorted to take the shield of faith. This shield of faith is the shield in Christ's atoning blood. When Satan brings the skeletons out of our past and accuses the believer concerning his former life, the saint can always successfully plead the blood of his great high priest intercessor (Heb. 7:25). Our Lord thus saves us "completely," even from the insinuations and accusations of our arch-enemy the devil.

On a tragic note, however, Christ's blood is (7) **SLIGHTED BLOOD** (Heb. 10:28,29). In those verses, the writer clearly indicates that those who reject the blood of the new covenant (testament-agreement) do despite to the "Spirit of Grace." The Holy Spirit is God's divine agent for (a) convicting of sin, (b) convincing of Saviour and (c) converting to salvation (Jn. 16:8-11). When the sinner resists the wooing work of the Holy Spirit, he is thus closing the door of hope on the only means whereby Christ's blood can cleanse and set him free.

### III. The Impact Of Christ's Blood

The shed blood of Christ in his death on the cross has tremendous power (impact) and brings to the repentance, believing sinner numerous benefits-blessings, including redemption. (1) The subjects of redemption are sold under sin (Rom. 7:14) and under sentence of death (Rom. 5:12). The purchase price of the sinful "slave" is the blood of Christ who dies in the sinner's stead (Rev. 5:9). (2) Purchased by His blood, believers are never again exposed to sale, being eternally secure (Jn. 10:28-29). (3) (I Pet. 1:18-19). Through Christ's ransom payment, we are forever loosed - set free from sin's power. Thus, the blood "shall never lose its power."

The second impact of the blood of Christ is **RIGHTEOUSNESS** (Rom. 3:25) "..... through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness..." Through the merit of Christ's blood, the repentant sinner is declared righteous - justified - in Christ (I Cor. 1:30). The same passage (Rom 3:25) also indicates that there is complete remission (forgiveness) of sin (Eph. 1:7), with the slate wiped clear with regard to the believer's eternal position in Christ. This total remission is again based solely upon Christ's blood (Heb. 9:22)

The blood also brings **RECONCILIATION** - the reuniting of God and man (Col. 1:20-22, Eph. 2:16), a relationship that had been severed by man's sin (Eph. 2:14), plus reception ("accepted in the beloved" - Eph. 1:6) - accession to God's presence by the "blood of Jesus" (Heb. 10:19). The final impact of the blood of Christ is the bringing of rejoicing to the believer's heart ("..we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the atonement" - Rom. 5:11). The believer can now joyfully sing "Redeemed by the blood of the Lamb."

### Conclusion

For those seeking freedom from the burden of sin, there is truly "power in the blood of the Lamb." When asked the question "What can wash away my sin?," the believer can confidently reply, "Nothing but the blood of Jesus," The emperor Napoleon once took a map, and pointing to the British Isles stated, "Were it not for the red spot, I would have conquered the world." The blood of Christ does not just mean something to the Christian - it means everything! In view of the Biblical emphasis upon the blood of Christ, the blood of Christ cannot just be merely symbolical in nature.

No Blood-No Remission!!

God bless,

Stever :-D

xxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Stever's

Quote:

-----In conclusion, from what I understand of this matter, Adam was God's representative on the earth. When he sinned, all were in sin

-----  
That still doesn't explain the transmission. I am still anxious for you to clarify what you think Christ received from Mary. Was Christ of the substance of Mary? and if so how do you persist in your view that Christ's blood was a direct provision from God?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/5 4:29**

Quote:

-----It (the Church) was NOT purchased with man's blood, but with the very blood of God.

Mary provided the body, that was impregnated by God through the power of the Holy Spirit.

-----  
The church was purchased with the blood of a man who was God. God is Spirit and until he became man He could have no blood.

I asked what did Christ receive from Mary. Your answer seems to be that she was simply a surrogate womb. If so, how can Christ come from Judah? Your view of the incarnation begins to sound like something from 'Alien'.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/5 5:17**

Acts 20:27-28 For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God. Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.

To attempt to make out from these primitive institutions any nice system, which shall be adapted to modern wants, and conformed to modern ideas, such as pleading the blood, is to mistake altogether the nature of all primitive institutions, which are essentially provisional, extemporaneous, informal, and changeable. ie.--Of God. In all the most ancient copies of the New Testament, and those most to be relied upon for correctness, it reads, "The church of the Lord, which," &c. Which is also past tense, not present tense in the sense of using it for the purpose of getting answered prayer or protection from Satan. These already happened and all we need to do is apply them in our presentation of prayer by faith in whom we pray to, not pleading them before God.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/5 16:17

Hi Stever,

I have not a few problems with your last post, so I'm going to make a few quotes from it, and one or two brief comments, and wait for your reply. (Please note, I may not be online much after now, till Sunday, when I'll be responding to your reply, though I hope to post my praise each evening.)

Quote:

-----At the beginning, after Adam's sin, God required a sinless animal to be sacrificed on an altar,

Please give a scripture reference for this which you state as if it is fact. Thanks.

Quote:

-----Genesis 4:3-7 that Abel's blood sacrifice was acceptable to the Lord, while Cain's SACRIFICE OF SOMETHING ELSE was not:

Genesis 4:4 says: "Abel also brought of the firstborn of his flock and of their fat. And the LORD respected Abel and his offering", (NKJV) so where do you get anything about 'blood sacrifice' from that? (Seriously?)

Quote:

-----395 years when Methuselah was born, 395 years old when Mahaleleel was born

Brother, you need to do this with a good ruler and graph paper, or something similar. Your conclusion of how long before Noah's birth, was Adam's death, is incorrect in this calculation.

Quote:

-----THE PROPHECY, GIVEN TO THEM BY GOD of the "Seed of the Woman", the Messiah to come, and what was required of them in the meantime- a blood sacrifice, the shedding of blood, of a sinless animal to cover sin until Messiah came.

In answering the previous point (on chapter and verse for a blood sacrifice if you can) this may be partly addressed.

I put it to you that as philologists pointed out, 'seed', technically, is progeny and in Eve's case, her immediate seed were Cain, Abel and Seth.

I also put it to you, that for a time, it may have been that Adam and Eve hoped Cain would be the one to kill the serpent - that is, until he showed his great lack of judgment in offering to God the 'SOMETHING ELSE' which you mention (quoted further above).

The reason that 'something else' was not acceptable to God, was, it was the fruit of the ground. God had formed Adam of the dust of the ground, and He was pleased with His handiwork. Then, when Adam sinned, He cursed the ground. The ground and its fruit then became a symbol of the **lost rest** from work which Adam had achieved for the whole of mankind. This was *not* a sweet smelling sacrifice to God's nostrils, in the face of its context.

In other words, the idea that Adam and Eve knew the Messiah (which means 'anointed' - a foreign concept to them) would not come for thousands of years after them, was not first in their minds - if at all.

Quote:

-----The problem is, some of them believed, and some didn't.

Seriously, I'm not sure faith, or belief, was the issue which most troubled God in those days. Can you find a scripture reference for it?

You see, in all the references to God speaking to man right up till Moses, there seems to be no question of His presence being overwhelmingly clear to the person with whom He was speaking. The faith that is mentioned, is purely to do with the individual carrying out what God has asked of him, or believing that God would bring to pass the promise God had made to him. It is not about believing into some future Saviour. That person himself, is the focus of God's attention, and usually that person himself is going to be blessed through being obedient to God's calling on his life.

In the cases of Noah, Abraham and Moses, there were other people depending on them, and this pattern continues, as God slowly reveals more and more of the context within which the Saviour ***of the whole world*** is going to appear.

This is as far as I'm going to comment, as these are the main things to which I'd like to hear your responses.

**Re: Cain and Abel - posted by lyndon, on: 2006/7/5 19:04**

Stever's

Quote:  
-----Genesis 4:3-7 that Abel's blood sacrifice was acceptable to the Lord, while Cains SACRIFICE OF SOMETHING ELSE was not:  
-----

and

Dorcas's

Quote:  
-----The reason that 'something else' was not acceptable to God, was, it was the fruit of the ground. God had formed Adam of the dust of the ground, and He was pleased with His handiwork. Then, when Adam sinned, He cursed the ground. The ground and its fruit then became a symbol of the lost rest from work which Adam had achieved for the whole of mankind. This was not a sweet smelling sacrifice to God's nostrils, in the face of its context.  
-----

It is my understanding that the reason Abel's sacrifice was better than Cain's is that Abel offered in faith where it seems Cain did not.

eg. Hbr 11:4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

Lyndon

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/5 19:32**

lyndon said

Quote:  
-----It is my understanding that the reason Abel's sacrifice was better than Cain's is that Abel offered in faith where it seems Cain did not  
eg. Hbr 11:4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.  
-----

Hi Lyndon,

I'm not disputing the verse in Hebrews about Abel's sacrifice, I was just sharing what the Lord showed me - because I had wanted to know why Cain's sacrifice had been unacceptable to Him.

Picking up on Stever's suggestion that Abel's was a sacrifice for sin, I disagree. I believe it was a service of worship, and that's another reason Cain's was unacceptable and his attitude wrong at a deep level (as later is shown). In a way, offering the fruit of the field in those circumstances, was way over-the-line-cheeky of Cain. His other mistake was to think he could get away with it.

Considering God could have been far harder on him, he was also foolish to miss the opportunity to capitulate and offer a lamb after all. Instead, he acted as if Abel was responsible for his misdemeanour. Later he tried to lie his way out of answering God's question about his brother, and lastly, he did not really lament Abel's death.... the only thing he was worried about subsequently, was his own personal safety.... which was a bit rich under the circumstances.... By then, he had begun to understand something about God's justice, but it was all too late. The grace of God in that situation is amazing

, and only makes sense in the light of The Lamb.

**Re: - posted by lyndon, on: 2006/7/5 23:18**

Quote:  
----- I was just sharing what the Lord showed me - because I had wanted to know why Cain's sacrifice had been unacceptable to Him.  
-----

Someone was once reading this story to their children and then asked me why God would accept Abel's sacrifice and not Cain's. And that's what the Lord gave me at the time is that verse out of Hebrews. Which I took to mean that the main difference between the two sacrifices was faith.

Quote:  
----- I believe it was a service of worship, and that's another reason Cain's was unacceptable and his attitude wrong at a deep level (as later is shown). In a way, offering the fruit of the field in those circumstances, was way over-the-line-cheeky of Cain.  
-----

That's kind of my question is there a scripture that shows that the reason God didn't accept Cain's sacrifice is because of what he offered. I think you're right on with 'his attitude wrong at a deep level'. I guess I'm thinking that both of them offered up the fruits of their labours, if Cain had sacrificed a lamb would he then not have been sacrificing something of Abel's? What would the true significance of such a sacrifice have been? Also had God given them specific commands as to what should be offered?

Lyndon

**Re: Pleading the blood?, on: 2006/7/6 0:47**

Hi Lyndon,

Here is Young's rendering of those verses. I think it helps to show that when God did not accept Cain's offering, it was much more of a big deal to Cain than it was to God, and all the fault was on Cain's side for not being willing to receive correction from Him. God even warned Cain that if he didn't do better, sin was waiting to leap on him.

I think the Young's use of the phrase 'sin-offering' is interesting, in that it may be Abel offered his best, partly in acknowledgement of an awareness of personal sin. Abel set out to please God in the first place.

Then we see that even when Cain *knows* he hasn't 'pleased' God, he is unwilling to put things right. If this was the case with his opportunity to maintain a peace with God over that single instance and other sins, then what was he like the rest of the year?

(Young) Genesis 4

1 And the man knew Eve his wife, and she conceiveth and beareth Cain, and saith, 'I have gotten a man by Jehovah;'

2 and she addeth to bear his brother, even Abel. And Abel is feeding a flock, and Cain hath been servant of the ground.

3 And it cometh to pass at the end of days that Cain bringeth from the fruit of the ground a present to Jehovah;

4 and Abel, he hath brought, he also, from the female firstlings of his flock, even from their fat ones; and Jehovah looketh unto Abel and unto his present,

5 and unto Cain and unto his present He hath not looked; and it is very displeasing to Cain, and his countenance is fallen.

6 And Jehovah saith unto Cain, 'Why hast thou displeasure? and why hath thy countenance fallen?

7 Is there not, if thou dost well, acceptance? and if thou dost not well, at the opening a sin-offering is crouching, and unto thee its desire, and thou rulest over it.'

I think this last phrase 'and thou rulest over it' shows clearly that Cain did not have to settle for his offering having not been acceptable to God. He could have taken the offensive and made another, better offering.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/6 1:06**

Genesis 4:7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

Since Able was the younger, and if Cain would do what is right, Able would be in submission unto Cain. It would also be Able's desire to do so, since God already knew Able's heart by his sacrifice. This was also said so Cain could in his own heart realize that God was still for Cain, and all would be well if Cain would do well and not get hot tempered by what he was already feeling about the whole thing being Able's fault.

Cain went to talk to Able with none of the desire in his heart to do what God said, Cain went with the things that he had already seen and had been warned him about. Genesis 4:6 And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? Cain went to Able, jealous and burning in anger. (wroth) Cain's face had been set like flint and he was going to overthrow and overwhelm what he believed, his countenance set against what his brother Able had done to him. The same lie to all who blame others, surly God knows you will be just like Him and you can make your own decisions and take things into your own hands.

Genesis 4:8 And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and slew him.

Cain charged and challenged his brother with these deceptive wrong feelings not coming from God, which God had already given, Cain used in his heart the deceptive feelings that were being enraged and burned into his own feelings and disregarding God completely, just like his father had fallen to the lie.

Cain continued and endured the lie of the enemy of his soul and killed his brother.

This is a picture of what man is and what he would always be, killing and blaming his innocent brother because of his own evil thoughts and his own evil heart which is the heart of Satan who was his spiritual father chosen by his own father Adam. A perfect picture of even the first son of Adam and Eve, what happened when they disobeyed God and ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The only thing related to the shedding of Blood is the crying out from the ground to God the innocent blood that was shed, the same blood that cries out to God now, that is the Blood shed at the bottom of the Cross on the last altar, the earth that Christ died for to cleanse the sin of the world. All we have to do is believe it.

No juvenile pleading of the blood here, but the true heart of God being presented in the further revelation of what Jesus Christ would do when God, choosing the fullness of time to give Him Birth through His own Seed placed in Mary by the Holy Spirit, that we might have Him in our believing the Jesus is the Son, that we would be born again unto a new Life Spirit, Jesus Christ with Satan defeated and cast out and Christ birthed in us.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: The Burnt Offering, on: 2006/7/6 2:11**

Most Christians today have no understanding of the sacrifices that took place in the Old Testament, and in the purpose for them. We all study the New Testament, and leave the Old Testament alone. There are nuggets of gold found in the Old Testament. Like the saying goes: "The Old Testament is the New Testament concealed, and the New Testament is the Old Testament revealed". The problem is, unless we study (not read) the Old, as well as the New, we cannot see the beauty of God's sacrificial system that was set up in the Old Testament in "type", and "fulfilled" in the New Testament with the actual "blood sacrifice" of His Son on Calvary.

There is only one sacrifice in the sacrificial system set up by God at Mt. Sinai that provides for the SKIN OF THE ANIMAL to be given to the PRIEST for his personal use.

In all of the sacrifices that occur in the Old Testament, PRIOR to the sacrificial system set up by God in Leviticus, ALL are referred to as "burnt offerings". See Noah 8:20; Job 1:5; 42:8

The complete understanding of the Burnt Offering can be found in Leviticus chapter 1 (all of chapter 1); Leviticus 6:8-13; Leviticus 8:18-28. Reference to the allocation of the skin of the sacrifice to the priest is found in Leviticus 7:8

The Burnt offering represents complete surrender unto God, and represents the person of Christ. The entire sacrifice was burned to ashes upon the altar and portrays our Lord's perfect submission to the Father. He was obedient unto death. The sacrifice was always an unblemished male firstborn Bull, Lamb, goat, dove or pigeon—representing the final sacrifice of Jesus Christ as our unblemished, perfect first born sacrifice. His blood was sprinkled on the altar and he was cut in pieces and wholly burned. The skin was given to the Priest.

The Burnt offering was a "Voluntary" sacrifice. Those that gave this sacrifice wanted a deeper, more personal walk with God. The Husband (father) would bring the sacrifice to the Tabernacle and bring it up to the altar. He would lay his hands on the head of the animal, to become one with the animal, thus symbolically transferring his sin and that of his family as well, into the substitute, and would then slit the animals throat. The Priest would then put the blood on the altar. The sinner would cut the animal up into small pieces, and the Priest would place them on the altar to burn to ashes. The Priest was allowed to keep the skin (Lev 7:8)

Before Leviticus, the husband was the "Family Priest", and until the Jewish sacrificial system was established by God in Leviticus that established a formal "Priesthood", the husband WAS THE PRIEST. All of the early sacrifices mentioned in the Genesis & Job were BURNT OFFERINGS (Check out Noah, and Job). Until the time that God formally set up the sacrificial system, the husband assumed all of the duties of "Priest".

Hence, when Adam & Eve received the skin of the animals, we can see that this was the point in time where God showed them WHAT HE REQUIRED OF THEM. The fact that God gave them animal skins to wear should reveal to us that the skins were part of the BURNT OFFERING, that HE required to "cover" sin until Messiah.

When we see in Genesis 4:4 that Abel brought the firstlings (first born) of his flock, AND THE FAT THEREOF as an OFFERING.

"4. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering."

If we understand our Old Testament, and the sacrifices demanded by God in Leviticus, we can see that God always considers "THE FAT" part of the offering to be a "SWEET SAVOR" to the Lord. GOD'S PORTION in ALL of the sacrifices is the "FAT OF THE INNER PARTS, KIDNEYS & LIVER". This part was always placed on the altar and burned to ashes, and was ALWAYS GOD'S PORTION.

Therefore, since Abel brought the firstborn and the fat as a sacrifice, we know that he can only be OFFERING A BURNT OFFERING since this is the only sacrifice where the animal, as well as the fat were offered on the altar!

In the Burnt offering, the entire animal, including the fat, was burned to ashes, and thus the entire animal, other than the skin, was offered to God.

By this understanding we can clearly see that God had prophesized to Adam and Eve in the Garden about a coming redeemer. We can see that God provided (gave to) Adam and Eve skins to cover themselves. These skins were the result of the burnt offering that God instructed them to perform.

We can see from Genesis 4 that Abel believed his parents when they told him of their encounter with God in the Garden, and in the fall of mankind, and what was required of all believers. Cain did not believe God, and cared not about what was required. The New Testament gives us more understanding of the sacrifice Abel made to God, in comparison to that of Cain.

"4. By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent **SACRIFICE** than Cain, by which he OBTAINED WITNESS THAT HE WAS RIGHTEOUS, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh."

Strong's tells us that the meaning of the word sacrifice, as found here in the New Testament means **BLOOD SACRIFICE** :

**Strong's Number: 2378**

**Transliterated: thusia**

**Phonetic: thoo-see'-ah**

**Text: from 2380; sacrifice (the act or the victim, literally or figuratively): --sacrifice.**

This tells us that Abel was judged to be "righteous" by God because of his "BLOOD SACRIFICE, HIS BURNT OFFERING".

The New Testament further tells us that Cain was of the wicked one, but Abel was considered righteous before God because of the sacrifice that he offered. This tells me that Abel believed God, and Cain believed in himself. Abel was looking to Messiah as the author and finisher of his faith, while Cain was looking to himself. Cain, like Sinatra, did it his way, and not God's way.

"12. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous."

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Cain's "works" referred to here is the sacrifice that he made---a sacrifice of the fruit of the ground. God required a blood sacrifice, a burnt offering. "Without the shedding of blood is no remission of sin."

Abel's "works" were considered "righteous" before the Lord. Abel's sacrifice WAS A **BLOOD SACRIFICE= A BURNT OFFERING**. Based upon the fact that he offered the FIRSTBORN AND THE FAT, we can see that it was a BURNT OFFERING! Cain's "sacrifice" was "the fruit of the ground."

"there is no remission without the shedding of blood!"

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S.

**The New Testament tells us that the offering involved a VICTIM:**

**Strong's Number: 2378**

**Transliterated: thusia**

**Phonetic: thoo-see'-ah**

**Text: from 2380; sacrifice (the act or the VICTIM, literally or figuratively): --sacrifice.**

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----  
dorcus wrote:  
lyndon said

Quote:

-----It is my understanding that the reason Abel's sacrifice was better than Cain's is that Abel offered in faith where it seems Cain did not.  
eg. Hbr 11:4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.



Hi Lyndon,

I'm not disputing the verse in Hebrews about Abel's sacrifice, I was just sharing what the Lord showed me - because I had wanted to know why Cain's sacrifice had been unacceptable to Him.

Picking up on Stever's suggestion that Abel's was a sacrifice for sin, I disagree. I believe it was a service of worship, and that's another reason Cain's was unacceptable and his attitude wrong at a deep level (as later is shown). In a way, offering the fruit of the field in those circumstances, was way over-the-line-cheeky of Cain. His other mistake was to think he could get away with it.

Considering God could have been far harder on him, he was also foolish to miss the opportunity to capitulate and offer a lamb after all. Instead, he acted as if Abel was responsible for his misdemeanour. Later he tried to lie his way out of answering God's question about his brother, and lastly, he did not really lament Abel's death.... the only thing he was worried about subsequently, was his own personal safety.... which was a bit rich under the circumstances.... By then, he had begun to understand something about God's justice, but it was all too late. The grace of God in that situation is amazing, and only makes sense in the light of The Lamb.

-----

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/6 5:38**

Quote:

-----The church was purchased with the blood of a man who was God. God is Spirit and until he became man He could have no blood.

I asked what did Christ receive from Mary. Your answer seems to be that she was simply a surrogate womb. If so, how can Christ come from Judah? Your view of the incarnation begins to sound like something from 'Alien'.

-----

Stever,  
perhaps you missed this post?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/6 5:48**

Stevens'

Quote:  
-----Abels "works" were considered "righteous" before the Lord. Abels sacrifice WAS A BLOOD SACRIFICE= A BURNT OFFERING. Based upon the fact that he offered the FIRSTBORN AND THE FAT, we can see that it was a BURNT OFFERING! Cains "sacrifice" was "the fruit of the ground."

-----

In fact the word used for 'offering' in

Quote:

-----Gen. 4:3 And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.  
Gen. 4:4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

-----

is (Strong's 4503). **&#1502;&#1460;&#1504;&#1456;&#1495;&#1464;&#1492;** *minchah* which is actually a 'gift' or 'donation' offering. It would seem plain that this was a 'voluntary' offering and not the 'mandatory' sin or trespass offering. The later Meal Offering of Lev 2 was also a 'voluntary' offering. Although many evangelical expositors have held differently, I do not think we have any 'sin offerings' or 'trespass offerings' in the OT before the giving of the Law at Sinai.

The Hebrews comment makes it plain that Cain's offering was not rejected because it was bloodless but because it was not offered in faith. The voluntary offerings of the OT do not portray 'sin-bearing' as much as the life utterly given up to God. The imagery here is not the remitting of sin but the yielding up of the life to God.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/7/6 8:11**

Hi Ron,

Quote:

-----The Hebrews comment makes it plain that Cain's offering was not rejected because it was bloodless but because it was not offered in faith.

-----

I have long believed that the reason the sacrifice was rejected was because Cain brought an offering in opposition to the revealed will of God. This would basically be 'do it yourself' religion. Doing what is right in one's own eyes. It seems that Cain should have known that the offering should have been a lamb, but chose rather to bring what he wanted to bring. T

his was an offering, in my mind, brought in unbelief because it was brought in willfull disobedience. I know that we are quite limited and have to try to reconstruct as much as possible from the tiny bits we have. I think of one part:

If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.(Genesis 4:7)

The passage seems to indicate that Cain did not do what he knew would have been an offering 'done well.' Sin in my thinking is disobedience to the revealed will of God. This, then, seems to be the first case of false religion. I agree that it was not offered in faith. If God had revealed a pattern of bringing an offering to Him and Cain rejected that revelation, it seems that 'rejection of revelation' would have been the controversy God had with Cain. If God had revealed the type of offering that Cain brought and Cain brought it, the bible is strangely silent on why it had not been accepted. We could suppose that Cain's heart was not right towards God or they were not in relationship, etc., but that would hold true for many who brought offerings in Israel also.

Are there other possibilities I could be missing here?

**Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/7/6 10:02**

Quoting from EW Bullinger:

With Cain, the LORD at once put the matter on its true ground "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" ( Gen. iv.7). This is rendered in the Septuagint Translation "if thou offer correctly."

This is what it means. " If Cain offered correctly;" i.e. what God had told him, he would have done "well", and his offering would have been accepted.

There was 'no difference' between the two men. All the difference lay in their offerings, which proved that the one believed God, and that the other did not.

Abel did "well" because he believed, and hence, obeyed God. Cain did "not well;" because he did not offer correctly, though a sin-offering lay at the door ready to his hand. (End EWB's Quote)

Like RobertW said, "Cain did not do what he knew". *He did his own thing*, so to speak?

mml

**Re: - posted by lyndon, on: 2006/7/6 10:30**

Quote:

-----3 And it cometh to pass at the end of days that Cain bringeth from the fruit of the ground a present to Jehovah;4 and Abel, he hath brought, he also, from the female firstlings of his flock, even from their fat ones; and Jehovah looketh unto Abel and unto his present,  
-----

I think what we see here is that Cain just brought something from the ground. In other words, walked in picked something up, and offered it to God. Whereas Abel brought from the firstlings of the flock, even from their fat ones. The very best, here we see again the difference in attitude between the two, or, Abel's faith.

Quote:

-----Then we see that even when Cain knows he hasn't 'pleased' God, he is unwilling to put things right.  
-----

The difference between the two brothers coming forth again. I think its safe to say, from what little we know of Abel, that he would have done whatever it took to make his sacrifice acceptable to God. I still see the primary difference as being faith, for it was Abel's faith that enabled him to offer up a better sacrifice. Or it was because of his faith that Abel brought

the best that he had to offer.

Lyndon

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/7/6 10:52**

Quote:  
-----I still see the primary difference as being faith, for it was Abel's faith that enabled him to offer up a better sacrifice. Or it was because of his faith that Abel brought the best that he had to offer.  
-----

This brings our question full circle. What does it mean to express faith? I love Ron's definition of faith as *right response to revelation*. This is even deeper than knowledge. It is the Lord quickening something to us that we have opportunity to respond to. Sometimes that response is to 'trust' and therefore 'wait'. Sometimes that response is to 'trust' and 'obey' and that in the here and now. For what Cain did to be sin it had to involve him not responding to what he consciously knew was as the Lord's will.

**Re: Sacrifices of Leviticus, on: 2006/7/6 10:56**

Stever responds to Philologos:

There seems to be some confusion here in regards to the sacrifices. The sacrifices in Leviticus all had specific names. If we look in the Bible, God starts with the most important first- the PEACE OFFERING. Then the MEAL OFFERING. Then the BURNT OFFERING. These three offerings were **VOLUNTARY.**

Then, the TRESPASS/GUILT OFFERING, and FINALLY the SIN OFFERING THAT WERE **MANDATORY.**

However, as far as man is concerned, **the offerings are REVERSED.** THE SIN & TRESPASS/GUILT OFFERINGS WERE MANDATORY, AND EVERYONE HAD TO PERFORM THEM.

The voluntary offerings were exactly that=VOLUNTARY.

In all of the offerings, the sinner would "Lay on Hands to become one with the animal, and then kills the Animal". In all of the sacrifices the sinner would pass HIS SINS, AND THOSE OF HIS FAMILY, onto the head of the animal AND SLIT ITS THROAT, **REGARDLESS OF THE NAME OF THE SACRIFICE.**

In only one offering, the MEAL OFFERING, which was a voluntary offering, was this not possible. Usually the MEAL OFFERING was part of the BURNT OFFERING.

However, IN REGARDS TO THE SIN OFFERING, (a Mandatory Sacrifice) if one was totally without resources, FINE FLOUR (MEAL) could be used instead of the required ANIMALS (in the SIN OFFERING). THOSE ANIMALS WERE: 1) Bull 2) Lamb 3) Goat 4) Dove or Pigeon.

However, if we understand God's requirement in the beginning, IN THE GARDEN, AND AFTER THAT, God REQUIRED ONLY ONE OFFERING--A BURNT OFFERING.

God bless,

Stever :-D

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Stevens'

Quote:

-----Abels "works" were considered "righteous" before the Lord. Abels sacrifice WAS A BLOOD SACRIFICE= A BURNT OFFERING. Based upon the fact that he offered the FIRSTBORN AND THE FAT, we can see that it was a BURNT OFFERING! Cains "sacrifice" was "the fruit of the ground."

-----  
In fact the word used for 'offering' in

Quote:

-----Gen. 4:3 And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord.

Gen. 4:4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

-----  
is (Strong's 4503). **&#1502;&#1460;&#1504;&#1456;&#1495;&#1464;&#1492;** *minchah* which is actually a 'gift' or 'donation' offering. It would seem plain that this was a 'voluntary' offering and not the 'mandatory' sin or trespass offering. The later Meal Offering of Lev 2 was also a 'voluntary' offering. Although many evangelical expositors have held differently, I do not think we have any 'sin offerings' or 'trespass offerings' in the OT before the giving of the Law at Sinai.

The Hebrews comment makes it plain that Cain's offering was not rejected because it was bloodless but because it was not offered in faith. The voluntary offerings of the OT do not portray 'sin-bearing' as much as the life utterly given up to God. The imagery here is not the remitting of sin but the yielding up of the life to God.

-----  
**Re:, on: 2006/7/6 11:08**

Stever responds:

What I think is interesting, is that God found Abel to be "righteous" because of his sacrifice.

Later, we see that God found Noah to be "righteous" as well.

Both men performed burnt offerings to the Lord. Both men believed God, and therefore did what God required.

God bless,

Stever :-D

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

-----  
lyndon wrote:

Quote:

-----3 And it cometh to pass at the end of days that Cain bringeth from the fruit of the ground a present to Jehovah;4 and Abel, he hath brought, he also, from the female firstlings of his flock, even from their fat ones; and Jehovah looketh unto Abel and unto his present,

-----  
I think what we see here is that Cain just brought something from the ground. In other words, walked in picked something up, and offered it to God. Whereas Abel brought from the firstlings of the flock, even from their fat ones. The very best, here we see again the difference in attitude between the two, or, Abel's faith.

Quote:

-----Then we see that even when Cain knows he hasn't 'pleased' God, he is unwilling to put things right.

-----  
The difference between the two brothers coming forth again. I think it's safe to say, from what little we know of Abel, that he would have done whatever it took to make his sacrifice acceptable to God. I still see the primary difference as being faith, for it was Abel's faith that enabled him to offer up a better sacrifice. Or it was because of his faith that Abel brought the best that he had to offer.

Lyndon

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/6 11:13

Quote:

-----There seems to be some confusion here in regards to the sacrifices. The sacrifices in Leviticus all had specific names. If we look in the Bible, God starts with the most important first- the PEACE OFFERING. Then the MEAL OFFERING. Then the BURNT OFFERING.

Which part of the Bible do you have in mind? Leviticus 1-3 has them exactly in the opposite order to you.

Additionally, there are references to burnt offering and peace offerings which antedate Sinai, but none (so far as I am aware) to the Meal Offering or to the Sin or Trespass offering.

Quote:

-----Ex. 24:5 And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord.

This is before the Sinai Covenant was operational. See also Gen 8:20; 22:2-3,6-8,13; Ex 10:25; 18:12.

Re:, on: 2006/7/6 11:31

Stever responds:

Exodus 20:22-24

22. And the Lord said unto Moses, Thus thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven.

23. Ye shall NOT make with me gods of silver, neither shall ye make unto you gods of gold.

24. An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy BURNT offerings, and thy PEACE offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee.

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Exodus 24:

"4. And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel.

5. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered BURNT OFFERINGS, and SACRIFICIAL PEACE OFFERINGS of oxen unto the Lord.

6. And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basins; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar.

7. And he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people: and they said, All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.

8. And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

The Burnt offering and the meal offering & the Peace Offering were required to consecrate the Priests:

Exodus 29:1-27

1. And this is the thing that thou shalt do unto them to hallow them, to minister unto me in the priest's office: take one young bullock, and two rams without blemish,

2. And unleavened bread, and cakes unleavened tempered with oil, and wafers unleavened anointed with oil: of wheaten flour shalt thou make them. 3. And thou shalt put them into one basket, and bring them in the basket, with the bullock and the two rams. 4. And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water. 5. And thou shalt take the garments, and put upon Aaron the coat, and the robe of the ephod, and the ephod, and the breastplate, and gird him with the curious girdle of the ephod: 6. And thou shalt put the mitre upon his head, and put the holy crown upon the mitre. 7. Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him. 8. And thou shalt bring his sons, and put coats upon them. 9. And thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his sons, and put the bonnets on them: and the priest's office shall be theirs for a perpetual statute: and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons.

10. And thou shalt cause a bullock to be brought before the tabernacle of the congregation: and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the bullock.

11. And thou shalt kill the bullock before the Lord, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. 12. And thou shalt take of the blood of the bullock, and put it upon the horns of the altar with thy finger, and pour all the blood beside the bottom of the altar. 13. And thou shalt take all the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul that is above the liver, and

the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, and burn them upon the altar. 14. But the flesh of the bullock, and his skin, and his dung, shalt thou burn with fire without the camp: it is a sin offering. 15. Thou shalt also take one ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram. 16. And thou shalt slay the ram, and thou shalt take his blood, and sprinkle it round about upon the altar. 17. And thou shalt cut the ram in pieces, and wash the inwards of him, and his legs, and put them unto his pieces, and unto his head. 18. And thou shalt burn the whole ram upon the altar: it is a burnt offering unto the Lord: it is a sweet savour, an offering made by fire unto the Lord. 19. And thou shalt take the other ram; and Aaron and his sons shall put their hands upon the head of the ram. 20. Then shalt thou kill the ram, and take of his blood, and put it upon the tip of the right ear of Aaron, and upon the tip of the right ear of his sons, and upon the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of their right foot, and sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about.

21. And thou shalt take of the blood that is upon the altar, and of the anointing oil, and sprinkle it upon Aaron, and upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon the garments of his sons with him: and he shall be hallowed, and his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him. 22. Also thou shalt take of the ram the fat and the rump, and the fat that covereth the inwards, and the caul above the liver, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, and the right shoulder; for it is a ram of consecration: 23. And one loaf of bread, and one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer out of the basket of the unleavened bread that is before the Lord:

24. And thou shalt put all in the hands of Aaron, and in the hands of his sons; and shalt wave them for a wave offering before the Lord.

25. And thou shalt receive them of their hands, and burn them upon the altar for a burnt offering, for a sweet savour before the Lord: it is an offering made by fire unto the Lord.

26. And thou shalt take the breast of the ram of Aaron's consecration, and wave it for a wave offering before the Lord: and it shall be thy part.

27. And thou shalt sanctify the breast of the wave offering, and the shoulder of the heave offering, which is waved, and which is heaved up, of the ram of the consecration, even of that which is for Aaron, and of that which is for his sons. 28. And it shall be Aaron's and his sons' by a statute for ever from the children of Israel: for it is an heave offering: and it shall be an heave offering from the children of Israel of the sacrifice of their **PEACE OFFERINGS**, even their heave offering unto the Lord. 29. And the holy garments of Aaron shall be his sons' after him, to be anointed therein, and to be consecrated in them. 30. And that son that is priest in his stead shall put them on seven days, when he cometh into the tabernacle of the congregation to minister in the holy place.

31. And thou shalt take the ram of the consecration, and seethe his flesh in the holy place. 32. And Aaron and his sons shall eat the flesh of the ram, and the bread that is in the basket by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation.

In Exodus, it is revealed that the most important offerings to God are the Burnt offering, the Meal Offering, and the Peace offering.

**At Mt. Sinai, the other two offerings were established. The Burnt Offering had been taking place since the Garden of Eden. The Peace Sacrifice is also the PASSOVER. How do we know that? Only in the Peace Sacrifice is the sinner provided the flesh of the animal to eat and all of the skin of the animal to keep!**

God bless,

Stever :-D

P.S. Leviticus 19:5-8 tells us about the Peace offering:

"5. And if ye offer a sacrifice of PEACE OFFERINGS unto the Lord, ye shall offer it at your OWN WILL.

6. It SHALL BE EATEN THE SAME DAY YE OFFER IT, and on the morrow: and if ought remain until the third day, it shall be burnt in the fire.

7. And if it be eaten at all on the third day, it is abominable; it shall not be accepted.

8. Therefore every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity, because he hath profaned the hallowed thing of the Lord: and that soul shall be cut off from among his people

Quote:

-----

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----There seems to be some confusion here in regards to the sacrifices. The sacrifices in Leviticus all had specific names. If we look in the Bible, God starts with the most important first- the PEACE OFFERING. Then the MEAL OFFERING. Then the BURNT OFFERING.

-----

Which part of the Bible do you have in mind? Leviticus 1-3 has them exactly in the opposite order to you.

Additionally, there are references to burnt offering and peace offerings which antedate Sinai, but none (so far as I am aware) to the Meal Offering or to the Sin or Trespass offering.

Quote:  
-----Ex. 24:5 And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord.

-----  
This is before the Sinai Covenant was operational. See also Gen 8:20; 22:2-3,6-8,13; Ex 10:25; 18:12.

**Re: - posted by lyndon, on: 2006/7/6 12:04**

Robert's

Quote:  
----- For what Cain did to be sin it had to involve him not responding to what he consciously knew was the Lord's will.

Quote:  
-----Cain bringeth from the fruit of the ground a present to Jehovah;

note that Cain brought FROM the fruit while Abel....

Quote:  
-----and Abel, he hath brought, he also, from the female firstlings of his flock, even from their fat ones; and Jehovah looketh unto Abel and unto his present,

Abel brought the first fruits, the very best, the 'fat ones'. The revelation that Cain could have been disregarding is that God wants all of us, not a part, not what we have no use for right now, not what we can spare, but our entire lives offered up unto him. This was an offering that was made, not a sacrifice, not something that God demanded of them, but something that they voluntarily gave up unto Him. Youngs translation calls it a present eg. and Jehovah looketh unto Abel and unto his present, and unto Cain and unto his present He hath not looked;

So it was not that the sacrifice was done in a wrong manner or using the wrong offering, but the attitude that it was given in, the devotion, or rather, how much of themselves or what was theirs they were ready to give. I think we would do well to examine ourselves in this light.

Lyndon

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/6 12:05**

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/7/6 12:15**

Quote:  
-----So it was not that the sacrifice was done in a wrong manner or using the wrong offering, but the attitude that it was given in, the devotion, or rather, how much of themselves or what was theirs they were ready to give. I think we would do well to examine ourselves in this light.

I was thinking earlier that if Abel had offered a burnt offering it would have been symbolic of *total* devotion and consecration to God. Any sacrifice is 'dead' after it is offered. Even the fruits of the ground were 'dead.' But a burnt offering is totally consumed in the flames and cannot be used for anything else. The passover lamb was to be eaten. The burnt offerings were ashes afterwards. Takes us to Romans 12:1. Imagine a life that was a living burnt offering?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/6 13:45**

Your latest response seems to have no relevance to my most recent posting.

Quote:

-----At Mt. Sinai, the other two offerings were established. The Burnt Offering had been taking place since the Garden of Eaden. The Peace Sacrifice is also the PASSOVER. How do we know that? Only in the Peace Sacrifice is the sinner provided the flesh of the animal to eat and all of the skin of the animal to keep!  
-----

I can't imagine why you identify the Peace Offering with Passover. Other than the fact the the Peace Offering was almost the OT equivalent of the NT Communion Meal and included a 'communion/fellowship' element there is no connection. No part of the Passover was offered to God, nor was any part of it waved before Him.

The Passover was not a Peace Offering and neither were Peace Offerings a form of Passover.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/7 1:52**

Cain and Able had no priests had no law and had no altar on which the high priest would offer any sacrifice. There was no Holy of Holies, there was no ark of the covenant. There was only God dealing with his creation personally.

If God has told each of the children of Adam what he wanted in a sacrifice and Cain did not bring the offering that God had told them what to bring and Cain did not and Able did. I can understand your argument. Cain and Able brought from their heart and minds. I am not even sure they knew what they were bringing. Only that they wanted to bring a gift offering to God. God did make a choice and approved the perfect Lamb offering and in Himself it was because it pointed forward to what the law of service and priesthood would point toward, that is the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the Cross for the whole world. Making those who would believe that the Perfect Sacrifice of the Perfect Lamb of God, being His Only Begotten Son given to bring those that would believe into the House of God as son's of God because each was given rebirth by the Son being born again in each believer, these are the son's of God.

Cain and Able did not have even the smallest thought of who this was, Adam and Eve had only one sentence that even remotely points to this Plan of God, Being Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Enmity, between his seed and your seed. We understand now exactly what God was saying, because it has happened and the Holy Spirit has revealed Christ in us, If Cain and Able knew this, it had to go no farther. All they would have to do is all wait for the Messiah to come and it would be over, knowing when death physically came and they believed in Him going to die on the Cross for them, all would be fine. Who would kill Him? I am sure they knew that God the Father would kill His own Son to save them from their sin. If Israel did not know it when Jesus was on this earth, how could Cain and Able have known it approx. 5 to 6000 years before it happened. Why are we trying to commingle law and Grace when The Given Law to Moses was not even known. Where are the different way God has dealt with man to bring him to where we are now. Believing the Jesus Christ is the Son of God and by Grace through Faith we are saved, and this Grace and Faith are not of ourselves, but of God. It took approx. 6000 years for God to get from first Adam to the second Adam. How can we make the truth at the end of the dispensation of time that God provided at the Cross to say they knew it then and happened before it was even known.

We are just arguing for argument sake, not knowing that even God took time to reveal Christ in Paul, the final Gospel of Christ in you the Hope of Glory. Christ was not born again in Cain or Able.

They were saved completely different than after the Cross. The proof, works offerings in all they did. Our proof believe, and God will save you by His Son. Grace by Faith, the only way.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: Burnt Offering - posted by GaryE (), on: 2006/7/7 10:55**

The way that the bible has been designed by God with the different figures, patterns, and shadows of things to come have been a blessing to me so many times when I could finally see them. After salvation and attending church for quite a while, one day while singing Just As I Am, I realized who the Lamb is.

Much understanding comes through time and growth and continues through our lives here. Not to many years ago the burnt offerings came to my attention. When the temple Solomon built was dedicated the Lord sent a fire to consume that offering. On Mt. Carmel, Elijah met the priests of Baal and the offering he made was consumed by the fire of God. As w



as mentioned the offering was cut up and consumed in the fire.

In Leviticus you sometimes see the types of Christ in the offerings, however, much of the types that I see are the types of Christ in the believer. The sin in our lives needs cut up by the Word of God and we need to live lives that are consumed by a fire that comes from God. We need to be a burnt offering to God and given over to his will and not our own will.

Rom 12:1 I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

Rom 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

Covered by his blood covenant,  
GaryE

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/7 14:36**

If "covered by His blood covenant" you mean sin taken away by the blood of Christ and never remembered again and put away by the Blood of Christ as far as the east is from the west, I agree.

Psalms 103:12-16 As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the LORD pitieth them that fear him. For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust. As for man, his days are as grass: as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth. For the wind passeth over it, and it is gone; and the place thereof shall know it no more.

Then in Christ our sin is taken away when we believe in the Name of Jesus Christ the Son of God. Jhn 1:29 The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

That we might be made perfect in Christ.

Col 1:28 Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

2Cr 12:9 And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Eph 4:13 Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

Col 4:12 Epaphras, who is of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

Hbr 13:21 Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom glory for ever and ever. Amen.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/7 15:58**

Quote:

-----when we believe in the Name of Jesus Christ the Son of God.  
-----

Can you explain biblically what you mean by this phrase?

**a Look at the Atonement, on: 2006/7/7 17:47**

Take a look a [https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id=11338&post\\_id=88502&order=0&viewmode=thread&pid=0&forum=34#88502](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=11338&post_id=88502&order=0&viewmode=thread&pid=0&forum=34#88502)

and read what P. P. WALDENSTROM says about the Blood.

**Re: a Look at the Atonement - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/8 0:30**

Long article, but true. Great article.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/8 0:49**

""Can you explain biblically what you mean by this phrase?""

"when we believe in the Name of Jesus Christ the Son of God."

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Jhn 1:12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, to them that believe on his name:

1Jo 3:23 And this is his commandment, That we should believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, as he gave us commandment.

2Cr 4:4 In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

Phl 1:29 For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake;

1Ti 1:16 Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.

1Cr 1:30 But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption:

Believe in the Name of Jesus Christ and you will be saved.

Ephesians 1:12-13 That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first trusted in Christ. In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise,

Finally: Jhn 20:31 But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.

2 Corinthians 4:4 In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

This word "unto" them: there(-at, - by, -in, -into, -of, -on, -with),

The Word "shine" unto: to beam forth

The image of God, (that is; from 1503; a likeness, i.e. (literally) statue, profile, or (figuratively) representation, resemblance:--image), should shine, that is beam forth, unto them, there-at, -by, -in, -into, -of, -on, and there-with.

In Christ and all the above and His Name: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/8 2:45**

Quote:

-----"Can you explain biblically what you mean by this phrase?"

"when we believe in the Name of Jesus Christ the Son of God."

OK thanks for all the verses but what do you understand the phrase 'believing in the Name of Jesus Christ the Son of God' to mean.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/8 14:13**

I believe in the Name of the Son of God Jesus Christ. I believe He born again in me. I believe He is now my Life. I believe He is doing all that He promised He would do if we believe. I believe He will come and get me with a shout and I will forever live with Him in me in my Fathers. I believe He has made me a son of God. All this a much, much more by believing in the Name of Jesus Christ the Son of God.

If you want more, you will have to clarify what it is you are after. Devils believe also but they are not believing unto salvation they are believing and not receiving Him, the sacrifice was for God's creation that they are trying to destroy. I am sure Saddam believes in President Bush. That does not make him a citizen of the U. S. I believe in the Name of Jesus Christ and He is birthed in me and that make me a citizen of the Kingdom of God, with all the rights and privileges thereof.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/8 16:14**

Quote:

-----Devils believe also but they are not believing unto salvation they are believing and not receiving Him

So how does someone distinguish between the two kinds of 'belief'. How does a person know if they have 'saving faith' as distinct from 'mental acknowledgment'?

I want to be sure we are talking about 'receiving Christ' and not the evangelical doctrine of 'receiving Christ'. If you want further explanation please see (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid14601>) Receiving Christ

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/8 21:11**

I can not show you what Christ has done for me because you are not around me to see the works He works in me. I can only give you the Word of God as The Spirit of Christ in me has revealed it to me by the Holy Spirit of Truth. I could tell you daily what the Spirit of Christ in me has changed me and it would only be a witness of what I say. If you want to be a witness of my being Born Again you would have to be around me to see the difference. It is not by my works but by His works in me that I am a new creature in Christ Jesus.

What do you mean by Evangelicals belief in Christ. If it is not of the Word and they can't testify of the New life they have in Christ Jesus, I guess it would be a false birth and by not believing that their life is now Christ. They may believe in His Name and be saved but never understand the Life they now have and what that New Life is doing and how great a salvation they truly have by the Christ that is Born Again in them.

I will check out your Christ revelation post.

1Jo 1:2 (For the life was manifested, and we have seen , and bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us;)

1Jo 5:6 This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.

1Jo 5:8 And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.

1Jo 5:9 If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son.

1Jo 5:10 He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar ; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son.

3Jo 1:6 Which have borne witness of thy charity before the church: whom if thou bring forward on their journey after a goodly sort, thou shalt do well:

Rev 1:5 And from Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/8 21:56**

I read your article, and it so perfectly describes doer religion of the Church and shows the biggest reason for so many false conversion, who by the Church says, we saved them and they fell away. What a lie, they were not even given the truth in their own salvation if they were saved.

The Church is so stuck on doer religion that no-one has any idea what being born again means. They are told repent and be baptized, well this is something they do. Then they are told to come to Church, read their bible, get plugged into a home bible study, join the ministry of the church and use the gift they have been given and witness to anyone they see. Then God will be pleased with them and they are assured that they are saved. These are all things they do, and there is nothing wrong with them but they are never no never, told Who He is and what He has done.

Nobody is given the truth of salvation that is Christ in them the Hope of Glory. They are not asked, do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, only when they are baptized maybe, do you believe that He died on the Cross for your sins and they are no more, Do you believe that He was buried and in three days was resurrected unto life again, do you believe He appeared to all His disciples and many more, do you believe He returned in the clouds into heaven, do you believe that by believing these things that Jesus Christ the Son of God has been birthed in you and the life you now live you live by the Faith of the Son of God who has come down from heaven to live in you. do you believe you are a new creature in Christ Jesus, Do You Believe You Are Now Seated In Christ Jesus with Him in Heavenly Places at the Right Hand of Your New Father. This is your salvation experience and this is the truth of your Born Again Experience. The Holy Spirit will reveal all these things to you and even things you don't understand, just ask.

If any one of these points is not understood they should be show from the Word of God where they come from, but how many so called evangelists know anything about these truths that precede and follow salvation?

Christ in You the Hope of Glory is not just a collection of word in scripture that say ok, now that you have been born again, God will set you on a course that you can clean up your life and make it to heaven. In You means that the convert has a complete new nature and a whole new life before him and The Holy Spirit will bring his mind into conformity with the Mind of Christ that is now in Him and he will know that he is a new creature in Christ, a new creature like no other on earth that has not the Spirit of Christ in him. A whole new race of people living their life in and by and through Jesus Christ guided by the Holy Spirit of Promise into all truth of the House of their Father they are being prepared for.

I could go on and on, but I must stop or I get to frustrated with the doer church realm we now live in. Sorry.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re:, on: 2006/7/15 23:53**

Steve's response to Philologos:

The Burnt offering is a voluntary offering, and represents worship. The animals sacrificed were: Bull, Lamb, Goat, Dove or Pigeon. The Family Priest (who was a sinner, just like all of mankind after Adam) would lay his hands onto the head of the animal, thus becoming one with the animal, and the sins of himself and his entire family would symbolically enter the sinless substitute, and then the Family Priest would cut the animal's throat. He would then place the blood on the altar. Then he would skin the animal and place the entire animal upon the altar, except the skin. The Skin belonged to the Family Priest, but the Lord required the remainder for a sacrifice, a "sweet savor".

If we look closely we find mention of the "Burnt Offering" from the very beginning of the Bible, in Genesis 3 and Genesis 4. In Genesis 3 we see how God explained to Adam and Eve that the seed of the woman would come to redeem man back to himself. The seed of the woman who would be bruised by Satan on the heel, but in the process of being bruised would bruise Satan on his head. Snakes carry all of their venom in their heads. Bruising the head speaks of crushing one's authority. When Christ resurrected from the dead, he took the keys from Satan--what keys? The keys to death and hell!

But what would Adam and Eve and fallen man do in the meantime, until "the Seed of the Woman" arrived? God had the answer for them- a burnt offering was to be sacrificed, as an offering for sin as well as method of worship. . God talked with them, and showed them how to build an altar and how to sacrifice an animal, a first born animal without spot or blemish. God gave them the skins of this slain animal to wear (HE "clothed them", i.e. "covered them"), to replace the covering that they had created themselves from the fig leaves. We see that Abel believed God, and believed his parents Adam & Eve, and offered his "first born" upon the Altar. Cain did not. We can see this same type of Burnt Offering offered by Noah, as well as Job. We can also see that Job was the family priest as he offered burnt offerings for his family continuously . We can also see at the original Passover the father held the position of "Family Priest", as he is the one who slayed the lamb in the doorway, over the basin in the doorway .

Up until the sacrifices set forth in the Mosaic Covenant on Mount Sinai, the only offering was the Burnt Offering. After Mount Sinai God created 5 sacrifices in total, that still included the Burnt offering. God also created an official Priesthood, all from the tribe of Levi, with specific duties in regards to Sacrifice.

With the New Sacrifices created by God, the "Skin" was NOW given to the Priest in the "Burnt Offering", and no longer to the family Priest! Ever since the garden, ever since Adam, GOD had provided the skin for the family Priest and his family. Now, that skin was provided to the MOSAIC PRIESTHOOD, TO THE TRIBE OF LEVI. NOW, the "nature" of the sinless substitute, that Represented Jesus Christ, was given to the LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD, and not the family priest!

How could the family Priest have the skin, that had been provided since the Garden of Eden? God created a NEW sacrifice, the PEACE OFFERING, that not only gave the "skin" to the father of the household (the Family Priest), but also all of the flesh, except the Breast and the Shoulder-that were given to the MOSAIC PRIESTHOOD. Of note is the flesh—all of it had to be eaten by the end of the second day, before the 3rd day: Lev 19:5-7 "5. And if ye offer a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the Lord, ye shall offer it at your own will. 6. IT SHALL BE EATEN THE SAME DAY YE OFFER IT, AND ON THE MORROW: AND IF OUGHT REMAIN UNTIL THE THIRD DAY, IT SHALL BE BURNT IN THE FIRE. 7. AND IF IT BE EATEN AT ALL ON THE THIRD DAY, IT IS ABOMINABLE; IT SHALL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

Now, compare how similar the original PASSOVER SACRIFICE is to the PEACE OFFERING. In both sacrifices: 1) The Family Priest was given the flesh of the sacrifice to eat-to be eaten right away. Exodus 12:7-10 tells us: "7. And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side posts and on the upper door post of the houses, wherein they shall eat it. 8. AND THEY SHALL EAT THE FLESH IN THAT NIGHT, ROAST WITH FIRE, AND UNLEAVENED BREAD; AND WITH BITTER HERBS THEY SHALL EAT IT. 9. EAT NOT OF IT RAW, NOR SODDEN AT ALL WITH WATER, BUT ROAST WITH FIRE; HIS HEAD WITH HIS LEGS, AND WITH THE PURTENANCE THEREOF. 10. AND YE SHALL LET NOTHING OF IT REMAIN UNTIL THE MORNING; AND THAT WHICH REMAINETH OF IT UNTIL THE MORNING YE SHALL BURN WITH FIRE.

The Peace offering and the ORIGINAL Passover are the only sacrifices that are SIMILAR in the fact that the flesh (meat)

of the sacrifice was given to the Family Priest to eat in a rushed period of time.

Are they identical? No, but they are similar AND THE ONLY SACRIFICES THAT PROVIDE THE FLESH OF THE SINLESS SUBSTITUTE TO BE EATEN BY THE FAMILY PRIEST.

**All of the Newer Versions (NIV, New American Standard, Living Bible, etc.) miss this FIRST prophecy, that the seed of the woman (an impossibility) will come at a future time and redeem fallen man from the sin imputed to him by Adam. God was revealing His Son, Jesus Christ to mankind, here in the Garden of Eden!**

KJV Bible:

14. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life:
15. And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.
16. Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.
17. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;
18. Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;"

**God began with the promise in this text above, and this the elect lived upon, till the time of Abraham. To him (Abraham), God made further revelations of his eternal council concerning man's redemption. Afterwards, at sundry times, and in divers manners, God spoke to the fathers by the prophets, till at length the Lord Jesus himself was manifested in the flesh, and came and tabernacled amongst us (Hebrews 1:1-2 "1. God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, 2. Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;")**

Look and see what Job had to say about His redeemer (that is our redeemer as well). Job is considered to be one of the oldest Books in the Bible.:

Job 19:25-27

- " 25. For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:
26. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God:
27. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me
- "

-----  
**In conclusion, all of the newer versions are what is responsible for creating such confusion in the body of Christ about the Burnt Offering, required by God in the Garden of Eden FROM THE VERY BEGINNING OF TIME, AFTER ADAM'S SIN.**

I have prepared an Excel Spreadsheet that I would be glad to share with anyone that goes into great detail about the Sacrifices of Leviticus in the Old Covenant . Just send me your personal email address. Let me know if you do not have Excel, and I will convert it to a Word Document.

God bless,

Stever :-D

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Your latest response seems to have no relevance to my most recent posting.

Quote:

-----At Mt. Sinai, the other two offerings were established. The Burnt Offering had been taking place since the Garden of Eden. The Peace Sacrifice is also the PASSOVER. How do we know that? Only in the Peace Sacrifice is the sinner provided the flesh of the animal to eat and all of the skin of the animal to keep!

-----  
I can't imagine why you identify the Peace Offering with Passover. Other than the fact the the Peace Offering was almost the OT equivalent of the NT Communion Meal and included a 'communion/fellowship' element there is no connection. No part of the Passover was offered to God, nor was any part of it waved before Him.

The Passover was not a Peace Offering and neither were Peace Offerings a form of Passover

**Re: - posted by WorldView (), on: 2006/7/16 21:45**

Quote:

-----  
Stever's response to Philologos:  
-----

Worldview responds:

Stever, you're hilarious.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/17 11:41**

Quote:

-----But what would Adam and Eve and fallen man do in the meantime, until "the Seed of the Woman" arrived? God had the answer for them- a burnt offering was to be sacrificed, as an offering for sin as well as method of worship. . God talked with them, and showed them how to build an altar and how to sacrifice an animal, a first born animal without spot or blemish.

-----  
This, of course, is sheer speculation on your part. You may choose to believe this but don't pretend you have it from the scriptures.

Quote:

-----We see that Abel believed God, and believed his parents Adam & Eve, and offered his "first born" upon the Altar. Cain did not.

-----  
Again, this is sheer speculation on your part.

Quote:

-----We can also see at the original Passover the father held the position of "Family Priest", as he is the one who slayed the lamb in the doorway, over the basin in the doorway .

-----  
Still sticking to your basin in the doorway I see.

Quote:

-----Up until the sacrifices set forth in the Mosaic Covenant on Mount Sinai, the only offering was the Burnt Offering.

-----  
In fact 'peace offerings' were used as part of the preparation to the Sinai Covenant and were offered in Exodus before the Sinai Covenant was in force and before the priesthood had been inaugurated. "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord." (Ex 24:4-5 KJVS)

BTW are you still planning to answer my question about the nature of Christ's human substance and from He received it ?



Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/17 17:40

Steve, Hi

How did God deal with man before the tabernacle in the wilderness? What was the Temple built for? God was dealing directly with all mankind. Then He told them to build a dwelling place for Himself that He could deal with all mankind through Israel. All this was done with all outward workings before the Law and then in the Law. The Blood of Christ had not been shed yet. The blood of animals is certainly an outward placing of all mankind on works directed through Israel. Man must kill to be forgiven of sin, not just once but until the Cross. Then the Holy of Holies was placed in man, we are not the physical temple, and all sacrifice ceased with the blood of Christ. We are now the temple of the Holy Spirit, Why do you keep pleading the blood? It was shed once and need not be used anymore except as a completed work of God in Christ Jesus and in remembrance of that effect.

Our present pleading should be the Spirit of Christ that is living in these Tabernacles. The Blood of Jesus of Nazareth, the physical blood was outward sacrifice that God could only accept on the altar of this earth. That is why it took away the sin of the world. The resurrection and rebirthing process in these tabernacles of clay is our spiritual service and worship, by presenting these bodies for spiritual service.

Rom 12:1 I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, your reasonable service.

We are now dealing with One Spirit, 1Cr 12:13 For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.

By pleading the blood you are living in the sacrifice not the baptism of us all into the Body of Christ, which has no blood. Plead our birth. 1Pe 1:23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

Blood cannot enter the kingdom of God. The born again spirit and soul being born again by the Incorruptible Seed and Mind of Christ can. The Blood of Christ is past, the Spirit of Christ is now. The blood and body are only to be used to remember what was already done by Christ and in remembrance of Him, by the representation of the wine and bread.

Colossians 1:18-20 And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by Him to reconcile all things unto Himself; by Him, I say, whether things in earth, or things in heaven.

Through the blood of His cross. By His blood shed on the cross. That blood, making atonement for sin, was the means of making reconciliation between God and man.

Atonement for Sin, "It is finished", not acknowledging Satan and using or as you put it pleading the blood to defeat Satan again in our own lack of knowledge. That is not what the blood was for, You should of all know that it was the Atonement for sin. Satan was completely put under the Heel of Christ and Satan's head is still there. Satan has access only to the children of Satan, unless God wants to use him in the believers life to defeat him under our feet also. Rom 16:20 And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ with you. Amen.

The life of Christ in us is our pleading, not the blood of His death to purchase this Hope of Glory, which is Christ in you. Col 1:27

In Christ: Phillip

Re:, on: 2006/7/20 0:46

Philologos posted:

"In fact 'peace offerings' were used as part of the preparation to the Sinai Covenant and were offered in Exodus before the Sinai Covenant was in force and before the priesthood had been inaugurated.

“**And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord**, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered b



urnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord.Â”  
(Ex 24:4-5 KJVS)”

Stever responds to Philologos:

The very first time any other offerings other than the BURNT OFFERING is mentioned in God's Word is in Exodus, and it is a COMMAND by God to Moses, AFTER PRESENTING THE LAW IN EXODUS chapter 20, 21 & 22

How were the Commandments first presented to the people of Israel?

"And GOD SPAKE ALL THESE WORDS, saying, I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. ETC., ETC. ETC." Exodus Chapters 20, 21, 22, & 23

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Following God's giving the Law to the Israelites (through Moses), we find that the Israelites all declared to God that they would KEEP HIS LAW. Please see Exodus 24:1-3 which were omitted in your post, Philologos:

(Ex 24:4-5 KJVS)

1. And he said unto Moses, Come up unto the Lord, thou, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and worship ye afar off.
2. And Moses alone shall come near the Lord: but they shall not come nigh; neither shall the people go up with him.
3. AND MOSES CAME AND TOLD ALL THE WORDS OF THE LORD, AND ALL THE JUDGMENTS: AND ALL THE PEOPLE ANSWERED WITH ONE VOICE, AND SAID, ALL THE WORDS OF THE LORD WE WILL DO.

The bottom line, is that the Peace Offering is first mentioned here, in Exodus 24:1-5 **AFTER**: 1) The Law was presented to the people and 2) accepted by the people.

God bless,

Stever

P.S.

There is mention of a Priesthood in Exodus Chapter 18:

- Â“21. And the Lord said unto Moses, Go down, charge the people, lest they break through unto the Lord to gaze, and many of them perish.
22. And let the **PRIESTS also, which come near to the Lord, sanctify themselves**, lest the Lord break forth upon them.
23. And Moses said unto the Lord, The people cannot come up to mount Sinai: for thou chargedst us, saying, Set bounds about the mount, and sanctify it.
24. And the Lord said unto him, Away, get thee down, and thou shalt come up, thou, and Aaron with thee: but let not **THE PRIESTS** and the people break through to come up unto the Lord, lest he break forth upon them.
25. So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them.

God bless,

Stever :-D

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:-----But what would Adam and Eve and fallen man do in the meantime, until "the Seed of the Woman" arrived? God had the answer for them- a burnt offering was to be sacrificed, as an offering for sin as well as method of worship. . God talked with them, and showed them how to build an altar and how to sacrifice an animal, a first born animal without spot or blemish.

-----  
This, of course, is sheer speculation on your part. You may choose to believe this but don't pretend you have it from the scriptures.

Quote:-----We see that Abel believed God, and believed his parents Adam & Eve, and offered his "first born" upon the Altar. Cain did not.

-----  
Again, this is sheer speculation on your part.

Quote:-----We can also see at the original Passover the father held the position of "Family Priest", as he is the one who slayed the lamb in the doorway, over the basin in the doorway .

-----  
Still sticking to your basin in the doorway I see.

Quote:-----Up until the sacrifices set forth in the Mosaic Covenant on Mount Sinai, the only offering was the Burnt Offering.

-----  
In fact 'peace offerings' were used as part of the preparation to the Sinai Covenant and were offered in Exodus before the Sinai Covenant was in force and before the priesthood had been inaugurated. "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord." (Ex 24:4-5 KJVS)

BTW are you still planning to answer my question about the nature of Christ's human substance and from where He received it?

**Re:, on: 2006/7/20 1:39**

Stever responds to Worldview:

What is of interest to me is that, after the Law was established ,only by THE Peace Offering could a believer in Jehovah (Messiah) be allowed to eat the flesh of the sacrifice, and keep all of the skin of the SACRIFICE.

The Burnt Offering provides a picture of Jesus Christ's final sacrifice. A picture of Him, and the total giving of Himself to God 100%.

When Jesus said this in John Chapter 6, what do you think he was referring to, Worldview? What exactly did he mean? The sacrifices were still taking place every day, at the Temple, when Christ said these words.

If you were there, in the audience, in 33 AD, what would you make of it? How would you apply what Christ said to your life as a believer in Messiah then? How do you apply it to yourself as a believer in Jesus Christ today?

"53. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. 54. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. 55. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

56. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. 57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me."

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Gold bless,

Stever :-D

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/20 18:24**

Quote:  
-----The bottom line, is that the Peace Offering is first mentioned here, in Exodus 24:1-5 AFTER: 1) The Law was presented to the people and 2) accepted by the people.  
-----

The bottom line is that the Peace Offering was part of the Sinai priestly provision which did not exist until the blood was sprinkled later in the chapter. The peace offerings mentioned in Exodus 24 are BEFORE any mention had been made of the Peace offering. At this stage of the inauguration of the Sinai Covenant, they had received no instruction as to the Tabernacle, the Priesthood or the Offerings. All that came after the blood had been sprinkled and the Covenant ratified.

Peace offerings clearly predated the Sinai Covenant.

BTW are you still planning to answer my question about the nature of Christ's human substance and from whom He received it?

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/24 16:38**

All this is only to point to the Peace offering that Christ is become, once forever. "My Peace I give you, not the peace as the world gives". Old Testament peace offering is of the flesh and temporary, New Testament Peace Offering is of the Spirit, Christ In you forever.

In Christ

**Re: - posted by Nellie, on: 2006/7/24 19:00**

I have a Source of strength when I am weak.  
That sees me through  
when life is pressing me.  
I have a Source of Power from above,  
I'm covered by a Crimson Stream of Love.

I claim the Blood  
Jesus shed on Calvary.  
Those Precious Blood stains  
Were shed there just for me.  
For all my sin, my sickness, and my pain.  
When I need Healing  
I claim Those Precious Blood Stains.

I do not know  
How others make it through  
Who never go to Calvary as I do.  
For there the Healing, Cleansing Stream still flows.  
With Peace that only His Redeemed can know.

I'm proud to claim and plead His Precious Blood.

Had it not been for a place called Mount Calvary  
Had it not been for the Old Rugged Cross.  
Had it not been for a Man called Jesus.  
Then Forever our souls would be lost..

When I stand in the presence of my Blessed Savior,  
I will bow at His Nail-Scarred feet.  
I will thank Him for dying, and buying my Pardon,  
For a Sinner condemned, and unclean.

I know that my Savior is waiting  
His Sweet Face will be the first that I see.  
If someone asks me how I made it,  
Quickly, I'll say it,  
By the Blood of the Lamb, I made it through.

God Bless  
Nellie

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/24 21:01**

Beautiful words Nellie.

By the Blood of the Lamb, I made it through.

By the death of the Lamb, I made it through by His resurrected Life in me. The Blood of the Lamb is for remembrance of what He did and what He is still doing, as is the Bread of Life His Body, as by which we are His Body the Church. My Savior is no longer waiting, His is in me and with me forever and ever.

Our Communion is with Him and in Him and Him in us and each other because of Him. I will plead the Life of Christ in me for all of us and pray you do the same for me.

Christinyou2: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/7/25 5:13**

Quote:

-----I will plead the Life of Christ in me for all of us and pray you do the same for me.

-----

There is no need for you to do so. He has pleaded His own blood and in Him we are accepted.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/7/26 18:52**

This is the only pleading I was speaking of.

Colossians 1:27-29 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles ; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

Lam 3:58 O Lord, thou hast pleaded the causes of my soul; thou hast redeemed my life.

In Christ: Phillip