



Scriptures and Doctrine :: My spirit shall not always strive with man

My spirit shall not always strive with man - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2012/11/6 9:15

Gen 6:3 And the LORD said , My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh : yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.

I am trying to get a better understanding of the term used in the New Testament called "flesh". To understand what Paul means by "Flesh" I reckon we must go back to the old Testament. For an example the verse above flesh in Gen 6 :3.

"My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh"

This to me would describe the condition of man in that it opposes God.

Flesh in my understanding would be 'humanity in the state of opposition to God' is simply the word, which is opposite to 'Spirit', which means the divine power. The word Flesh points not to humanity as a physical body, but to humanity as a enemy in that it fights and struggles against God.

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man - posted by Sree (), on: 2012/11/6 10:17

Quote:

The word Flesh points not to humanity as a physical body, but to humanity as a enemy in that it fights and struggles against God.

Yes Flesh referred by Paul in new covenant does not represent the physical body. It represents the Adamic nature in us that opposes to God. We still live in the same flesh even after we are born again. Flesh will be with us till we die. It is a selfish ambition that is against doing the will of God. Jesus came to earth in the likeness of human flesh, hence he too had his own will but he decided not to do it and to be obedient to the will of God. This is our calling today as a Christian as well. Thats why Paul says,

Romans 8 -12:-

Therefore, brothers and sisters, we have an obligation—but it is not to the flesh, to live according to it. For if you live according to the flesh, you will die; but if by the Spirit you put to death the misdeeds of the body, you will live.

We still live in this flesh but we are not obliged to obey it because Jesus has nailed the certificate of debt that we had with flesh to the cross. We can still choose to obey flesh and go into bondage. It is a battle, but the battle is not the same as it was before because we have the spirit now who strengthens us if we are willing to obey him.

If we still live pleasing our flesh but claim that we are dead with Christ to the world, then we are liars, the truth is not in us. There are many who claim to have died but their testimony will tell us whether they are really dead to flesh or not. God cannot be fooled.

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2012/11/6 11:24

Okay I am a bit confused.

Quote: If we still live pleasing our flesh but claim that we are dead with Christ to the world, then we are liars, the truth is not in us. There are many who claim to have died but their testimony will tell us whether they are really dead to flesh or not. God cannot be fooled.

I can see in the new testament there are different types of people for example the Galatians they began in the Spirit but they tried to be made perfect by the flesh Gal 3:3

I guess the Galatians one is easy enough to understand as they were trying to be "perfected" by the flesh rather than the Spirit. Their testimony was that they started in the Spirit but were tricked and went back to the Flesh to seek after perfection.

Then you have the Corinthians And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. 1 Cor 3:1. The problem that there was carnality remaining "envying, and strife, and divisions" 1 Cor 3:3

What about the Corinthians? Paul called them "babes in Christ" so we know they were in Christ, but their testimony would say they were not dead to the flesh.

What I mean, "envying" is the flesh, rather than us doing something to please the flesh. Envy is something that comes from the inside of man rather than something he does to please the flesh like taking 30 minutes extra in the bed.

Envy is the Adamic nature can they really claim to be dead in Christ

Do you get where I am coming from or should I try and explain myself better?

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 11:44

by murrcolr on 2012/11/6 6:15:27

Flesh in my understanding would be 'humanity in the state of opposition to God' is simply the word, which is opposite to 'Spirit', which means the divine power. The word Flesh points not to humanity as a physical body, but to humanity as an enemy in that it fights and struggles against God.

Would that include Jesus, as well?

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/6 11:50

Quote: Would that include Jesus, as well?

No, he wasn't opposed to God in the way we are opposed to God because he didn't have sin.

Re: 'The Flesh' - posted by TheophilusMD (), on: 2012/11/6 13:02

"The Flesh" was discussed at length by some who are members of SI in another forum.

You can check it out here: http://ncw.biblebase.com/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id=158&forum=21&viewmode=flat&order=ASC&start=0

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 13:33

by murrcolr on 2012/11/6 8:50:56

Quote: Would that include Jesus, as well?

No, he wasn't opposed to God in the way we are opposed to God because he didn't have sin.

By that, you are saying Jesus had no warfare with His flesh. Do you mean to be saying that?

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/6 14:06

Quote: By that, you are saying Jesus had no warfare with His flesh. Do you mean to be saying that?

Now you're going down a different route your speaking about Jesus warfare with his own flesh meaning to me in his physical body, muscle and bones and skin.

What I am speaking about is the enmity that is in all men against God.

Did Jesus have enmity against God in his body?

Do we have Sin in our physical body, muscle and bones and skin?

TheophilusMD thanks for link I will check it out?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2012/11/6 14:33

Quote:

----- Would that include Jesus, as well?

No, he wasn't opposed to God in the way we are opposed to God because he didn't have sin.

Absolute lie against the word of God. Because people have such wrong definition of Flesh they come against the scripture. The presence of Flesh is not sinful, the obedience to flesh is sinful. Jesus had the flesh but did not obey it.

The scripture is clear when it says that Jesus was tempted in all things like any Christian would be. Just like we have flesh Jesus came in likeness of Human Flesh. He was tempted to go against God. That is why he said 'I am not here to do my own will but the will of my father'. So it is clear that he had a will that might not have been same as his father.

See if we take the human aspect of Jesus out (which is done now by 99% Churches), we have no Gospel. How can a person who was not tempted like me say that follow me? I will tell I cannot follow you because you have special skills that I do not have. It is like following an aeroplane, how can I follow it, as I do not have the ability to fly.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 14:42

by murrcolr on 2012/11/6 11:06:26

Quote: By that, you are saying Jesus had no warfare with His flesh. Do you mean to be saying that?

Now you're going down a different route your speaking about Jesus warfare with his own flesh meaning to me in his physical body, muscle and bones and skin.

What I am speaking about is the enmity that is in all men against God.

OK. Too be sure, you are saying Jesus was not ever tempted ___ "In all ways as man but without sin" ___ Isn't that right?

Sree, beat me to it . . .))

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/6 14:49

We have an interesting clue concerning 'the flesh' and 'the Spirit' in Galatians,

But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. (Galatians 4:29)

This passage calls our attention to an important Old Testament story and it is that of Abraham and Sarah. God had given Abraham a promise that he would have a son. Abraham and Sarah had gone down into Egypt and picked up Hagar. When the promise seemed to be delayed, Sarah suggested to Abraham that he take Hagar and have a child through her. So long as Abraham continued to wait for the true promise he was moving in faith, but at the moment he hearkened to a different revelation than what he was told by God, he brought forth a child 'of the flesh'. Ishmael was born 'after the flesh' and Isaac was born 'after the Spirit'.

We have then an important passage in an obscure minor prophet;

For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith. (Hab. 2:3-4).

Notice that God's promises are for 'an appointed time' and though they appear to tarry, we must wait for them. Notice how the writer to the Hebrews arranges these thoughts, For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the just shall live by faith: but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him. (Hebrews 10:37-38) This is a quote taken from Hab. 2:3-4)

God gave Abraham revelation of His will and it was up to Abraham to continue in that revelation. He did not. He obeyed a different revelation that was coming from his wife and ultimately from the enemy. Abraham had to decide whose revelation he was going to move in. Here we have our definition of 'the flesh' as Abraham (through Hagar) gave birth to the Ishmaelites.

Contextually this passage is in Paul's mind when he writes Galatians 5. The works of the flesh are the direct consequence of a person refusing to wait on God's provision. Hagar was 'provision' picked up in Egypt that is a type of this evil world. A passage comes to mind: But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof. (Romans 13:14) This is what it is to walk in 'the flesh'.

What happened? He leaned to his own understanding and attempted to fulfill a promise God had already set up to be fulfilled at an appointed time. Likewise, God has given human beings many natural desires. They are God-given and we must fulfill them- not in Egypt, but according to the boundaries and provision He gives. If the provision seems to tarry, we must wait for it. Why? Because the Just shall live by faith. To take matters into our own hands will be to seek fulfillment 'in the flesh' (adultery, fornication, uncleanness, etc.). Blessings.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/6 15:11

Quote:

-----By that, you are saying Jesus had no warfare with His flesh. Do you mean to be saying that?

I hope to take this up a bit by coupling these comments with my last post. When we use the term 'flesh' it is the Greek word *sarx* and comes down in 2 primary forms; fallen and unfallen. A human being with a sin nature is tempted from 'within'. They are in Adam and under his head. So this person has effectively the flesh+sin or a sinful human nature. Jesus had only the flesh and did not have a sin nature. He was tempted (tested) from 'without'. This is important to keep clear.

Adam had no sinful nature in the beginning. Jesus, the last Adam, had no sinful nature either. They both had a human body with all of its natural desires (food, rest, leadership, procreation, etc.). They were human. When Adam fell in the Garden, Sin entered the human race and corrupted man's once good nature. Jesus told the leaders, "You are of your father the Devil and the lusts of your father you will do." People don't need the Devil to tempt them from without, he can influence

ce them from within. They didn't need to be taught how to lie and cheat and steal. Ephesians 2 explains this in brief.

Jesus was tempted from 'without'. When He was in the wilderness He faced the Devil. Why? Because He had no inward compulsion to rebel against His Father. Notice how this plays out. Jesus knew His fast was for a set time. He knew He was the Son of God and was capable of doing just about anything He wanted to. Satan tried to tempt Him to take matters into His own hands and use the powers available to Him rather than wait on God. He refused to do anything 'in the flesh'; that is to say, He refused to move in any other revelation than every Word that is proceeding from the mouth of God. Did He have a natural desire to eat? Absolutely. Just like Abraham had a desire to have a son. The difference is that Jesus waited on the Father and Abraham hearkened to Sarah.

Same with Adam. God had already determined to make man in His image and likeness. When God seemed to tarry, Satan came along and tempted Adam to take matters into His own hands. This is why we are told to 'wait upon the Lord'. Adam sought to fulfill God's plans in a forbidden way and plunged the human race into total ruin. All of these issues tie together. God has a plan and means of fulfilling His plan. He knows our natural needs and has a means of fulfilling them. Satan comes along and attempts to lure us to fulfill a good desire in a sinful way. Simply put, Satan wants human beings living by every word that proceeds from his mouth rather than God's mouth. Blessings.

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2012/11/6 15:14

Quote: Absolute lie against the word of God. Because people have such wrong definition of Flesh they come against the scripture. The presence of Flesh is not sinful, the obedience to flesh is sinful. Jesus had the flesh but did not obey it.

Hold on, hold on remember what you said.

Quote: Yes Flesh referred by Paul in new covenant does not represent the physical body.

And I am not speaking about a physical body either.

I felt Coref questions were loaded so I wrote a post to clear it up.

Quote: Now you're going down a different route your speaking about Jesus warfare with his own flesh meaning to me it is physical body, muscle and bones and skin.

Re: - posted by Coref, on: 2012/11/6 15:53

Reply To This Post |

Quote:

By that, you are saying Jesus had no warfare with His flesh. Do you mean to be saying that?

Quote:

-----Adam sought to fulfill God's plans in a forbidden way and plunged the human race into total ruin.

Gotta have more than that, Robert. What is more, it doesn't have to be the case for why he transgressed.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/6 15:59

Quote: I hope to take this up a bit by coupling these comments with my last post. When we use the term 'flesh' it is the Greek word sarx and comes down in 2 primary forms; fallen and unfallen. A human being with a sin nature is tempted from 'within'. They are in Adam and under his head. So this person has effectively the flesh+sin or a sinful human nature. Jesus had only the flesh and did not have a sin nature. He was tempted (tested) from 'without'. This is important to keep clear.

Thanks for clearing it up...

But when you say flesh we can end up coming up thinking about the physical body, legs, arms, muscles and bones. The body legs, arms, muscles and bones can get tired, it can get hungry but it can't be envious.

For example it can commit adultery but only because it's being obedient to what your will wants to do. Likewise your body can sit down and read the bible but only because you will wants to..

So the body, legs, arms, muscles and bones to me are neutral.

While the core of man or the soul of man his will, mind and emotions are the driving force behind the choices we make and not the body.

Does that make sense?

Re: RoberW - posted by Sree (), on: 2012/11/6 16:08

I appreciate your post. I had a similar view as yours about the flesh nature of Jesus, that he did not have the inner temptation that I am going through. When I presented this view in my Church for discussion no one agreed with it. I tried to prove them using the temptations of Jesus in wilderness. Though it sounds logical, it is still against scripture (according to them). I then took it to Zac Poonen himself and I got an answer from another elder who answered on behalf of Zac saying Jesus was tempted like me both from inside and outside. I still don't know why Brother Zac did not answer me.

Here are my questions on this theory of yours, what happens if a man is born again? Is he still tempted from inside? I believe I am born again and I still have this inner temptation. Bible says Jesus was tempted in ALL things like his brother (born again believers). ALL should include both inside and outside.

Here is my final take on this:-

Bible also says that Jesus came in the LIKENESS of Human flesh. It does not say that he came in Human flesh. That is why if you look into my previous posts I always use this word likeness of human flesh. Which means there is a difference, obviously because he was not born of the seed of Adam. But it is not left for me to analyze and figure out what kind of likeness it was. This is a mystery and Bible keeps it so. If Paul or Jesus himself wanted to explain it, they would have explained it plainly. There is a reason for not explaining it and we should respect it and not look too deep into it and coming up with logical conclusions.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/6 16:59

Quote: Here are my questions on this theory of yours, what happens if a man is born again? Is he still tempted from inside? I believe I am born again and I still have this inner temptation. Bible says Jesus was tempted in ALL things like his brother (born again believers). ALL should include both inside and outside.

Okay why I am trying to get a better understanding of the flesh is for this very reason. After a time of fasting and prayer God made me aware that in the very deepest part of my being Sin remains. In a nut shell without going into it too much is that there Self and there's Sin...

You see I get confused when Christian's claim to be dead to sin because as you say we still have the "inner temptation" if we are truly dead to sin that inner temptation would no longer be there and therefore not hinder us...

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/6 17:24

Hi murrcolr,

Quote:
-----But when you say flesh we can end up coming up thinking about the physical body, legs, arms, muscles and bones. The body legs, arms, muscles and bones can get tired, it can get hungry but it can't be envious.

For example it can commit adultery but only because it's being obedient to what your will wants to do. Likewise your body can sit down and read the bible but only because you will wants to..

So the body, legs, arms, muscles and bones to me are neutral.

While the core of man or the soul of man his will, mind and emotions are the driving force behind the choices we make and not the body.

Does that make sense?

I'm trying to think as biblically in answering the question as possible, so I want to be careful not to impose any modern psychological ideas to the mix. When I think about the flesh for a believer that is truly 'In Christ', I think of a person dealing with their 'humanness' in a fallen world. This is one aspect of the subject.

I see second aspect in that there is a distinction between a spiritual body and a natural body.

It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body. (1 Cor. 15:44)

This passage is difficult to translate, but I think Paul is pointing our attention to the fact that a day is coming when our bodies will be transformed so that they no longer have some of the natural desires and characteristics necessary for God's purposes on earth. The new body will be suited for Heaven, where there is neither marriage nor giving in marriage, etc.

So I don't see the body as sinful flesh as do the dualists. I see the body as natural. If a person feeds their natural desires too much they will become unnatural lusts and then a whole series of sinful possibilities come into play. Keep this in mind as we move to the next point.

But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. (James 1:14-15)

The greater the lust the more vulnerable the person. Since the body is neutral it cannot discriminate between what is good and evil when it comes to fulfilling desires. What sets the one apart from the other is our knowledge of God's will. He has set up boundaries so that we know what is acceptable and perfect. If we trespass into forbidden areas then we commit sin. This was true in the Garden. Every tree was good for food, but one tree was off limits.

The temptation was simple, For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. (Genesis 3:5) Here gods is the Hebrew word Elohiym and is often translated as God. God had given Adam and Eve a desire for knowledge just as He given them one for food, procreation, rulership, etc. The desire for knowledge is a powerful driving force in human beings even today. The Internet itself is proof of this. The question is, what knowledge do we desire? Even sinners have inquiring minds that want to know. Satan tempted Eve with forbidden knowledge and experience. Some have called it 'illicit experience'. The desire for knowledge is good and natural, but when we are tempted with illicit knowledge and experience we have to draw the line.

Eve did not do that and disobeyed the commandment. Yet we have an interesting statement made by Paul; Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. (Romans 5:12) Notice that God held Adam responsible, one MAN (anthropos). Why? Because Eve's sin was due to beguilement so she was in the transgression, but Adam sinned with eyes-wide-open.

This leads us to our next desire that Satan exploited; the desire for companionship. It is a good and natural desire, but Adam was faced with choosing either God or the woman and chose the woman. It is my view that he knew she could never come up to an unfallen state, but he could take of the tree and join her in her fallen condition. It is all speculation at this

s point, I think, but how often have we seen a person turn from Christ for a relationship (companionship)? I have see countless young people and even widows meet a man or a woman that was in sin and they waxed wanton against Christ. I think this is what Adam probably did. The fear of loss and loneliness may well have been in view. God said it was not good for man to be alone. Again, if he would have waited on God - God may well have given him a replacement. But he hearkened to the voice of his wife instead of what God plainly said. That deadened sense of loss is a powerful one. Nobody wants to lose something they love dearly. Sense of loss has driven many people to do unreasonable things.

He couldn't blame his 'will' or some other psychological phenomena, it was Adam. He blamed the wife and she blamed the Serpent, but Adam is where the buck stopped. God told him to his face and he disobeyed God. At this point reasons are immaterial. Excuses are indefensible. Blessings.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/6 18:26

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----Gotta have more than that, Robert. What is more, it doesn't have to be the case for why he transgressed.

I think it would be more accurate for me to have said it was Eve's primary motivator. But as with any temptation, there is often secondary motivators that make the temptation all the more alluring. This is why a lot of times when we ask a person 'why' they did something they answer, "I don't know, it was just sin." I think the enemy plays on man's desires like a piano player and sometimes his temptations strike a chord (multiple keys as it were) to pull it off. But we have to keep God's command before our eyes and believe Him in faith (Ephesians 6:16). Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 2:53

by RobertW on 2012/11/6 15:26:59

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----Gotta have more than that, Robert. What is more, it doesn't have to be the case for why he transgressed.

I think it would be more accurate for me to have said it was Eve's primary motivator. But as with any temptation, there is often secondary motivators that make the temptation all the more alluring. This is why a lot of times when we ask a person 'why' they did something they answer, "I don't know, it was just sin." I think the enemy plays on man's desires like a piano player and sometimes his temptations strike a chord (multiple keys as it were) to pull it off. But we have to keep God's command before our eyes and believe Him in faith (Ephesians 6:16). Blessings.

G'mornin' my Brother!

How 'bout considering Adam and Jesus were both subjected to vanity. Why did one fail the test while the other passed it ?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 3:14

by RobertW on 2012/11/6 14:24:32

Hi murrcolr,

The greater the lust the more vulnerable the person. Since the body is neutral it cannot discriminate between what is good and evil when it comes to fulfilling desires. What sets the one apart from the other is our knowledge of God's will.

God's will?__or the test of allegiance and love TO Him? __Intimacy here that mere knowledge of God's will now takes on a deeper dimension.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/7 7:19

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----Why did one fail the test while the other passed it?

I think this answer is found in Hebrews 1:9; Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

There is an important component that we have to examine in answer to this question. Adam and the last Adam (Jesus) had a relationship with God the Father that had to be protected. Adam lived in a sanctuary where God walked with him in the cool of the day. Jesus WAS the Sanctuary as God was in Christ continually. This is two sanctuaries. Isaiah 66 tells us that one of the qualifications for being a place of God's rest is that one must TREMBLE at His word. How did Adam do?

Before God created man He had already determined to prepare a place where He and man could fellowship together face to face and eye to eye. God placed Adam in the prepared place and charged him to tend it and keep it. Our words here mean literally to work it and to guard it. Adam was to 'hedge in' this sanctuary to protect it from forces that would seek to destroy the sanctity of such a place that it might be a place of God's rest. God could be at home in fellowship with Adam so long as he protected this sanctuary. Adam failed, sin entered and defiled, God left and Satan reigned. This is the story of Adam and later Israel would repeat it. God made a sanctuary in the wilderness as a place of rest where He could dwell among His people as King. Israel was to hedge this place in from forces that would threaten the sanctity of it. Israel failed, sin defiled, God left and Satan reigned. Jesus Christ the Last Adam came as the embodiment of sanctuary. He hedged Himself in from forces that would defile, entertained the presence of God, lived holy and separate from Sin, and conquered death, hell and the grave. He loved the Father and protected the relationship from forces that would defile. He trembled at God's word. he lived by every word that proceeded from the Father's mouth.

A lot of people claim to 'love' God, but when it comes to loving His precepts they fall short. People make decisions about things and don't even bother to inquire of the LORD. Jesus would not as much as turn a stone into bread for His own benefit without inquiring of the Father. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. (John 5:19)

Jesus loved to do the Father's will. It was His necessary food. This is how His love was expressed. There was no shallowness or pretense in His love. On the contrary, I think shallowness and pretense of love is a tremendous problem in our times. Peoples words and actions do not match. Hebrews 1:9 could have easily said, "Thou hast loved God and hated Satan", but that is not what it said. Jesus walked in agreement with His Father's righteous and holy attributes. They saw all things eye to eye. He loved His Father, not in spite of the fact that He is righteous and holy, but He Himself loved and hated the very same things as His Father. Adam could never say that. Just some thoughts. Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 12:28

Bac'atcha Robert!!

by RobertW on 2012/11/7 4:19:44

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----Why did one fail the test while the other passed it?

Quote:

-----I think this answer is found in Hebrews 1:9; Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath appointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

If we say innocence is without knowledge as we speak of Adam being, where is the accountability on that level of understanding? Perhaps a better understanding for us is to view it as a violation we see God dealing with in Uzzah who attempted to steady the ark where neither ignorance nor innocence can be the excuse. Note: Think what we are dealing with here and the absoluteness of it all.

Quote:

-----There is an important component that we have to examine in answer to this question. Adam and the last Adam (Jesus) had a relationship with God the Father that had to be protected. Adam lived in a sanctuary where God walked with him in the cool of the day. Jesus WAS the Sanctuary as God was in Christ continually.

But only by the "freewill" of Jesus was He.

Quote:

----- This is two sanctuaries. Isaiah 66 tells us that one of the qualifications for being a place of God's rest is that one must TREMBLE at His word. How did Adam do?

I can well understand that being for me and you that Isaiah would say such but, Jesus trembled? And Adam? What reason would they have had to in their innocence?

Quote:

-----Before God created man He had already determined to prepare a place where He and man could fellowship together face to face and eye to eye. God placed Adam in the prepared place and charged him to tend it and keep it. Our words here mean literally to work it and to guard it. Adam was to 'hedge in' this sanctuary to protect it from forces that would seek to destroy the sanctity of such a place that it might be a place of God's rest. God could be at home in fellowship with Adam so long as he protected this sanctuary. Adam failed, sin entered and defiled, God left and Satan reigns.

Because Jesus literally "clothed" Deity of the Godhead, I can understand that what He clothed was a Sanctuary to and for Him however, in the case of Adam, where was this sanctuary he was given to protect but, outside himself? ___the "Tree of Life", that would have become so by obedience and revealed allegiance.

Quote:

-----This is the story of Adam and later Israel would repeat it. God made a sanctuary in the wilderness as a place of rest where He could

dwelt among His people as King. Israel was to hedge this place in from forces that would threaten the sanctity of it. Israel failed, sin defiled, God left and Satan reigned. Jesus Christ the Last Adam came as the embodiment of sanctuary. He hedged Himself in from forces that would defile, entertained the presence of God, lived holy and separate from Sin, and conquered death, hell and the grave. He loved the Father and protected the relationship from forces that would defile. He trembled at God's word. He lived by every word that proceeded from the Father's mouth.

By what process did He do this and was it not from innocence He did so? Jesus feared not the Father but loved Him
"There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love." 1 John 4:18 (KJV)  

Quote:
-----A lot of people claim to 'love' God, but when it comes to loving His precepts they fall short. People make decisions about things and don't even bother to inquire of the LORD. Jesus would not as much as turn a stone into bread for His own benefit without inquiring of the Father. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise. (John 5:19)

That is innocence manifested to be made holy, is it not? "full of Grace and Truth".

Quote:
-----Jesus loved to do the Father's will. It was His necessary food. This is how His love was expressed. There was no shallowness or pretense in His love. On the contrary, I think shallowness and pretense of love is a tremendous problem in our times. People's words and actions do not match. Hebrews 1:9 could have easily said, "Thou hast loved God and hated Satan", but that is not what it said. Jesus walked in agreement with His Father's righteous and holy attributes. They saw all things eye to eye. He loved His Father, not in spite of the fact that He is righteous and holy, but He Himself loved and hated the very same things as His Father. Adam could never say that. Just some thoughts. Blessings.

Beautifully expressed! ___but why could not have Adam done it, if I understand you correctly, he was given a sanctuary to protect? Was there no vision to relate him to it?

I guess what I am getting at here is while, with Jesus, everything that related to God as Father was within Him whereas, with Adam it was all on the outside of him___purposed to be in him had he obeyed and then, with the eating of the tree of life, become incarnated.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/11/7 13:51

It is my belief that Jesus had no "special advantage" over us that assisted him in his sinlessness, other than he was able to control his temptations through willpower and obedience to conscience. And while I do believe this to be true, nobody has provided me with an answer as to HOW he was able to do it. We know He did it, but how?

I believe it would be unacceptable to answer this question by bringing up that he was the Son of God, the lack of a sin nature, etc because these would all give him a special advantage. So, if one argues that Jesus was just like us, i.e. subject to the exact temptations and equally susceptible to sin, etc, the question on the table is how in the world could he keep from sinning? Everyone else who is "just like me", meaning every other person on the planet now and in the past has sinned. So why didn't Jesus? And, if it was due to his divinity, then He DID have a special advantage.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 14:08

by TMK on 2012/11/7 10:51:18

It is my belief that Jesus had no "special advantage" over us that assisted him in his sinlessness, other than he was able to control his temptations through willpower and obedience to conscience. And while I do believe this to be true, nobody has provided me with an answer as to HOW he was able to do it. We know He did it, but how?

He didn't obey His conscience, as you would have it. He loved His Father as a son and only functioned according to His will. Jesus lived with a vision of joy set before Him that was His strength given Him by Father because of His love shown Him. Why do you purposely overlook that "little" thing???

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/7 14:55

Hi CroRef,

Quote:
-----I can well understand that being for me and you that Isaiah would say such but, Jesus trembled? And Adam? What reason would they have had to in their innocence?

I should have identified the Hebrew word here for 'tremble', but sometimes these posts are so long as it is. The word for 'tremble' in Hebrew is chared and in this context means 'to reverence'. I typically draw an illustration by citing the reason why Moses was not allowed to enter the Promised Land:

And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice: and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank, and their beasts. And the LORD spake unto Moses and Aaron, Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation into the land which I have given to them. (Numbers 20:11-12)

Notice the statement, "Because ye believed me not, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel." That is to say, he gave the impression to the people that God could be disobeyed. Had he done as did Jesus, he would have lived by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God (an obvious anthropomorphism). It was an act of irreverence to disobey God before the people. Adam did not reverence God's word either or he would not have sinned and been cast out. The parallel to Adam and Moses is that one single sin cost each of them dearly. Jesus was 100% percent obedient 100% of the time. Why? Because He is our example and as our example He revered (feared) the Lord and trembled at (chared/reverenced) His Word.

Quote:
-----I guess what I am getting at here is while, with Jesus, everything that related to God as Father was within Him whereas, with Adam it was all on the outside of him__purposed to be in him had he obeyed and then, with the eating of the tree of life, become incarnated.

I don't think we should lose sight of our Lord's humanity while on the earth. (Phil. 2:6-7) I also think we need to make the case that if Jesus had an inward reality working, Adam lived in a world devoid of sin. In other words, Sin had not yet entered the world so the creation was much more conducive to righteousness. The common denominator was Satan as the tempter. So I don't see one or the other necessarily having an advantage. Just some more thoughts. Blessings.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/11/7 15:30

Croref: wrote:

"He didn't obey His conscience, as you would have it. He loved His Father as a son and only functioned according to His will. Jesus lived with a vision of joy set before Him that was His strength given Him by Father because of His love shown Him. Why do you purposely overlook that "little" thing???"

I am not overlooking it- that is just the point. If Jesus had no "special advantage" when it came to obedience/not giving into temptation, why has no other person been able to do so, if it is such a "little thing?"

If we say it is because Jesus is God (which of course he is- but scripture said he emptied himself of divine attributes when

n incarnated), then He obviously had a special advantage. If that is the answer, that is fine-- but then he wasn't really tempted as we are- and the scripture says that he WAS tempted as we are.

So there must be some reason that He was able to go w/o sinning. Did he have a larger portion of the Holy Spirit than we do today?

I don't really expect answers, as I am not sure there are any, but these are points to ponder.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 15:37

by RobertW on 2012/11/7 11:55:25

I don't think we should lose sight of our Lord's humanity while on the earth. (Phil. 2:6-7) I also think we need to make the case that if Jesus had an inward reality working, Adam lived in a world devoid of sin. In other words, Sin had not yet entered the world so the creation was much more conducive to righteousness. The common denominator was Satan as the tempter. So I don't see one or the other necessarily having an advantage. Just some more thoughts. Blessings.

Hi Robert!

The un-common denominator was the issue of "intimacy". Adam had none with God and Jesus, because of His birth, indwelling and "unction to function" had much more to protect but also without an advocate. I would say Jesus had an advantage insofar as by virtue of His birth He possessed what Adam had to learn before he could possess it__Love.

We'll have to agree to disagree, I guess.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 15:43

by TMK on 2012/11/7 12:30:49

Croref: wrote:

"He didn't obey His conscience, as you would have it. He loved His Father as a son and only functioned according to His will. Jesus lived with a vision of joy set before Him that was His strength given Him by Father because of His love shown Him. Why do you purposely overlook that "little" thing???"

I am not overlooking it- that is just the point. If Jesus had no "special advantage" when it came to obedience/not giving into temptation, why has no other person been able to do so, if it is such a "little thing?"

If we say it is because Jesus is God (which of course he is- but scripture said he emptied himself of divine attributes when incarnated), then He obviously had a special advantage. If that is the answer, that is fine-- but then he wasn't really tempted as we are- and the scripture says that he WAS tempted as we are.

So there must be some reason that He was able to go w/o sinning. Did he have a larger portion of the Holy Spirit than we do today?

I don't really expect answers, as I am not sure there are any, but these are points to ponder.

Well if that is the case I'll leave you with the fact that Jesus, as no other, was full of Grace and Truth. That position in the Father, I feel quite sure, carries with it something special insofar as God withheld nothing from Him, according to His will.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2012/11/7 15:58

Croref wrote:

"Jesus, as no other, was full of Grace and Truth. That position in the Father, I feel quite sure, carries with it something special insofar as God withheld nothing from Him, according to His will."

So in other words, he DID have a special advantage ;)

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 17:15

by TMK on 2012/11/7 12:58:51

Croref wrote:

"Jesus, as no other, was full of Grace and Truth. That position in the Father, I feel quite sure, carries with it something special insofar as God withheld nothing from Him, according to His will."

So in other words, he DID have a special advantage ;)

Yes and one that required of Him what could not be required of Adam, i.e., protect the "Word" of Glory His flesh clothed.

In Adam's case, the "Word" of Glory resided in the Tree of Life". Eternal "Life" as God designed/purposed to be was in Himself. cf John 17:3.

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/7 23:43

Hi RobertW

I am greatly Appreciating so many of your post.

I have some questions ??

RE: RobertW wrote ///I hope to take this up a bit by coupling these comments with my last post. When we use the term 'flesh' it is the Greek word sarx and comes down in 2 primary forms; fallen and unfallen. A human being with a sin nature is tempted from 'within'. They are in Adam and under his head. So this person has effectively the flesh+sin or a sinful human nature. Jesus had only the flesh and did not have a sin nature. He was tempted (tested) from 'without'. This is important to keep clear.///

This sounds good but what scriptures are being used to come to this conclusion ??

I must say that I have discussed these thoughts with tons of people and have studied both sides, I personally am not convinced that men have a sin nature, (the phrase is not even in the bible) but what you wrote is by far the best defense that I have ever read, very well wrote and I must humbly say that it causes me to think, so please do not be offended by my questions.

Was Eve not tempted from within before the Fall ??

1 John 2:16

For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.

" And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food (lust of the flesh), and that it was pleasant to the eyes"(Lust of the eyes)

had the serpent said anything about the fruit being good for food or looking pleasant ?, was this part of the temptation no

t from within ?, Was this anything other than what causes us to sin ?, a natural God given appetite and propensities that breaks the laws of God in order to satisfy itself. If there was no Law there would be no temptation to break that law thus no sin. But since there was a law then an inward decision had to be made, will I listen to God or will I listen to the flesh the appetite and propensities.

Even though the serpent outwardly enticed Eve the realm of temptation worked within, (Lust was within Eve before she was guilty of sin) (when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin) I do not see how this is much different for us today in that most temptations or enticements start from without but yet the realm of temptation and decision are made within.

Adam and Eve were naked yet it was not sin to them, A 2 year old can run around naked and yet there is no guilt no sin, But now if you or I run around naked we are sinful perverts because we hold a law within that says thou shalt not.

RE: RobertW wrote ///Jesus was tempted from 'without'. When He was in the wilderness He faced the Devil. Why? Because He had no inward compulsion to rebel against His Father. Notice how this plays out. Jesus knew His fast was for a set time. He knew He was the Son of God and was capable of doing just about anything He wanted to. Satan tried to tempt Him to take matters into His own hands and use the powers available to Him rather than wait on God. He refused to do anything 'in the flesh'; that is to say, He refused to move in any other revelation than every Word that is proceeding from the mouth of God. Did He have a natural desire to eat? Absolutely. Just like Abraham had a desire to have a son. The difference is that Jesus waited on the Father and Abraham hearkened to Sarah.///

I have talked with many people and even started a thread here on si about if Jesus was tempted from within or from without, Most everyone seems to agree from without, But I must ask what is the biblical evidence for this speculation ? How can it be temptation for the Son of God who knows clearly the intentions and motivations and history of the Devil to be tempted by the devil if he was in form externally ??

But rather if the temptation was in the realm of the mind as is with us, (an inward spiritual battle) we all can relate)

Re: RobertW wrote ///Same with Adam. God had already determined to make man in His image and likeness. When God seemed to tarry, Satan came along and tempted Adam to take matters into His own hands. This is why we are told to 'wait upon the Lord'. Adam sought to fulfill God's plans in a forbidden way and plunged the human race into total ruin. All of these issues tie together. God has a plan and means of fulfilling His plan. He knows our natural needs and has a means of fulfilling them. Satan comes along and attempts to lure us to fulfill a good desire in a sinful way. Simply put, Satan wants human beings living by every word that proceeds from his mouth rather than God's mouth. Blessings.///

this paragraph I found to be extremely insightful and very edifying

Brother, I must humbly admit you have me thinking, Good Post

Re: Sree - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/8 10:22

Hi Sree

Somethings to think about

RE: Sree wrote ///Bible also says that Jesus came in the LIKENESS of Human flesh. It does not say that he came in Human flesh.///

The Bible does not say anywhere that Jesus came in the LIKENESS of Human flesh. But it does say "Hereby know ye t

he Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God"

our flesh (sarx) is called sinful because it is the vessel by which we have sinned. once we come into understanding (of good and evil)(age of accountability)and we make a judgment of right and wrong and we fail our own judgment at this point (rom 7:9) guilt (sin is imputed) enters into the soul and our flesh, than our flesh becomes considered sinful,(at this point we die of innocence).

Jesus never sinned, thus His Flesh could not be called sinful.

RE: Sree wrote ///That is why if you look into my previous posts I always use this word likeness of human flesh. Which means there is a difference, obviously because he was not born of the seed of Adam. ///

Did not Jesus called Himself the Son of man(adam) ???

Romans 1:3

Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh.

2 Timothy 2:8

Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my gospel

Matthew 9:6

But that ye may know that the (((Son of man))) hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy ,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house

Matthew 11:19

The (((Son of man))) came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children

Matthew 12:8

For the (((Son of man))) is Lord even of the sabbath day

Matthew 12:40

For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the (((Son of man))) be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.

I could go on but there is almost a hundred more verses that clearly say the same thing.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/8 17:53

Quote: It is my belief that Jesus had no "special advantage" over us that assisted him in his sinlessness, other than he was able to control his temptations through willpower and obedience to conscience. And while I do believe this to be true, nobody has provided me with an answer as to HOW he was able to do it. we know He did it, but how?

What is willpower and conscience, it's the Soul, if you do a study of the bible of the word heart you'll find that Soul and heart are the same things.. Lets have a quick skim

And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually. Gen 6:5

Imagination and thoughts = the heart

Said he not unto me, She is my sister? and she, even she herself said, He is my brother: in the integrity of my heart and innocency of my hands have I done this. Gen 20:5

Integrity of my heart = conscience

Nevertheless he that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well. 1 Cor 7:37

Decreed in his heart that he will = Will is in the heart.

Quote: I must say that I have discussed these thoughts with tons of people and have studied both sides, I personally am not convinced that men have a sin nature, (the phrase is not even in the bible) but what you wrote is by far the best defense that I have ever read, very well wrote and I must humbly say that it causes me to think, so please do not be offended by my questions.

If you do a search in the King James Bible you will not find the word "raptured" but most of us believe that at some time in the future we will be raptured. So let's not get hung up on phrases.

When they speak about a "Sin Nature" they really mean a heart that's prone to sin. Look at what Jesus said "For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies" Matt 15:19

The bible tells us "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? Jer 17:9

Sin Nature = The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.

So the difference between Jesus and us is that his heart was pure and full of love, he truly loved God with all his heart and that love motivated him to obey and do the will of the Father.

While our heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked, that heart puts self before everyone else and everything else, that's why we need the law to expose what's in us. After that heart has been changed and it loves God totally and loves others fully then we have no need of the law because there is no law against love..

Was your heart changed at conversion, is there still a wicked way in your heart? Of course there is because we don't get it all at conversion.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/8 18:44

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

-----This sounds good but what scriptures are being used to come to this conclusion ??

I must say that I have discussed these thoughts with tons of people and have studied both sides, I personally am not convinced that men have a sin nature, (the phrase is not even in the bible) but what you wrote is by far the best defense that I have ever read, very well wrote and I must humbly say that it causes me to think, so please do not be offended by my questions.

The subject of original sin has been discussed at length here in the forums where I have participated in the past. It is impossible in my view to understand regeneration until we understand original sin or congenital sin. I will offer one passage in passing:

For as through the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinners: so also through the obedience of the one, shall the many be constituted righteous. (Romans 5:19 YLT)

It would be a tremendous effort to rehash constitutional sin all again, but I wish to share a link of a dear brother that participated in many of these discussions. Well worth watching.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hxACfxxcZec>

Quote:
-----Even though the serpent outwardly enticed Eve the realm of temptation worked within,(Lust was within eve before she was guilty of sin)(when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin) I do not see how this is much different for us today in that most temptations or enticements start from without but yet the realm of temptation and decision are made within.

I have a theory here that ties in with some other conversations we have had on SI in the past dealing with Charles Finney. I think he made the mistake of relying on his own inward experience of temptation, etc., rather than following closely the revelation of scripture. I believe Finney was regenerated, which would have reversed the effect of original sin in his life and left him with basic human temptation. Sinners are moving in the law of Sin; that is to say, an inward constitutional law that rebels against the will of God for rebellions sake. This is why Paul said, "when the commandment came sin revived and I died." This is why the commandment that was supposed to bring life brought death. It brought Sin (the dynamis) to the surface. The Law gave man's sinful constitution something to rebel against. If God reverses this phenomena so that we now rejoice and are edified and gratified by doing God's will, then we risk assuming this is the situation for ALL people- sinner and saint alike. I think this is a bad mistake. We have to trust the revelation of scripture as we follow through. Jesus told the people that they must be born again (John 3:3). Why? Because they are otherwise of their father the Devil and the lusts of their father they will do.

Quote:
-----I have talked with many people and even started a thread here on si about if Jesus was tempted from within or from without, Most everyone seems to agree from without, But I must ask what is the biblical evidence for this speculation ?

It is simply that Satan himself came to tempt (test) Jesus. It is no more complicated than that. Satan himself came to tempt Eve. Had he never entered the picture there would likely never have been any real temptation for Eve. She was beguiled. Natural desires were not sufficient in themselves to lure Eve to eat of the Tree of Knowledge. Had she had a sinful nature her own heart that the scripture defines as "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" (Jer. 17:9) would have led her to the tree in time.

So I think we have to keep our eye on the fact that the Born Again will not experience the world in the same way as the Unregenerate. Finney, in my view, assumed that because he no longer had an inward propensity to sin, that nobody in the world had the propensity. As for me, I can tell you the time when I was changed into a New Creature. All of my desires changed and my whole perspective of past and present events was from a totally different point of view. Just a thumbnail sketch, but hopefully you will give a look to the video. Blessings.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/8 19:08

I wish to return to the original question, "My spirit shall not always strive with man."

There is another aspect to God ceasing to strive with man that we cannot overlook and it is that point when man chooses to truly submit to God. The Lord's hand is heavy upon a person, He is goading them and convincing them of sin, righteousness and judgment to come with a powerful effect. He is pricking the hearts. This is the operation of the Holy Spirit as He strives with man to repent and turn to Christ in genuine faith.

However, when the person finally submits to Christ in such a way that God can believe him/her, the Holy Spirit leaves off with the heavy hand, goading and pricking, etc; and POURS out into the heart love (Romans 5:5) and joy and the rest of the fruit of the Holy Spirit. (Galatians 5) This is why the old timers used to refer to God's dealings with man in 4 states:

- A. The Careless Sinner
- B. The Awakened Sinner

C. The Convicted Sinner
D. The Regenerated Believer

A. The "careless sinner" can simply "care-less" about their soul's salvation and need for God. They are opposed to their own salvation. Some will get hostile or even violent at the proposal of being saved. Upon hearing about God their mind and conscience is stirred which is very troubling. They will most often avoid this state. Sinners are very creative in finding ways to ignore their need for God and press Him as far back in their minds as possible. They do not like to retain God in their knowledge and prefer to sin unabated (unrestrained and unhindered). These people are enemies of both God and themselves. Some people are subtle about it and simply ignore God and believe they are "good people." Yet others may be in some form of false religion. No matter which category they fall into- they are quite careless about their souls. They are deceived by Satan, taken captive at his will and are fearlessly confident in their sinful condition. They feel no need to consider the vast number of ways in which God is trying to gain their attention at any given moment. They ignore the sight of a church. They skip past Christian TV and radio when skimming channels. They ignore Christian related billboards and bumper-stickers. More than that, they do always resist the Holy Ghost that is using these and many other means to arrest their attention. As Jesus told Saul on the road to Damascus, they do always kick against the goads (pricks). God uses means to alter their direction in life towards Himself- but they resist to their own hurt. They beat the drums as in Tophet to drown the screams; that is, they surround themselves with worldly distractions that bolster their deception and hasten their damnation. God often has to use radical measures to snap a sinner out of a careless state.

B. The "awakened sinner" is someone that has been shocked into at least "considering" their need for God. This happens at times when tragedy strikes such as a loved one passing away or being suddenly killed. It happens when the individual themselves suffer some calamity such as being diagnosed with cancer or falling into financial crisis. It can happen at times of great distress and fear such as the events of 9-11 or the Great Tsunami Disaster. It may also happen at times when sudden danger is upon them such as a Tornado Warning. The job of the minister is to awaken sinners by the truth of the Gospel. The Gospel message pours light into the darkness so that the lost can feel their condition. The Holy Spirit works to convince the person of sin, righteousness and judgment to come. Occasionally God sovereignly shakes a sinner from slumber with prophetic dreams or supernatural dealings (Genesis 41:8, Daniel 4:5, etc.).

C. The "convicted sinner" is a person who after hearing a Gospel message and having been dealt with greatly by the Holy Spirit is convinced of their need for God and the Gospel. They are convinced they are a sinner and need to repent. They are convinced that they need to trust in Christ and turn everything completely over Him. To a lesser or greater degree they understand the Gospel. They are familiar more or less with God and His word- at least enough to be born again. The Holy Spirit has brought them to that place where they are trembling in awe of God and are halting between two opinions (will I serve God or will I serve sin). They are at the crossroads- and must choose whom they will serve. At this time the Holy Spirit is in the role of Jesus Christ. Just as Jesus dealt with the rich young ruler- the Holy Spirit, in the same fashion, is dealing with this person. He is showing them in their "mind's-eye" what they must submit to Him in order to be saved and "have treasure in Heaven." This is a "one-on-one" with the Holy Ghost. This is where the great striving and wrestling happens. The Holy Spirit knows what is standing between Him and them and He is showing it to them. The convicted sinner is made to know exactly what he/she is trading for their immortal soul.

D. The Regenerated Believer

When the striving and resisting ends and the heart surrenders in such a way that God will believe us- the Holy Spirit will come in and pour in the oil and the wine. Sadly, so few never make it past conviction of sin. They pray a prayer and are told they are saved. But when a person gets truly 'saved' the joy of the Lord supplants the feelings of hopelessness and the love of Christ is poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that has been given to us (Romans 5:5). The Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are sons of God. We cry out from within as it were, ABBA Father. While Sin reigned the heart was burned in affection for sin and this world- but in with Christ came what the old timers called, "The Expulsive Power of a New Affection." The love of Christ in our hearts- expelled our love for sin and this world. We gained an all new affection for things above and not of things on the earth. We see the wonder of the great love where with He loved us and His goodness that had long been leading us to repentance.

We receive life- eternal life. We are grafted into the vine. We are New Creatures in Christ. We come under a new head (Jesus Christ)- and are dead to Sin and alive to God. God takes up residence in us and we 'begin' in the Spirit. We no longer live 'striving' with God, but are led of the Spirit as the true sons of God.

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/8 20:34

Hi RobertW, rather I am in agreement or not, exelant post, It has me thinking, some quick questions as I meditate on the rest

RobertW wrote ///It is impossible in my view to understand regeneration until we understand original sin or congenital sin. I will offer one passage in passing:///

Would you also believe that Paris Reidhead understood nothing about regeneration also ?

RobertW wrote ///It is simply that Satan himself came to tempt (test) Jesus. It is no more complicated than that. Satan himself came to tempt Eve. Had he never entered the picture there would likely never had been any real temptation for Eve. She was beguiled. Natural desires were not sufficient in themselves to lure Eve to eat of the Tree of Knowledge.///

But who than tempted Lucifer to cause his fall ??

I apperciate the thought provoking answers brother

Edit: I feel uncomfortable with how I asked//Would you also believe that Paris Reidhead understood nothing about regeneration also //" I just mean to say that I am not convinced that one has to hold an orthodox view on original sin or congenital sin to understand regeneration.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/8 23:17

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:
-----RobertW wrote ///It is impossible in my view to understand regeneration until we understand original sin or congenital sin. I will offer one passage in passing:///

Would you also believe that Paris Reidhead understood nothing about regeneration also ?

I'm not a close follower of Reidhead, but I have listened to many of his messages. If he did not believe in Original Sin then in my view he would not understand regeneration biblically. That is not to say that he may not have many good things to say, it is just that his approach to regeneration would be on a much different order than men like Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Whitfield, Spurgeon, Moody, etc. He would be more on the order of Finney and Pelagius and out of step with an overwhelming number of Protestants past and present. Both Finney and Pelagius have been greatly marginalized and worse for their unorthodox views. But, as I mentioned before I believe I have a good theory as to why Finney held the views.

Quote:
-----But who than tempted Lucifer to cause his fall ??

Lucifer was in a unique spot as the Anointed Cherub 'that Covers'. This basically means that he was the greatest of all created beings. He knew this. He thought upon this. And then he began to corrupt himself with the notion that he could exercise his own will rather than God's will. We have to keep in mind that he pioneered rebellion; that is to say, he is the father of lies and is the father of rebellion. There was none before him. We have a clue in Ezekiel 28:17, "Your heart was proud

oud because of your beauty; you corrupted your wisdom for the sake of your splendor. I cast you to the ground; I expose d you before kings, to feast their eyes on you." Pride is the snare and condemnation of the Devil. Pride is a sense of excessive self-worth. In his free moral condition, He saw God and the worship He received continually, and apparently considered equality with God a thing to be grasped. In other words, he considered equality with God a prize to be gained and retained.

Now, keep in mind that the TRUE nature of God is one of absolute humility. This is not what Satan desired. Satan corrupted his wisdom for the sake of his splendor. He worshipped himself by obeying himself. He wanted to be worshipped as God is worshipped and he started it by doing it himself. He then worked on a third of the angels to get them to do it. This played on out again in the wilderness when he wanted Jesus (the Second Person in the Godhead) to worship him.

All indicators are that Satan corrupted himself and became the father of that same corruption. He is where the buck stops. He sowed the same self-will seed thought into Eve- it conceived and brought forth sin. The thoughts themselves stirred up desire in her. Now there is a clash of wills- her will was being influenced by and moved by this beguilement. She was in the transgression. This is why we are told to cast down imaginations and every thought that exalts itself against the knowledge of God. The longer a person sits around mulling over something, the more it stirs the mind with a desire that longs to be satiated. The more this goes on the more dangerous the situation becomes.

Christ's death on the cross revealed what it would take to be like God. If Eve and Adam could have looked through a telescope to Calvary they would have seen what it would be like to 'be as God'; instead they listened to the lies of Satan and became like him. He wanted an aspect of God that Jesus did not consider a thing to be grasped. In other words, Satan is going to burn in hell for desiring to be something Christ willingly laid down. That is a staggering thing to comprehend. Jesus had been there, seen it, and done it and yet did not consider it a thing to be grasped. It is that simple in my view. Satan tempted himself to want the power and glory that belonged to God but wanted nothing to do with his real attributes. He coveted God's glory rather than desiring earnestly the best things. He saw it and he coveted it. Jesus on the other hand was a foot washer that loved His Father and to do His Father's will. He had it, but didn't grasp it.

Re: murrcolr - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/8 23:48

Hi murrcolr

excellent thoughts

where does compassion proceed from ??

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 0:28

Hi RobertW

RobertW wrote ///It is impossible in my view to understand regeneration until we understand original sin or congenital sin. I will offer one passage in passing:///

Is there any evidence that the early church fathers before Augustine held to the this belief ?

RobertW wrote ///I'm not a close follower of Reidhead, but I have listened to many of his messages. If he did not believe in Original Sin then in my view he would not understand regeneration biblically ///

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pHgsZv1JyJE>

RobertW wrote ///That is not to say that he may not have many good things to say, it is just that his approach to regeneration would be on a much different order than men like Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Whitfield, Spurgeon, Moody, etc.///

Luther and calvin got there understanding from the writings of Augustine that is clear when reading there own works, all of the others mentioned studied heavenly the works of calvin and luther.

I do believe that their are men of this tradition whom are used of God.

But This is another problem I have with this doctrine, my understanding is that Augustine brought forth the view of Just war into the church and also death to the heratick in which brought about the inquisition, infant Baptism was deeply rooted into the church because of this doctrine (because Augustine believed in regenerative Baptism and that all infants are born sinful thus infant baptism)

History records that often times Those whom held strongly to infant baptism persecuted those whom believed in adult baptism, As I read and study about Calvin and Luther I find a lack of compassion for there fellow man that I do not find to be biblical. The history I find of the latter end of Luther I feel to be highly disturbing.

Yet I also see another line in history one that was considered heratick and persecuted by the mentioned line It is a trail of blood, people whom believed in not Baptizing infants

Have to go to bed, I want to say I do not want to misrepresent any one of history and am open to being corrected with facts but What I Read of History Is honestly extremely disturbing to me and another reason that I question this doctrine.

Great thoughts everyone has me really thinking

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 3:45

by RobertW on 2012/11/8 20:17:03

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:
-----RobertW wrote ///It is impossible in my view to understand regeneration until we understand original sin or congenital sin. I will offer one passage in passing:///

Would you also believe that Paris Reidhead understood nothing about regeneration also ?

I'm not a close follower of Reidhead, but I have listened to many of his messages. If he did not believe in Original Sin then in my view he would not understand regeneration biblically. That is not to say that he may not have many good things to

o say, it is just that his approach to regeneration would be on a much different order than men like Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Whitfield, Spurgeon, Moody, etc. He would be more on the order of Finney and Pelagius and out of step with an overwhelming number of Protestants past and present. Both Finney and Pelagius have been greatly marginalized and worse for their unorthodox views. But, as I mentioned before I believe I have a good theory as to why Finney held the views.

Dear Robert, Objective thinking and not marginalization is the key to understanding the scriptures. That is why, those who are not objective, will never connect the dots-so to speak. That is why you/me can say about Reidhead: "He had some nice things to say"__however, what keeps you/us from going further is our brand of subjectivity. No apology needed here by either of us in that regard. That said and with the Lord saying He would not despise a broken and contrite spirit, in the arena of the subjective mind, how does one sustain a contrite disposition if he adheres to the subjective teaching about grace? Tradition and self preservation will blow us off course every time when we fail to tend the wheel in attempting to grasp the more complete doctrine of Jesus Christ. Using Luther in this we could say he was responsible for WW11 by his (mis-understood) stance on grace, his position being: all our sins, past, present and future, are forgiven. Taken the wrong way, the church, presumptuously, took it to mean forgiveness without repentance__and many still do.

God, in His foreknowledge of course, knew this and planned for it. Keeping in mind that God never gave anyone ALL the truth but Jesus, for His reason for being sent into the world, I believe that is why He gave us Wesley and others like him, to bring rectification to our thinking but, only made alive to those who are able to receive it without agenda except perfection in the Father. He knows who they are. Here is an example of what I am getting at that that the OP asks about:

"But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." Genesis 4: 5-7 (KJV)

I ask, where is the issue of original sin seen in this passage, that God addresses, waiting to rear itself that God could invite Cain to challenge it__and be victorious! KEEP IN MIND__no assist here, no special grace in this, no any indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It was Cain alone against__what?____And it remains the same today.

OMT: In light of the above might we not re-evaluate what is a "Tare" that when He comes "will He find faith"__of Abraham?

". . . The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also." Matthew 13:24-26 (KJV)

Lov'in Jesus.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 3:55

by proudpapa on 2012/11/8 20:48:56

Hi murrclor

excellent thoughts

where does compassion proceed from ??

Please forgive my un-invited reply that will no doubt cause consternation but, I couldn't resist?

Answer:

A heart of flesh____)). And didn't we read something about such a thing in the OT??

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/9 4:50

Croref --- Quote A heart of flesh

Your right and you beat me to it. LOL

Quote: where does compassion proceed from ??

I get where your coming from but remember the tree that Adam ate. And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever Gen 3:22

We must understand that there are two sides to the story man can be evil but man can be "compassionate" good because he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

But the key to understanding our hopelessness is that in eating of the tree we were released from the Spirit of God...

Looking at it from man's viewpoint then man may not be all defiled. We are capable of compassion, of love. We know it's better to be good rather than evil, we give awards to people who do good, who show great bravery in times of danger and we teach our children to be good.

But we will miss the issue if we look at it from that viewpoint because we will forget that we are separated from God's Spirit. Being separated from God's Spirit means that we are not dependent on God anymore but are independent of him.

So the source of the Good and Evil stems not from God but from Self.

Self has replaced God, but Self can never please God, if Self could please God then the unbeliever could get to heaven by doing compassionate works like taking care of orphans or widows, which many unbelievers do.

The difference between the good, which proceeds from the Self, and the good that flows from the new life is that the Self always has Self at its center. It is my Self who can perform and does perform good without the need of trusting in the Holy Spirit, without being humble before God, or waiting on God, or praying to God.

Since it is I who wills and thinks and does without the need of God and who consequently considers how improved I am or I have now become good through my own efforts, is it not inevitable that I bring glory to myself?

So when God looks at someone being compassionate but Self is at the center what does he see THE FLESH...

Hope that helps..

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 5:24

by murrcolr on 2012/11/9 1:50:41

Croref --- Quote A heart of flesh

Your right and you beat me to it. LOL

Quote: where does compassion proceed from ??

I get where your coming from but remember the tree that Adam ate. And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever Gen 3:22

We must understand that there are two sides to the story man can be evil but man can be "compassionate" good because he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

But the key to understanding our hopelessness is that in eating of the tree we were released from the Spirit of God...

What did you do with Cain?

Quote:
-----Self has replaced God, but Self can never please God, if Self could please God then the unbeliever could get to heaven by doing compassionate works like taking care of orphans or widows, which many unbelievers do."

Why not just consider that Adam sealed us eternally to a life of warfare with Vanity that, without God, we cannot win?

OMT: Lets lay aside the heaven and hell issue because this goes w-a-a-y beyond that.

OMT2: Adam was independent of God before he transgressed.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 6:10

that's the problem all deeds done by the self are inherently selfish

unregenerate men do good so others might think he is good
he does good so he might gain friends
he does good so others will do good back to him
he does good because others do good to him

Jesus said something like what reward will you have from God if you do good to those who love you

he does good because he thinks he should, to live up to a self-standard his self has set

he does good because it makes himself feel good,

he does good to puff up his false sense of humility

he does good to get praise from people

he does good to bribe God, to gain entrance into heaven

and I would submit Jesus did not do any of these things

Jesus did all he did for the glory of God as the primary motivation

Paul said whatever you do do it all for the glory of God, not the glory of man

implication is what is not done for the glory of God is sinful
what is not of faith is sin, Paul said

and this is what fallen man will not do

so keeping Scripture in mind, all good deeds from man are sin, not being done with faith towards God
and for God's exultation, and glory

a filthy rag in reality

it only takes one drop of sewage toilet water in to a bucket of pristine mountain spring water „and it is spoiled

we should not glorify man's depravity ,it only tends towards taking glory due god

we don't need to praise man's faithless self centered deeds as if he pleases god

without faith it is impossible to please god

blessings brethren

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 6:25

the problem with satan was god made him so full of himself that he thought too highly of himself ,he was so nearly unfathomable in beauty that due to free will he turned to looking at himself „god must needs harden his heart

freewill and beauty was his downfall

when the kingdom comes i will be glad that i won't have the free will that satan and adam had „i want to be irresistibly guided by god's will and not some freewill „god had his reasons for giving satan and the angels and adam free will in the fullness of the word „„god's will be done in all

blessings

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 6:38

by brothagary on 2012/11/9 3:10:43

that's the problem all deeds done by the self are inherently selfish

unregenerate men do good so others might think he is good

he does good so he might gain friends

he does good so others will do good back to him

he does good because others do good to him

Do you believe that was what Joseph was all about ___ Abel, Abraham, Moses, David, Ruth? Shall I go on?

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 6:48

well i don't know what others think „„but in the old testament certain individuals had a personal relationship with god and the spirit of regeneration and were filled with the spirit ,that for me is being born from above „

these individuals did good deeds in faith by the power of the holy spirit ,even if they were not born again in the precise way we are in the new covenant

blessings

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 7:06

by brothagary on 2012/11/9 3:48:24

well i dont know what others think ,,,but in the old testament certain indavidals had a personal relashenship with god and the spirit of regeration and were filled with the spirit ,that for me is being born from above ,,

these indaviduals did good deeds in faith by the power of the holy spirit ,even if they were not born again in the presise way we are in the new coverent

Then my Brother, I would think it incumbent upon you produce evidence of that considering Jesus had to die, resurrect and ascend, before that could have been made possible. If, on the other hand you want to have be that the Spirit of God moved UPON the "righteous" for to do His works then, you'll find no disagreement in me. You might think that David was an exception. Think again because, he was an unregenerate man after God's own Heart to such a degree God set him apart to reveal Himself in a very special way. Having said that, it was also the reason "unregenerate" Abraham was set apart and is viewed as the father of faith to all those "unregenerate" folk who believe in Christ.. that they might move on to receive the Faith OF Christ. cf Gal. 2:20 KJV only.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/9 7:18

Hi CroRef,

Quote:
-----I ask, where is the issue of original sin seen in this passage, that God addresses, waiting to rear itself that God could invite Cain to challenge it___and be victorious! KEEP IN MIND___no assist here, no special grace in this, no any indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It was Cain alone against___what?___And it remains the same today.

I typically use Cain as an illustration of how quickly the congenital sin made itself known in the human race. John, who gave us our Lord's words that we must be born again, explains the issue from the example of Cain:

He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. For this is the message that ye heard from the beginning, that we should love one another. Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous. Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you. We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. He that loveth not his brother abideth in death. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him. (1 John 3:8-15)

Notice a glaring question in this passage, "Have you and I passed from death unto life?" Those that are in a state of death are children of the devil. They do not do righteousness and they do not love their brother. Cain is then said to be 'of that wicked one' and slew his brother. With the exception of only a remnant the whole human race had corrupted its way and filled the earth with violence by Genesis 6. Why? Paul explains it in Ephesians 2:

And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) (Ephesians 2:1-5)

Notice first of all that Paul places everybody in this text as he says, "we ALL had our conversation (manner of living) in times past." What were we doing? Paul tells us plainly, "you walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience." This is Paul telling us that while

we were dead in sin we were alive unto the Prince of the Power of the Air (Satan) and his disobedient spirit was working IN us. We were dead (separated) from God and alive unto Satan. As Jesus said it, we were children of the Devil and we did the deeds that the devil does. Hate is evidence of this. Many people may resist this notion, but John already told us that a person who hates his brother is a murderer no matter if they killed anyone or not. We then refer back to Jesus:

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. (John 8:44)

We see then there are two prime and inescapable characteristics of Satan found in man: 1. hate 2. lying

These are NOT learned behaviors. They are natural to unregenerate man. No one has to be taught to hate or to lie, it comes as natural to unfallen man as anything. This is why we have to train our kids NOT to do all these things. Again, Paul tells us that the unregenerate are BY NATURE children of wrath. No matter how much sin would exist in the world it could never change a person's inherent constitutional nature from neutral to sinner. That constitutional change came by one man (Adam) when by one man's disobedience many were constituted sinners. This is why when we are Baptized by the Spirit into Christ we are constituted righteous. These are the two men that dictate what nature a person is of. They that are in Adam suffer the change of nature brought about by him choosing to enslave himself in obedience to the Serpent (Satan). By one man The Sin entered the world and The Death by The Sin. This is not sin the fruit, but Sin the Root. The dynamic of Sin that was in Satan entered the human race and is evident on every hand.

We have to believe what God has said about man's condition or we will not seek Him for the cure. As a student of Patristic's (Early church Father's), Josephus, and also the Rabbinic Sages, I can say categorically that many New Covenant truths were lost during the first few centuries of the Church. the focus was on issues such as the Trinity and the Nature of Christ, etc. It only got worse until the Reformation when things started to come back around. There are many articles here on SI I have written in years past along these lines. I do not go to the Father's, Josephus or the Rabbinic Sages for counsel, but for historical data and even then I do so cautiously. Only the scriptures are authoritative.

And God has indeed used men that did not believe in Original Sin. I do not say that condescendingly. And anyone that has known me for very long knows I am not afraid to challenge the status-quo. Although my views on subjects are more orthodox than they appear if I am allowed to explain them thoroughly, which can rarely happen when were typing with writer cramp. From my view we have to start by agreeing with God. Man is not just a poor sinner that has made a few bad choices, man is shot through with Sin and is utterly bent towards doing evil unless he is restrained by God with a multitude of measures. Since God thrust Adam from the Garden lest he eat of the Tree of Life and live forever as a sinner, he has employed many measures to contain his sinful nature. For example:

1. He strives with man
2. He gave man to work by the sweat of his face and woman's pain was increased in child bearing
3. He gave the seasons to limit man's means and opportunities
4. After the flood man's years reduced slowly down to max 120 years
5. Death penalty employed
6. God confounded the languages
7. God gave the law at Sinai

Just to name the major ones that come to mind. God had to deal with a people that were bent towards rebellion, hate and lies.

And the LORD smelled a sweet savour; and the LORD said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done. (Genesis 8:21)

Why is man's heart evil from it's youth? Because unregenerate men are of their father the Devil and must be born from above (Genesis 3:3). They have his spirit of disobedience working in them to do his good pleasure. Fallen man has stage 4 Sin with one foot in the grave and one on a banana peeling. If we won't believe what God has said about man's condition, what is the point of even seeking to be born from above? Moreover, we are told categorically that men either bear thorns and briars to be rejected and burned or they bear fruit and are blessed. (Hebrews 6:7-8) There is no middle ground where men are neutral. There are no maple trees (as it were). It's either thorns or fruit. The axe is now laid to the root of the trees and any that do not bring forth good fruit are hewn down and cast into the fire. It is a new day. Christ has come

. We need to accept the sentence and diagnosis and go to Him for the cure. IF any man be IN Christ he/she is a new creature, the old things are passed away and behold all are made new. Hope that helps explain a bit more of my view. Blessings.

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 7:28

Hi Croref

RE: ///Croref wrote by brothagary on 2012/11/9 3:10:43

that's the problem all deeds done by the self are inherently selfish

unregenerate men does good so others might think he is good
he does good so he might gain friends
he does good so others will do good back to him
he does good because others do good to him

Do you believe that was what Joseph was all about ___ Abel, Abraham, Moses, David, Ruth? Shall I go on? ///

and the good Samaritan. Some thoughts that need to be thought about is why did the unregenerate Samaritan have compassion on a Jew ,when at the same time the religious priest and Levite had hearts of stone for their own.

there is no evidence that the good Samaritan did anything out of a self or being inherently selfish

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 7:28

well i don't see in scripture any evidence that Jesus made it possible through his death to cause regeneration ,,,,,making that statement brother would also require you to show evidence ,according to your own demands on me

i would agree maybe with a baptism of his spirit was reliant on his death and resurrection

but as i said even if they were not born again according to the new covenant economy

but no i don't believe God's spirit moved upon the righteous

i think first he moved upon the sinner ,and made him righteous through faith as Paul said about Abraham's imputation of righteousness ,and then moved upon and in ,due to the fact that old testament says the words filled with the spirit

the bible doesn't say that David was unregenerate nor Abraham ,,,that would be your interpretation sir

but it doesn't really bother me whether a person believes this or that

but i think it can lead to thinking too highly of our selves ,and boasting against the branches so to speak

blessings

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 7:28

Hi Croref

RE: ///Croref wrote by brothagary on 2012/11/9 3:10:43

thats the problem all deeds done by the self are inhertly selfish

unregernerent men does good so others might think he is good
he does good so he might gain friends
he does good so others will do good back to him
he does good becasue others do good to him

Do you believe that was what Joseph was all about ___ Abel, Abraham, Moses, David, Ruth? Shall I go on? ///

and the good Samaritan. Some thoughts that need to be thought about is why did the unregenerate Samaritan have compassion on a Jew ,when at the same time the religious priest and Levite had hearts of stone for their own.

their is no evidence that the good Samaritan did anything out of a self or being inhertly selfish

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 7:28

Hi Croref

RE: ///Croref wrote by brothagary on 2012/11/9 3:10:43

thats the problem all deeds done by the self are inhertly selfish

unregernerent men does good so others might think he is good
he does good so he might gain friends
he does good so others will do good back to him
he does good becasue others do good to him

Do you believe that was what Joseph was all about ___ Abel, Abraham, Moses, David, Ruth? Shall I go on? ///

and the good Samaritan. Some thoughts that need to be thought about is why did the unregenerate Samaritan have compassion on a Jew ,when at the same time the religious priest and Levite had hearts of stone for their own.

their is no evidence that the good Samaritan did anything out of a self or being inhertly selfish

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 7:28

well i dont see in scripture any evedence that jesus made it possable through his death to cause regeneration ,,,,making that statment brother would also require you to show evedence ,accoring to your own demands on me

i would agree maby with a baptism of his spirit was reliant on his death and resarection

but as i said even if they were not born again accoring to the new covernt econemey

but no i dont believe gods spirit moveed upon the righeous

i think first he moved upon the sinner ,and made him righeoues through faith as paul said about abrahams imputation of righeousness ,and then moved upon and in ,due to the fact that old testament says the words filled with the spirit

the bible doesnt say that david was unregenerent nor abraham ,,,that would be your interprtation sir

but it doesnt really bother me weather a person believes this or that

but i think it can led to thinking to highly of our selfs ,and boasting against the branches so to speak

blessings

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 7:28

Hi Croref

RE: ///Croref wrote by brothagary on 2012/11/9 3:10:43

thats the problem all deeds done by the self are inhertly selfish

unregenerent men does good so others might think he is good

he does good so he might gain friends

he does good so others will do good back to him

he does good becasue others do good to him

Do you believe that was what Joseph was all about ___ Abel, Abraham, Moses, David, Ruth? Shall I go on? ///

and the good Samaritan. Some thoughts that need to be thought about is why did the unregenerate Samaritan have compassion on a Jew ,when at the same time the religious priest and Levite had hearts of stone for their own.

their is no evidence that the good Samaritan did anything out of a self or being inhertly selfish

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 7:40

hi proud pappa ,that wasnt a literal account of anything that happened ,,it was a parable ,to explain a deeper truth ,, i so upose one can make asumptions abouts a parable and try to use it to suport preconceived notions about doctrines we hold ,,,but dont you think we would be beter off gleainng from doctrine that is taught in scripture it self ,,

in contrass and in full bibilical contex ,there is also no direct evedence that the good samaritan did not do a good deed out of the flesh and self ,or weather or not jesus was desribing through forknowlage a bornagain samamaritan

we would be only asuming

blessings

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 7:41

by RobertW on 2012/11/9 4:18:46

Hi CroRef,

Quote:
-----I ask, where is the issue of original sin seen in this passage, that God addresses, waiting to rear itself that God could invite Cain to challenge it__and be victorious! KEEP IN MIND__no assist here, no special grace in this, no any indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It was Cain alone against__what?____And it remains the same today.

I typically use Cain as an illustration of how quickly the congenital sin made itself known in the human race. John, who gave us our Lord's words that we must be born again, explains the issue from the example of Cain:

Dear Robert, You are wording me to death without addressing the issue of God NOT giving "unregenerate" Cain something he could not perform. This, in the OT, is not about salvation but finding favor with God. If it was not within man's power to perform righteously then God would not have required it. He was a respecter of persons in that regard. He simply exhorted Cain to do good with a caution. We can extend this instruction right up to Duet.6:4__and beyond, if you like.

Lets make no mistake that when we stand before the Lord in that day, He will look at our righteousness or lack of it__not that of Jesus who "gifted" His Life that we might be rectified by the purposed relationship in Him by which we would attain unto perfection in Father.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 7:41

the computed acted up, why some many same post

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 7:44

brothers i hope im not disrupting your thread ,,i feel i dont want to disrupt a good conversation that yous were having with robert ,,,,forgive me if i have ,,and please continue on with out me disrupting you

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 7:46

ahhhhh im seeing double tripple ,,,man i must be getting tired

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 7:55

by brothagary on 2012/11/9 4:28:47

well i dont see in scripture any evidence that jesus made it possible through his death to cause regeneration ,,,,making that statement brother would also require you to show evidence ,according to your own demands on me

i would agree maybe with a baptism of his spirit was reliant on his death and resurrection

but as i said even if they were not born again according to the new covenant economy

but no i dont believe gods spirit moved upon the righteous

i think first he moved upon the sinner ,and made him righteous through faith as paul said about abrahams imputation of

righteousness, and then moved upon and in, due to the fact that old testament says the words filled with the spirit

Quote:

-----the bible doesn't say that David was unregenerate nor Abraham, that would be your interpretation sir

The Bible doesn't say a lot of things but sufficient is given for our understanding.

Quote:

-----but it doesn't really bother me whether a person believes this or that

but I think it can lead to thinking too highly of our selves, and boasting against the branches so to speak

Since you can't provide scripture to support your opinion and deny/dismiss out of hand scriptural understanding with evidence that counters it, what's left to discuss?

I will say this: Regeneration was not for salvation. Faith in God and righteousness alone was all that was necessary to keep man from hell's fire. Regeneration can take man beyond that and directly into the presence of God either for the living or dead. Paul spoke of it. All the OT saints, Elijah and Enoch notwithstanding, died with but the promise of that and, upon death had to wait for it in the grave.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/9 8:00

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----Dear Robert, You are wording me to death without addressing the issue of God NOT giving "unregenerate" Cain something he could not perform. This, in the OT, is not about salvation but finding favor with God. If it was not within man's power to perform righteously then God would not have required it. He was a respecter of persons in that regard. He simply exhorted Cain to do good with a caution. We can extend this instruction right up to Deut.6:4 and beyond, if you like.

I have never said that man could not obey God. I don't think I have ever said that once in my life. When God speaks to man His Word carries within itself the grace to accomplish what He is saying. No Word from God is void of Power.

Satan obeys God every time he is told to do something. Even the demons believe and tremble. But they do not desire to obey God. Man, in a fallen state, typically does not desire to obey God. There are some 'exceptions' to this. Some have testified and seen that the Lord is good and have sought to obey God- all the while another law was working in their members bringing them into captivity to the law of Sin. They were in Adam striving against sin. This was Paul's experience, I believe, before he was born again. (Romans 7)

A person does not have to subscribe to total depravity to believe in original sin. When God speaks we can and we must. What regeneration brings is a whole new nature that loves righteousness and hates iniquity. It loves our neighbor as God works within both to will and do his good pleasure. Even Paul placed himself in Ephesians 2 when he said, "We all walking in times past..." So even while he desired to please God, he still was living in the lusts of the flesh, etc. Hope that helps. Blessings.

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man, on: 2012/11/9 8:09

Quote:
-----Dear Robert, You are wording me to death without addressing the issue of God NOT giving "unregenerate" Cain something he could not perform. This, in the OT, is not about salvation but finding favor with God. If it was not within man's power to perform righteously then God would not have required it. He was a respecter of persons in that regard. He simply exhorted Cain to do good with a caution. We can extend this instruction right up to Duet.6:4___and beyond, if you like.

Lets make no mistake that when we stand before the Lord in that day, He will look at our righteousness or lack of it___not that of Jesus who "gifted" His Life that we might be rectified by the purposed relationship in Him by which we would attain unto perfection in Father. croref

IÂ'm not sure that God did actually require Cain to act righteously in the sense of true righteousness. Could it not be as simple as God telling Cain the truth, that sin was crouching at the door and he would have to master it? There was no remedy for CainÂ's problem if Cain himself could not control himself. This is not a mockery or a test on GodÂ's part but a way of showing Cain his true condition. The Law of Moses was subsequently given to make this same lesson. Today we have the same understanding if we reckon with sin, but our power to resist primarily comes from a new life. I expect that Cain needed a conviction of sin, but what use would a conviction be to a man who had no choice but to live independently of God as far as his natural condition is concerned. For this reason when I read Â"sin crouches at the door etc.Â" I understand that to mean the body of sin and death (physical body) which without the Law of Moses was not yet a law of sin and death, but a power of sin and death and therefore could be restrained by the man (Cain) if he had a heart to restrain in himself. Didn't God "wink" at sin before the Law and by the Law reckon all men incapable of obedience? All things pointing to Christ Jesus crucified before the foundation of the world. When God spoke to Cain was He unaware of that which in His sight was true before the earth itself was even formed? Praise God for His foreknowledge of all things.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/9 8:18

well im sure i can say the same back to you that you are making statements and not using scripture to back it up

please let me glean from what you just said and repeat your quote that you used to justify your self not using scripture

The Bible doesn't say a lot of things but sufficient is given for our understanding

now i agree with that statement

marks of regenerations are faith and righteousness and that alone will save from hell

old testaments saints lived in the presence of god as we do some more than others ,,

sure the new covenant the blood of that ,,opened up the door of heaven for us all ,,definitely

faith is a gift from god ,righteousness accounted to or imputed to man is a gift,, and good deeds perform by faith for god's glory ,is a gift,,for god works in you both to will and to do for his good pleasure ,,paul said that

i don't like to take credit for what god does ,,it smells of pride ,and can produce self praising and boasting in my opinion ,
,

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/9 9:26

by brothagary on 2012/11/9 5:18:52

well im sure i can say the same back to you that you are making statements and not using scripture to back it up

Why don't you ask___as I did only to be dismissed.

___And I will tell you there is nowhere in scripture, before John 20:22, that speaks of or even hints at anyone who could have been even remotely born again. One who is, functions upon a totally new foundation for living life and living it more abundantly is the basis of it. Ergo, the chief purpose for the Word incarnated in Jesus___ He is a new creation living out his life on a totally new basis of life ___Redemption. Know of anyone redeemed in the OT, bro?

Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2012/11/9 12:14

Quote:

RE: Sree wrote ///Bible also says that Jesus came in the LIKENESS of Human flesh. It does not say that he came in Human flesh.///

The Bible does not say anywhere that Jesus came in the LIKENESS of Human flesh. But it does say "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God"

Philippians 2-6:- although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, and being made in the LIKENESS of men. Being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross.

This is the word I quoted. I agree with Brother Robert that there is a difference in the Flesh of Jesus and ours. But my point is we cannot speculate on what the difference is because Bible does not put light on it. I believe everything that the Bible says is true, I do not support any theology to be blinded by it in seeing God's truth.

Jesus was 100% God and at the same time 100% man when he was on this earth. He was tempted in all things both inside and outside like his fellow brothers (bornagain believers) and this where I disagree with Brother RobertW.

By seed, I meant the virgin birth of Jesus and not his Genealogy. By Genealogy he was the son of David and by his heart he was a humble 'Son of Man'. Also my post was for Brother RobertW who understood what I said and gave me an explanation personally. I am sorry if it was not elaborate enough for others to understand.

Re: Sree - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 20:42

after reading your other post and this post, I want to apologize for jumping in the middle of your conversation without researching your entire conversation first. I was mistaken on what you were implying and I thank you for the correction.

RE: Sree wrote///Jesus was 100% God and at the same time 100% man when he was on this earth. He was tempted in all things both inside and outside like his fellow brothers (bornagain believers) and this where I disagree with Brother RobertW.///

I agree, and actually misunderstood your position, when I posted what I did.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/9 21:26

Quote:
----- I agree with Brother Robert that there is a difference in the Flesh of Jesus and ours. But my point is we cannot speculate on what the difference is because Bible does not put light on it.

Just as a point of clarification I want to say that I view our Lord's experience on the Earth, in the body of His flesh, as the same as Adam's human experience prior to the fall. He was fully human, but did not have a sin nature. Whereas people that are born in Adam have both their human nature with the additional corruption of Sin.

- * Some in these threads seem to be saying that man does not have a sin nature.
- * Some seem to be saying that Jesus had a sin nature.
- * I am saying that man is born with a sin nature, but Jesus was not.

One of the problems I see when the subject of original sin or sin nature is brought up is that the issues get straw-manne d until the conversation becomes unfruitful. When i say that man has a sin nature I am not saying that he is not accounta ble for his actions. I am not saying that he could not have chosen NOT to sin when he did sin. I am not saying that the si n nature forces him to sin and thet he cannot help himself. I am saying that man has an inward bent towards sin that is s piritual in nature. Jesus did not have this bent, so Satan himself came to do the tempting. It was an external agency. Fall en man does not need Satan to come and tempt him, he is already walking in the spirit of disobedience as a child of wra th. (Ephesians 2) Blessings.

Re: brothagary - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 21:38

hi brothagary,

RE: brothagary wrote ///hi proud pappa ,that wasnt a literal account of anything that happened ,,it was a parable ,to expl ain a deeper truth///

well it for sure may have been a literal account.

But what was this deeper truth ?? (I pose this question to everyone involved in this discussion ? (we are speaking of the good Samaritan)

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 21:43

Hi Robert W

Do unregenerated men (at least some) posses Compassion ??

Where does this compassion come from??

Why do men feel Compassion??

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/9 21:59

I posted this earlier but you might have missed it due the amount of posts that came at once.

Quote: where does compassion proceed from ??

I get where your coming from but remember the tree that Adam ate. And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is becom e as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and li ve for ever Gen 3:22

We must understand that there are two sides to the story man can be evil but man can be Â“compassionateÂ” good bec ause he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

But the key to understanding our hopelessness is that in eating of the tree we were released from the Spirit of GodÂ…

Looking at it from manÂ’s viewpoint then man may not be all defiled. We are capable of compassion, of love. We know it Â’s better to be good rather and evil, we give awards to people who do good, who show great bravery in times of danger and we teach our children to be good.

But we will miss the issue if we look at it from that viewpoint because we will forget that we are separated from God's Spirit. Being separated from God's Spirit means that we are not dependent on God anymore but are independent of him.

So the source of the Good and Evil stems not from God but from Self.

Self has replaced God, but Self can never please God, if Self could please God then the unbeliever could get to heaven by doing compassionate works like taking care of orphans or widows, which many unbelievers do.

The difference between the good, which proceeds from the Self, and the good that flows from the new life is that the Self always has Self at its center. It is my Self who can perform and does perform good without the need of trusting in the Holy Spirit, without being humble before God, or waiting on God, or praying to God.

Since it is I who wills and thinks and does without the need of God and who consequently considers how improved I am or I have now become good through my own efforts, is it not inevitable that I bring glory to myself?

So when God looks at someone being compassionate but Self is at the center what does he see THE FLESH...

Hope that helps..

Re: murrcolr - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/9 22:32

Hi murrcolr

I fairly agree with your post but let me address one area that I disagree with

murrcolr wrote ///We must understand that there are two sides to the story man can be evil but man can be "compassionate" good because he ate of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.///

an intellectual understanding of good does not produce true compassion, the eating of the forbidden fruit for sure did not cause men to become compassionate. true Compassion is from the heart, true compassion is an attribute of God. it is part of the nature of man since he has been made after the similitude of God.

this attribute becomes more and more suppressed in men as more and more guilt enters the man

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/9 23:58

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

-----Do unregenerated men (at least some) possess Compassion ??

Where does this compassion come from??

Why do men feel Compassion??

I don't know that they possess compassion, but there may be times when they are moved with some level of compassion. The term in the New Testament comes from a root that we get our word spleen from. It means tender mercy. Jesus said that even the publicans love those that love them. This has never been the question as far as I know. The question is, can we love 'perfectly' as God loves.

Jesus comes on the scene in Matthew preaching some radical things that expose the sinful nature, the deadness of man towards God, and how he/she ongoingly falls short of the glory of God. In other words, God wants more than folks that give a head-nod to a series of commandments; He wants people that walk-out the two great commandments as a matter

of course in life- which summarize the 365 Don'ts and 248 Do's (613 Laws) that make up the whole law. We are to love God with all of our heart, soul, mind, etc. and our neighbor as ourselves. That is a tall order.

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?

And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so?

Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect. (Matthew 5:44-5:48)

Jesus points out man's problem; he loves discriminately. Even publican's love those that love them. No big deal. This is not the question. The question is, do men love as God has called us to love; that is to say, do we have the same personality as God. What does He do? For He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.

When a person receives the Holy Spirit for real, the Love of God is poured out into the heart by the Holy Spirit. (Romans 5:5) They are enabled for the first time to meet God's requirement (will) by nature and without coercion; and it is that we love like He loves. Not with a punishment waiting if he/she refuses to love; but they become people that cannot help but be moved with compassion and love. If they get angry, they default right back to love again.

Now we are back to our original subject again, "My spirit shall not always strive with man for he is also flesh." God seeks to goad men and women into the right path, but they do always resist the Holy Spirit. The consequence of this is found in Genesis 6 when the whole earth was FILLED with violence. They were walking according to the spirit of disobedience while simultaneously resisting the Holy Ghost that would have led them in the path of love and mercy. In some way they were yielded to and drawing from the murderous influence of Satan himself. Their nature is to hate; not everyone- but to a greater or lesser degree those that they have set outside of the circle of their love and compassion. Blessings.

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 0:24

Hi RobertW.

RobertW wrote ///Their nature is to hate; not everyone- but to a greater or lesser degree those that they have set outside of the circle of their love and compassion. Blessings.///

But that is the thing mans nature is not totally to hate, the unregenerate man naturally contains attributes of Compassion this is because he is created after similitude of God.

Gen ch 33 v 9-10

And Esau said, I have enough, my brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself.

And Jacob said, Nay, I pray thee, if now I have found grace in thy sight, then receive my present at my hand: for therefore I have seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God, and thou wast pleased with me.

The attribute of grace and compassion and forgiveness that wicked Esau showed to Jacob, Jacob says it is as though I had seen the face of God

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 0:46

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:
-----The attribute of grace and compassion and forgiveness that wicked Esau showed to Jacob, Jacob says it is as though I had seen the face of God.

I understand. There are other examples as well, not the least of which was when Pharaoh's daughter had compassion on a baby Moses and spared his life when he in his infancy had been ordered killed. This is the residual image of God left in a man. Although the image of God has been marred, it is not completely gone. Undoubtedly there will be many people in hell that had showed compassion on many occasions in this life. All their compassion showed, was that they were created in the Image of God and that their natural human capacity for love had not yet waxed cold. The Hebrew word for 'fool' (as in the fool has said in his heart there is no God) is Nabal and it means to wilt. This denotes a process. One is not born a fool, they become a fool through a figurative process of wilting. My point is that human beings, though fallen, are not totally evil as if they are possessed of devils. But they can become that evil if they continue to resist the Holy Spirit and the light of their conscience.

What God has said about man (children of the devil) contrasted with where God is wanting to take man (sons of God), there is a great gulf affixed. I may send my dog to obedience school a couple times and he may learn to be a good-boy. What have I done? I have imposed an institutional law upon his constitutional nature. It looks like it is working real good until the front door opens and he sees a cat in the road. Suddenly his constitutional nature overrides the institutional law I imposed upon him and he bolts through the door and chases the cat. What happened? You cannot with law do what can only be done by the Finger of God. The dog would need his nature changed in order to be civilized like I want him to be.

Likewise, the Law may give man a figure of loving each other, etc., but when the trial comes see if they answer as did Jesus on the Cross or as Stephen when he was stoned; "Lord lay not this sin to their charge!" See who has a disposition like Paul that said he wished himself accursed from Christ for his kinsman the Jews. Man does not move in this love, but God has designed that we would.

I often tell people that regeneration is not a New Years resolution or a getting rid of a few bad habits; it is a total transformation of the person from being a child of the devil to a child of God. We become partakers of the Divine nature. This is not a doctrinal event; it is a bonafied life changing - flesh and blood 'happening'. It is the benefits of the New Covenant that is an exceedingly better covenant established on better promises. Man has always had sins forgiven; but in the New Covenant God has chosen to deal with man sin nature and give him a nature like His own- that can love the unlovable and without discrimination. God wants a people that will pray for those that are murdering them. Anything less is to sell the Gospel short. Just a few thoughts. Blessings.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 0:59

Great post RobertW.

and blessings to you brother.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 5:49

by Sree on 2012/11/9 9:14:02

“Philippians 2-6:- although He existed in the form of God, did not regard equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a bond-servant, and being made in the LIKENESS of men. Being found in appearance as a man, He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death, even death on a cross.”

Grasped? That means something reached for. Oswald Chambers cleared this up very nicely for me when he said: “Our reach must exceed our grasp. . . . Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect. . . . If we have only what we have experienced, we have nothing; if we have the inspiration of the vision of God, we have more than we can experience.”

Jesus, as Son of God, could never have conveyed His life to man as an example of life to be lived, intended as the Father purposed, if He had not laid aside His "birth right" to become as they were, i.e., flesh and bone AND blood ___and all else that comes with that package. The only difference was Jesus was a sinless man Who was indwelt by the very Godhead of the Father, born with it as *one born innocent. His living His life was of the Father's will in all that Jesus did and thought. He was, as someone put it, "Consummate man" not easily understood by man who was not consummate___nor could ordinary understand unless he partakes of that which is.___And then it is seen to be something striven for once "conception" has taken place in his heart.

*Though both arrived on the scene innocent and independent, the main difference between Adam and Jesus was Adam was formed out of the dust of the ground with no "indwelling" life of God in Him. Jesus was born with it. Adam was purposed to "arrive" at a point in his life, by a series of moral choices, when he would have received it whereas Jesus, who already possessed it, was given the responsibility of protecting it.

By being received as a "regular guy" meant that He could evangelize the people to the Father as a man and not as God; someone the masses could "more easily grasp", until John 6 when He declared Himself Son of God.

Quote:

-----This is the word I quoted. I agree with Brother Robert that there is a difference in the Flesh of Jesus and ours.

In this from bro. Robert, I see no difference insomuch as His flesh was tempted every bit as our is. Jesus showed us how He overcame it.

Quote:

----- But my point is we cannot speculate on what the difference is because Bible does not put light on it. I believe everything that the Bible says is true, I do not support any theology to be blinded by it in seeing God's truth.

I think your Phil 2:6- quote does. I trust the Lord opened it up a little by what I posited. If He didn't, it profited me in doing it.))

Quote:

-----Jesus was 100% God and at the same time 100% man when he was on this earth.

That understanding is very true and needs be extended, made clear, to all those born again of Him for two reasons: to overcome our flesh, for the cleansing of our souls and, to protect the Godhead. cf 1Pet.1:22.

Thank you Sree for this. It has been a great help to me and I hope you a swell.

"And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory." Mark 13:26 (KJV) Hallelujah!!

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2012/11/10 7:38

proud papa wrote: an intellectual understanding of good does not produce true compassion, the eating of the forbidden fruit for sure did not cause men to become compassionate. true Compassion is from the heart, true compassion is an attribute of God. it is part of the nature of man since he has been made after the similitude of God.

Okay to understand what was changed when the forbidden fruit was eaten we must look at where knowledge is seated.

The heart of him that hath understanding seeketh knowledge: but the mouth of fools feedeth on foolishness. Proverbs 15:14

The heart of the prudent getteth knowledge; and the ear of the wise seeketh knowledge. Proverbs 18:15

Bow down thine ear, and hear the words of the wise, and apply thine heart unto my knowledge. Proverbs 22:17

I communed with mine own heart, saying, Lo, I am come to great estate, and have gotten more wisdom than all they that have been before me in Jerusalem: yea, my heart had great experience of wisdom and knowledge Ecclesiastes 1:16

So the heart of man is where knowledge or understanding is according to the bible along with all the will and emotion, the very same place that compassion or love comes from. I can agree with you that we are created in God's image but that image has been perverted and as such we can love or be compassionate but at a far lower level than what God is capable of, he alone is the only being of "True Compassion".

Man's heart was changed when he ate of the fruit there was a (using Robert W word) a constitutional change. A change to his nature, he no longer was what God had created him to be, "the heart" (or soul) was moved from the place of a submission to God Spirit's to rebellion against God's Spirit.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 8:24

by murrcoir on 2012/11/10 4:38:19

So the heart of man is where knowledge or understanding is according to the bible along with all the will and emotion, the very same place that compassion or love comes from. I can agree with you that we are created in God's image but that image has been perverted and as such we can love or be compassionate but at a far lower level than what God is capable of, he alone is the only being of "True Compassion".

God's image cannot be perverted! So what is left is that it was rejected by "individual" man to set up in his heart a god of his own making__himself and anything else he might wish to worship.. 'Unrepentant man has said in his heart he will have no God over him'. In this is he his own god.

Quote:
-----Man's heart was changed when he ate of the fruit there was a (using Robert W word) a constitutional change. A change to his nature, he no longer was what God had created him to be, "the heart" (or soul) was moved from the place of a submission to God Spirit's to rebellion against God's Spirit.

Man's heart was sealed to "Vanity" Adam was unwillingly subjected to with the hope of God that he would overcome it and move on in Him. He did not and sealed us all to our fate of having to our lifelong having to deal with it. It goes by the name, "Flesh".

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 9:03

Hi Croref

Croref wrote
///It goes by the name, "Flesh".///

Is that what the flesh or carnal mind is ?? or is the Carnal (sarx) mind the voice of reason ??

Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2012/11/10 9:16

Quote God's image cannot be perverted!

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. Gen1:27

And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years Gen 6:3

God's image in man has been perverted...

As you say man is man's own god.

In the Kingdom of Light Jesus is Lord

In the Kingdom of Darkness self is lord.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 9:19

Hi Croref

Croref wrote
///It goes by the name, "Flesh".///

Is that what the flesh or carnal mind is ?? or is the Carnal (sarx) mind the voice of reason ??

Hi Papa! If what rules us is not of God or God Himself, does it really matter? It needs to be overcome and that is what our new birth is all about, i.e., the perfection of our life in the Father as Jesus lived it FROM His. I know of only one hindrance to such success in my life__ME! Now, who is "me" but my own "mortal flesh". Are they thought processes? Too be sure, yes and is the doorway to my soul to get it involved with my flesh, to utilize its control over my mind, will and emotion.

Now where do we go from here except to believe as Paul believed was his problem and the solution to it, shown us in Rom 7. Make no mistake about it, this warfare will go on until the day of the Lord but we should rejoice inasmuch as it is our opportunity to perfect our allegiance in Him and by Him because we cannot unless we abide IN Him.

Jesus said: "He who overcomes

Re: murrclor - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 9:24

Hi murrclor, we are getting deep, I am enjoying it

murrclor wrote ///So the heart of man is where knowledge or understanding is according to the bible along with all the will and emotion, the very same place that compassion or love comes from///

The problem I find in this statement is that you have lumped understanding (intuition) with (intellectual) knowledge.

they do not reside in the same place,

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 9:24

by murrcolr on 2012/11/10 6:16:40

Quote God's image cannot be perverted!

So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. Gen1:27

And the LORD said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years Gen 6:3

God's image in man has been perverted...

As you say man is man's own god.

In the Kingdom of Light Jesus is Lord

In the Kingdom of Darkness self is lord.

Yes, I know but, your conclusion is wrong.

Re: Rom 7. - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 9:29

Hi Croref

Romans 7 is a person living under the Law rather than under grace, Christians as Galatians points out some times bring themselves under this bondage, But Romans 7 is speaking of a pre conversion.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/10 9:30

Quote: Is that what the flesh or carnal mind is ?? or is the Carnal (sarx) mind the voice of reason ??

This last few days I have been reading the book called His Deeper Work in Us by Sidlow Baxter, This morning i was reading the part below.

Romans 12:2, "Be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind". That word, "transformed", here, is arresting. It is used by a divinely inspired apostle, and it is used in relation to human character. Its meaning cannot be thinned down; the Greek word is that from which comes our own word, "metamorphosis".

In Romans 12:2, therefore, the word "transformed", must not be denied its maximum meaning; so it indicates nothing less than a radical renovation.

Moreover, it is no mere theoretical transformation, or something which the believer has to "reckon" as having taken place, whether the evidences are apparent or not; for, as the text says, it takes place by the actual "renewing" of the "mind"—something actually effected by divine interference in the depths of human personality.

http://www.prayermeetings.org/files/J_Sidlow_Baxter/Baxter_His_Deeper_Work_In_Us.pdf

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 9:42

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 6:29:02

Hi Croref

Romans 7 is a person living under the Law rather than under grace, Christians as Galatians points out some times bring themselves under this bondage, But Romans 7 is speaking of a pre conversion.

Come again?? No,no. Bro. Re-read a few more times. Here:

"I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man : 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. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. Romans 7:21-25 (KJV)

Here is the conclusion to the matter:

There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the FLESH, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. Romans 8:1-2 (KJV)

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 9:45

by murrclor on 2012/11/10 6:30:54

Hi murr!

If you will fit this verse into Baxter's thinking you will our have responsibility in the matter:

"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" 1 Peter 1:22 (KJV)

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 9:57

Hi Croref

Croref wrote ///No,no. Bro. Re-read a few more times///

I have read it hundreds of times! practicaly have it memorized, it is a first person narrative of a past tense event.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 10:05

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 6:57:12

Hi Croref

Croref wrote ///No,no. Bro. Re-read a few more times///

I have read it hundreds of times! practicaly have it memorized, it is a first person narrative of a past tense event.

Indeed__it is a "past tense" event__one Paul got the "first person"al victory over. He then sets out to reveal how it can b

e done IN us if we are truly IN Christ.

The word, "Abide" somehow comes to mind. .))

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 10:07

start at verse 9 (For I was alive without the law once) that is Paul saying once upon a time,(past tense) He then goes into describing His (past life,Past tense)life before conversion before Grace being brought up under the law. He ends with the conclusion (who shall deliver me from the body of this death?) and then gives the solution to that question (I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.)

Romans 7 is unarguably a man under the Law not A Christian under Grace

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 10:16

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 7:07:37

Romans 7 is unarguably a man who WAS ONCE under the Law and not a Christian, who came into the knowledge of Jesus Christ, became a Christian and, in the process of learning Christ, moved out of condemnation and into His life..

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 10:36

Hi Croref

If Romans 7 is speaking of the Crucifying process or learning of Christ. Then Paul would not have started the narrative at his Birth as what he did in verse 9

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 10:41

Whatever Proud papa. It's all there I see as being the case. I don't believe I am wrong.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 10:43

D.M. Lloyd Jones, Commentary on Romans, Zondervan, 1980, pp 251, 252

All the scripture in their accounts and descriptions of the regenerate man teach the exact opposite of what we find here in Romans 7. But we must go further. I suggest that to interpret Romans 7 in terms of the fully regenerate man - Paul at his best - is indeed to place the regenerate man at his best in an inferior position to the saints of God under old testament teaching...

'To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion, to give them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.' In such words Isaiah had already answered Romans 7 nearly eight centuries beforehand. These are the blessings of the gospel dispensation - beauty, joy, praise! It is the very antithesis of 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?'

"Indeed, I do not hesitate to say that if you interpret Romans 7 as referring to the regenerate man you are really excluding the doctrine of sanctification altogether. Or if not that, it certainly excludes the possibility of any growth in sanctification. .. So it comes to this, that the more Christian a man becomes the more miserable he becomes, and the highest point he reaches will mark the greatest depth of his misery..."

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 10:51

The reason I am so adamantly opposed to the doctrine of sin nature and Romans 7 taught as the normal Christian life is because I was once enslaved to gross habitual sin and I excused it in my mind with these beliefs. It was not until I had these views challenged did I truly come to a realization of my own personal depravity and my true need of a savior.

edit: I am going to change the word 'understanding' to 'beliefs' to more accurately articulate my point

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 11:08

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 7:51:29

The reason I am so adamantly opposed to the doctrine of sin nature and Romans 7 taught as the normal Christian life is because I was once enslaved to gross habitual sin and I excused it in my mind with these understandings, It was not until I had these views challenged did I truly come to a realization of my own personal depravity and my true need of a savior.

You just told me you didn't read a word of my replies for understanding __and now I know why. Thank you.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 11:10

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 7:43:33

D.M. Lloyd Jones, Commentary on Romans, Zondervan, 1980, pp 251, 252

All the scripture in their accounts and descriptions of the regenerate man teach the exact opposite of what we find here in Romans 7.

Throw out your commentaries, especially him and others like him who write from a position of unbelief and protectionism of their doctrine, read your bible and write your own.

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 11:38

Hi Croref

I do not use commentaries for any other reason than to see if any of them has come to the same conclusion as I have, I believe for the most part that they muffle the Word of God.

As in this case I only use it to show that my perspective is held by others than just myself and since they often times are better at articulating the belief,

You keep speaking of Chambers and others so do not take a position as though you only read your bible.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 12:29

by proudpapa on 2012/11/10 8:38:18

Hi Croref

I do not use commentaries for any other reason than to see if any of them has come to the same conclusion as I have, I believe for the most part that they muffle the Word of God.

As in this case I only use it to show that my perspective is held by others than just myself and since they often times are better at articulating the belief,

You keep speaking of Chambers and others so do not take a position as though you only read your bible.

I don't trust commentaries, Papa. The fact I might happen to refer to one that will agree with my thinking is 1. rare. 2. That they do it is usually with a caveat. I never take anything from them for the most part because they are grossly slanted/biased in their take on the issues surrounding redemption, salvation and the new birth. Most all very shallow and stuck in one mode of thinking that excuses man/relieves him of all responsibility after his initial salvation __and spend much time and words exhorting one to hang in there. That's sometimes called the "white knuckle club". How they know anyone is saved is beyond me. Anyway, you mentioned Chambers. I would say this: he is not slanted. He is not a commentator but a teacher. Not a theologian but an expositor of his vision of Jesus Christ, established in a pure heart that, next to my Bible is the next best literary treasure anyone could possibly have and take into himself for the perfecting of his soul for the Father... He covers all the issues in a way that one who seeks Father with all his heart, soul and mind will find to be an e

lder brother.

As a closing exhortation: if you want a word from the Lord read his devotional, "My Utmost for His Highest". No other compares.

In Christ,

Cross

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 13:07

Hi proudpapa,

The reason I am so adamantly opposed to the doctrine of sin nature and Romans 7 taught as the normal Christian life is because I was once enslaved to gross habitual sin and I excused it in my mind with these beliefs, It was not until I had these views challenged did I truly come to a realization of my own personal depravity and my true need of a savior.

I think it is important to keep in mind that Christ dealt with man's sinful nature on the cross so that they that are IN Christ have been freed from it. I personally don't believe that true Christians that are truly born again (not of a decision or merely saying a prayer, etc.) have two natures. This is a common view, but I do not share it. Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/10 13:36

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 10:07:01

I think it is important to keep in mind that Christ dealt with man's sinful nature on the cross so that they that are IN Christ have been freed from it. I personally don't believe that true Christians that are truly born again (not of a decision or merely saying a prayer, etc.) have two natures. This is a common view, but I do not share it. Blessings.

I fully agree! The soul of man can only handle one. I do however, believe the flesh is that which remains that must be overcome by that one new born from above. Jesus exemplified this that we might understand the issues.

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/10 15:18

Hi RobertW

///think it is important to keep in mind that Christ dealt with man's sinful nature on the cross so that they that are IN Christ have been freed from it. I personally don't believe that true Christians that are truly born again (not of a decision or merely saying a prayer, etc.) have two natures. This is a common view, but I do not share it. Blessings.///

why add the word nature to man's sinfulness? why not just say that Christ dealt with man's sin on the cross so that they that are IN Christ have been freed from it.

why be so adamant about using a phrase that is nowhere found in scripture, KJV, greek or hebrew ?

I only say that because had you just said sin without adding the word nature. I could have and would have simply said (well said)

But anyhow it is more of the dual nature theology that I am opposed to, thank you for clarifying your position on that aspect.

great thoughts and great discussion

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/10 18:40

Quote: But anyhow it is more of the dual nature theolgy that I am opposed to.

Personally I don't really care what you want to call it.

Scripture tells us that we as Christian's two opposing forces that are work in us.

Gal 5:17 For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/10 19:07

i think there will allways be fruitless dialog when there is different definitons used by different people for a word like nature

some will call it one nature,,somewill call it two natures some will call it two forces that effect our nature

i honestly dont know what the standared defenition of the word nature is

all i know is the flesh and the spirit seems to have effects on our nature and how we act

and before we recieved the spirit of god ,andd were givern a new heart

this flesh seemed to control us to the extent ,that it ws imposable to please god ,in anything we did

weather we call it a sinnature ,or a flesh nature

or flesh or sin ,,or evil ,or courption

it had us all as its slave and we obaed it

sin nature ,,or a slave to sin ,,seems to mean the same thing

slave is bound by his master and can not just be set free

he is a bond slave of sin ,

whats worse is he knowns no other master ,and drinks sin as if it was water

he has allways been free from righteousness ,till christ set him free as paul said

blessings

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/10 22:25

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

-----why be so adamant about using a phrase that is no where found in scripture, KJV ,greek or hebrew ?

The term sin nature is based in part on Ephesians 2:3b; ...fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. It is actually the term employed by the NIV translators to translate sarx in Galatians 5:17, "For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature

e. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want." This was likely done to keep folks from thinking that the trouble is our flesh (body). That would be dualism.

Quote:

-----why add the word nature to mans sinfulness

Because man is not a sinner simply because he/she sins; they sin because they are sinners. They are by nature children of wrath. By one man The Sin entered the world and by one man's sin we were all constituted sinners. In contrast, by one man's obedience many will be constituted righteous. That is to say, in the same way that men were by nature rebellious children of wrath IN Adam- they can be by nature obedient loving children of God IN Christ. Hope that helps. Blessings.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/11 0:25

Let me say first of all thanks to all who have posted on this thread.

On my quest I have read many books, listened to many sermons, posted many posts to try and understand the "theology" on how a man becomes "Holy". I became a member of sermonindex 2007 after finding Duncan Campbell's testimony on here. God Spirit through Duncan's testimony opened up the door that it was possible to be Holy. It was these words of Duncan's that cut through my heart like knife "go for God whatever it takes" This led to a whole month where God's Spirit was on me in a very strong way, during this time he opened my eyes to see my condition but he also gave me the hope for a cure.

As we say here in Scotland "the penny has dropped" it has become clear to me on what must be done to crossover in to Canaan to live a Holy and Victorious life. I now understand what happened to Duncan Campbell as he lay bleeding on the battlefield in France. As he lay there bleeding to death with no hope of rescue he surrendered his all to God. When God saw that complete and full surrender by the faith to the Son of God he purified Duncan and allowed him into Canaan Duncan "entered into his rest"

I see it like Duncan I must surrender completely to the Spirit of God because it's me I am the Flesh; it is me that hinders God Spirit. The life of a Christian is not supposed to be walked in the power of self but in the Power of the Holy Spirit.

I know understand what Paul means, I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me Gal 2:20

I have not found that place of surrender yet but I can see that is what is required a full surrender by faith in Christ; then and only then will I be able to declare although I live it's not me, it's Christ.

Blessings and thanks again.

Re: murrcolr - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 0:51

excellent post, murrcolr

I have just finished spending 2 hours on an in-depth response to brother Robert's last post (one that I was real proud of) but I believe I will hold off on posting it. There is a lot of power in your post and I do not want to disrupt it. we are spending too much time in the wilderness if not still in Egypt it is time to step into Jordan.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2012/11/11 7:10

proud papa. I don't think that we need to say Romans 7 is arguably dealing with an unregenerate man under grace and not a believer under grace. Paul's statements are much too clear for that. Paul is unquestionably dealing with his life before grace and the futility of trying to be right with God and live a righteous life by the works of the flesh.

as to nature, I agree that the concept of man's nature is not a direct biblical teaching. Being by nature the children of wrath is not speaking of an innate nature, but is saying that by nature of the fact that we were lost, we were deserving only of God's wrath. It is a different definition of the word nature.

The only real scriptural defense of duality of nature comes from these two passages. I don't think, if we interpret correctly, that the idea of duality of nature has a leg to stand on.

however we do deal with our flesh, and its desires. My flesh is not born again. My spirit is. This is why Paul spends so much time talking about our walking in the spirit. Romans 7 is between 6 and 8 in much the same way as 1 Corinthians 13 is between 12 & 14. It cannot be pulled out to stand on its own. It is given in the context of contrasting flesh and spirit.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 7:11

by RobertW on 2012/11/10 19:25:28

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

-----why be so adamant about using a phrase that is nowhere found in scripture, KJV, Greek or Hebrew?

The term sin nature is based in part on Ephesians 2:3b; "...fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. It is actually the term employed by the NIV translators to translate *sarx* in Galatians 5:17, "For the sinful nature desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the sinful nature. They are in conflict with each other, so that you do not do what you want." This was likely done to keep folks from thinking that the trouble is our flesh (body). That would be dualism.

Quote:

-----why add the word nature to man's sinfulness

Because man is not a sinner simply because he/she sins; they sin because they are sinners. They are by nature children of wrath. By one man's sin the world was entered and by one man's sin we were all constituted sinners. In contrast, by one man's obedience many will be constituted righteous. That is to say, in the same way that men were by nature rebellious children of wrath IN Adam- they can be by nature obedient loving children of God IN Christ. Hope that helps. Blessings.

Which only means the redeemed of the Lord will face a greater judgement for his sins. So, "Let every man examine himself . . ."

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 7:41

by twayneb on 2012/11/11 4:10:56

Beautifully put and G'mornin, twayneb!

For some reason that escapes me, folk refuse to view flesh and vanity as being complimentary when coming to grips with the issue of overcoming. When born of God they become something outside us. Let me say this and then please comment:

Our old nature was not influenced by sin__our souls were. How? Through our flesh, by temptation and untoward affinities. Our natures being devoid of God made us to be our god. Our souls were in complete union with our flesh and vanity. Our "I love you's" always went out from us with a hook in it. We chose as we saw fit but always looking out for our interests. I was not a "child of wrath" until you crossed me or I had to "deny myself". BTW: I was a compassionate man__when it suited me. So what is the problem that we need a new nature? Might we liken the need to one who has cataracts? "Unless you are born again__you cannot see. . ." (cf Jn3:3,5)

OMT: As someone lamented we should be discussing crossing over into Jordan instead of some of this over stuff, let me say that there were and are giants in the "promised land" given us to defeat. Therefore to expect a "no warfare" scenario is folly. We must expect it. We must overcome those giants in our lives and that is what our new birth from above is all about. We are given to do it the same way He did and then prayed for our success in John 17. However, let him who enters the process, "first count the cost".

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 8:57

We have been touching upon this and similar subjects in at least 3 threads that I know of these last few weeks so it may not be completely clear where we all come down on these great subjects. Lest we talk around each other for days, months and years, I want to spell out what I believe on this matter in one spot. Let me first say that I seem to be seeing several posts that suggest that man is effectively born WITHOUT what is sometimes known theologically as Original Pollution. This is effectively what Charles Finney believed and his view is gaining momentum.

One of the fundamental elements of the subject of man's sin and salvation (soteriology) biblically is what came to be known as 'Original Sin.' There are various ways this doctrine is described, but typically it is understood to mean that men and women are born into this life as sinners with a sinful nature. There are the matters of original guilt and original pollution. As David said, "...in sin did my mother conceive me." (Psalm 51:5) Some more radical ideas suggest that the WILL is in complete bondage to the Sinful Nature in a state of Total Depravity. This essentially means that man in his fallen state cannot rightly obey God. I'm not sure the Bible uses the concept of the will in this way. The sad thing is that folks that discuss these topics typically straw-man the other sides views until there is little fruit in the conversation. I hope to change that here.

I want to say that I would affirm that though man is born constituted as a sinner because of the choice of Adam, this constitution by no means relieved man of his free choice. (Joshua 24:15) God is JUST in condemning man for his sin because man could have chosen at any given time NOT to sin. (Romans 2:1) This is the essential message of Romans chapters 1-3. However, we must bear in mind that Romans goes on to tell us that man has been constituted a sinner in Adam. (Romans 5:19 YLT) The KJV uses the phrase "were MADE sinners." Paul goes on to say that by the obedience of one man many will be MADE righteous. Keep our eye on the word 'made'. Finney and neo-Finnyites will balk at the notion of imputed righteousness, so there is only one other way for them to see this passage. It has to mean that we are made righteous in Christ, not positionally but actually.

God made man good and upright. But by one man The Sin entered the world and The death by The Sin. This is not sin the fruit (deeds) this is Sin (the root or the dynamic). It should go without saying that all people everywhere have sinned and fall short of the glory of God. There is none righteous, no not one. There is none that seeks after God and there is none that does good- no not one, etc. Jesus told Nicodemus that he must be born from above and mildly chided him for being a teacher in Israel and not knowing this basic fact. Why did he not believe it or teach it? Because you first have to believe that you are of your father the devil and the lusts of your father you will do. How can a person sin their life away and then try to suggest that they are not of their father the devil? Not to be surprised, people typically did not accept the sentence then and they don't now. But what did John say?

He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.

In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. (1 John 3:8-10)

This is straightforward truth. A person is either a child of God or a child of the Devil. A person cannot become a child of God simply by turning over a new leaf or getting rid of a few lousy habits (as L. Ravenhill would say). A person must be BORN of God. This is John 3:3 all over again that Nicodemus, the teacher in Israel, had no clue about. Look around in the world. What do you see? Do you see people sinning and hating one another or do you see people living righteously and loving one another? Some would dismiss these passages or explain them away and say, "It is their choice", etc. and this is true. It IS their choice, but it is also their nature. It's what they do in the same sense that producing thorns is what a thorn bush does. Notice John did NOT call the sinners 'disciples of the Devil'. He did not call them 'followers of the Devil'. He called them CHILDREN of the Devil. Why? Because the Devil is their father. A father does not make followers and disciples, a father makes sons and daughters. This is one of the oldest truths in the Bible- living things bring forth fruit after their own kind. Look at the fruit and you can know the parent.

Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh. (James 3)

The answer to James' question is a resounding no, it cannot. If you are going to change the fruit of something you have to change its essential nature. Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil. (Jeremiah 13:23) This motif continues to play out when we read in Hebrews:

For the earth which drinketh in the rain that cometh oft upon it, and bringeth forth herbs meet for them by whom it is dressed, receiveth blessing from God: But that which beareth thorns and briers is rejected, and is nigh unto cursing; whose end is to be burned. (Hebrews 6:7-8)

This passage is dealing with the very subject of this thread- the Holy Spirit striving with man. Notice there is no such thing in this passage as a fruitless or thornless tree- a tree is one or the other. Trees are used figuratively in scripture for men. God is pouring out grace and His Spirit and He continues to get thorns and briars. The axe is laid to the root of the trees and those that do not bring forth good fruit are cast into the fire. But a thorn tree cannot arbitrarily decide one day it will bring forth fruit. People try it all the time though. They try to cut the thorns off of their limbs and hang the fruit of the Spirit on like Christmas ornaments. But when the chips are down the real nature of the tree comes out again. Give it time. You will see if it is changed. It is a thorn tree and will always be until God changes its essential nature by the Finger of God in regeneration (palingenesis). What did Jesus say?

Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. (John 15:4-5)

If there is no fruit then the person is NOT In Christ. It doesn't matter how many times they said the sinners prayer or signed a card. The reality is in the fruit.

Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. (Matthew 7:16-21)

If a person is not bearing fruit- they are not partaking of the Holy Spirit. This is because figuratively they are not grafted into the vine. This is what Paul was talking about when he told the Gentiles not to boast against the branches. They had been 'grafted in' to the olive tree (Christ). Let's turn this around. What is a person 'grafted in to' that bears thorns, briars, thistles, etc.? Why do they have to be burned? Because they are bringing forth from their essential nature that is drawing from a totally different spirit. Nobody on earth lives without drawing from some well- either of Satan or of God. This is not a casual dropping by to get some advice from the Devil, it is a drawing forth of the very life (death) of Satan himself. Jesus told them, "You are of your father the devil." The fruit of the life demonstrates the source of their strength. Paul said it plainly in Ephesians:

And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins;

Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:

Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us,

Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved; (Ephesians 2:1-5)

So we were dead towards God and alive (quickened) towards the Prince of the Power of the Air- walking in the Spirit of Disobedience- and were by NATURE children of wrath. This is an almost parallel to walking in the Spirit- born of the Spirit- except it is the spirit of the Devil himself. As surely as a thorn tree is one by nature surely a sinner is a sinner by nature. I know it sounds simple, but this is why John had to keep coming back to the subject over and over again. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother. (1 John 3:8-10)

There is no middle ground where folks are just neutral. One is either a child of God or a child of the devil. They are either in Adam or in Christ. They are either grafted into Christ bearing the fruit of His vine- or they are grafted into the Prince of the Power of the Air and moving in the spirit of disobedience yielding thorns and briars. If a person wants to switch from being a thorn yielding child of the Devil, they have to agree with God in what He has said about them and their condition. You MUST be born from Above. (John 3:3) It is a simple statement of fact. I know it is a little long, but I hope this is enough info to clear up my view of it. Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 9:16

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 5:57:08

There is no middle ground where folks are just neutral. One is either a child of God or a child of the devil. They are either in Adam or in Christ. They are either grafted into Christ bearing the fruit of His vine- or they are grafted into the Prince of the Power of the Air and moving in the spirit of disobedience yielding thorns and briars. If a person wants to switch from being a thorn yielding child of the Devil, they have to agree with God in what He has said about them and their condition. You MUST be born from Above. (John 3:3) It is a simple statement of fact. I know it is a little long, but I hope this is enough info to clear up my view of it. Blessings.

"Enoch walked with God and God took him". Which side was he on, Robert? Was he born from above? And then there is Abel that, by his faith, pleased God. What about him? Which side was he on? ___Why are these people and others as David, a man after God's own heart, completely dismissed when speaking as you have written above. I don't get it. Sorry

.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 9:20

Quote:
-----"Enoch walked with God and God took him". Which side was he on, Robert? Was he born from above? And then there is Abel that, by his faith, pleased God. What about him? Which side was he on? ___Why are these people completely dismissed when speaking as you have written above. I don't get it. Sorry.

They were heirs to the righteousness that is of God by faith. That is a completely different thing than being born from above.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 9:22

the nature in Ephesians 2:3 is speaking of the natural course 'the past walk' as 2:2 as does all the verses that use the word nature in scripture

Eph 2:6 Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of (these things!!) cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience

Paul is saying in the future there will be a widespread deception that men with vain words (great orators) will try to deceive many into believing, it will teach that it is not the actions of men that cause the men to become the recipients of the wrath. Paul says of this 'Let no man deceive you with vain words'

Galatians 2:15

We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,

Where the Jews sinless by their nature?? As Ephesians 2:3 this verse is in reference of their natural course our natural course.

Romans 11

17 And if some of the branches be broken off, (because of unbelief some of the Jews were thrown off course) and thou, being a wild olive tree, (being on a natural course that will cause us to do things that will bring about the wrath of God on us) wert grafted in among them, (grafted on to a new course) and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

18 Boast not against the branches. (Jews) But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

19 Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in.

20 Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear:

21 For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

The word nature in scripture is never in context to some inherent sin that we inherit at conception that causes us to be the recipient of God's wrath because we are of Adam's offspring but rather the term is always referring to our natural course.

that voice that you right now are reasoning these things with is the Flesh the sarx mind as murrcolr has realized ///it's me I am the Flesh/// it is our voice of reason.

step on into the water

I had to edit the paragraphs in order

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 9:24

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 6:20:26

Quote:
-----"Enoch walked with God and God took him". Which side was he on, Robert? Was he born from above? And then there is Abel that, by his faith, pleased God. What about him? Which side was he on? ___Why are these people completely dismissed when speaking as you have written above. I don't get it. Sorry.

They were heirs to the righteousness that is of God by faith. That is a completely different thing than being born from above.

Quote:

Not in a heartbeat can you reconcile them with your pronouncement. They were either on one side or the other. You said so.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 9:27

Quote:
-----I don't get it. Sorry.

What is being lost in this conversation is the distinction between the old testament and New Covenant possibilities. There were saints in the Old Testament, but they did not have the promises of the New Covenant. The New Covenant brings to the table exceeding great and precious promises whereby we can become partakers of the Divine Nature. The Old Covenant desired to hear the things that we now hear but never heard them.

For I tell you, that many prophets and kings have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them. (Luke 10:24)

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 9:30

RE: Poudpapa

The word nature in scripture is never in context to some inherent sin that we inherit at conception that causes us to be the recipient of God's wrath because we are of Adam's offspring but rather the term is always referring to our natural course.

that voice that you right now are reasoning these things with is the FLESH the sarx mind as murrcoir has realized ///it's me I am the Flesh/// it is our voice of reason.

No! The ME is my SOUL. MY SOUL is who I am.

How 'bout going at this OMT with that in mind?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 9:34

Quote:
-----Not in a heartbeat can you reconcile them with your pronouncement. They were either on one side or the other. You said so.

For one, the paragraph you quoted is out of it's context. I didn't say that one is one or the other, John did. I am merely agreeing with what he said. I believe John is right. Do you?

Abraham, Enoch and the rest of the Old Testament believers were all in Adam, but they died in faith- not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 9:36

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 6:27:27

Quote:
-----I don't get it. Sorry.

What is being lost in this conversation is the distinction between the old testament and New Covenant possibilities. There were saints in the Old Testament, but they did not have the promises of the New Covenant.

Here is your error:

Quote:
-----The New Covenant brings to the table exceeding great and precious promises whereby we can become partakers of the Divine Nature. . .

By the new birth, WE ARE partakers of the Divine Nature and. . . what's more are we given to learn by it and to protect it just as Jesus learned it and protected it. On this is the covenant established. "Let this Mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus".

No one in the OT was given that responsibility. No one.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 9:39

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 6:34:19

Quote:
-----Not in a heartbeat can you reconcile them with your pronouncement. They were either on one side or the other. You said so.

For one, the paragraph you quoted is out of it's context. I didn't say that one is one or the other, John did. I am merely agreeing with what he said. I believe John is right. Do you?

That being the case, you used John to make your point. . did you not?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 9:42

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 6:34:19

Abraham, Enoch and the rest of the Old Testament believers were all in Adam, but they died in faith- not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Totally irrelevant.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 9:43

Hi proudpapa,

Quote:

the nature in Ephesians 2:3 is speaking of the natural course 'the past walk' as 2:2 as does all the verses that use the word nature in scripture

I understand that Paul is speaking of our past walk. In no way am I now or have I suggested in these threads that it is the walk of the Born Again Saint of God. Paul is dealing with what we were as sinners.

Quote:

-----Where the Jews sinless by their nature?? As Ephesians 2:3 this verse is in reference of their natural course our natural course.

Returning now to my long post where I explained my view of sin nature you will recall I spoke often about the children motif. By nature children of wrath is a statement that through the use of Children (τέκνα) emphasizes the connection by birth; see on John 1:12. By nature (φύσει) accords with children, implying what; is innate. That man is born with a sinful nature, and that God and sin are essentially antagonistic, are conceded on all hands. (Vincent)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 9:44

Quote:

-----Abraham, Enoch and the rest of the Old Testament believers were all in Adam, but they died in faith- not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Totally irrelevant.

Your dismissive attitude does not lend well to a fruitful conversation. I must ask, are you really trying to reckon what what I am saying or are you wanting to argue? I have no desire whatsoever to participate in an argument. Blessings.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 9:53

///it's me I am the Flesh///

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 9:53

///it's me I am the Flesh///

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 10:15

Hi CroRef,

Quote:

-----No one in the OT was given that responsibility. No one.

I never placed the responsibility of being born again on OT saints or on anyone else. John 3:3 is merely given as a statement of fact. We cannot in of ourselves make ourselves born again. We can only cooperate with God as He deals with us.

In other conversations we have had you will remember I have suggested that the OT Saints are the souls of just men made perfect in Hebrews 12:23. That is when their change came in my view. They were not born from above as they walked the earth, they walked in the revelation they had and were faithful. They were not in Christ or crucified with Christ, etc. Their possibilities were far less than ours. John is speaking to us in 1 John, not the Old Testament saints. The New Testament is not retroactive. I think we agree wholeheartedly there. Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 10:15

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 6:44:56

Quote:

-----Abraham, Enoch and the rest of the Old Testament believers were all in Adam, but they died in faith- not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.

Totally irrelevant.

Your dismissive attitude does not lend well to a fruitful conversation. I must ask, are you really trying to reckon what what I am saying or are you wanting to argue? I have no desire whatsoever to participate in an argument. Blessings.

I cannot reckon what you are saying and have been trying to give you my reasons you don't have answers for but instead invoke the opinions of whomever, I don't know, but I recognize the words and phraseology as stemming from 'critical' sources.

However, no. To the contrary, Brother. However, we cannot dismiss the fact that this is an argument and a needed one that we might all understand better what the issues are surrounding the new covenant relationship with God for which the old one that prohibited those who died with only the promise, longed for. The fact they were ALL faithful to God however, born in Adam, proves the point that man, on his own could achieve of God __short of the RIGHTEOUSNESS necessary for reconciliation. Only the Blood of Jesus could achieve that. However, God's favor, blessings, protection was all there for those of a contrite spirit who were faithful, some more than others for His Divine purposes placed in those He trusted to carry the responsibility appointed them. That was the extent of the old covenant in a small nut shell..

The new covenant is a different ball game that carries with it the very Nature of the Godhead onto the playing field that by it men who are in it 'game' function from a source once outside themselves but is now in themselves.

I hope this clears up a few things between us.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 10:17

Quote:
-----The new covenant is a different ball game that carries with it the very Nature of the Godhead onto the playing field that by it men who are in it 'game' function from a source once outside themselves but is now in themselves.

I hope this clears up a few things between us.

I think we are saying the same things my friend. See my last post. Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/11 10:39

by RobertW on 2012/11/11 7:15:07

Hi CroRef,

Quote:
-----No one in the OT was given that responsibility. No one.

I never placed the responsibility of being born again on OT saints or on anyone else. John 3:3 is merely given as a statement of fact. We cannot in of ourselves make ourselves born again.

I don't believe that as well.

However, by implication you have placed them in Christ which they were not except by faith in a hope ___from themselves, that God honored because they lived it out. I call it an Abraham faith.

Quote:
-----In other conversations we have had you will remember I have suggested that the OT Saints are the souls of just men made perfect in Hebrews 12:23. That is when their change came in my view.

But it could not be a change whereby they realized a happening other than perhaps being confident their "Redeemer lives" nor need it have a change when justification was meted out to them because of their faith and righteous life before God for which Romans 5:1 satisfied their longing.

Quote:
-----They were not born from above as they walked the earth, they walked in the revelation they had and were faithful. They were not in Christ or crucified with Christ, etc. Their possibilities were far less than ours. John is speaking to us in 1 John, not the Old Testament saints. The New Testament is not retroactive. I think we agree wholeheartedly there. Blessings.

Interesting you use the word "revelation", which is what I also believe, the interesting thing here being they were not indwelt by the Holy Ghost in the sense of John 20:22. In their case it was simply the holy Spirit revealing Himself in some unmistakable way and perhaps even in some not so unmistakable ways to test their fortitude.. All as a demonstration of God's faithfulness, to be sure. ___and of course, I agree with you___wholeheartedly. Blessings
bac aha.

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 16:11

Hi RobertW

RobertW wrote ///Because man is not a sinner simply because he/she sins; they sin because they are sinners. They are by nature children of wrath. By one man The Sin entered the world and by one man's sin we were all constituted sinners. In contrast, by one man's obedience many will be constituted righteous. That is to say, in the same way that men were by nature rebellious children of wrath IN Adam- they can be by nature obedient loving children of God IN Christ. Hope that helps. Blessings.///

I would understand you to be saying that "man is not a sinner simply because he/she sins" "they sin because they are sinners. That is to say, that men were by nature rebellious children of wrath IN Adam- so as to say that They are deserving of Gods wrath not because of disobedience but because they are simply human"

So to be human simply by its self is cause enough for us to be deserving of Gods wrath ?? am I somehow misunderstanding your position??

how is this not a clear contradiction to what you posted on the "Why do people go to hell?" thread Where you wrote

RE: RobertW wrote/// So we see then the issue is not children making it to heaven, for they are as the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven. The disciples asked the question and Jesus called a child to Him. Any theology that cannot account for this reality has to be scrapped and reworked. Shockingly men make it difficult for a child to get into Heaven, when Jesus spun it around on the adults and made the children (in effect) the standard.///

I think we need to scrapp and rework this theolgy that I have found no evidence of existing before Augustine

- posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 16:59

Will the Theologians please sit down by David Bercot copyright 2009 scroll publishing

p101

Luther told the German rulers: "The fact that seditious articals of doctrine should be punished by the sword needs no further proof. For the rest, the Anabaptist hold tenets relating to infant baptism,((original sin)), and inspiration, which have no connection with the Word of God,and are indeed opposed to it....Think what disaster would ensue if children were not baptized?" Luther went on to complain:

The Anabaptist set up a ministry and congregation of their own,which is also contrary to the command of God. From all this it becomes clear that the secular authorities are bound...to inflict corporal punishment on the offenders...Also when it is a case of only upholding some spiritual tenent, such as infant baptism, ((original sin)), and unnecessary seperation,the n ...we conclude that...the stubborn sectarians must be put to death.

Is this doctrine really that important??

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/11 18:32

Hi proudpapa,

I have a couple of David Bercot's books and have liked a lot of what he has said, however I think he presses a little too hard in some areas.

Quote:

-----Is this doctrine really that important??

It is important to keep in mind that these were different times than today. A lot of things ended up being punishable by death. We have moved past this approach to enforcing doctrine, but the answer to the question is 'no' it is not important enough to put someone to death. But its like swerving to miss the ditch on the left we risk over correcting and going into the ditch on the right. What I mean is, we risk an attitude that theology and doctrine are not important at all. We don't want to put people to death, but we don't want to be cavalier about it either.

As the saying goes, "In essentials unity, in non essentials liberty, and in all things charity."

Men like C.G. Finney did not believe in Original Sin. He also had a different view of the atonement, etc. He is way out of the mainstream and some have taken up his views to combat what they see is the error of Augustine and the Reformers. I think they are mistaken, but I also don't come down in line with the Reformers in some areas.

The great value of these forums is that one can do a search on google with key words and sermonindex added and see many of these old discussions from the past. We have been blessed to have many Godly men and women contribute- that were not always conformists, but were very passionately Biblical in their thinking. I urge everyone that is really interested in looking at these great subjects to look at some of these past discussions.

I have been on both sides of some of these conversations over the years so I don't hold views the same as I did 8 years ago. I have been willing to change and amend my views as I have seen necessary. WKIP (we know in part). As long as we are willing to really listen to each other we may be surprised to find that they may have a valid point that has to be considered. That is always my approach. Iron sharpens iron. That is the great value, along with the many friendships we make, in these forums; and unlike in the 1400's-1600's we don't have to worry too much about any real life witch hunts or burnings at the stake as we make our way doctrinally. Blessings.

Re: RobertW - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/11 22:28

Hi RobertW I greatly appreciate your gracious responses.

RE: RobertW wrote ///I have a couple of David Bercot's books and have liked a lot of what he has said, however I think he presses a little too hard in some areas.///

I understand what you mean by pressing a little too hard in some areas, I think his best book that I have read is the kingdom that turned the world upside down.

RE: RobertW wrote ///It is important to keep in mind that these were different times than today. A lot of things ended up being punishable by death. We have moved past this approach to enforcing doctrine, but the answer to the question is 'no' it is not important enough to put someone to death.///

I realize that we live in different times but endorsing the deaths of someone that slightly differs in theology was rejected by many whom had less theological understanding than did the Reformers.

Many criticized them in their own day for their bizarre lack of compassion. 1 Cor 13 is clear it does not matter how much you know or how much you do, if you lack compassion the rest is all vanity. If there is one point that all Christians throughout history ought to agree upon is that we should have a Love for our fellow man despite rather or not they see eye to eye with us theologically. It does not take a theologian to realize this but unfortunately it is just those whom seems to be the furthest from understanding this truth. as the scripture says beware of the scribes

What puts this doctrine into even more question is the reality that it has followed along the same doctrinal lineage as has the death to the heretic mentality.

The new Foxes Book of Martyrs John Fox rewritten updated by Harold J Chadwick p.56

referring to Papal persecutions and the Inquisition

/They justified the horrors they committed by wresting Old Testament Scriptures, and by appeal to (Augustine), who had interpreted Luke 14:23 as endorsing the use of force against heretics: "Then the master said to the servant, 'Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.'"

a great many of these papal persecutions had to do with those whom rejected infant baptism see martyrs mirror

We see the reformers not coming to their doctrinal positions from scripture alone but unarguably through the lens of Augustine's writings, this is more than clear thru their writings. as far as I am aware We do not find these doctrines in the Church fathers before Augustine. which is another reason to question these doctrines

This lack of compassion for anyone whom even slightly disagreed theologically, I find not only for the most part starts around the time of Augustine but also follows thru the same path as does those whom were very adamant about the doctrine of original sin.

I do not wish at all to misrepresent the reformers and am open to being corrected by facts but I will say I do not consider it as building a strawman case by looking at the fruit of the vessels by whom these doctrines have been passed down thru history. especially when I personally as have others are not convinced that the few scriptures that are used in defense of the doctrine actually imply what is said of them to imply.

When they use verses like psalms 58:3 totally out of context to make their case it seems to me that they are more than desperate to find actual scriptures to support such a doctrine.

rather we are looking at

Ulrich Zwingli - Felix Manz

or

John Calvin, not only in the Michael Servetus case that is very well known and excused, he was a unitarian.

But listen to what John Calvin says concerning Michael Sattlers martyrdom, I challenge all to find one thing of error with Michael Sattlers that even slightly is worthy of death.

John Calvin Treatise against the anabaptist and against the libertines translated by Benjamin Wirt Farley p.157

John Calvin wrote

// Now in order to give a favorable pretext to their doctrine, they have published along with their resolution the history of the Death of a certain Michael (footnote says Sattler) an accomplice and member of their sect. In fact, they are in the habit of making a powerful defense out of the fact that some have been killed for holding views which would not retract, although if they had they might have escaped death and ransomed their life. Indeed, it is an effective means of authorizing a doctrine for a man to abandon his life courageously and freely in order to confirm his belief. For when we are told what the prophets, apostles, and other martyrs endured in order to maintain the truth of God, we are so much the more strengthened to adhere to the faith we hold, which they sealed by their blood.

I acknowledge, therefore, that we must not vilify the death of God's servants, since their courage and constancy is no small aid in supporting our weakness. But since we can be thoroughly deceived by this unless we have another criterion, we must return to the foundation without which we should be unable to make sound judgments or be certain about the matter.

Certainly a man's death, whoever he might be, is never so precious that it can or ought to prejudice God's truth in any thing, or be so beneficial as to approve of erroneous and perverse doctrines. Therefore let us hold to this: that although a sound and solid doctrine, being founded on reason, is confirmed later by the death of its adherents and confessors by whom it is maintained, nevertheless, the death of the whole world cannot prove a lie.

Indeed what separates the martyrs of God from the devil's disciples is that the martyrs die for a righteous cause. Therefore in the same way that it is laudable and courageous to suffer death when necessity calls for it in order to bear witness to the truth, so also it is insane obstinacy to suffer for a wicked cause. So much so that whoever suffers for it the most is all the more reprimanded. In fact, when we let ourselves be carried away by this pretext, we lose complete judgment and esteem.//

I am sorry but I personally have a difficult finding these words and the actions to represent what I read in the New Testament, and I am not saying this proudly but rather from a most disturbed position, It breaks me to read how these men whom we have been taught to have been the Torchbearers of the truth had a bizarre lack of compassion for their fellow man

I could now go on with Luther but I think the point is more than clear,

But this mentality did not stop with the reformers. We see how others whom passed this doctrine of original sin as a foundational truth reacted in the Synod of Dort which had 0 tolerance and zero compassion, and persecuted and put to death

people over similar doctrinal differences, We also see this same mentality in the American puritans whom held this doctrine as a foundational truth with how they put to death the early Quakers 'Boston martyrs'.

The point is not to misrepresent nor to build a strawman but rather to show why I personally am not convinced that such doctrine is the truth when one says that the true church has always held these doctrines, I have to ask myself whom has carried the touch of truth 'Orthodoxy'?

I wonder if there could be a connection with the mindset that has in the past approved of killing the heretic and the mindset that all men are conceived wicked sinful and evil in mind body and soul, because if such a case was true and the only exception is those whom agree with you theologically, whom would feel compassion for the killing of a venomous serpent. So such a doctrine can and most likely has effected men's perception of their fellow man.

but yet the new testament says to love thy neighbour as thyself and when asked who is thy neighbour, Jesus gives an example of one that would have been considered a heretic by the one asking and goes on to explain how this heretic possessed more godly compassion than did the leaders of the one's own religion.

James says "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God."

Why would it be wrong to curse or even kill men, if every bit of their nature is wicked evil and hated by God?? But rather than say that man was made a sinner at conception, James says men are made after the similitude of God.

RE: RobertW wrote ///As the saying goes, "In essentials unity, in non essentials liberty, and in all things charity."///

good saying brother

RE: RobertW wrote ///Men like C.G. Finney did not believe in Original Sin. He also had a different view of the atonement, etc. He is way out of the mainstream and some have taken up his views to combat what they see is the error of Augustine and the Reformers. I think they are mistaken, but I also don't come down in line with the Reformers in some areas.///

I actually know very little of Finney, before listening to Keith Daniels 'walking the tight rope,' (which was an excellent sermon) All I had heard was negative slang about him, how he was a sheep in wolves clothing as what spurgeon.org and the like propagates. I was so scared of him, I have since read a little of his bio, in which seems to declare just the opposite of what is said of him. and of course I have searched what he has said concerning this subject.

RE: RobertW wrote ///The great value of these forums is that one can do a search on google with key words and sermon index added and see many of these old discussions from the past. We have been blessed to have many Godly men and women contribute- that were not always conformists, but were very passionately Biblical in their thinking. I urge everyone that is really interested in looking at these great subjects to look at some of these past discussions.///

I must agree that God uses men with all different understandings of such doctrines he looks past our ignorance

RE: RobertW wrote ///I have been on both sides of some of these conversations over the years so I don't hold views the same as I did 8 years ago. I have been willing to change and amend my views as I have seen necessary. WKIP (we know in part). As long as we are willing to really listen to each other we may be surprised to find that they may have a valid point that has to be considered. That is always my approach. Iron sharpens iron. That is the great value, along with the many friendships we make, in these forums; and unlike in the 1400's-1600's we don't have to worry too much about any real life witch hunts or burnings at the stake as we make our way doctrinally. Blessings///

I agree my thinking is constantly changing and I must be open to God to change me where I need to be changed,

Blessings brother

Edit, proof read for clarity

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2012/11/12 8:14

Creref: I did not mean to drop a comment and run, so to speak. It is deer season here in Missouri, and I have been busy trying to lay in a years supply of meat for my family. I am not sure that I need to respond as the discussion has moved, but I wanted to reply to your post.

Quote:

-----Let me say this and then please comment:

Our old nature was not influenced by sin__our souls were. How? Through our flesh, by temptation and untoward affinities. Our natures being devoid of God made us to be our god. Our souls were in complete union with our flesh and vanity. Our "I love you's" always went out from us with a hook in it. We chose as we saw fit but always looking out for our interests. I was not a "child of wrath" until you crossed me or I had to "deny myself". BTW: I was a compassionate man__when it suited me. So what is the problem that we need a new nature? Might we liken the need to one who has cataracts? "Unless you are born again__you cannot see. . " (cf Jn3:3,5)

I am not sure exactly what perspective you are coming from, but I notice a few things that I wanted to comment on. Before the rebirth, man's spirit is dead toward God. This is due to Adam's transgression. By the one man, Adam, all are made sinners. As such, we sin. We are not sinners because we committed actions of sin, we commit actions of sin because we are sinners. We are not sinners because we have allowed our mind, will, and emotions or our bodies to become corrupt. Our mind, our will, and our emotions, and our bodies have become corrupt because of original sin. So we don't have to teach a child how to lie, steal, or be jealous, nor do we have to teach a child how to become sick physically.

The rebirth brings to life (spiritually) our spirit. We who were dead in sin are now alive in Christ. We are now in right relationship with God. This is a spiritual rebirth (see Jesus' discussion with Nicodemus in John 3).

Yet we still live in a body and have a soul that is not born again and that is still subject to corruption. When we are born again, we can think of it as though 1/3 of us is now partaking of the divine nature of God. It is through knowing God through communion with Him in the spirit that we can be empowered to escape the corruption that is in the world.

I want to come back to that, but since I mentioned natures, let me insert that being "children of wrath" does not mean that we get angry when we are crossed. In the end we will either be subject to God's grace or to His wrath. It is a question of whose child we are. "Who is our Daddy?", so to speak. A child of wrath is one who is, due to not being born again, is destined to experience the wrath of God on the unGodly.

It is through the divine nature that we overcome. Our flesh we will have with us until the return of Christ. Paul addresses this in Romans 8 (remember my comment about Romans 6-8 needing to be read in continuity). He also addresses this in his letter to the Thessalonians when he prays that God would sanctify them wholly, spirit, soul, and body, and in Romans 12 when he speaks of being transformed by the renewing of the mind.

We will always battle the flesh. But we can make progress. This progress can come only through the empowering work of the Holy Spirit. I can tell you that when I received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, I found my battle against the flesh now had a new element of overcoming power that was missing before. Now we cannot separate God. Any work He does in us is through His Spirit. So the impact of the word of God and continually study of and revelation from His word, the impact of fellowship with His body (the church), etc., is all empowered by the Holy Spirit.

So if a person wants to view this as starting with one nature and having that nature changed, I am not going to argue the point. If it helps to view it as a change of nature, OK. But technically, I don't see the Bible teaching anything about two natures in man, nor about man having his nature changed. I do see clear teaching that man was unregenerate due to original sin and as a result was spiritually dead. I see that through the sacrifice of Christ, man is now forgiven and is made alive by the Spirit of God. We can now be in fellowship with God in the spirit and are made a partaker of His Spirit. We now partake of the divine nature and are empowered to live an overcoming life by walking in the Spirit.

Hope that clarifies it a bit.

Blessings

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man, on: 2012/11/12 10:39

Trilogy of Spirit, Soul, and Body by Watchman Nee

From The Latent Power of the Soul

“And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground” (Gen. 2.7). This refers to the human body. “And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.” This describes how God gave spirit to man; it was Adam’s spirit. So man’s body was formed of the dust of the ground, and man’s spirit was given to him by God. “And man became a living soul.” After the breath of life had entered into his nostrils man became a living soul. The spirit, the soul, and the body are three separate entities. “May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire” (1 Thess. 5.23). The spirit is God-given; the soul is a living soul; and the body is God-formed.

According to common understanding the soul is our personality. When the spirit and the body were joined, man became a living soul. The characteristic of the angels is spirit and that of the lower animals such as beasts is flesh. We humans have both spirit and body; but our characteristic is neither spirit nor body but soul. We have a living soul. Hence the Bible calls man soul. For example, when Jacob went down into Egypt with his family, the Scriptures tell us that “all the souls of the house of Jacob, that came into Egypt, were threescore and ten” (Gen. 46.27). Again, those who had received Peter’s word on Pentecost were baptised and “there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls” (Acts 2.41). Hence soul stands for our personality, for what makes us as man.

What are the various functions of spirit, soul, and body? These have already been explained in Part One of The Spiritual Man. But I was most happy one day to find on the bookshelf a volume of Andrew Murray’s writings in which is to be found an explanation of the spirit, soul, and body in the appended notes that is quite similar to our interpretation. What follows is a quotation from one of the notes:

Quote

In the history of man’s creation we read, “The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground”—thus was his body made—“and breathed into his nostrils the breath” or spirit “of life”: thus his spirit came from God; “and man became a living soul.” The spirit quickening the body made man a living soul, a living person with the consciousness of himself. The soul was the meeting-place, the point of union between body and spirit. Through the body, man, the living soul, stood related to the external world of sense; could influence it, or be influenced by it. Through the spirit he stood related to the spiritual world and the Spirit of God, whence he had his origin; could be the recipient and the minister of its life and power. Standing thus midway between two worlds, belonging to both, the soul had the power of determining itself, of choosing or refusing the objects by which it was surrounded, and to which it stood related.

In the constitution of these three parts of man’s nature, the spirit, as linking him with the Divine, was the highest; the body, connecting him with the sensible and animal, the lowest; intermediate stood the soul, partaker of the nature of the others, the bond that united them and through which they could act on each other. Its work, as the central power, was to maintain them in their due relation; to keep the body, as the lowest, in subjection to the spirit; itself to receive through the spirit, as the higher, from the Divine Spirit what was waiting (sic) it for its perfection: and so to pass down, even to the body

y, that by which it might be partaker of the Spirit's perfection and become a spiritual body.

Murray, The Spirit of Christ. Fort Washington, Pa., Christian Literature Crusade, 1964. Note C: The Place of the Indwelling, p.227-228.

End Quote

What is the spirit? That which makes us conscious of God and relates us to God is the spirit. What is the soul? It is that which relates us to ourselves and gives us self-consciousness. What is the body? It causes us to be related to the world. C. I. Scofield, in his reference Bible, explains that the spirit gives God-consciousness, the soul self-consciousness, the body world-consciousness. Horse and ox are not conscious of God because they have no spirit. They are only conscious of their own beings. The body causes us to sense the world—such as our seeing the things of the world, our feeling hot or cold, and so forth.

Re: amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/12 11:16

Hi amrkelly

Did Adam and eve have self-consciousness before eating of the fruit??

Where Adam and eve controlled by a voice of reason before eating the fruit??

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/12 11:27

by amrkelly on 2012/11/12 7:39:35

Trilogy of Spirit, Soul, and Body by Watchman Nee

From The Latent Power of the Soul.

A great little book for understanding this issue.

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/12 11:35

Hi Croref

Croref wrote ///No! The ME is my SOUL. MY SOUL is who I am.///

The Soul is your life,

The Me is the Flesh, carnal Mind, the voice of reason, The voice that is all ways reasoning between the knowledge of good and evil.

Men loose their Carnal mind all the time the soul remains the same

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man, on: 2012/11/12 11:57

Quote:

-----Did Adam and eve have self-consciousness before eating of the fruit??

Were Adam and eve controlled by a voice of reason before eating the fruit? Proud papa

It seems incomprehensible to me that Adam and Eve did not have self-consciousness. Adam said "bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh" he could not have spoken thus unless he had been aware of himself. Of course one could say that this is just physical awareness, yet he didn't say "wow and naked too". The knowledge of good and evil did produce an awareness that was not present before yet even in this regard it cannot be awareness simply of the fact of nakedness, but an implication inherent in nakedness. Their view of one another changed. What had previously been pure and undefiled in understanding became something to hide from each other. None of this is self-consciousness it is a consciousness of another's condition giving rise to an awareness of one's own condition. This is self-awareness not self-consciousness. Self-consciousness at this time of innocence would have been high reason, after the fall it became base awareness.

I think that Adam and Eve would have been self-controlled in a mind of obedience and innocence. The organ of reason is the mind of the soul. I can't see any controlling going on between them or between them and God Himself. They were equipped to function perfectly, which must have included a perfect ability to exercise self-control as well. When Eve became deceived she lost that ability temporarily but Adam never lost his at all. His action of listening to Eve and eating was his choice and represented perfect self control, albeit disobedient to God's commandment.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/12 12:34

Hi Croref

Croref wrote ///No! The ME is my SOUL. MY SOUL is who I am.///

The Soul is your life,

The Me is the Flesh, carnal Mind, the voice of reason, The voice that is all ways reasoning between the knowledge of good and evil.

Men loose their Carnal mind all the time the soul remains the same.

Then why are we given to purify our soul??

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/12 13:27

Croref wrote ///Then why are we given to purify our soul??///

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

What is the god little g that rules the unsaved man?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/12 13:49

Read 1peter 1:22. Lets go from there, OK?

Re: amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/12 13:49

Hi amrkelly

When Adam and Eve ate of the fruit "And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons."

The voice of reason took control it now had the ability to judge for its self right from wrong to be a god to its own soul,
how can you judge if you do not understand right from wrong ??

Jesus says I judge no one my father does that for me but you judge after the (Sarx) (voice of reason)

jn ch 8

15 Ye judge after the flesh;(sarx) I judge no man.

16 And yet if I judge, my judgment is true: for I am not alone, but I and the Father that sent me.

Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/12 13:54

Croref wrote ///Read 1peter 1:22. Lets go from there, OK?///

22 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

v 23 23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word (Logos) of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

we could start an entire new thread on the Logos

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man, on: 2012/11/12 14:31

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

What is the god little g that rules the unsaved man? proudpapa

Having one's conscience cleansed from dead works on a personal level must point to the moment we first believed. Apart from the context of Hebrews chapter nine, which is a reference to the dead works of the Law, which could not cleanse the conscience at all, the experience of being cleansed in our conscience is the only personal basis we have to assert that this Scripture is true. The business of the on going problem of dead works is dealt with by repenting of them and acknowledging that by our own works we cannot please God. If we believed that we would surly seek to understand how it is possible to please God apart from believing in His Son! How can we please God? Whether we attempt to do this natur

ally or spiritually will be the basis of what amounts to a dead work. Is it an effort or is it a rest?

Quote:
-----The voice of reason took control it now had the ability to judge for its self right from wrong to be a god to its own soul,   how can you judge if you do not understand right from wrong ??  Jesus says I judge no one my father does that for me but you judge after the (Sarx) (voice of reason) proudpapa

I think the term "judge" and "reason" are being confused a little. Jesus said, "I came not to judge" and "you judge after the flesh". If "judge" in this verse was interchangeable with reason it would amount to saying "I came not to reason" and "you judge with reason". It may be that put this way suits your understanding because after all you are speaking about the organ of reason and not the validity of the judgment arising from the organ (mind). The part following on appears to support this somewhat "But even if I do judge, My judgment is true; for I am not alone in it, but I and the Father who sent Me." However one has to take the statement of The Lord as true. If Jesus had judged, which of necessity would have to have involved His understanding mind, it would be true regardless. The organ of His mind would in this circumstance have been the vehicle for all that which arises between The Father and The Son. The mind is simply a vehicle not an originator of what is good or evil. In short Jesus may have been saying "you don't have the ability to judge properly, I do".

The voice of reason that you keep referring to is beginning to sound like an alien. Adam and Eve didn't reason or judge that they were naked they simply knew it. One moment they didn't the next they did. Everything that follows on from there no doubt involves the mind and reason, but it doesn't require a judgment it demanded a response. Covering themselves was a response to a perceived condition that did not change the fact of nakedness rather it produced the knowledge of it. I really do wish you would state what it is you believe brother and spell it out so that I can at least attempt to make sense of it. I feel like this emphasis on Sarx theology is eluding me somewhat.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/12 14:45

Hi amrkelly

RE:///Is it an effort or is it a rest?///

Canaan is a rest

Hebrews 4:10

For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his

imagine with me an amish buggy crossing the interstate highway tons of vehicles the horse has ceased from being controlled by his own voice of reason and rest in the fact that the master will lead him safely.

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man, on: 2012/11/12 15:39

Quote:
-----Hi amrkelly   RE:///Is it an effort or is it a rest?///   Canaan is a rest  Hebrews 4:10  For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his  imagine with me an amish buggy crossing the interstate highway tons of vehicles the horse has ceased from being controlled by his own voice of reason and rest in the fact that the master will lead him safely. proudpapa

The Scripture which immediately came to mind when I read your example was Matthew 11:29-30 "Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest to your souls; for my yoke is easy, and my burden is light".

There is a rest from dead works that equates to trying to justify ourselves before God, for which remedy we have Christ crucified for sin. And has to do with our conscience. After all if our conscience did not find rest how would we believe in the efficacy of Christ shed blood. Then there is a rest for our soul's that does not involve inactivity but rather walking. The walking is a rest as well as the believing. The one, believing, is into Christ; the walking is bonded to Christ as servants. One makes us fit for heaven and presents us to The Father Holy and blameless, even as He is holy and blameless. The other presents us to Christ as judge and King and has to do with good works .

I like the analogy of the Amish buggy it's a pleasing picture and appears to have wisdom. Yet I cannot see it as a true picture of our reasonable service in obedience to Christ. For one thing we are not asked to yield up our minds in this way, we are told that we have the mind of Christ and to be also renewed in our minds in order that we might prove that perfect and acceptable will of God. In short I believe the saint is asked to submit but to think as well. This seems a little picky I realise that, but yet somehow the idea of becoming passive repels me. It is completely contrary to everything I have experienced in The Lord. I cannot recall a single instance in this walk where obedience took on the form of passive obedience. It was always a willing obedience or none. In fact it has always had the character of participation with God and not imposition. If I had to give up my mind in order to serve God I do believe that I would walk away and decline. This is speaking foolishly and I cannot walk away, but the idea of not participating in a reasonable mind of obedience is anathema to me. As a matter of fact the parable of the talents where The Master "goes on a long journey" as a contrast with your picture would equate to the Master of the Buggy doing a runner and abandoning the horse to its own devices LOL.

Of course it seems likely that we know the same reality when it comes down to it otherwise we would not be brethren. Perhaps the distinctions in all of this lies in an understanding of the character and extent of salvation itself, by which I mean what does it mean to be saved? 1 Thessalonians 5:23.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/12 16:10

by proudpapa on 2012/11/12 10:54:26

Croref wrote ///Read 1peter 1:22. Lets go from there, OK?///

22 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

v 23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word (Logos) of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

we could start an entire new thread on the Logos

Why? It is not quite clear that it is something we do by the "power" of our new birth?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/12 19:07

by twayneb on 2012/11/12 5:14:32

Croref: I did not mean to drop a comment and run, so to speak. It is deer season here in Missouri, and I have been busy trying to lay in a years supply of meat for my family. I am not sure that I need to respond as the discussion has moved, but I wanted to reply to your post.

No worries, twayneb! I wish I could do what you are doing for meat.

You wrote this that immediately stopped me in my tracks from going further in my desire to reply to you:

". . . Before the rebirth, man's spirit is dead toward God."

If you believe that then obviously you have a reason Abel desired to please God__to the degree he gave God his best? Abel was but the first fallen man to do so. When you think you have all your bases covered for a good explanation, I have a list of others I want to ask the same of you and then we can move on with the rest of your sincere reply__for which I sincerely thank you.

OMT, If as you say that when we are born again we are in right relationship to God and that relationship secures us to Him, why do we have to overcome anything? Did not Jesus "do it all"? Is not repentance a necessary element in your thinking?

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2012/11/13 5:38

Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Joh 3:5-6

Man is flesh and he can only give birth to flesh, Adam can only give birth to Adam.

So also it is written, The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit 1 Cor 15:45

The last Adam Christ is a life-giving Spirit and gives birth to the Spirit.

Men need to be born twice to enter the Kingdom of God

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/13 9:09

by murrcoir on 2012/11/13 2:38:17

Men need to be born twice to enter the Kingdom of God

Kingdom of God???? Is that what is being discussed?

Re: My spirit shall not always strive with man, on: 2012/11/13 11:15

Quote:
-----Man is flesh and he can only give birth to flesh, Adam can only give birth to Adam.  So also it is written, The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit 1 Cor 15:45  The last Adam Christ is a life-giving Spirit and gives birth to the Spirit.  Men need to be born twice to enter the Kingdom of God. murrcoir

I agree brother. Christ became a life giving Spirit. That which is born of the Spirit is spirit. It is our spirits that are born again. The fact that the first man Adam became a living soul should tell us everything we need to know about the nature of salvation. The soul is not born again. Neither is the physical body. It is the spirit that is born of the Spirit according to the same life that is in Christ, Who became a life giving spirit. If we can really make the connection here and believe that the soul is not born again then we stand a reasonable chance of understanding that the soul must become subject to the new life in our renewed spirits and only insofar as we walk by the spirit are we fully saved.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/13 14:10

2 Corinthians 1:10 Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us ;

This is a matter in Paul's mind of dispare in the flesh so great that he feared for his very life.

This also is a truth of what salvation is about. We are saved in spirit, we are being saved in our soul/mind and will be completely saved in the resurrection of this body of flesh.

He who has delivered His people, saved them by Grace, (delivered), who (doth) constantly deliver and keep, renewing our minds to the help and protection of our souls in renewing our minds to the Mind of Christ, will (yet deliver) do so in the future till the final great deliverance comes and all His redeemed people will be gathered home.

Intering the Kingdom now and seated in the heavenlies in Christ Jesus by our born again spirit which is now the Spirit of Christ, already delivered. Sons of God.

Romans 8:9-14 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you. Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

"doth deliver"; Our soul/minds being renewed now and into all eternity, our souls in the body being saved, sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise.

Ro 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

Ti 3:5 Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;

So we have the Spirit of Christ, the Holy Spirit in our souls forever and the future body of Life renewed to a body Just like His on resurrection day being kept from the second death of the ungodly in the Great White Throne Judgement.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2012/11/13 16:02

Quote:

-----No worries, twayneb! I wish I could do what you are doing for meat.

You wrote this that immediately stopped me in my tracks from going further in my desire to reply to you:

" . . . Before the rebirth, man's spirit is dead toward God."

If you believe that then obviously you have a reason Abel desired to please God__to the degree he gave God his best? Abel was but the first fallen man to do so. When you think you have all your bases covered for a good explanation, I have a list of others I want to ask the same of you and then we can move on with the rest of your sincere reply__for which I sincerely thank you.

We relate to God in the spirit, not in the flesh. God is spirit, and they that worship Him do so in spirit and in truth. It is the spirit of man that is born again, not the soul (I define this as mind, will, emotions) or the body. It is the outworking of a spirit that is now alive toward God. Romans 8:10 tells us that if Christ be in us, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness.

Before we were born again, we were unable to have righteousness (we might say right relationship) with God. It is as though we were dead to God. But when we are born again, we are now in right relationship with God. We are now alive unto God.

Paul speaks in Romans 7 about this very concept. When he was under the law (before his conversion), he desired to please God. He tried to please God. But he was doing so out of his flesh and he found himself utterly incapable. The good he desired to do, he did not do, and the evil that he wished not to do, he found himself doing. The solution? The work of Jesus Christ.

But remember, it is only the spirit of a man that is born again. We still live in a body and have a mind, a will, and emotions that are unregenerate, that are still corrupt from the fall. Refer again to Romans 8:10. It is a battle of flesh and spirit that we fight. This is why Paul says so much about the war between the two.

Yes, repentance is important, but not because each time we fail we need to repent in order to appropriate God's forgiveness one more time. Repentance is not found in saying I am sorry, but it is found in turning from the thing that we were doing. I have repented of a great many things since I was born again. God has dealt with me, and I have responded in obedience and changed course.

As I write the topic broadens, and I have to stop shortly, but we must realize that I am not lost because I miss the mark. But if I do not repent and I harden my heart against God, I may very well reject my salvation, from which Hebrews tells me there is no recourse. As well, sin opens the door for the enemy to come in and establish strongholds in my life. As well, a born again man does not desire to sin, but rather desires to live a holy life.

Gotta Go
Blessings.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/13 16:07

by twayneb on 2012/11/13 13:02:15

Quote:

-----No worries, twayneb! I wish I could do what you are doing for meat.

You wrote this that immediately stopped me in my tracks from going further in my desire to reply to you:

". . . Before the rebirth, man's spirit is dead toward God."

If you believe that then obviously you have a reason Abel desired to please God__to the degree he gave God his best? Abel was but the first fallen man to do so. When you think you have all your bases covered for a good explanation, I have a list of others I want to ask the same of you and then we can move on with the rest of your sincere reply__for which I sincerely thank you.

We relate to God in the spirit, not in the flesh. God is spirit, and they that worship Him do so in spirit and in truth. It is the spirit of man that is born again, not the soul (I define this as mind, will, emotions) or the body. It is the outworking of a spirit that is now alive toward God. Romans 8:10 tells us that if Christ be in us, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness.

Before we were born again, we were unable to have righteousness (we might say right relationship) with God. It is as though we were dead to God. But when we are born again, we are now in right relationship with God. We are now alive unto God.

I am not speaking of being lost or any such thing. I did ask about Abel you have not addressed.. Was he not alive to God ??

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/14 3:29

Ge 4:4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

Abel's offering is proof that Jesus Christ was not born again in him. If I went to God with a slain lamb and offered its blood for forgiveness of sin, because of the true Lamb of God's blood shed now being the only offering for sin, once, God would not accept the blood of an animal to bring forth salvation. We know from scripture that Adam, Cain spoke direct with God and Able I assume also spoke with God.

Who put it in Abel's heart to kill a spotless lamb and with its shed blood, the offering would have respect with God. Scripture does not say. But with Abel's offering, it pointing to the Shed Blood of Jesus Christ and His shed blood for the sin of the whole world and giving salvation to whom the Father gives to Jesus of which none could come unless the Father draws them to The Cross. So I can only by faith believe that God giving the first knowledge of "without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sin". The mystery of Christ in the believer hid from all until it was revealed to Paul to give to usward the mystery revealed of, "Christ in you the hope of glory".

This giving imputed righteousness to Abel, just like Abraham, but not Christ being made by the Father righteousness, wisdom, sanctification and redemption which Jesus is now made unto us.

Abel knew God but was not born again, by the incorruptable Seed of the Father, making us the offspring of the Father, the son's of God in Christ Jesus who is the Seed (sperma) of God in us, sealed by the Holy Spirit of Promise. This beginning of the new process 53 days after the death of the Son of God, salvation by Grace through Faith. Not by works and the blood of animals

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/14 6:01

by Christinyou on 2012/11/14 0:29:16

Ge 4:4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering:

Abel's offering is proof that Jesus Christ was not born again in him. If I went to God with a slain lamb and offered its blood for forgiveness of sin, because of the true Lamb of God's blood shed now being the only offering for sin, once, God would not accept the blood of an animal to bring forth salvation. We know from scripture that Adam, Cain spoke direct with God and Able I assume also spoke with God.

Proof, my Brother? What proof do we need except we know Jesus had to die and resurrect before anyone could ever be born again. That said, let's look for another reason Abel sacrificed as he did.

Quote:

-----Who put it in Abel's heart to kill a spotless lamb and with its shed blood, the offering would have respect with God.

No one. In this is Abel seen of God to be like Himself Who would eventually give His best__all that he had to give and give it in the same "loving" way, i.e., there was nothing else of Abel to give. In other words, God saw Himself, His Love, in Abel, expressed as it could only be expressed__done so without any kind of indwelling we might think would be necessary. Extend this out to also be the reason why God chose anyone in whom He called. One might even say these men became "men of renown".

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2012/11/15 13:08

Quote:

-----Who put it in Abel's heart to kill a spotless lamb and with its shed blood, the offering would have respect with God.

Maybe he saw Adam do it

Quote: In this is Abel seen of God to be like Himself Who would eventually give His best__all that he had to give and give it in the same "loving" way, i.e., there was nothing else of Abel to give.

What???

Heb 11:4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

Ahhhhh By Faith

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/16 6:04

by murrcolr on 2012/11/15 10:08:52

Quote:

-----Who put it in Abel's heart to kill a spotless lamb and with its shed blood, the offering would have respect with God.

Maybe he saw Adam do it

Quote: In this is Abel seen of God to be like Himself Who would eventually give His best__all that he had to give and give it in the same "loving" way, i.e., there was nothing else of Abel to give.

Quote:

-----What???

Seems you wish to make a point?

Quote:

-----Heb 11:4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

Ahhhhh By Faith

Yes. And?

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/16 12:10

Quote: ""Maybe he saw Adam do it""

Being probably only 3rd from Adam speaking directly to God, I would say that is a really good assumption.

So then asking, where did Adam get the information, that a slain lamb, would be respected by God? This information did not just appear out of the blue. I see, just like now, the heavenly message is given by God, through revelation, and the faith to believe what God says, it is true, Paul says.

Colossians 1:25-29 Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

"God would make known"

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/16 14:03

by Christinyou on 2012/11/16 9:10:05

Quote: ""Maybe he saw Adam do it""

Being probably only 3rd from Adam speaking directly to God, I would say that is a really good assumption.

Interesting. Do you also believe Adam taught him faith __and love?

If raising sheep was Abel's only vocation, the only thing he had that could speak of his love and faith was his best lambs and I believe he picked the fairest of them all. I don't believe that doing so from obedience alone would have evoked from God His "regard" that is recorded for our benefit. Though I could be wrong and your point is the point but, given Cain's offering, his vocation was raising crops. That is all he had to offer. Could it be it was his offering from a lack of love and unwillingness to retain God in his thinking?

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/17 13:19

Quote: ""Do you also believe Adam taught him faith __and love?""

What faith and what love are we speaking of? Agape love can only come from God, not man. The faith of Jesus Christ given to believe that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, must come from the Father through Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit.

If Cain had love and faith of Jesus Christ why would his face drop and he be upset because God did not respect his offering? Would Cain not heed God's rebuke and repent and ask his brother Abel for a lamb for his next offering? This is not seen, only the evil in Cain's heart and the murder of his brother over jealousy.

I see God only in this reference when it comes to the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. The plan and mind of God is in this pointing to the Lamb slain, that after the Cross we might see that God intended to save all that He would give to the real Lamb Slain at the Cross. Blessing Jesus Christ the Lamb above all else, giving Him the Body of Christ His Church, of which He is the ultimate Head. The One and only by which we might be saved.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/17 15:08

by Christinyou on 2012/11/17 10:19:20

Quote: ""Do you also believe Adam taught him faith __and love?""

What faith and what love are we speaking of? Agape love can only come from God, not man. The faith of Jesus Christ given to believe that Jesus Christ is the only begotten Son of God, must come from the Father through Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit.

If Cain had love and faith of Jesus Christ why would his face drop and he be upset because God did not respect his offering? Would Cain not heed God's rebuke and repent and ask his brother Abel for a lamb for his next offering? This is not seen, only the evil in Cain's heart and the murder of his brother over jealousy.

And if the seed of Abraham were "given" faith to believe, why did God want to destroy them all and start over with Moses ?

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/18 2:12

Quote: ""And if the seed of Abraham were "given" faith to believe, why did God want to destroy them all and start over with Moses?""

I don't understand the question.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/18 6:06

by Christinyou on 2012/11/17 23:12:53

Quote: ""And if the seed of Abraham were "given" faith to believe, why did God want to destroy them all and start over with Moses?""

I don't understand the question.

Sure you do. They all were believers.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/18 6:07

by Christinyou on 2012/11/17 23:12:53

Quote: ""And if the seed of Abraham were "given" faith to believe, why did God want to destroy them all and start over with Moses?""

I don't understand the question.

Sure you do. They all were believers__or maybe God gave only few of them faith?

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/18 6:16

by Christinyou on 2012/11/17 23:12:53

Quote: ""And if the seed of Abraham were "given" faith to believe, why did God want to destroy them all and start over with Moses?""

I don't understand the question.

Sure you do. They all were believers__or maybe God gave only few of them faith? Lets see__
They all put blood over their lintels and posts, by His Hand were released from Egypt. They saw God's mighty works-miracles__ I wonder what happened that they should lose confidence or did they lose it at all but really wanted God but only on their terms? Maybe they wanted to use God for their purposes or thought they deserved better treatment after being shut up by Him for so many years? Suffice to say, they believed in God.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/19 13:40

Quote: ""Sure you do. They all were believers__or maybe God gave only few of them faith? Lets see__
They all put blood over their lintels and posts, by His Hand were released from Egypt. They saw God's mighty works-miracles__ I wonder what happened that they should lose confidence or did they lose it at all but really wanted God but only on their terms? Maybe they wanted to use God for their purposes or thought they deserved better treatment after being shut up by Him for so many years? Suffice to say, they believed in God.""

So now, what does this have to do with us who believe in a mystery, hidden from even those old testament saints including the devil, whom did not know what the Cross would do for those chosen in Christ by the Father. Satan thought he had won when Jesus was crucified.

Colossians 1:21-28 And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unreprouable in his sight: If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister; Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church: Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God; Even the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints: To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

How are we made perfect? Not by old testament standards, but by the mystery revealed; Colossians 1:27-29 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

It is us, "us striving according to His working, which worketh in me mightily."

Are we presented perfect in Christ? By my works or His?

My works are filthy in the sight of God unless it is according to His working in me mightily.

IN Jesus Christ the mystery revealed; "Christ in you, the hope of Glory".

Now, what are we to do?

"Strive according to His working in us" According to Paul's Gospel, "My Gospel"; Christ in us:

In Him, us in each other by His love that we love one another as He loves us: Phillip

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/19 16:40

by Christinyou on 2012/11/19 10:40:44

Quote: ""Sure you do. They all were believers__or maybe God gave only few of them faith? Lets see__

Quote:

-----Are we presented perfect in Christ? By my works or His?

The OT righteous were held blameless by THEIR faith in God but, neither they or your by placing this in our time of Christ doesn't address my question --does it?

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/21 0:08

Quote: ""The OT righteous were held blameless by THEIR faith in God but, ""

Then why did the Father of Jesus Christ send His Son to be crucified on a Cross.

Acts 2:22-23 Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain:

There is none righteous or blameless, no not one, save Jesus Christ whom by our hands He was crucified and slain for our transgressions.

Ro 3:10 As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one:

Ro 3:12 They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.

There is only one reason a believer is blameless.

1 Corinthians 1:29-31 That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

Christ has been made our righteousness, by being born again of His Spirit that lives in us. As He is righteous, so are we

Joh 17:23 I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me.

Joh 17:26 And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.

Written much better than I;

John Gill's Exposition of the Entire Bible

John 17:23

I in them, Christ is in his saints; not as he is in all the world, being the omnipresent God; or as he is in every man, communicating the light of nature as Creator; or as he is in the human nature, which is united to his divine person; or circumscriptively to the exclusion of him elsewhere; for he is in heaven, his blood is within the veil, and his righteousness without us: but he is in them, in a gracious manner, in regeneration; when he is revealed to them, formed in them, enters into them, takes possession of them, communicates his grace, grants fellowship with himself, and dwells in them; not only by his Spirit and grace, but in person, as the head in the members, as the master of the house, and the King of them; which

is an instance of condescending grace, and is peculiar to God's elect: hence all their holiness and fruitfulness; nor shall they ever perish; their bodies shall rise from the dead, and being reunited to their souls, Christ will be in them in a glorious manner to all eternity:

and thou in me; the Father is in Christ, not only by union of nature, nor merely in him, as Mediator, in a way of grace; but as he will show himself in and through him in glory for evermore, and is what is here prayed for:

that they may be made perfect in one; this regards not their justification, which is already perfect; nor their sanctification, which will be; but either perfection in glory, when they will be perfect in knowledge, in holiness, in peace, joy and love: or rather the perfection of their numbers is meant, when the whole election of grace will be completed in regeneration, sanctification, and glorification:

and that the world may know that thou hast sent me: as before; ;

and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. The Oriental versions, the Syriac, Arabic, Persic, and Ethiopic, all read the words thus, "and I have loved them, as thou hast loved me"; contrary to all the Greek copies, and other versions, which read as we do. The Father loved Christ as his own Son, and as Mediator; so he loved him when he assumed human nature, and became obedient to his will both in doing and suffering; when his Father left him, and poured out his wrath upon him, and when he laid down his life for the sheep. The instances of his love to him as Mediator are, his putting all things into his hands, showing him all that he does, and concealing nothing from him, and appointing him the only Saviour, the head of the church, and Judge of the world. The nature of this love is, that it is from eternity; is a love of complacency and delight; it is special and peculiar, unchangeable and inseparable, and will last for ever: now God has loved his people, as he has loved his Son; he loves them not merely as creatures, as the descendants of Adam, or as considered in themselves, but as in Christ. The instances of his love to them are, his choosing them in Christ; making a covenant with them in him; the mission of him into this world, to obtain salvation for them; the quickening and calling of them by his grace; the care he takes of them afterwards in supplying their wants, supporting them under temptations, delivering them out of afflictions, and causing all things to work together for their good; to all which add the provisions he makes for them, both for time and eternity. The nature of this love is such as that he bears to Christ; it is from everlasting; a love of the utmost delight and pleasure; it is special and peculiar, unchangeable, and will continue for ever: there is not the same reason for his loving them as his Son; and this as must not be thought to denote equality, but similitude and order. End.

Which all old testament saints will acquire at His coming.

By the Christ in us, we are righteous, redeemed, sanctified and have the wisdom of Him by the Holy Spirit revelation of all truth. His Spirit will always strive with those The Father has given to the Son.

IN Him and He in me: Phillip

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2012/11/21 0:40

There is a big difference in reckoned righteousness and made righteous.

Romans 4:9 Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? for we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness.

Reckoned; Rom 4:9

Strong's Greek Dictionary

3049. logizomai

Search for G3049 in KJVSL

logizomai logizomai log-id'-zom-ahee

middle voice from 3056; to take an inventory, i.e. estimate (literally or figuratively):--conclude, (ac-)count (of), + despise, esteem, impute, lay, number, reason, reckon, suppose, think (on).

Made; 1 Cor: 1:30

Strong's Greek Dictionary

1096. ginomai

Search for G1096 in KJVSL

ginomai ginomai ghin'-om-ahee

a prolongation and middle voice form of a primary verb; to cause to be ("gen"-erate), i.e. (reflexively) to become (come in to being), used with great latitude (literal, figurative, intensive, etc.):--arise, be assembled, be(-come, -fall, -have self), be

brought (to pass), (be) come (to pass), continue, be divided, draw, be ended, fall, be finished, follow, be found, be fulfilled, + God forbid, grow, happen, have, be kept, be made, be married, be ordained to be, partake, pass, be performed, be published, require, seem, be showed, X soon as it was, sound, be taken, be turned, use, wax, will, would, be wrought.

Made righteous in Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/21 7:25

Re:

Quote: ""The OT righteous were held blameless by THEIR faith in God but,""

Then why did the Father of Jesus Christ send send His Son to be crucified on a Cross.

Why? To redeem them by making peace with God in their behalf. Reconciliation with God was all they needed that ONLY the Blood of a sinless person of Adam's race, could provide for.

"I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Luke 5:32 (KJV)

"Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ: By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." Romans 5:1-2 (KJV)

That should satisfy the issue.