

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Atonement Theory's

Atonement Theory's - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 23:38

I have been studying the atonement and I am planing on making a list of all the theory.

So I was reading around for the evening on this subject and here is a list of what I found. I am wondering besides the Satisfaction Theory or Commercial Theory, the Ransom Theory, the Penal Substitution Theory, and the Governmental Theory or Moral Government Theory (RC, Eastern, and Calvinistic, Arminian) which of the following are popular.

I come from a very strong Calvinistic background and at one time would have embraced the Penal Theory. When I embraced the Free From Sin teaching Calvinism when out the door. The Wesleyan-Arminian system is basically the Satisfaction theory with some parts from the Ransom, and Penal Substitution theories of the atonement.

That there was an atonement was more important to Wesley than laying out a systematic theory on how it was effected.

Do we have any Wesleyan-Arminians in this forum that know Wesley's system well?

Any way here is what I found.

Theories of the Atonement:

Satisfaction Theory or Commercial Theory -- Anselm, Roman Catholic Church -- The theory is based on the assumption that because God is infinite, even a single, minor human sin is an infinite insult to God. It can only be cancelled by an infinite satisfaction. A type of ransom was paid to God by Jesus.

Ransom Theory -- Origen, Eastern Orthodox Churches -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as a ransom that was paid to Satan to purchase man's freedom from being enslaved to Satan. It is based on a belief that man's spiritual condition is in bondage to Satan and that the meaning of Christ's death was to secure God's victory over Satan.

Penal Substitution Theory -- Aulen, Hodge, Calvinistic -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as being a vicarious, substitutionary sacrifice that satisfied the demands of God's justice upon sin. In His death Christ paid the penalty of man's sin bringing forgiveness, imputing righteousness and reconciling man to God. Those that hold this view believe that every aspect of man, his mind, will and emotions have been corrupted by sin and that man is totally depraved and spiritually dead. This view holds that Christ's death paid the penalty of sin for those whom God elects to save and that through repentance man can accept Christ's substitution as payment for sin.

Governmental Theory or Moral Government Theory -- Hugo Grotius, Albert Barnes, Arminian -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as demonstrating God's high regard for His law and His attitude towards sin. It is through Christ's death that God has a reason to forgive the sins of those who repent and accept Christ's substitutionary death. Those that hold this view believe that man's spiritual condition is as one who has violated God's moral law and that the meaning of Christ's death was to be a substitute for the penalty of sin. Because Christ paid the penalty for sin, it is possible for God to legally forgive those who accept Christ as their substitute.

Example Theory -- Martyr, Liberal Christians & post-Christians -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as simply providing an example of faith and obedience to inspire man to be obedient to God. Those that hold this view believe that man is spiritually alive and that Christ's life and atonement were simply an example of true faith and obedience and should serve as inspiration to men to live a similar life of faith and obedience.

Moral Influence Theory -- Origen, Abelard -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as demonstrating God's love which causes man's heart to soften and repent. Those that hold this view believe that man is spiritually sick and in need of help and that man is moved to accept God's forgiveness by seeing God's love for man. They believe that the purpose and meaning of Christ's death was to demonstrate God's love toward man.

Recapitulation Theory -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as reversing the course of mankind from disobedience to

of obedience. It believes that Christ's life recapitulated all the stages of human life and in doing so reversed the course of disobedience initiated by Adam.

Dramatic Theory -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as securing the victory in a divine conflict between good and evil and winning man's release from bondage to Satan. The meaning of Christ's death was to ensure God's victory over Satan and provides a way to redeem the world out of its bondage to evil.

Satisfaction Theory or Commercial Theory -- Anselm, Roman Catholic Church -- The theory is based on the assumption that because God is infinite, even a single, minor human sin is an infinite insult to God. It can only be cancelled by an infinite satisfaction. A type of ransom was paid to God by Jesus.

Accident Theory -- Jesus was a man, subject to death. His methods and principles were opposed by the powerful of his day. They killed Him. It had no further, deeper significance.

Mystical Theory -- Schleiermacher -- Christ, by the Holy Spirit kept His corrupt human nature from manifesting sin and gradually purified this sinful nature until at death all that was sinful in it was eradicated. We can mystically share in that salvation. Christ's activity is meant to influence and inspire us.

Re: Atonement Theory's - posted by boG (), on: 2008/12/11 1:02

Other than the last two weird ones and the Example Theory, I would say they all share truth. I have also been highly focused upon this doctrine. Not for the sake of fascination or that I might spend idle-time pondering secondary issues but for the critical understanding of how to preach the Gospel to those who are dead in their sins and understanding just how much we all need a Savior to save us from ourselves.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 1:17

boG:

boG is God backward and it is God's name in Russian.

I see you are quoting William Booth. I think the world of him. He was Wesleyan in doctrine.

Blood and Fire was one of their motto's and another was soap, soup, and salvation.

Brengle wrote some very nice booklets for them.

Re: Atonement Theory's - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/11 4:36

Quote:

-----I come from a very strong Calvinistic background and at one time would have embraced the Penal Theory. When I embraced the Free From Sin teaching Calvinism went out the door. The Wesleyan-Arminian system is basically the Satisfaction theory with some parts from the Ransom, and Penal Substitution theories of the atonement.

Wesleyan theology was straight down the line Penal Substitution. The one aberration to this group was Finney who embraced the Moral Government theory.

I was never a Calvinist but who doesn't need to throw everything out of the door just because Calvinists believe them.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/11 4:38

Quote:

-----I see you are quoting William Booth. I think the world of him. He was Wesleyan in doctrine.

Indeed he was. One of his somewhat incendiary comments was "There is One God and John Wesley is his prophet!"

But YOU are not Wesleyan but Finneyist and the two views are chalk and cheese.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/12/11 6:40

It should also be noted regarding Wesley that most churches that trace their roots back to him espouse the penal/substitution theory of atonement. Wesley, while not using that theological vocabulary (to my knowledge), clearly taught such a view. Those who would say otherwise clearly have not read very much Wesley, but have merely cherry-picked various sermons of his.

Wesley's doctrine of justification by faith is clearly at odds with any Finneyism/Moral Government theory. One has to look no further than Wesley's famous "The Almost Christian" sermon to determine that. Indeed, up until a year or so before his conversion, Wesley could have probably been considered as a proponent of moral government. According to his own testimony, he believed in God and did everything in his own strength and power to serve God. He determined to love God and love his neighbor, and always keep the commandments. He determined to be disciplined in prayer, fasting, and giving. He determined to evangelize the heathen (this sounds like some traveling street preachers we know of on SI!), and always speak an edifying word. Indeed, John Wesley, according to his own testimony, was living his life for God most of his life before he ever got saved!!!

Some spiritually dead commentators that wrote on Wesley wondered just how he, according to his own words, was not a genuine Christian prior to his conversion at 34. God knows Finney would have deemed him saved prior to then. But Wesley makes it clear in his sermon, that in spite of all his determination, obedience, and work, that he was but "almost a Christian" up until his actual conversion at Aldersgate, when his heart was "strangely warmed."

I've said it before and will say it again: Justification by faith (apart from the works of the law) is truly a matter of life and death. Until one realizes that all their works are but filthy rags, and realizes that it is "through the obedience of the One," one is trapped in the grave errors of Finney.

And I choose the word "grave" intentionally. Righteousness comes through faith, not obedience to the law. The only righteousness that has ever been through the law is a ceremonial righteousness having to do with external things. If one attempts to live before God with a righteousness based on the law, one will surely be damned (for your good works will never undo your bad works). Only the one who lives before God by faith will be saved. For faith brings an end to man, who has no works to offer God. Instead he says that Christ's work on the cross alone can stand in his place (substitution). And only once man has been brought to his end, and thus dying, can Christ begin to live in him. Moral government attempts to add our works to Christ's work to produce salvation. But so long as he does that, he denies the sufficiency of the cross of Jesus Christ, and effectively says that Christ's work was not good enough. Such a man is on his way to hell.

Re: Atonement Theory's - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 7:09

Quote:
-----I come from a very strong Calvinistic background and at one time would have embraced the Penal Theory. When I embraced the Free From Sin teaching Calvinism went out the door. The Wesleyan-Arminian system is basically the Satisfaction theory with some parts from the Ransom, and Penal Substitution theories of the atonement. That there was an atonement was more important to Wesley than laying out a systematic theory on how it was effected.

Although I have already been accused of many things by this man, one of which that I don't understand Finney; I know for a fact that the revivalist approach to salvation employed by Finney did not allow him to believe in Penal Substitution. The reason is that Finney used the dreaded measure of challenging a person's salvation for even the most craziest of behaviors. This is how he won the effect. He challenged their assurance and linked their assurance to their behavior making void in the minds of the people the fact that grace through faith is the means by which a person is declared righteous before God.

And this is one of those 'Paul Harvey', "*The Rest of the Story*" threads. After a multitude of exchanges on point number nine (a person becoming a child of the devil after a single willful sin) and my perception that Bob's views were essentially Finney's (although he has shown me convincingly that he is more radical than Finney) we see now that he has rejected Penal Substitution. This answers why he said Finney had done more in a day than 'we' had done in a lifetime. I pray to

God I never wreak as much havoc on the souls of men as does this notion that man has no security in God except to walk in Christian Perfection.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 10:47

philologos:

>>>But YOU are not Wesleyan but Finneyist and the two views are chalk and cheese.

While I will have to let you believe what you want, I clearly reject Finney's no original sin, his legalism on coffee and black tea (even though I drink neither), and many other points.

It was Wesley that held the free from sin teaching not Finney. Finney clearly taught you were still a Christian when you sinned.

It wasn't until Oberlin that he even addressed the issue "can a Christian live free from sin". Oberlin Perfectionism even with Asa Mahan's influence was a far step from Wesley's Christian Perfection teaching.

So clearly philologos you have made a wrong call on this one.

>>>I was never a Calvinist but who don't need to throw everything out of the door just because Calvinists believe them.

I didn't throw everything out the door that Calvinist teach. They teach Christ is the only way to God. Clearly I didn't throw that out. I did however throw the 5 points out lock stock and barrow.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 11:25

RobertW:

I broke off what I considered a circle conversation with you on one of my threads yesterday Robert and let you know for the second time in that thread that I feel the conversation wasn't going anywhere and told you I wouldn't be responding to you on the thread any more Lord willing. Since then you have posted 9 more posts to me ignoring my request which of course raised my eyebrows.

I trust you are not going to follow me around and post on my threads or the threads I post on the kind of things you have posted there like...

>>>Although I have already been accused of many things by this man, one of which that I don't understand Finney;

I think as mature adults if someone indicates they feel like the conversation is going nowhere and they feel like it is in the best interest of the forum and their Christian witness to not continue -- then the other person should respect that.

To then move to another thread and post "I have already been accused of many things by this man" in my mind is getting close to slandering a person.

Also let me correct one of your quotes so that others will not be confused as to what the 'we' is in your statement.

>>>This answers why he said Finney had done more in a day than 'we' had done in a lifetime.

Here is what I said.

"Finney had many errors but one thing he did have that neither you or I have is results. He likely did more in an average day than you or I will do in a lifetime."

I can see now that I made the right choice to break off conversation with you on the other thread. I trust I won't need to do the same thing here.

I feel that those that accuse me of being a Finneyite are really mistaken and either have not taken the time to see what teaching I do hold or they don't know the clear differences between Finney and Wesley.

I would consider those that say my doctrinal position is Finneyism being very close to a strawman attack.

While I hold Finney high for the work God did through him in the same way I hold Whitefield high for the work God did through him -- I reject Finney's theology.

So in closing Robert from what I have seen so far I think it would be best for both our Christian witness and the forum for you to keep posts directed toward me to a minimum per my request.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 11:41

Quote:
-----So in closing Robert from what I have seen so far I think it would be best for both our Christian witness and the forum for you to keep posts directed toward me to a minimum per my request.

I will meet you and your error where I find it. What about Peter? Did that raise an eyebrow also?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2008/12/11 12:19

Atonement is required for the reason of proving the true worth of God and His character. The atonement acknowledges the true value and worth of God **by** the One who is sacrificed. God must sacrifice something just as valuable, if not greater in **actual worth** as the one who offended Him. The sacrifice must be of equal severity as to the offence of the crime committed. The punishment must fit the crime.

A sin as to the degree of a slap on the face or steeling a shoe lace does not require the death penalty of the one who sinned, that would give the message of the sinner being as worthless as the shoe lace. The punishment must fit the crime.

However, the theft of a shoe lace is still a breach of the same law which is against such heinous crimes as, rape, murder, or similar in degree which are a total tainting &/or maligning of personal worth and character of the Law Maker. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all (James 2:8). A slap on the face or steeling a shoe lace is only breaking one aspect of the whole law which includes the greater aspects such as the heinous crimes.

Justice is meant to teach that whoever it serves and protects has personal worth so if one offended by a crime, or committed a crime, he will be judged as someone who is worth equal to but not greater than the criminal, or the victim if being the criminal. In other words, Justice is to keep the establishment of both, the victim and the criminal as being equal in worth and in value.

The only one able to atone for the damage that is done to His name must be equally great, **not in worth only but in all aspects to God** whom we offended (not just deemed as valuable as mankind is); The one who makes atonement can not be a mere mortal, for then he would only be able to atone for just one man, tooth for tooth & eye for eye. Furthermore, he must be eternal so that he may atone for all (Hebrews 9:14). Therefore, it must be God Himself in the likeness of "sinful flesh" who must make atonement (Roman 8:3 Phil 2:7-8); for Jesus is the only one who has satisfied the Father, even until the cross, therefore, only He can satisfy Him on the cross.

The one being atoned for must change in order for him to be forgiven. He must first meet the set conditions in order for the atonement to be applied for the forgiveness (Matthew 18:23-35). This proves that the one being atoned for understands the true value of the one who is forgiving and that he can not take this whole thing lightly. If the one refuses to acknowledge the true value and worth of God and refuses to meet the set conditions in order to be forgiven; if he takes lightly all that God has said and done to forgive, he can not be forgiven.

The atonement is an influence on one's heart/soul. A revelation of the suffering of Christ should break and subdue one's heart and bring him to complete surrender to God. The atonement should so affect our hearts that we turn from our disobedience in humble, sincere, and deep repentance. Repenting out of a motive of love, remorse, and sincerity (1 John. 4:19). God is drawing all men to Himself through the atonement (John. 12:32), and it is His loving kindness which draws us

s (Jer.31:3; Rom. 2:4). The atonement transforms and liberates through reciprocation, when men obey the gospel of Jesus Christ from the heart because God was loving them all along, from the beginning.

However, there is no possible way that anyone may have a substitute for punishment of a crime such as murder in a moral governmental judicial system as we have in society. For example, a father could never take a son's place in his execution for murder. Furthermore, a King could never let a law breaker go free as in the case of Daniel and the lion's den. However, Jesus did take our place in judgment through His sacrifice that He might satisfy the law as our proxy. He could do this because sin is only against God personally and not against a moral governmental judicial system.

All sin is against God personally and not His law. His law is only to show us what and how we accomplished by breaking it.

Whenever anyone disobeys God in any way, they are virtually not trusting God calling Him a liar, stating by their actions that God can not be trusted and that He is no authority to make any boundaries. Proclaiming that God is not good in providing what is needed for staying within His boundaries. In doing this they sin.

Whenever anyone sins, they are transgressing what they know to be true (that there is a law which is being broken) which proclaims that they are autonomous, self governing and in no need of support from anything apart from themselves. They are basically saying, "I am that I am". Doing this they are opposing and exalting themselves above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that they deem themselves as God (2Thessalonians 2:4).

All mankind has brought damaged to God's character or tainted His holy Name by breaking His Law, disobeying His Commandments, rebelling against His Word & authority.

Sin insulted God to a degree that His character was maligned and He was defamed and virtually dethroned by the offender.

We did not sin in away as to owe God a debt as in the form of a sum, but in the way of disbelief and unfaithfulness, which deems God to be a liar on our behalf and in doing so, we destroy His character; this is elevating ourselves over God and putting ourselves in His place. We owe God the repair or renewal of His character which we maligned.

God sent his Son to be the propitiation for us maligning His character. In other words, God sent Jesus to appease or satisfy Himself on account of our sins against Him.

Jesus is the only Man that has performed the law perfectly, which is what satisfies God.

Jesus was required perfect obedience to the law for Himself, and since he perfectly obeyed, he did not need to suffer the penalty of breaking the law or sin. He could therefore suffer the penalty of sin in our place as a proxy by laying down His life for His brethren; no one took His life..

Atonement appeases God by satisfying His demands, which are shown in His law, and fulfilling the judgment that is due to us.

The judgment is spiritual death which is actually a severed relationship from God. all who sin have died spiritually, for that is the wage of death(Romans 6:23)

Therefore, we must spiritually die to the Law through the body of Christ by faith. We will then also rise from the dead with Him through faith. (Romans 6:3, Ephesians 2:5-6)

This is why Jesus needed to die physically and raise from the dead with His glorified body, so that we might die through Him and be raised with Him by and through faith so that by Him and through Him we might take the penalty for our own sins; all this is through the spirit of the law.(2 Corinthians 5:14-15, Galatians 2:20, Hebrews 2:9,14,17-18)

To understand how the sacrifice of Jesus (The Atonement) satisfies the law which gives glory to God, we must know what God says concerning the Atonement.

Since we already know that all sin is against God personally and not against any moral government judicial system, God will only forgive on the bases of the sinner being changed by repentance and a new life all together.

Just so God does not have people whom He forgives to take it lightly and stay just as wicked as before being forgiven as we read in Matthew 18:28-30, God uses His law of death on the account of sin to implement the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross.

God says, in **Romans 6:23** for the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal (spiritual) life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

and, **Deut.21:23** His body shall not remain overnight on the tree (cross), but you shall surely bury him that day, so that you do not defile the land which the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance; for he who hangs on a tree is accursed of God.

Jesus was taken off the cross that same day He died so the curse of sin would stay on Him.

Lev 17:11 For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement for the soul. **Heb 9:22** for without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin

When Jesus finished all that needed to be done:

(1) Curse of the law to be taken away (2Corinth 5:21, Gal 3:13).

(a) For the setting free of the captive slave of the law (Luke 4:18, Galatians 5:1).

(2) Blood to be shed for the cleansing/purging from the guilt and the clearing of the conscience of the guilt of sin (Ephesians 1:7 & Colossians 1:14)

(a) purchasing/redeeming from the judgment of sin which is our forgiveness (Ephesians 1:7 & 1 Corinthians 6:20 & 7:23).

God accepted His sacrifice. In verification of God's acceptance, He raised Jesus from the dead. The resurrection is the basis of our Faith (1 Corinthians 15:14).

This selfless, loving sacrifice on our account is to break the heart of the sinner and cause him to acknowledge his sin and the judgment of his sin.

When we acknowledge our place in His death we may also acknowledge our place in resurrection (Rom 6:3-6), only then can we be redeemed & cleansed with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot (1 Peter 1:19, Titus 2:14) and freed from being under the law (Romans 6:14 & 7:4) as being under grace instead (Romans 6:14): acknowledging that He is representing us on that cross and we die through Christ and rise in newness of life (Romans 6:4 & 11).

We acknowledge this by baptism, which symbolizes our death and resurrection in Christ, not by the removing of outward filth of the flesh but by providing us with a good and clear conscience (inward cleanness and peace) before God through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. **1 Peter 3:21**.

Supplemental:

An account of satisfying the law:

Heb. 9:22 for without the shedding of blood, there is no remission of sin

Or, without the clearing of the character of God, there is no giving up the punishment of the crime.

It is the sentencing of God Himself on another's behalf by **deeming** the offenders in Him being sentenced, by grace in the spirit of the law. Therefore, it is by grace through faith in the spirit of the Law.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 12:52

KingJimmy:

>>>It should also be noted regarding Wesley that most churches that trace their roots back to him espouse the penal/substitution theory of atonement. Wesley, while not using that theological vocabulary (to my knowledge), clearly taught such a view.

What do you think of this article then.

John Wesley's Doctrine of Justification.

In this article the author claims the following.

"What we discern in Wesley's atonement theology is a distinction between objective and subjective aspects of the atonement. To describe the former he employed the traditional concepts of satisfaction, ransom sacrifice, and substitution. Among these the most important was satisfaction. The Wesleyan theology of atonement is essentially Anselmian, with other themes playing secondary, albeit significant, roles in his thinking. He believed that God was morally offended by human sin. The divine wrath meant an angry God. Sin was an affront to God and a failure of man to fulfill his role in the scheme of creation. The justice of God required that the affront be propitiated. The morality of God required that the failure be corrected. Man, however, had no way to correct this situation for which he alone was responsible. He could neither allay nor flee the wrath of God."

>>>Wesley's doctrine of justification by faith is clearly at odds with any Finneyism/Moral Government theory.

When you say "Finneyism/Moral Government theory" are you referring to Grotius' atonement theory?

And is it correct that this is the theory that Arminius taught?

>>>And I choose the word "grave" intentionally. Righteousness comes through faith, not obedience to the law.

I completely agree!

I just re-read both Salvation by Faith and The Almost Christian today. Both beautiful sermons.

I have enjoyed Wesley's sermons so much that I had them all put in booklet form in PDF's on my site where they can be accessed and printed into booklet form.

John Wesley's Sermons

I am currently getting a picture put on the front cover of all of them and then Lord willing the plan is to put them in book stores in revolving book racks.

>>>Moral government attempts to add our works to Christ's work to produce salvation. But so long as he denies the sufficiency of the cross of Jesus Christ, and effectively says that Christ's work was not good enough. Such a man is on his way to hell.

As you say that Finney held the Moral Government theory of the atonement would you hold that he was not converted or that those that were said to have been converted under his preaching to not be converted?

Also would you feel like the following is a fair description of the Moral Government view of the atonement?

Governmental Theory or Moral Government Theory -- Hugo Grotius, Albert Barnes, Arminian -- This view sees the atonement of Christ as demonstrating God's high regard for His law and His attitude towards sin. It is through Christ's death that God has a reason to forgive the sins of those who repent and accept Christ's substitutionary death. Those that hold this view believe that man's spiritual condition is as one who has violated God's moral law and that the meaning of Christ's death was to be a substitute for the penalty of sin. Because Christ paid the penalty for sin, it is possible for God to legally forgive those who accept Christ as their substitute.

Thanks for your response!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/11 13:02

Quote:

-----It was Wesley that held the free from sin teaching not Finney. Finney clearly taught you were still a Christian when you sinned.

This is absolute nonsense.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 13:26

philologos:

>>>This is absolute nonsense.

Which did you feel like is nonsense. That Wesley held to the free from sin teaching or that Finney taught you were still a Christian when you sinned?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/11 13:35

Quote:

-----Which did you feel like is nonsense. That Wesley held to the free from sin teaching or that Finney taught you were still a Christian when you sinned?

I was referring to the fact that Finney regarded a single sin as canceling out previous faith and left the one who had sinned without hope of salvation. See Robert W's mails.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 14:03

Quote:
-----Finney: The Christian, therefore, is justified no longer than he obeys, and must be condemned when he disobeys; or Antinomianism is true. Until he repents, he cannot be forgiven. In these respects, then, the sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are upon precisely the same ground.

- 1) The Christian is justified no longer than he obeys.
- 2) He must be condemned when he disobeys.
- 3) Until he repents he cannot be forgiven.
- 4) The sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are on precisely the same ground.

What more evidence is necessary to prove the point?

Re:, on: 2008/12/11 14:13

I know I'm late in the game here, and am probably beating a dead horse but I wanted to give a perspective. I posted this on the previous thread but it looks like there is a new venue. I'm not addressing anyone specifically nor am I saying I possess anything without error. But these scriptures have come to mind on this topic (my apologies for any redundancy) and I felt compelled to share a perspective on it. All I ask is that if anyone does read it, read it in its entirety before getting out the carving knives. Blessings. Rich

Romans 4

Abraham Justified by Faith

"1What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather, discovered in this matter? 2If, in fact, Abraham was justified by works, he had something to boast about—but not before God. 3What does the Scripture say? "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness." 4Now when a man works, his wages are not credited to him as a gift, but as an obligation.

5However,

.....to the man who does not work but trusts God who justifies the wicked, his faith is credited as righteousness.....

David says the same thing when he speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God credits righteousness apart from works:

7"Blessed are they

whose transgressions are forgiven,

whose sins are covered.

8Blessed is the man

whose sin the Lord will never count against him."

9Is this blessedness only for the circumcised, or also for the uncircumcised? We have been saying that Abraham's faith was credited to him as righteousness. 10Under what circumstances was it credited? Was it after he was circumcised, or before? It was not after, but before! 11And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness that he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised. So then, he is the father of all who believe but have not been circumcised, in order that righteousness might be credited to them. 12And he is also the father of the circumcised who not only are circumcised but who also walk in the footsteps of the faith that our father Abraham had before he was circumcised.

13It was not through law that Abraham and his offspring received the promise that he would be heir of the world

, but through the righteousness that comes by faith. 1

.....For if those who live by law are heirs, faith has no value and the promise is worthless,.....

because law brings wrath. And where there is no law there is no transgression.

.....THEREFORE, the promise comes by faith, so that it may be by grace and may be guaranteed to all Abraham's offspring.....

Â—not only to those who are of the law but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham. He is the father of us all. 17As it is written: "I have made you a father of many nations." He is our father in the sight of God, in whom he believedÂ—the God who gives life to the dead and calls things that are not as though they were.

18Against all hope, Abraham in hope believed and so became the father of many nations, just as it had been said to him, "So shall your offspring be." 19Without weakening in his faith, he faced the fact that his body was as good as deadÂ—since he was about a hundred years oldÂ—and that Sarah's womb was also dead. 20Yet he did not waver through unbelief regarding the promise of God, but was strengthened in his faith and gave glory to God, 21being fully persuaded that God had power to do what he had promised. 22This is why "it was credited to him as righteousness."

.....23The words "it was credited to him" were written not for him alone, but also for us, to whom God will credit it righteousnessÂ—for us WHO BELIEVE IN HIM who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead.....

25He was delivered over to death for our sins and was raised to life for our justification."

>>>>>> Paul is clear that Abraham was NOT JUSTIFIED AS A CHILD OF GOD IN WHAT HE DID OR DID NOT DO. Some have pointed out that transgression was not counted before the law.. as stated above. I believe the context of these verses are meant to explain that the law is worthless in fulfilling the promises of God obtained by faith.... the same faith that credits righteousness to us. Otherwise Abraham could use the law in obedience, as the Pharisees held, as a basis for righteousness.... and God could use his disobedience with Hagar as means of eternal condemnation. So I believe Paul's point is that, in Abraham's case, righteousness had to come by faith for there was no law. Abraham was not eternally condemned for his relations with Hagar, nor was he justified as a child of God by his works in keeping a law that was non-existent. David was the example of faith after the law. This point is exclamatory by Paul....."By faith in the promise of a righteous God who will justify those who believe in Him, will righteousness be credited."

Before the law Abraham was justified in faith, after the law David is justified by his same faith. The X factor in both cases is faith.... for before the law righteousness was credited by faith and after the law righteousness was credited by faith. And this faith is an example of relationship, not through any strict, regimental observances. Both Abraham and Noah had faith, and they were noted for their relationship to God in this faith, not in any regimented discipline of perfect holiness. Despite their shortcomings they loved God, and despite their shortcomings God loved them. Their faith in Him was His key to this relationship. This is meant as an example for us today.

And why did David say

"Blessed are they
whose transgressions are forgiven,
whose sins are covered.
Blessed is the man
whose sin the Lord will never count against him"

.....if observing the law only was the way to righteousness? Both of these men pointed to the New Testament faith in Christ to be justified.

>>>>Paul says that Abraham had the markings of circumcision by his faith even though he was not circumcised outwardly. Therefore he received a 'sign of circumcision' or a 'seal of righteousness' by faith even though circumcision was not in existence. So Abraham is the father of all who are circumcised and not circumcised as an example of New Testament faith in Christ who is our 'seal of righteousness' by faith via the Holy Spirit. I believe P

Paul implies here that Abraham was a prophetic example of faith to the uncircumcised Gentiles and the circumcised Jews in his faith. In symbolic fashion, Jesus is the Savior of those who are Jews and Gentiles, and the faith of Abraham exemplifies what is necessary to be credited as righteousness for the circumcised and uncircumcised. If we repent of our sins and receive our Savior in faith, it is counted to us as righteousness and we are given the Holy Spirit. From the point of a born again state moving forward, if we are a 'child of the devil' when we sin then we would not be capable of GRIEVING THE HOLY SPIRIT. I would base this on the assumption that a child of the devil has no Holy Spirit.... for a house divided against itself cannot stand. Scripture doesn't say "do not let the Holy Spirit depart". It says do not grieve Him. Therefore I don't think the Holy Spirit is in and out of us based on works related righteousness.

>>>Paul reiterates his point of justification in

Galatians 3:

...."Did you receive the Spirit by observing the law, or by believing what you heard? 3Are you so foolish? After beginning with the Spirit, are you now trying to attain your goal by human effort? 4Have you suffered so much for nothing?—if it really was for nothing? Does God give you his Spirit and work miracles among you because you observe the law, or because you believe what you heard?

6Consider Abraham: "He believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness." 7Understand, then, that those who believe are children of Abraham.

.....The Scripture foresaw that God would justify the Gentiles by faith..., and announced the gospel in advance to Abraham: "All nations will be blessed through you." So those who have faith are blessed along with Abraham, the man of faith.

10ALL WHO 'RELY' ON OBSERVING THE LAW IS UNDER A CURSE, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who does not continue to do everything written in the Book of the Law." Clearly no one is justified before God by the law, because, "The righteous will live by faith." The law is not based on faith; on the contrary, "The man who does these things will live by them." Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree." He redeemed us in order that the blessing given to Abraham might come to the Gentiles through Christ Jesus, so that by faith we might receive the promise of the Spirit"

>>>Does this mean we use our justification by faith as a free pass to sin? No, for we are now obligated to come into the likeness of The One who redeemed us and whom we have accepted by faith. But the stain of sin is removed from us so we can move forward in becoming like Christ in our love for Him, not by mere obligation to the law for righteousness.

As Paul stated above we do not 'RELY' on the law to overcome sin, because the law cannot take away sin... it can only define what is considered sinful... like Paul said the law brings wrath because it cannot atone for itself. But, like Abraham before us to the Father, we rely on faith in Christ and His atoning work..... we rely on Him... our High Priest who, being tempted in every way, to strengthen us in our time of need...(Hebrews 4: 4-16) as well as acknowledging our weakness to obey in our own strength, yet we are culpable in our decision to come to Him for His overcoming strength and not to fight the battle without Him in our own strength.

My heart desires to be like Christ but, like Paul, some things that I don't want to do, I do....and those things I should do, I do not do. Although these things happen, I should not fall into condemnation, but press forward in my faith of the promise of Christ, always striving to do the will of the Father in Christ. I'm not talking about things like rampant adultery or a murder spree but those things that can cause us to stumble from time to time while keeping a heart that is void of rejecting Christ and the Father altogether. In fact it is in my stumbling that I cry out in my need for The Lord. Does this mean I do not believe I need the Lord unless I stumble? No. I fully admit that I always need Him, especially for strength against stumbling to begin with, but a heart that loves Him will recognize the brief shame and sting of sin yet continue to have a willingness and a desire to do better and move forward in faith.

The Holy Spirit regenerates our heart to not like the sin we want to do because it grieves Him.... not just because the law says it's wrong, and to want to do the works that bears the fruit of God. We are not always successful in

n this, but our heart is still full of the desire to please God as Christ wanted to please Him. This is a process, a marathon, it's not instantaneous and it's not about keeping a law abiding 'legalistic score'. It's a process of love. ... a love that is relational with the Father in Christ in the progress of overcoming disobedience without condemnation, and the moving forward in a constant regeneration of heart in overcoming and bearing fruit in our faith and our works.

I believe that the falling away from the faith to which there is no sacrifice left, isn't the faith of someone who is progressive and regenerative in the mutual love between God and His creation..... but this falling away is, however, exemplified in the rejection of this love in the atonement of Christ through one's unbelief....or..... in their self-serving nature to which they regress in this love via their constant willful sin that has no desire to serve or please God, and have only a desire to get to heaven on their terms. Their theology is the opposite of John The Baptist in that "they must increase, and He must decrease" as a willful choice to be a reprobate which kills the faith that is counted as righteousness. The promise of righteousness is for those who accept the atonement of Christ on the cross in order to become more like Christ as a follower of the Most High God, and to do His Will. It is not to boast and say 'I am righteous', it is not to condemn others, it is not to obsess over right theology, it is not to quarrel over disputable matters, it is not legalistic and paralytic scorekeeping with one's self in their own effort to overcome temptation and sin, it is not to draw attention to one's self in good works (they have their reward), it is not to seek or chase compilations of writings and theologies by great men of God to find your own perfect theology (although there is a secondary place for seeing these men of God as brotherly examples of relationship and good theology, but it is not an end to itself).

IT IS SIMPLY A PROGRESSIVE RELATIONSHIP IN LOVE, which... by faith... has already accepted the gift of Christ by the Father for the atonement of our sins. Christ's atonement relieves me of the pressure to have a relationship with God by works alone. If my relationship was in the law then I would be in and out of relationship with God hundreds of times a day depending only on my obedience or lack of. But this isn't so, Christ did the work that opened the way for relationship. God's wrath was satisfied through the Cross and we must accept this truth in faith. In doing so, can now passionately pursue His Will for me out of my love for Him without having to worry about being perfect in the process. This is freedom!!!

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 14:52

philologos:

>>>I was referring to the fact that Finney regarded a single sin as canceling out previous faith and left the one who had sinned without hope of salvation. See Robert W's mails.

I have seen Robert's posts and I have clearly shown that Finney doesn't hold to this and I have posted the same on the thread where Robert and I had that conversation.

Let me post it for you.

"2. In two important respects the sinning Christian differs widely from the unconverted sinner:

(1.) In his relations to God. A Christian is a child of God. A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God. An unconverted sinner is a child of the devil. A Christian sustains a covenant relation to God; such a covenant relation as to secure to him that discipline which tends to reclaim and bring him back, if he wanders away from God. 'If his children forsake My law, and walk not in My judgments; if they break My statutes and keep not My commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless My loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips' (Psalms 89:30-34)." Lecture 9 Unity of Moral action

As I have noted before Finney is closer to the P in TULIP than to the Christian Perfection taught by Wesley. Any one that has read much of Finney should know this.

Finney didn't even address the concept that one could live free from sin until later in Oberlin. I don't have the quote for that one but I will try to find it.

Wesley is well known to have taught the "free from sin" message. This is the central plank of his theology.

The other issue of course is that Finney often would say one things at one time and then another thing at another place, or even in the same place, and the two didn't match.

Wesley held and taught the position that sin was "an actual, voluntary transgression of the law; of the revealed, written law of God" (The Great Privilege of Those That Are Born of God section II.2) and that "even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin" (Plain Account of Christian Perfection section 12.2).

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 15:15

Logic:

Very interesting post. I read it through twice and looked up all the scriptures. Thanks!

>>>The atonement should so affect our hearts that we turn from our disobedience in humble, sincere, and deep repentance. Repenting out of a motive of love, remorse, and sincerity (1 John. 4:19). God is drawing all men to Himself through the atonement (John. 12:32), and it is His loving kindness which draws us (Jer.31:3; Rom. 2:4). The atonement transforms and liberates through reciprocation, when men obey the gospel of Jesus Christ from the heart because God was loving them all along, from the beginning.

Very very nice. This paragraph made me weep and praise God.

I am really enjoying my study on the atonement.

>>>A revelation of the suffering of Christ should break and subdue ones heart and bring him to complete surrender to God.

Yes I love looking at my book The Passion on the film (I have never seen the film) and it touches my heart some and I have had wonderful time before the Lord weeping with thankfulness and praise. Thank you Jesus!

>>>All sin is against God personally and not His law. His law is only to show us what and how we accomplished by breaking it.

Whenever anyone disobeys God in any way, they are virtually not trusting God calling Him a liar, stating by their actions that God can not be trusted and that He is no authority to make any boundaries. Proclaiming that God is not good in providing what is needed for staying within His boundaries. In doing this they sin.

In view of this how to you deal with those that say that God has programmed them to sin via the inherited Adamic nature. That people have not asked to be born into this world programmed to sin.

>>>all who sin have died spiritually,

What do you mean by this. Do you hold that spiritual death is spiritual separation from God as in a relationship or do you hold that some thing has happened to the spirit of a man?

And if you don't mind what are the different views on what spiritual death is?

>>>Therefore, we must spiritually die to the Law through the body of Christ by faith.

What do you mean by spiritually dying to the Law?

>>>so that we might die through Him and be raised with Him by and through faith so that by Him and through Him we might take the penalty for our own sins; all this is through the spirit of the law.

What do you mean by "this is through the spirit of the law"?

>>>God uses His law of death on the account of sin to implement the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross.

What do you mean by law of death? What do you mean by God "uses His law of death" to "implement the sacrifice of Jesus"?

>>>Jesus was taken off the cross that same day He died so the curse of sin would stay on Him.

I have never heard that before. Where did you get that?

>>>(a) For the setting free of the captive slave of the law(Luke 4:18, Galatians 5:1).

Ok when you say the law you are referring to the law of Moses? Now do you feel like the Christian is lawless or without law or do you feel like we are under the perfect law of liberty which some hold is the new covenant scriptures?

>>>When Jesus finished all that needed to be done:

What about delivering the Christian from the power of sin whereby we may take the way of escape in every temptation (1Cor 10:13, 2Th 3:3, 2Pet 1:10, Jud 1:24)? And also what about deliverance from the pollution of sin (Mat 5:8, Act 15:9, 1Tim 1:5, 2Tim 2:22, 1Pet 1:22)?

Thanks again for this good point!

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 15:28

ccrider:

>>>My heart desires to be like Christ but, like Paul, some things that I don't want to do, I do....and those things I should do, I do not do. Although these things happen, I should not fall into condemnation, but press forward in my faith of the promise of Christ, always striving to do the will of the Father in Christ. I'm not talking about things like rampant adultery or a murder spree but those things that can cause us to stumble from time to time while keeping a heart that is void of rejecting Christ and the Father altogether. In fact it is in my stumbling that I cry out in my need for The Lord. Does this mean I do not believe I need the Lord unless I stumble? No. I fully admit that I always need Him, especially for strength against stumbling to begin with, but a heart that loves Him will recognize the brief shame and sting of sin yet continue to have a willingness and a desire to do better and move forward in faith.

I would hold that there is something better than the Romans 7 "For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do... But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. " (Rom 7:19, 23) experience.

I would hold that Romans 7 is the experience under the law. Romans 8:2 tells us "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."

God promises are ye and amen.

1Co 10:13 There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.

2Th 3:3 But the Lord is faithful, who shall establish you, and keep you from evil.

2Pe 1:10 Wherefore the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall:

Jud 1:24 Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy,

God has something better for us than sinning and repenting and sinning and repenting.

>>>I'm not talking about things like rampant adultery or a murder spree but those things that can cause us to stumble from time to time while keeping a heart that is void of rejecting Christ and the Father altogether.

I would hold that the Bible teaches that the Almighty God has can save us from "big" sin can save us from "small" sins to . Save and keep by the power of God thought faith. Against not works but keep by the power of God thought faith.

2Co 1:24 Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy: for by faith ye stand.

Eph 6:16 Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked.

1Pe 1:5 Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.

1Jn 5:4 For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.

>>>In doing so, can now passionately pursue His Will for me out of my love for Him without having to worry about being perfect in the process. This is freedom!!!

When you say with out being perfect do you mean with out having to worry about being obedience?

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/12/11 15:57

Quote:
-----I broke off what I considered a circle conversation with you on one of my threads yesterday Robert and let you know for the second time in that thread that I feel the conversation wasn't going any where and told you I wouldn't be responding to you on the thread any more Lord willing . Since then you have posted 9 more posts to me ignoring my request which of course raised my eyebrows.

I trust you are not going to follow me around and post on my threads or the threads I post on the kind of things you have posted there like...

Bob. You have come in here charging and now wish to dictate, you are out of order and if you do not change your tune you will be removed from participation.

Take some time and read through the following;

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id10733&forum34&post_id&refreshGo) Jonathan Edwards - Undiscerned Spiritual Pride

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 17:49

crsschk;
>>>Bob. You have come in here charging and now wish to dictate, you are out of order and if you do not change your tune you will be removed from participation.

I don't consider posting 2 posts and asking for comments "charging" but if you feel that way I will leave that up to you.

As far as wishing to dictate. All I was doing was pointing out to Robert that I didn't think our coversation was profitable for either of us or the forum and bowed out. Following my 2nd request to end our discuss he posted a further 9 posts and has started answering his posts to me him self. I think that is a bit much.

So when he made a comment on this thread and start it off with "I have already been accused of many things by this man", which in my opinion is close to slander, I told him that for now I didn't think it would be best to engage him in a conversation and that I hoped he wasn't going to do the same thing he did in the first thread with any further threads I start or make comments on.

His answer...

"I will meet you and your error where I find it."

So I am not sure where you would want to me "change my tune".

Do you think it would be godly and proper to continue to discuss with Robert given his tone.

It seems to me that the Community Rules on posting here is very clear that we are not to strive with one another and cause problems and commotion.

I would think the one that needs to change his tune would be Robert.

Now crsschk in your first post to me you have accused me of having an "air that is arrogant" and now you have threaten to remove me from participation. And top of that it appears you have accused me of spiritual pride if I am understanding the reason you have posted the link to Jonathan's article on Undiscerning Spiritual Pride.

Now considering that I have made a verbal declaration that all I was trying to do is walk away for a posting conversation that I didn't feel like was going anywhere, and requesting that Robert didn't start another one of the same on this thread, do you think it is necessary or even right for you to accuse me of arrogance and what seems like to me to imply that I have spiritual pride?

It would appear to me that your conduct is directly in violation of the community rules you have made a commitment to uphold.

The rules clearly state that "What is not tolerated Slander. Ill-will. Unnecessary accusations, comments."

Do you think accusing me of being arrogant and seemingly to imply that I have spiritual pride fits within the above rule?

Was this a Christ like action on your part? Inasmuch as you do to the least of these my brethren you have done it unto me .

So I am very open to being corrected and if you have a point where I have broken the Community Rules please point it out and I will apologize and make it right and we can all move on.

I still feel that my actions to avoid conflict as much as possible with Robert have been correct, godly and according to the Community Rules . However my friend I can't say the same for you.

I will go ahead and prayerfully read Edwards article you posted for me and pray and ask the Lord to guide me in my conversations with you.

Christian love and prayers,

Bob.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 18:05

Quote:
-----Bob's: I still feel that my actions to avoid conflict as much as possible with Robert have been correct, godly and according to the Community Rules . However my friend I can't say the same for you.

Bob, when the conversation does not flow according to your will you want to bow out. You want to leave a host of people thinking that one willful sin makes a person a child of the devil. With impressionable minds looking on, I cannot in good conscience allow your error to go unchallenged no matter how many times you try to act Christlike and pointing out our errors- even likening me a 'Chicken-Little.'

You refused to submit to both moderators by suggesting Mike read the rules. That is blatant highhandedness.

If you think your false doctrine will go unchallenged in these forums or if you think you are taking the high road by 'bowing out' to avoid conflict you are seriously mistaken. Impressionable minds are watching and picking up what they read. You ought to be more circumspect in your radical propagations. Obviously you are not used to being challenged, but in these forums Iron sharpens Iron.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2008/12/11 18:25

Quote:
-----bobmutch wrote:

In view of this how do you deal with those that say that God has programmed them to sin via the inherited Adamic nature. That people have not asked to be born into this world programmed to sin.

I deal with it by showing them that it is God frustrating His own plan & purpose to "programmed them to sin via the inherited Adamic nature"

One must understand what sin is & why men sin.

Quote:
-----What do you mean by this. Do you hold that spiritual death is spiritual separation from God as in a relationship or do you hold that some thing has happened to the spirit of a man?

spiritual death is spiritual separation from God as in a relationship.

John 17:3 Now this is eternal life: that they shall be knowing You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You sent. Eternal life is a spiritual life; knowing the Father through Christ.

Quote:
-----And if you don't mind what are the different views on what spiritual death is?

Sorry, I don't keep track of any other view.

Quote:
-----What do you mean by spiritually dying to the Law?

If one replaces the woman to be more personal & the husband to be the righteous requirements of the law. As the husband lives, the requirements which the husband has apply to the wife, but if & when he dies, they are no longer applicable to the widow.

Romans 7:2 You are bound by the requirements of the law so long as you are under them; but if the requirements of the law are taken out of the way, you are loosed from them.

3: So then if, while the righteous requirements of the law are still binding & you don't abide by them, you shall be called a transgressor: but, if the righteous requirements of the law are taken out of the way, you are free from them; so that you are not a transgressor, even though you don't abide by them.

4: Therefore my brothers, you are truly become separated from the requirement of the law through the body of Christ; that you should be bound to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God
Verse four would be the best way to describe spiritually dying to the Law.

Quote:

Quote:
-----so that we might die through Him and be raised with Him by and through faith so that by Him and through Him we might take the penalty for our own sins; all this is through the spirit of the law.

What do you mean by "this is through the spirit of the law"?

The difference between the letter of the law and the spirit of the law is that the letter relates to the outward action; the spirit relates to the motive or intention of the heart and from which the act should proceed.

The spirit of the law requires impartial goodwill or benevolence, and is all expressed in one word--love. The letter of the law requires strict adherence to every precept, it is all expressed in one word--obey.

An example, the letter of the law says, "Do not commit murder!" but the spirit of the law says, "anyone who is angry with his brother without cause shall be liable to Judgment." (Matthew 5:21-22)

The spirit requires that certain conditions to be examined in their proper place.

The letter of the law is unyielding and sentences guilty all violators of its precepts, without regard to purpose. Just as the speed limit is 55 mph and one exceeds the limit, the law says, "guilty". The spirit of the law sees the purpose of the excess speed for an emergency and says, "keep speeding until purpose is met.

Furthermore, when speeding for the purpose of an emergency, the spirit of the law is not broken, but fulfilled

I hope this answers your question well enough.

Quote:
-----What do you mean by law of death?

The "law of death" is mentioned in Romans 8:2 along with the "law of sin" For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death.

Deut.21:22-23, Lev.17:11a, Ezek 18:4,20 Romans 6:23. Basically, all the laws there are for sin concerning death as the punishment.

If your wondering what the "law of sin" is; it's from Romans 7:25.

To define law of sin:

The "law of sin" is the demands of our own fleshly desires & affections against known law that bring us in opposition to God which separates us from Him.

The "law of sin" includes the inability of the flesh to deny its own fleshly desires apart from the Spirit & faith in HIM.

Remember this, for it is important to remember!

This concludes that which is in our "members" (Romans 7:23) are the unlawful affections &/or desires which brings about spiritual death.

Quote:

-----What do you mean by God "uses His law of death" to "implement the sacrifice of Jesus"?

God applied the law of sin in a manner consistent with physical & spiritual death's purpose &/or design.

The purpose &/or design of Physical death is not a penalty for sin, but only a consequence of Adam being cut off from the Tree of Life.

Physical death is more of a mercy built into the plan of God.

It is so mankind will not live forever knowing good & evil (Genesis 3:22-23)

Furthermore, physical death would have come upon Adam & Eve even if they never sinned, because this flesh was never supposed to be eternal in the first place.

Things made with hands are temporal.

Things not made with hands are eternal.

Our flesh & Jesus' is temporal just as Adam & Eve's was to begin with.

Mark 14:58 We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another **made without hands**.

1Corinthians 5:1 For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house **not made with hands**, eternal in the heavens.

Now, since our "earthly house of this tabernacle" is temporal in contrast to the one which is not made with hands eternal which is eternal, then we must know that is the same with Jesus in Mark 14:58.

Other examples:

Ephesians 2:11 Therefore remember, that you 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 (not eternal in value)

Colossians 2:11 In whom also you are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands (eternal in value), in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ

Hebrews 9:11 But Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands (contrast this with the temporal "holy place" made with hands in verse 24), that is to say, not of this building;

Hebrews 9:24 For Christ has not entered into the holy places made with hands (contrast this with the eternal "holy place" not made with hands in verse 11), which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.

The purpose &/or design of spiritual death is so God may not have fellowship with them that malign Him, which is what sin does as you read already.

Therefore, God put Jesus in our place while deeming us in Jesus place. IOW, God is punishing us in Christ, we paid the penalty of our own sins in Christ.

Since that happened, God can not punish again, because of double jeopardy.

Quote:

Quote:

-----Jesus was taken off the cross that same day He died so the curse of sin would stay on Him.

I have never heard that before. Where did you get that?

Read Deut.21:22-23

Quote:

-----Ok when you say the law you are referring to the law of Moses? Now do you feel like the Christian is lawless or without law or do you feel like we are under the perfect law of liberty which some hold is the new covenant scriptures?

More like For the setting free of the captive slave of the letter of the law.

We are held to the Spirit of the law, the law of Christ (1Corinth 9:21) which is Love & the law of the Spirit (Romans8:2)
By this law the righteousness of the letter of the law is fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. (Romans 8:4)

Quote:

Quote:

-----When Jesus finished all that needed to be done:

What about delivering the Christian from the power of sin whereby we may take the way of escape in every temptation (1Cor 10:13, 2The 3:3, 2Pet 1:10, Jud 1:24)? And also what about deliverance from the pollution of sin (Mat 5:8, Act 15:9, 1Tim 1:5, 2Tim 2:22, 1Pet 1:22)?

Good points, however, I would claim that these are effects that come from the relationship between you & God which came by the atonement.

Please feel free to keep asking questions. I am not very articulate, I don't really know how to say the things which I really want.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 18:56

RobertW

>>>and pointing out our errors- even likening me a 'Chicken-Little.'

Quote from past another thread:

"Really Robert you see danger everywhere. Danger in self-examination, danger in telling people the requirements of salvation, danger in telling people they must have godly sorrow, danger of teaching people that fruits befitting of repentance are a Bible requirement, danger of proof texting salvation, danger in missing the life in the Spirit. Is there any thing you don't see a danger in.

How about the danger of not telling people what the Word of God says about the conditions of obtaining and retaining salvation.

You seem to be like Chicken Little who thinks the sky about to fall everywhere.

The Bible tells us to examine ourselves to see if we are in the faith (2Cor 13:5).

I don't know Robert you seem to see boogie men every where. I am starting to wonder what kind of life experiences you have had. Have you seen a lot of this stuff going on?"

I apologize for saying that and regret having done that and I am sorry. If there is anything else that I have said or done toward you that you feel was below the spirit of Christian love please point it out to me and I will quickly make it right.

When I said that I didn't mean it in an attacking way but it just seemed to fit things after you listed your long list of dangers you were seeing. The Lord pointed this out to me when I was really the community rules earlier today. Thanks for bringing it up and making it easier for me to make my wrongs right.

There may be one or two other comment I made toward you that I can't remember what they were but I think they were below the standard of Christian charity. One was I express my surprise that you have been preaching all these years but just got peace in your soul in the last few months. I should have rejoiced with you instead of making a fault out of that. Very sorry for that also.

I also apologize and regret the comment about the boogie man. I should be more sensitive where you are at considering all that you have been through with the bashing preaching you have had sit under and the lack of peace you have had that you shared with me.

If you see any other things I have said to you (or even others) that is below the Bible standard of Christian charity let me know and if God can give me eyes to see I will make them right and apologize!

Again thanks for bringing this up.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 19:55

Quote:
-----If you see any other things I have said to you (or even others) that is below the Bible standard of Christian charity let me know and if God can give me eyes to see I will make them right and apologize!

Bob I appreciate your words and accept them. I harbor no ill feeling at all. I really have just tried to express my experience and how a Finney-type theology dogged my steps for years.

I always understood that God loved me. I knew He did. But roaring in my mind were teachings that never allowed me to feel I measured up. No matter what. I had been radically changed and Spirit filled in early 1992, but when I went to the UK and later to Greenock God lifted a burden off of me that felt like a coat of mail.

I just hope that you will consider the things I have shared. Please bear in mind the implications and consequences of these teachings (especially point 9). That's all I would ask. I see no reason why we can not dialogue about this. Even if we seem to go in circles. I don't mind going in circles. I've been told I am slow but worth waiting on. I think there is too much at stake with both salvation and atonement to not have a balanced bible based doctrine.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2008/12/11 19:57

Hi Bob.

You might like to check out this thread. It will show you how to do quotes and things. It will make your posts much easier for everyone to read. Sometimes, if you don't use the quotes others can't tell if it is you speaking or you quoting.

Josh

(https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id15477&forum21&8) The Messageboard Handbook

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 19:59

crsschk:

I read a couple of times the Edwards article on Spiritual Pride you linked to. Some very good stuff there. Looks like the one that Chris posted was an abridged copy. The complete article is here.

SECTION I. Spiritual pride

I am going over it and taking a number of thoughts from it and will combine it with some other notes I have on William Law's two chapters on pride from his book Serious Call. Then I think I will write an article on it and perhaps post it here.

While Edwards has lots of good points the puritan woe is me wretched man syndrome way of stating things distracts for the value of the article in my opinion. I like Law's style much better but he doesn't include all the things that Edwards does.

So thanks for suggesting the article to me.

Note: I crossed out syndrome and added "way of stating things" so that it would appear to discredit those that are of a puritan leading. Sorry about that.

I tried del, s, strike, and strikeout. Only del works here.

< del>del< /del>
del

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 20:03

Hi PreachParsly,

Sometimes, if you don't use the quotes others can't tell if it is you speaking or you quoting.

I tend to not long using the quote system and use 3 greater than sign in front of the quote. Or if the quote is long I put it in quotes. Perhaps I will just indent it with a div and apply some css via style.

style="margin:0 0 0 15px;text-align:left;" is what I used above.

Quote:

-----Sometimes, if you don't use the quotes others can't tell if it is you speaking or you quoting.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/11 20:15

Quote:

-----the puritan woe is me wretched man syndrome distracts

The "syndrome" - interesting word choice.

With all due respect, this confession speaks volumes.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 20:24

PaulWest

I didn't mean any thing negative by it and I didn't even think it would be taken a wrong way. Let me see if I can pick a better word. Sorry if this word was taken wrongly. Nothing meant by it.

It is kind of interesting I Googled it up under define:syndrome and it is a disease.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 20:52

PaulWest:

>>>With all due respect, this confession speaks volumes.

Yes it means that I am Wesley and use terms that are compatible with the Wesleyan system of doctrine.

Those that are familiar with the Wesleyan system and terminology will understand that.

I am not of that group that consistently speak of having a heart that is deceitful and desperately wicked above all things. Of those that continuously confess sinning for any thing that is below angelic perfection.

I see that the blessed man is "pure in heart", that the blessing of the Holy Spirit baptism "purifying" the "hearts by faith" (Act 15:9), that the "end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart" (1Tim 1:5), that we are to "call on the Lord out of a pure heart" (2Tim 2:22) and we are to "love one another with a pure heart fervently" (1Pet 1:22).

I hold this is what the new covenant has given us and I have thrown off the yoke of the old covenant system based on the blood of bulls and goats that could only bring forgiveness but couldn't "take away sins" (Heb 10:4).

Now we are "justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Act 13:39) and the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom 8:2) for "what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh".

I have experienced this and have it in my soul and I say glory be to Jesus who not only saves from the penalty, and love of sin, but the very power and pollution of it.

Christian love,

Bob.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 21:07

RobertW:

>>>Bob I appreciate your words and accept them.

Thank you very much. While I trust you have enough victory that it was not an offense to you (most people that can dish it out can take it), I truly regret saying them and really thought nothing of it until I read the community rules.

I can be a bit rough around the edges. While I am not making excuses or bragging about my sin life I am an ex-street person, ex-dealer, ex-con, ex-crackhead that has spend 5 years on the street off and on in my late teen and early twenties. I had a very serious substance abuse problem and caused me to fall back into the old life twice since I got saved ~29 years ago. The last relapse ended about 5.5 years ago.

So using terms like chicken-little and boogie man to describe a persons disposition is being nice if you know what I mean.

I think for now we should give things a bit of a break and let me learn the ropes here and see what action the mods may take toward me for my forwardness with them.

Again thank you for your quickness to forgive!

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/11 21:24

Quote:

-----Yes it means that I am Wesley and use terms that are compatible with the Wesleyan system of doctrine.

I see. Allow me me to quote a man who was also familiar with Wesleyan doctrine. You've probably heard of him:

"Thou, O Christ, art all I want, more than all in Thee I find; Raise the fallen, cheer the faint, heal the sick, and lead the blind. Just and holy is Thy Name, **I am all unrighteousness; False and full of sin I am; Thou art full of truth and grace**."

Charles Wesley penned these words while hiding out from an angry mob seeking to crush him for preaching the gospel open-air. He was already saved, already born-again. Bob, I do not sense this kindred spirit in your posts; I instead see theories and wrested scriptures that look good on paper but dissolve in the face of reality, in defining God's true character and in the way He relates to us, through His unspeakable grace, love and mercy.

Quote:

-----I have experienced this and have it in my soul and I say glory be to Jesus who not only saves from the penalty, and love of sin, but the very power and pollution of it.

You've experienced something, this I have no doubt. The problem is, your haughty conduct and the conspicuous absence of the authority of God in your posts belie this so-called experience. You are teaching and professing what you know, and this is as far as you can go because this is all you know. The best thing that can happen to you is for God to allow a crushing failure in the area you deem yourself strongest to teach you the grand lesson of grace and humility. This is the way the Holy Spirit drops the self-occluded blinders of "arrival" and instead seats us with humility in the school of God.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 23:04

This post should have been addressed to crsschk and I sent it to PaulWest by mistake. I apologized to Paul for this. Sorry for any misunderstandings.

PaulWest:

You passed over 6 questions that I asked you in the last post. Let me restate my point and ask just half of these which will be 3. I would ask you prayerfully answer them, keeping in mind as a moderator you have made a commitment to act Christ like, to not be bias against those who are not of same doctrinal understanding as you are, and to keep the community rules.

Let me remind you of just a few of the community rules.

- Let us bear with one another with patience and understanding.
- Be polite. Don't be rude to others.
- Try and think of the ramifications of your thoughts and comments. Some things need not to be said.
- Again, ask a question rather than making an accusation.
- Better to not accuse at all but in points of biblical doctrine a challenge may be forwarded to our interpretations, do not take it personally and do not make it personal.
- Control your emotions and keep before you the mandate of humility.

First you charge me with arrogance, then seem to imply I am spiritually proud by your offering for me to read Edwards Undiscerned Spiritual Pride, now you accuse me of being haughty.

Now these three things are all subjective as I am sure you know and I trust you feel there is a possibility for you to be wrong.

That being said here are my 3 questions.

1. Do you think this is the way one Christian should deal with another ?
2. Are you being an example to the believers in this conduct?

>>>The best thing that can happen to you is for God to allow a crushing failure in the area you deem yourself strongest to teach you the grand lesson of grace and humility.

3. You you saying you wish for me to fall into sin?

I await your answers.

Christian love and prayers,

Bob.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 23:24

PaulWest:

>>>I see. Allow me me to quote a man who was also familiar with Wesleyan doctrine. You've probably heard of him:

As you know hymn writers are not always writing of there present experience when they write a hymn. This is clear in the many hymns that have been written calling people to Christ that are written by saved authors.

I do expect you know that Charles' hymn is not the testimony that he or his brother John had but just in case you have not read a lot on the Wesley teaching of Christian Perfection let me post you chapter 12 from John Wesley's book Plain Account. I am sorry it is so long but I think it will be a blessing for you to see just what John Wesley taught on the sin question.

I am not asking you to agree with it but to just come to an understanding on what he taught.

A Plain Account of Christian Perfection Chapter 8 -14

A Plain Account of Christian Perfection

Chapter 12 Views on Christina Perfection

12. I think it was in the latter end of the year 1740, that I had a conversation with Dr. Gibson, then Bishop of London, at Whitehall. He asked me what I meant by perfection. I told him without any disguise or reserve. When I ceased speaking, he said, "Mr. Wesley, if this be all you mean, publish it to all the world. If any one then can confute what you say, lie may have free leave." I answered, "My Lord, I will;" and accordingly wrote and published the sermon on Christian perfection.

In this I endeavoured to show, (1.) In what sense Christians are not, (2.) In what sense they are, perfect.

"(1.) In what sense they are not. They are not perfect in knowledge. They are not free from ignorance, no, nor from mistake. We are no more to expect any living man to be infallible, than to be omniscient. They are not free from infirmities, such as weakness or slowness of understanding, irregular quickness or heaviness of imagination. Such in another kind are impropriety of language, ungracefulness of pronunciation; to which one might add a thousand nameless defects, either in conversation or behaviour. From such infirmities as these none are perfectly freed till their spirits return to God; neither can we expect till then to be wholly freed from temptation; for 'the servant is not above his master.' But neither in this sense is there any absolute perfection on earth. There is no perfection of degrees, none which does not admit of a continual increase.

"(2.) In what sense then are they perfect? Observe, we are not now speaking of babes in Christ, but adult Christians But even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin. This St. John affirms expressly; and it cannot be disproved by the examples of the Old Testament. For what, if the holiest of the ancient Jews did sometimes commit sin? We cannot infer from hence, that 'all Christians do and must commit sin as long as they live.'

"But does not the Scripture say, 'A just man sinneth seven times a day?' It does not. Indeed it says, 'A just man falleth seven times.' But this is quite another thing; for, First, the words, a day, are not in the text. Secondly, here is no mention of falling into sin at all. What is here mentioned, is, falling into temporal affliction.

"But elsewhere Solomon says, 'There is no man that sinneth not.' Doubtless thus it was in the days of Solomon; yea, and from Solomon to Christ there was then no man that sinned not. But whatever was the case of those under the law, we may safely affirm, with St. John, that, since the gospel was given, 'he that is born of God sinneth not.'

"The privileges of Christians are in nowise to be measured by what the Old Testament records concerning those who were under the Jewish dispensation; seeing the fulness of time is now come, the Holy Ghost is now given, the great salvation of God is now brought to men by the revelation of Jesus Christ. The kingdom of heaven is now set up on earth, concerning which the Spirit of God declared of old time, (so far is David from being the pattern or standard of Christian perfection,) 'He that is feeble among them, at that day, shall be as David, and the house of David shall be as the angel of the Lord before them.' (Zech. 12:8.)

"But the Apostles themselves committed sin; Peter by dissembling, Paul by his sharp contention with Barnabas. Suppose they did, will you argue thus: 'If two of the Apostles once committed sin, then all other Christians, in all ages, do and must commit sin as long as they live?' Nay, God forbid we should thus speak. No necessity of sin was laid upon them; the grace of God was surely sufficient for them. And it is sufficient for us at this day.

"But St. James says, 'In many things we offend all.' True; but who are the persons here spoken of? Why, those 'many masters' or teachers whom God had not sent; not the Apostle himself, nor any real Christian. That in the word we, used by a figure of speech, common in all other as well as the inspired writings, the Apostle could not possibly include himself, or any other true believer, appears, First, from the ninth verse, 'Therewith bless we God, and therewith curse we men.' Surely not we Apostles! not we believers! Secondly, from the words preceding the text: 'My brethren, be not many masters,' or teachers, 'knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation. For in many things we offend all.' We! Who? Not the Apostles nor true believers, but they who were to 'receive the greater condemnation,' because of those many offences. Nay, Thirdly, the verse itself proves, that 'we offend all,' cannot be spoken either of all men or all Christians. For in it immediately follows the mention of a man who 'offends not,' as the we first mentioned did; from whom therefore he is professedly contradistinguished, and pronounced a 'perfect man.'

"But St. John himself says, 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves;' and, 'If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.'

"I answer, (1.) The tenth verse fixes the sense of the eighth: 'If we say we have no sin,' in the former, being explained by, 'If we say we have not sinned,' in the latter, verse. (2.) The point under consideration is not, whether we have or have not sinned heretofore; and neither of these verses asserts that we do sin, or commit sin now. (3.) The ninth verse explains both the eighth and tenth: 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' As if he had said, 'I have before affirmed, The blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin.' And no man can say, 'I need it not; I have no sin to be cleansed, from.' 'If we say, we have no sin, that 'we have not sinned, we deceive ourselves,' and make God a liar: But 'if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just,' not only 'to forgive us our sins,' but also 'to cleanse us from all unrighteousness,' that we may 'go and sin no more.' In conformity, therefore, both to the doctrine of St. John, and the whole tenor of the New Testament, we fix this conclusion: A Christian is so far perfect, as not to commit sin.

"This is the glorious privilege of every Christian, yea, though he be but a babe in Christ. But it is only of grown Christians it can be affirmed, they are in such a sense perfect, as, Secondly, to be freed from evil thoughts and evil tempers. First, from evil or sinful thoughts. Indeed, whence should they spring? 'Out of the heart of man,' if at all, 'proceed evil thoughts.' If, therefore, the heart be no longer evil, then evil thoughts no longer proceed out of it: For 'a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit.'

"And as they are freed from evil thoughts, so likewise from evil tempers. Every one of these can say, with St. Paul, 'I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me;' - words that manifestly describe a deliverance from inward as well as from outward sin. This is expressed both negatively, 'I live not,' my evil nature, the body of sin, is destroyed; and positively, 'Christ liveth in me,' and therefore all that is holy, and just, and good. Indeed, both these, 'Christ liveth in me,' and, 'I live not,' are inseparably connected. For what communion hath light with darkness, or Christ with Belial?

"He, therefore, who liveth in these Christians hath 'purified their hearts by faith;' insomuch that every one that has Christ in him, 'the hope of glory, purifieth himself even as he is pure.' He is purified from pride; for Christ was lowly in heart: He is pure from desire and self-will; for Christ desired only to do the will of his Father: And he is pure from anger, in the common sense of the word; for Christ 'was meek and gentle. I say, in the common sense of the word; for he is angry at sin, while he is grieved for the sinner. He feels a displacency at every offence against God, but only tender compassion to the offender.

"Thus doth Jesus save his people from their sins, not only from outward sins, but from the sins of their hearts. 'True,' say some, 'but not till death, not in this world.' Nay, St. John says, 'Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because, as he is, so are we in this world.' The Apostle here, beyond all contradiction, speaks of himself and other living Christians, of whom he flatly affirms, that, not only at or after death, but 'in this world,' they are 'as their Master.'

"Exactly agreeable to this are his words in the first chapter: 'God is light, and in him is no darkness at all. 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.' And again: 'If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' Now, it is evident, the Apostle here speaks of a deliverance wrought in this world: For he saith not, The blood of Christ will cleanse, (at the hour of death, or in the day of judgment,) but it 'cleanseth,' at the time present, us living Christians 'from all sin.' And it is equally evident, that if any sin remain, we are not cleansed from 'all' sin. If any unrighteousness remain in the soul, it is not cleansed from 'all, unrighteousness. Neither let any say that this relates to justification only, or the cleansing us from the guilt of sin: First, because this is confounding together what the Apostle clearly distinguishes, who mentions, first, 'to forgive us our sins, and then 'to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.' Secondly, because this is asserting justification by works, in the strongest sense possible; it is making all inward, as well as all outward, holiness, necessarily previous to justification. For if the cleansing here spoken of is no other than the cleansing us from the guilt of sin, then we are not cleansed from guilt, that is, not justified, unless on condition of walking 'in the light, as he is in the light.' It remains, then, that Christians are saved in this world from all sin, from all unrighteousness; that they are now in such a sense perfect, as not to commit sin, and to be freed from evil thoughts and evil tempers."

It could not be, but that a discourse of this kind, which directly contradicted the favourite opinion of many, who were esteemed by others, and possibly esteemed themselves, some of the best of Christians, (whereas, if these things were so, they were not Christians at all,) should give no small offence. Many answers or animadversions, therefore, were expected; but I was agreeably disappointed. I do not know that any appeared; so I went quietly on my way.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 23:43

PaulWest:

>>>You've experienced something, this I have no doubt. The problem is, your haughty conduct and the conspicuous absence of the authority of God in your posts belie this so-called experience. You are teaching and professing what you know, and this is as far as you can go because this is all you know.

I have posted what John Wesley teaches on Christian Perfection which is the same thing (as far as I know) that I am holding and maintaining (perhaps a few minor differences).

I trust you would not charge John Wesley with arrogance, spiritual pride, and haughty conduct as you seem to have to me. So Paul if it is not the doctrine that has caused you to make your charges I would ask what is it.

If you can point out any thing in my conduct toward you (or any one else here on this forum) that is below the Bible standard of Christian charity I will quickly apologize, retract, and sincerely make any wrong right.

I have to tell you your conduct toward me is uncalled for and unacceptable for a moderator that has committed to be unbiased and Christ like. I would ask you to retract your charges and make your wrongs right and I am more willing to do the same if God can open up my eyes enough by his grace to allow me to see any where I have been below the Bible standard.

I desire to be reconciled with you, and to put this exchange behind us, and as Christian brothers to move forward and to bring glory to God's name and not shame on his holy cause.

I have not traded insult for insult, charge for charge, nor railing for railing. I have shown Christian charity toward you in t

he middle of your charges toward me. Now I ask for reconciliation.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/12/11 23:50

Quote:
-----First you charge me with arrogance, then seem to imply I am spiritually proud by your offering for me to read Edwards Undiscerned Spiritual Pride, now you accuse me of being haughty.

That was me Bob. And yes I did indeed mean to imply that you are proud, that was the reason for the link.

It is evident enough by the constant defending of yourself and your brash conduct. It is also evident by the level of self defense you put up.

It is evident in that rather than taking a step back you rise to the occasion further wishing to dictate in a setting where you are a guest.

So far you have talked a great deal about your self, how you are rough around the edges, how *you* like to structure your posts, your preferences, your 'stance' ...

Dear brother you are full of yourself! Full of your opinion and full of a constant penchant to ignore what is being asked of you, quickly throwing it behind your back so that you can try and gain some sort of upper hand. This is ridiculous gamesmanship, you have the wrong forum if you think this is like others where anything goes.

You are also seriously mistaken that you can present some of the things you have here and not be taken to task.

Here is the million dollar question brother;

Could it possibly be *you*?

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 0:10

PaulWest:

I just want to apologize to you. Some how I got you and another moderator mixed up when you charged me with having "haughty conduct". The other moderator had changed me with being arrogant and seemed to imply that I had spiritual pride. So sorry about the mix up. I am going to go ahead and repost and just make a note on the old post about the mistake. Sorry about that again!

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/12 0:19

Quote:
-----1. Do you think this is the way one Christian should deal with another ?

Yes, I do, and I've tried to do it in a non-malicious way. My charges are, in fact, observations. I am not alone in these observations. I hold no animosity toward you, but I have noticed certain things about your posts that trouble me. It is not so much your theology as it is your attitude. It seems you came into these forums with a chip, with an agenda, with hidden colors - and now these colors are coming out after a little probing. It makes no difference to me if you are a Calvinist, Wesleyan, Pelagian; you are welcome to share, but only up to the point of personal conflict. I must confess the suspicion I have had (from the very beginning) that you came here not so much for fellowship, but for the sole purpose to teach and perhaps even proselytize and promote your blog.

Quote:
-----2. Are you being an example to the believers in this conduct?

Well, I try to be a prudent, friendly moderator by the grace of God. Have I been unduly rude and abrasive to you? Has anyone? You, sir, are the one showing disrespect and proving a bad example by making a spectacle of yourself here. You are not in the same spirit of John Wesley whom you ceaselessly align yourself with; the writings of the Wesley brothers are full of grace and the sweet perfume of charity - a fragrance decidedly absent from your own posts. It doesn't matter how prodigiously you quote Wesley, the perfume doesn't carry over if your own heart is not right with God.

Quote:

-----3. You are saying you wish for me to fall into sin?

No, I only wish God would open your eyes. If God allows you to fall into sin for this to happen, so be it. He is strong enough to break and then restore for you to understand grace and true repentance. If anyone here has experienced failure after failure in trying to meet this perfection standard, it is I. The teachings you propagate are poisonous. They look good on paper, but in the face of reality they dissolve. You know it, and I know it.

You may be able to fool some people here with your alleged perfectionism and mockery of the Puritan "wretched man syndrome", but you can't fool me. If I could display some of the thoughts and visuals you entertained in your heart today across this computer screen, you would disappear from this site and never show your face again. Beneath that neat Wesleyan band aid, that wound is still festering, isn't it?

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 0:21

crsschk:

I had sent this post to PaulWest by mistake so I made a note on the post I send to him to that effect. So I will just repost this to you. It seems another post I have made got lost during the 11pm GMT-5 update on the site tonight. So I am revamping the post set Paul but was meant for you. Sorry about any mix up.

First you charge me with arrogance, then seem to imply I am spiritually proud by your offering for me to read Edwards Undiscerned Spiritual Pride which now you have clarified that that was how you felt.

Now these two things are all subjective as I am sure you know and I trust you feel there is a possibility for you to be wrong.

1. Do you think this is the way one Christian should deal with another ?

2. Are you being an example to the believers in this conduct?

Let me remind you of a few of the community rules.

--Let us bear with one another with patience and understanding.

--Be polite. Don't be rude to others.

--Try and think of the ramifications of your thoughts and comments. Some things need not to be said.

--Again, ask a question rather than making an accusation.

--Better to not accuse at all but in points of biblical doctrine a challenge may be forwarded to our interpretations, do not take it personally and do not make it personal.

--Control your emotions and keep before you the mandate of humility.

I await your answers.

Christian love and prayers,

Bob.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 0:24

PaulWest:

So you really think that it is acceptable to accuse some one of being proud and arrogance and you think that is being Christ like and a good example.

All I can say is amazing my friend.

I do desire reconciliation with your and if you desire the same please contact me via message. For now I think the best thing for me to do is to bow out of this conversation.

Christ love and prayers,

Bob.

Re: False Brethren - posted by savannah, on: 2008/12/12 0:25

Psa 1:1,2 Blessed is the man who has not walked in the counsel of the ungodly, and has not stood in the way of sinners, and has not sat in the seat of scorners. But his delight is only in the Law of Jehovah, and he meditates in His Law day and night.

But although my companion Titus was a Greek they did not insist upon even his being circumcised. Yet there was danger of this through the false brethren secretly introduced into the Church, who had stolen in to spy out the freedom which is ours in Christ Jesus, in order to rob us of it. But not for an hour did we give way and submit to them; in order that the Good News might continue with you in its integrity. From those leaders I gained nothing new. Whether they were men of importance or not, matters nothing to me--God recognizes no external distinctions. To me, at any rate, the leaders imparted nothing new. (Gal. 2:3-6)

Php 3:2,3 Beware of 'the dogs,' the bad workmen, the self-mutilators. For we are the true circumcision--we who render to God a spiritual worship and make our boast in Christ Jesus and have no confidence in outward ceremonies

2Co 11:26 In journeying I was often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils of mine own nation, in perils among the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren,

Php 3:17,18 Brethren, vie with one another in imitating me, and carefully observe those who follow the example which we have set you. For there are many whom I have often described to you, and I now even with tears describe them, as being enemies to the Cross of Christ.

Recommended read:

<http://www.hartsvillereformedbaptist.com/legalism.pdf>

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 0:37

>>>It is evident enough by the constant defending of yourself and your brash conduct. It is also evident by the level of self defense you put up.

I don't feel like defending ones self against charged that one feels are incorrect is brash or wrong. Any more than if I charged you with arrogance and you pride and you defended yourself.

>>>It is evident in that rather than taking a step back you rise to the occasion further wishing to dictate in a setting where you are a guest.

Lets not miss the forest for the trees. This all started by me trying to walk away from a conversation that I felt was going nowhere but in circles. The only thing I want to dictate if you can call it that is to not get involved in strife.

>>>So far you have talked a great deal about your self, how you are rough around the edges, how you like to structure your posts, your preferences, your 'stance' ...

Yes I have shared with Robert my past, how I like to use CSS in my posts, and yes I am human so I have preferences, and I have discussed my doctrinal stance. I am not sure what is wrong with that. Do you have rules here from a person discussing any of these things?

>>>Dear brother you are full of yourself! Full of your opinion and full of a constant penchant to ignore what is being asked of you, quickly throwing it behind your back so that you can try and gain some sort of upper hand.

Glory to God brother I am full of Christ and you are taking the place of the accuser of the brethren and make charges that I consider false on subjective matters.

Ignored what is being asked of me. Do you change ever one that ignores what you ask with pride and arrogance. You realize I presume that subjective charges for pride and arrogance than be flung out by any one towards any one.

You are not God. You don't know my heart. So to me to press these charges as hard as your have is very surprising conduct to me.

>>>You are also seriously mistaken that you can present some of the things you have here and not be taken to task.

I don't have a problem with been taken to task for the doctrines I hold. I do start to pull away when I feel the conversations are becoming unprofitable. And I don't think there is anything wrong with that.

Any way it does seem like we are not going to be able to resolve this. You appear very set in your position so I will just have to leave it here.

I want you to know I love you in the Lord and wish you all the best in your spiritual life. At this point I think I will bow out of this conversation. I wish for reconciliation and you should feel free to contact me via message if you desire the same.

Christian love and prayers,

Bob.

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2008/12/12 1:55

bobmutch:

Quote:

-----I am full of Christ

If this is true, it does not show right at the moment.

Quote:

-----You don't know my heart.

What is in your heart is coming out in your words.

Please Bob, pray and ask the Lord to show you the truth of the matter - and then go back and read the things that you have written.

Christ never defended Himself as you have - He only defended others.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/12/12 8:16

As you say that Finney held the Moral Government theory of the atonement would you hold that he was not converted or that those that were said to have been converted under his preaching to not be converted?

Being unable to address the finer points of Wesley's theology due to time constraints (which I have studied quite in depth over the years, as Wesley is one of my favorite preachers/theologians), I will simply say this in regard to this one question:

Paul told the Galatians, who sought to be justified by the works of the law, namely through circumcision, that such individuals have fallen from grace and are severed from Christ. Such persons have been bewitched, and were seeking to accomplish by the flesh what was once begun in the Spirit. Such persons may have indeed been saved at one time in their life. But it is my conviction that whether they were ever really saved or not, such people are fallen from grace and are damned and on their way to hell.

Seeking to be justified by the works of the law, and thus being self-righteous, is one of the greatest offenses in the mind of God. It is far greater than being a crack addict, prostitute, or whoremonger. Jesus' greatest condemnations were against those who thought they were righteous because of what they did, instead of because of God's free gift which makes men brand new.

Justification is by faith, and faith alone. It's not by faith plus works, faith plus circumcision, or faith plus obedience, but by faith alone. To say otherwise is to choose one of the many paths that lead to hell, and is a departure from the straight and narrow road that leads to heaven, and that is the road of grace. Had Finney and his followers done that? So far as I have understood their theology (and I'm no expert on Finney), quite possibly so.

Self-righteousness looks all nice and religious on the outside, and even has a form of godliness, but ultimately, denies the power thereof. Which means, at the end of the day, such a theology is useless, and should be abandoned very quickly unless you wake up in hell one sad morning.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/12 9:29

As a side note I have to say that I'm not so concerned about the radical views of perfection based on what I have read. I'm not really taking it seriously at this point. :roll:

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 9:36

HeartSong:

In short HeartSong it is impossible to defend oneself against subjective charges. If people get it in their mind that a person is proud, arrogant, haughty, there is little you can do if they are at a place in their Christian experience where they feel comfortable accusing others of these things.

However the Word of God teaches us that Christian charity bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things, and thinks no evil of others, and I have no problem doing that.

It has not been the first time I have been falsely accused nor will it be the last time. What we must do as Christians is show them the better way. To not return charge for charge and to show them by example. Before the Lord I feel like this is what I have done not only in my posts but in my heart.

>>>If this is true, it does not show right at the moment.

Well if you could kindly point out to me anywhere I have conducted myself below the Bible standard of Christian charity I will be happy to make that right. If this is just your feeling there is little I can do to convince you one way or the other. Unless you can bring out things that clearly show that a person is not displaying Christ in them and all that can be said are subjective things then it becomes just so much subjective accusations.

>>>What is in your heart is coming out in your words.

Well if you would like to show me what is below the Bible standard of Christian charity in my words I would be very happy to correct those.

>>>Please Bob, pray and ask the Lord to show you the truth of the matter - and then go back and read the things that you have written.

I have re-read most of the things I have written here and Beside the things that Robert pointed out to me and I made right with him I don't see that I have done wrong other than enter into a discussion with the two mods. I would have been better off not engaging them but I had no way to know how things would turn out nor how strong and forward a position they would take. So I have regret there but there is little I can do about that now. The damage is done.

>>>Christ never defended Himself as you have - He only defended others.

When other Christians charge me with things that I don't feel like I have done I feel like it is best to try to resolve those things with brotherly kindness and love. This is what I have done. Christ didn't defend himself against the religious hypocrites and certainly the Bible teaches us to not cast our pearls before swine and to not answer a fool according to his folly I didn't think that any of those things applied in this case.

If one brother in Christ accusing another brother in Christ with some thing that is subjective like being pride, haughty, or arrogant, I think it is the duty of both brothers to try to work it out. As I noted before I don't know these the mods and if I had any idea that things would turn out as they would have I would not have entered into any discussion with them.

But I think it is time to move on. I am not offended by the charges and I will with the help of the Lord avoid getting into similar discussions (Lord willing) with them again if they make more charges.

Christian love and prayers,

Bob.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 10:02

KingJimmy:

>>>Justification is by faith, and faith alone. It's not by faith plus works, faith plus circumcision, or faith plus obedience, but by faith alone.

I would agree with this completely.

Are you saying that Finney held to a justification that was by faith plus works? And would you think that Finney would admit to teaching faith plus works or would just be just another Calvinistic charge that is made against those that hold to an Arminian view point.

Sometimes Calvinists accuse Arminians of a works based salvation, that they deny original sin and total depravity, and that they deny the substitutionary payment for sins.

In fact if you read Fletcher's 5 checks it will give you a good idea of how far some Calvinists will go in making charges against those that don't agree with them. While I am sure there are many that are not this way I have found many Calvinists are quick to lay unfounded charges against those that disagree with them.

I would hold that making unfounded charges is contrary to Christian charity and while people can do it sometimes because they are partly blinded by zeal for their system, it should never be done willfully.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/12 10:50

Quote:
-----Paul told the Galatians, who sought to be justified by the works of the law, namely through circumcision, that such individuals have fallen from grace and are severed from Christ.

and severed from Christ?

Re: persecution of true brethren - posted by savannah, on: 2008/12/12 10:55

Quote: "...I have found many Calvinists are quick to lay unfounded charges against those that disagree with them."

From Still Waters Revival Books:

John Wesley, the great apostle of Arminianism in the following century, manifested the same malicious spirit of persecution against Augustus Toplady, an earnest defender in his day of the doctrines of free and sovereign grace, and author of 'Rock of Ages Cleft for Me.'

When Toplady was thought to be on his death-bed, Wesley industriously circulated a report that Toplady had recanted the principles which it had been the business of his life to advocate. Wesley supposed Toplady to be too near the grave to contradict this foul calumny and write in his own defence. "But to the confusion of his enemies" to quote from Volume I of Toplady's Works "strength was given him to do both." Nor did he ever appear more triumphant than when, almost with his dying breath, he made so honourable and so successful an effort to repel the attacks of calumny and maintain the cause of truth.

On , June 14th, less than two months before his death, he came from Knightsbridge, and after a sermon by his assistant , the Rev. Dr. Illingworth, he ascended the pulpit, to the utter astonishment of his people, and delivered a very short but a very effective discourse from 2 Peter 1:13,14, Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up by putting you in remembrance; knowing that shortly I must put off this, my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me.' When speaking of the abundant peace he experienced, and the joy and consolation of the Holy Ghost, of which for months past he had been a partaker, together with the persuasion that in a few days he must resign his mortal part to corruption, as a prelude to seeing the King in His beauty, the effect produced was such as may, perhaps, be conceived, but certainly cannot at all be described. His closing address was in substance the same with the following paper which was published the week after, and entitled, 'The Rev. Mr. Toplady's Dying Avowal of His Religious Sentiments.'

Concerning Toplady's end we are told,

"All his conversations, as he approached nearer and nearer to his decease, seemed more heavenly and happy. He frequently called himself the happiest man in the world. 'O!' (says he) 'how this soul of mine longs to be gone! Like a bird imprisoned in a cage, it longs to take its flight. O that I had wings like a dove, then would I flee away to the realms of bliss and be at rest for ever!' Being asked by a friend if he always enjoyed such manifestations, he answered, 'I cannot say there are no intermissions; for, if there were not, my consolations would be more or greater than I could possibly bear; but when they abate they leave such an abiding sense of God's goodness and of the certainty of my being fixed upon the eternal Rock Christ Jesus, that my soul is still filled with peace and joy.'"

Within the hour of his death he called his friends and his servants and said,

"It will not be long before God takes me; for no mortal man can live (bursting while he said it into tears of joy) after the glories which God has manifested to my soul.' Soon after this he closed his eyes and found (as Milton finely expresses it)-'A death like sleep, A gentle wafting to immortal life' on Tuesday, August the 11th, 1778, in the 38th year of his age." (pp. 119, 120).

Toplady was not long in his grave when John Wesley publicly asserted that "the account published concerning Mr. Toplady's death was a gross imposition on the public; that he had died in black despair, uttering the most horrible blasphemies, and that none of his friends were permitted to see him." Sir Richard Hill, a friend of Mr. Toplady's, and also the Rev. J. Gawkrödger publicly wrote John Wesley and accused him of vilifying the ashes and traducing the memory of the late Mr.

Augustus Toplady," and affirming that "many respectable witnesses could testify that Mr. Toplady departed this life in the full triumph of faith." (Vol. I, pp. 121-128).

The report continues that a pious dissenting minister expostulated in a pamphlet with Mr. Wesley on his unjust assertions in the following words:

"Mr. Wesley and his confederates, to whom this letter is addressed, did not only persecute the late Mr. Toplady during his life, but even sprinkled his death-bed with abominable falsehood. It was given out, in most of Mr. Wesley's societies, both far and near, that the worthy man had recanted and disowned the doctrines of sovereign grace, which obliged him, though struggling with death, to appear in the pulpit emaciated as he was, and openly avow the doctrines he had preached, as the sole support of his departing spirit. Wretched must that cause be, which has need to be supported by such unmanly shifts, and seek for shelter under such disingenuous subterfuges. O! Mr. Wesley, answer for this conduct at the bar of the Supreme. Judge yourself and you shall not be judged. Dare you also to persuade your followers that Mr. Toplady actually died in despair! Fie upon sanctified slander! Fie! Fie!"

Those who have read the preceding letters (by Sir Richard Hill and Rev. J. Gawkrödger) astonished as they must have been at their contents, will yet be more astonished to hear, that to the loud repeated calls thus given to him to speak for himself, Mr. Wesley answered not a word. Nor is it too much to say, that by maintaining a pertinacious silence in such circumstances, the very vitals of his character were stabbed by himself. He thus consented to a blot remaining on his name, among the foulest that ever stained the reputation of a professed servant of Christ.

Why should Toplady who kept the faith and finished his course in this world with joy be the target of the shafts of Wesley's venom?

It is because he refuted on Scriptural grounds the Arminianism of Wesley, and fearlessly stood in defence of the eternal truths of free and sovereign grace?

"By what spirit," writes Toplady: "this gentleman and his deputies are guided in their discussion of controversial subjects, shall appear from a specimen of the horrible aspersions which, in 'The Church Vindicated from Predestination,' they venture to heap on the Almighty Himself. The recital makes one tremble; the perusal must shock every reader who is not steeped to all reverence for the Supreme Being. Wesley and Sallou are not afraid to declare that on the hypothesis of divine decrees, the justice of God is no better than the tyranny of Tiberius. That God Himself is 'little better than Moloch.' 'A cruel, unwise, unjust, arbitrary, a self-willed tyrant.' A being devoid of wisdom, justice, mercy, holiness, and truth.' 'A devil, yea, worse than the devil.' Did the exorbitancies of the ancient ranters, or the impieties of any modern blasphemers, ever come up to this? ... Observe, reader, that these also are the very men who are so abandoned to all sense of shame, as to charge me with blasphemy for asserting with Scripture, that God worketh all things according to the counsel of His own will, and that whatever God wills is right."

"In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Ephesians 1:11).

Gal 4:21-5:1 Tell me--you who want to continue to be subject to Law--will you not listen to the Law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, one by the slave-girl and one by the free woman.

But we see that the child of the slave-girl was born in the common course of nature; but the child of the free woman in fulfilment of the promise. All this is allegorical; for the women represent two Covenants. One has its origin on Mount Sinai, and bears children destined for slavery. This is Hagar; for the name Hagar stands for Mount Sinai in Arabia, and corresponds to the present Jerusalem, which is in bondage together with her children. But the Jerusalem which is above is free, and she is our mother.

For it is written, "REJOICE, THOU BARREN WOMAN THAT BEAREST NOT, BREAK FORTH INTO A JOYFUL CRY, THOU THAT DOST NOT TRAVAIL WITH CHILD. FOR THE DESOLATE WOMAN HAS MANY CHILDREN--MORE INDEED THAN SHE WHO HAS THE HUSBAND."

But you, brethren, like Isaac, are children born in fulfilment of a promise. Yet just as, at that time, the child born in the common course of nature persecuted the one whose birth was due to the power of the Spirit, so it is now.

Gal 4:30 But what says the Scripture? "SEND AWAY THE SLAVE-GIRL AND HER SON, FOR NEVER SHALL THE SLAVE-GIRL'S SON SHARE THE INHERITANCE WITH THE SON OF THE FREE WOMAN."

Therefore, brethren, since we are not the children of a slave-girl, but of the free woman-- Christ having made us gloriously free--stand fast and do not again be hampered with the yoke of slavery.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/12 11:08

Quote:
-----I would hold that making unfounded charges is contrary to Christian charity and while people can do it sometimes because they are partly blinded by zeal for their system, it should never be done willfully.

I knew there had to be some way to make this type of 'perfection' work. When I hear 'perfection' I am not looking to read the fine print. I'm looking for a straight forward Christlikeness that makes no excuses to justify any kind of acting out. ;-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/12/12 11:31

Philogos wrote:

and severed from Christ?

Galatians 5:4 You have been severed from Christ, you who are seeking to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace . (NASB)

Re: anupokritos - posted by savannah, on: 2008/12/12 12:00

Rom 12:9,10 Let love be without hypocrisy . Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good. In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned one to another; in honour preferring one another;

2 Cor. 6:3-10 Give ye no occasion of offence to any one in any thing, that there may be no reproach on our ministry. But we, in all things, would show ourselves to be the ministers of God, in much endurance, in afflictions, in necessity, in distresses, in scourgings, in imprisonments, in tumults, in toil, in watching, in fasting; by purity, by knowledge, by long suffering, by benignity, by the Holy Spirit, by love unfeigned ,by the speaking of truth, by the energy of God, by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left; amid honor and dishonor, amid praise and contumely; as deceivers, and yet true; as not known, and yet we are well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastised, yet not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as indigent, yet enriching many; as possessing nothing, yet having all things.

1 Pet. 1:22-25 Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren: see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently, Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.

For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass: the grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away. But the word of the Lord endureth for ever: and this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you.

1 Tim. 1:5 Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned .

Eph 6:24 Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

anupokritos

Thayer Definition:

1) unfeigned, undisguised, sincere

Part of Speech: adjective

A love from God that is sincere and without dissimulation(hypocrisy), unfeigned or unpretended.

May His children who are born of His Spirit practice this God-given love.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2008/12/12 12:05

Are you saying that Finney held to a justification that was by faith plus works?

So far as I have understood him, he did. He might have insisted he believed one was saved by faith and faith alone, but so far as I have seen, Finney denied the doctrine of original sin, imputed righteousness, and penal substitution view of the atonement. I stand to be corrected, should, it be shown otherwise. Doctrinally, as far as I'm concerned, should you deny these three you are building a works-based salvation scheme, even if you insist you are "justified by faith," especially in regard to imputed righteousness and a substitutionary view of atonement. And I say that as a firm Arminian with Wesleyan roots :-)

And regarding the charges of Calvinism, some only charge Arminians with a works based understanding of salvation because they seem to believe that Arminians think of faith as a work one does to get saved (based off their monogistic view that regeneration precedes faith in the *ordo salutis*). Any Arminian with a true understanding of faith, however, does not understand it to be a work they do to get saved. I have found, generally speaking, those with a Finney/Moral Government view of things tend to look at faith as a work.

Re: , on: 2008/12/12 12:10

"When you say with out being perfect do you mean with out having to worry about being obedience?" Bob

>>>No sir, this means I will pursue the will of God in the bearing of fruit in Christ without worrying about never making mistakes along the way. Obedience as a 'means only' will not attain the fruit of works and Christ like attitude. Great men of God have stumbled along the way to serving the Lord faithfully.

If I tell my little girl to always wash her hands after using the restroom, and she either forgets to or is simply too excited about recess and runs out, she and I are still in relationship. Although 95% of the time she is obedient and her lack of obedience wasn't malicious or blatant, then these things I do not stew and fret over. . I believe I know her and she knows me. She has a heart of gold and wants to please me. I love her and want her to grow in the love of God. Knowing this, our relationship in love trumps some imperfections along the way. I won't worry about if she washes her hands every time or if she brushes her teeth for exactly four minutes, or doesn't use fluoride rinse every night. Sometimes I ask and get an honest answer, and sometimes I make her go back and rinse, and she does.. no problem. Her fruit bearing is a process and I doubt she will produce that fruit if my love for her is exclusively legalistic in regimented discipline. Even if my teenager blatantly disobeyed, discipline and correction are in order. But if I threaten to condemn her and disown her the next time she disobeys my law, our relationship in love will be strained by legalistic obligation. I'm not their drill Sergeant, I'm their Father. In relationship, obedience is wrapped up in love. In the strict obligation and adherence to commands, obedience is wrapped up in duress and lack of intimacy. Christ took the duress of being perfect in obedience from me by taking away the sin I may do in my continuing and progressive relationship with Him, so I can serve Him faithfully bearing fruit without the 'weight of perfection' hanging over my head.

In Christ, I have a heart that wants to please God. If my focus is on helping others, ceaselessly praying, meditating in the Word with my work boots on and my work boots off, I trust that in my willingness and desire to please Him in works and obedience, the Holy Spirit will do His work in regeneration. And I will be strengthened to obey without getting stuck in the mud of legalism. I'm not the same guy I was ten years ago.... this because of the regenerative work of the Holy Spirit... not because I fret over always being obedient. Things that were gut wrenchingly hard for me to turn away from in obedience no longer have that same hold. I caved into this thing now and again, along the path to overcoming it. But I didn't overcome right away and it did not come from condemnation if I failed.

I found that when stuck in legalism, my work boots don't move for the Lord. I believe Christ took the sting and stain of sin, in part, so we can focus on relationship in love and not righteousness through strict obedience to the law. In relationship I want to serve the Lord because I love Him not out of obligation or the desire to just "be righteous". In this freedom, I can focus on relationship and a perfecting work of the Holy Spirit as a process of this relationship... not a process of 'chalk board' do's and don'ts. Paul puts it this way:

Romans 7

An Illustration From Marriage

"But if her husband dies, she is released from that law and is not an adulteress, even though she marries another man.

4So, my brothers, you also died to the law through the body of Christ, that you might belong to another, to him who was raised from the dead, in order that we might bear fruit to God."

>>>> We died to the law as a means of righteousness so we can move forward in relationship and good works..... bearing fruit. The sting of condemnation that the law brought was removed. We are no longer bound by the law as an example through marriage. But by faith, we died to the law and belong to Christ, our promise of righteousness. This relieves me of works related relationship so I can have an intimacy with Him that helps me know His will and move forward in the process of regeneration into His likeness.... without the heavy yoke of legalistic perfection and condemnation.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/12/12 12:37

Mt 7:1 Judge not, that ye be not judged.

Mt 7:2 For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

Mt 7:3 And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Ro 14:4 Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand.

I am not saying that Bob is right in all his beliefs but I must say that we are supposed to be in Christian love and in the right attitude toward all people. I have been more grieved at the accusations and judgments made toward Bob than at any time I have been on this site. I think he has been gracious considering all the judgment that he has endured.

I have also prayed over the years not to be judgmental toward others. I must say that I am praying for you Bob and the areas in your life and teachings that God's grace will be abounding toward you. I hope that you will learn from this and I pray God will help you not to become bitter toward your accusers. I hope that you will consider that we all need more grace.

The first thread you started that you were asking feedback on, I noticed that you were accepting other points of views. The point 9 in your document is where everything went haywire. I would like to make a comment on that point. I hope you will consider that the point is taken by others to mean that one sin will cause us to lose our salvation. I hope that you don't believe this. I also notice that you put willful in front of the word sin, you also stated at what point. I believe point no. 9 needs reworked. The reason why many feel this is dangerous is because there is no grace in point 9. We can't keep ourselves from sin, only by the grace of God. The bible teaches that if we sin we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. After we are saved if we backslide and start sinning again then we lose our fellowship with God and if we continue in sin then we are in danger of being apostate but a true child of God should grieve when he sins and also desire to confess and be cleansed of sin, therefore coming back in fellowship with God.

Jesus is the only one, who can, by his grace free us from sin. I believe you stated that you have fallen back into sin and now are enjoying a greater freedom over the sins that ensnared you. I believe that because one is a true child of God they won't be able to live in sin but in their desperation of seeking God they will come to know the truth that will make them free. I believe that if you were a child of God before you fell into sin then that is the very reason why you will persevere to overcome the sins that were so easily ensnaring you. Christ is our victory!

It is amazing to me how so many on here don't agree on many doctrinal points but have decided to be Bob's accuser. The last time I read where the accuser of the brethren was the devil, I decided then that I will not work for Him. Jesus didn't come to condemn the world but to save the world and I believe we all could treat our brethren better than we do. I believe we all need to grow in grace and knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Lord help me to treat others the way I want to be treated by them.

If you would like to throw some stones at me go ahead, we could give Bob a rest, I believe he needs one. I am by no means too good to have them thrown at me. I need more grace everyday and I need to learn more on how to love with the love of Christ those that I disagree with.

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2008/12/12 12:38

Bob,

Just to clarify, did you pray and ask the Lord to show you the truth of the matter?

I am praying for you also.

EDIT: I am also praying for the moderators - as well as everyone else here on SI. So much divisiveness. The evil one would have us all divided to the point of wandering aimlessly, lost in the woods - weak and crippled - with no power or hope.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/12 13:11

Quote:

-----The point 9 in your document is where everything went haywire. I would like to make a comment on that point. I hope you will consider that the point is taken by others to mean that one sin will cause us to lose our salvation. I hope that you don't believe this. I also notice that you put willful in front of the word sin, you also stated at what point. I believe point no. 9 needs reworked. The reason why many feel this is dangerous is because there is no grace in point 9. We can't keep ourselves from sin, only by the grace of God. The bible teaches that if we sin we have a advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. After we are saved if we backslide and start sinning again then we lose our fellowship with God and if we continue in sin then we are in danger of being apostate but a true child of God should grieve when he sins and also desire to confess and be cleansed of sin, therefore coming back in fellowship with God.

Jesus is the only one, who can, by his grace free us from sin. I believe you stated that you have fallen back into sin and now are enjoying a greater freedom over the sins that ensnared you. I believe that because one is a true child of God they won't be able to live in sin but in their desperation of seeking God they will come to know the truth that will make them free. I believe that if you were a child of God before you fell into sin then that is the very reason why you will persevere to overcome the sins that were so easily ensnaring you. Christ is our victory!

It is amazing to me how so many on here don't agree on many doctrinal points but have decided to be Bob's accuser.

I have not read what everyone has written to Bob, but my primary issue is point 9 and his rejection of Penal Substitution. I'm willing to keep discussing it. :-)

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/12 13:56

Quote:

-----It is amazing to me how so many on here don't agree on many doctrinal points but have decided to be Bob's accuser. The last time I read where the accuser of the brethren was the devil, I decided then that I will not work for Him. Jesus didn't come to condemn the world but to save the world

No one is being accused (not in the Satanic sense, anyhow), and no one has been condemned. An ungainly demeanor was detected and brought to a person's attention. There is nothing out of the ordinary in offering this sort of correction to a saint. It only becomes "accusation" and "condemnation" when pride gets in the way and emotions start to flare. One of the delicate balances here is to get a message of correction across with meekness, gentleness, love and humility. I know I often fail grievously at this, for it is truly an art, aided by the wisdom of God.

I hold no animosity toward Bob; I welcome him to SermonIndex and embrace him as a brother just as I embrace you. I realize I am not perfect, and if I've been unduly abrasive, callous or condescending, I do repent and ask forgiveness. Only time will tell how all this will end up.

I wish him a long and profitable stay here in the forums, and in a spirit of grace and truth.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/12 15:10

Quote:
-----Galatians 5:4 You have been severed from Christ, you who are seeking to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace. (NASB)

Ah well, if you WILL use these peculiar translations... :-)

This is the wonderful verb katargeO and should never have been translated as 'severed'. Check out
(<http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongsg2673&tKJV>) Strong's G2673 - katargeō

ergeO would mean 'to work'

if you put an 'a' in front of it it means 'to not work'

if you put the prefix 'kata' in front of it you add the sense of 'down' to the bottom or utterly.

hence katargeO is to render something utterly non-working, you might say 'neutralize'. Tracing the meaning of this word through the scriptures will give wonderful insights into all kinds of truths.

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2008/12/12 15:22

Ron,
Thank you for showing me how this works - and for the assignment! :-)

I just love learning new things.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 15:38

HeartSong
>>>Just to clarify, did you pray and ask the Lord to show you the truth of the matter?

If I remember right I started praying and asking the Lord how to respond to the charges that were being made after it appeared they were not going to back down.

As far as me praying and asking God if I had a haughty, proud, or arrogant spirit, no I didn't pray and ask the Lord that.

I am very clear that I am not operating under that kind of a spirit at all.

I did re-read what I posted in a prayerful manner before the Lord with a heart to correct any thing no matter how small that I had done wrong.

These two moderators made a judgment call on a subjective area where they can't see my heart and perhaps they felt if they did what I did it would be from a haughty, proud, or arrogant spirit.

From what I can see the charges stem from nit picky things like me making a statement about the way I prefer to indent quotes, from my sharing with Robert a bit from my background of being a street person, and for me making statements like I take a Wesleyan position.

But I have grown to expect these kinds of things from Calvinists. If they think their heart is deceitful and desperately wicked according to Jer 17:9 you can't really blame them for expecting every one else's heart to be the same way and even more so toward those that profess to have a pure heart by the grace of God.

For me it is just another chance to let Jesus shine and to display a Christ like spirit and not return charge for charge. And not only to do it on the outside but to have the love of God reigning and ruling in my heart.

While clearly I am unimpressed I can say though out the whole ordeal by the grace of God I had no malice or ill will toward either of them at all.

By the grace of God I have been made thick skinned.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 15:40

RobertW

>>>and his rejection of Penal Substitution

Could you quote where I stated I rejected Penal Substitution please.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 15:56

rbanks:

>>>I must say that I am praying for you Bob and the areas in your life and teachings that God's grace will be abounding toward you. I hope that you will learn from this and I pray God will help you not to become bitter toward your accusers. I hope that you will consider that we all need more grace.

Thank you. Well I am some what taken back but I am thankful I can report abounding grace for this tiny trial if I could even call it one.

I read a lot of Martyrs Mirror so is water off a ducks back.

At one time in my life I was very easily offended and it was an area in my life that I didn't apply myself and find the grace I needed in that area and it ending up being an area where I backslide and when out into the world. When God by his grace rescued me he showed me this was the a weakness that must go.

By God's grace I can say he has turned this from a weakness to a strength and I praise him for it.

Thank you for your concern and the Lord bless you also!

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2008/12/12 15:59

Quote:

-----By the grace of God I have been made thick skinned.

Oh, now you made me laugh. You and Krispy should get along really well.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 16:07

savannah:

Toplady was not long in his grave when John Wesley publicly asserted that "the account published concerning Mr. Toplady's death was a gross imposition on the public; that he had died in black despair, uttering the most horrible blasphemies, and that none of his friends were permitted to see him." Sir Richard Hill, a friend of Mr. Toplady's, and also the Rev. J. Gawkrödger publicly wrote John Wesley and accused him of vilifying the ashes and traducing the memory of the late Mr. Augustus Toplady," and affirming that "many respectable witnesses could testify that Mr. Toplady departed this life in the full triumph of faith." (Vol. I, pp. 121-128).

The report continues that a pious dissenting minister expostulated in a pamphlet with Mr. Wesley on his unjust assertion in the following words:

"Mr. Wesley and his confederates, to whom this letter is addressed, did not only persecute the late Mr. Toplady during his life, but even sprinkled his death-bed with abominable falsehood. It was given out, in most of Mr. Wesley's societies, both far and near, that the worthy man had recanted and disowned the doctrines of sovereign grace, which obliged him, though struggling with death, to appear in the pulpit emaciated as he was, and openly avow the doctrines he had preached, as the sole support of his departing spirit. Wretched must that cause be, which has need to be supported by such unmanly shifts, and seek for shelter under such disingenuous subterfuges. O! Mr. Wesley, answer for this conduct at the bar of the Supreme. Judge yourself and you shall not be judged. Dare you also to persuade your followers that Mr. Toplady actually died in despair! Fie upon sanctified slander! Fie! Fie!"

Have you checked both sides of this story to see if it was true or are you just believe it from the testimony of one side?

Pro 14:15 The simple believeth every word: but the prudent man looketh well to his going.
Pro 18:13 He that answereth a matter before he heareth it, it is folly and shame unto him.
Pro 18:17 He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him.

After reading the supposed attacks on Fletcher I would be careful to check both sides on any of these reports.

Note: < div "padding:0 0 0 30px;text-align:left;">text< /div> works well.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/12 16:11

HeartSong:

>>>By the grace of God I have been made thick skinned.

If you prefer me to state it another way I can do that.

By the grace of God when I suffer for doing well I am able to take it patiently as I know this is acceptable with God.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/12/12 16:29

Quote:

-----These two moderators made a judgment call on a subjective area where they can't see my heart and perhaps they felt if they did what I did it would be from a haughty, proud, or arrogant spirit.

From what I can see the charges stem from nit picky things like me making a statement about the way I prefer to indent quotes, from my sharing with Robert a bit from my background of being a street person, and for me making statements like I take a Wesleyan position.

But I have grown to expect these kinds of things from Calvinists.

Perhaps we were not blunt enough.

Bob, use the quote function.

Read the helpful link posted back a number of pages. It is practically impossible to figure out who has said what because you think you can waltz in here and do as you please. Enough.

Your attitude and conduct is haughty, proud, evasive, defensive, carnal and soulish. These are not insinuations of inferences nor mere observances, they are fact.

Your attitude screams "I will do as I please".

No, you will not. Not here.

It is a rebuke. Back off or move on.

To others ...

Enough of the Calvinism\Arminianism torture test people. It's neither, it's 'both' here, it has always been. For the sake of others and trust that we have been hearing from them. Can we please just stop for a season?

At least long enough for those entrusted with trying to mitigate all this to pray and try and craft up some kind of guiding principles for everyone to abide by?

It has gotten way, way out of hand.

This thread will be locked.