



Revivals And Church History :: The Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith

The Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/13 20:24

Beloved I hope to generate an awareness of this topic as I know it is close to the heart of our Lord.

Why don't a majority of the Jews Believe? Paul said that he wished he could be accursed from Christ for his people the Jews to be saved. I propose a series of statements to spark an interest in this subject as it has been widely ignored in Church history; it is this:

Jesus was a Jew. The Gospels were set in Israel with Jewish characters looking for a Jewish Messiah. Every author of the scriptures was Jewish and it can be argued that Luke was 1/2 Jew. Nearly every one of Jesus' followers were Jews. All of the disciples were Jews. There was not a single Gentile mentioned as being saved before Acts 10. The Gospel was carried to the ends of the earth originally by Jews. Much of the confusion concerning the whole topic of election is furthered by the whole misunderstanding that Paul sought to establish in the hearts of the Gentiles that they were not an "after thought" of God. The Jews already believed they were the elect of God- the Gentiles needed that to be emphasized to them.

Who really were the Pharisees (Perushim)? What really was the upper room? What are tzitzit? Who were the Galileans? Who are the Goyim? What is a both kol? How many gentiles are mentioned in the New Testament before Acts Chapter 10? Who were the Zealots and Sacarii? What is the "Oral Law"? What is the Talmud? What is the Mishna? Who was Rabbi Akiba (Akiva)? Who was Simon Bar kochba?

Pretty Good Start! Any Interest?

God Bless and Best Regards In Christ,

-Robert

Re: The Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/3/14 0:06

Quote:

-----I propose a series of statements to spark an interest in this subject as it has been widely ignored in Church history

Yes, Praise God Robert! I do hope we can grasp this, it is truly a incredible thing that we have largely westernized the faith and forgotten that we are the branches. Art Katz has been a tremendous help in drawing my attention back to this fact, if you haven't you might check out:

(<http://www.benisrael.org>) <http://www.benisrael.org>

Art is a Jewish believer for those who are unfamiliar with him. Astute. Intelligent and a man after God's own heart if I might be so bold to say.

You got my interest.
Where do we start?

Mike

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/14 15:42

Bro Mike,

Thanks for the interest. I think I saw a quote you made from the Talmud on the cannibalism thread. I rolled out and kept my word not to return. I appreciate your added Talmudic insight- as I am in full agreement with you. One of the things that at knowing the Jewish Roots of the faith does is emphasize Jeremiah 31:33 as the New Covenant that we are now under. "I will put my law (Torah) into the hearts and in their minds will I write it..." We are grossly missing this in the Church. When I say that passage or make reference to God's law on our hearts people often assume "personal convictions"- when it is not that at all. Personal convictions change from person to person- while God's law is no respecter of persons and the "Spirit of the Law" is the same for everyone. God's nature and His word do not change. The conduct of a born again believer will always be in harmony with God's word- if they are led by the Spirit of God. The Spirit and the Word always agree (I know you know this). And though the Law of Moses was a national law for Israel it embodies the personality of a holy and righteous God. Art Katz did an awesome job describing profaning the things of God. Yes, I'm afraid, our liberty in the eyes of the Jews has become a cloak of malice. Did you know that Jews (so I have heard told) hold the human body so precious in Israel that when a bomb blows a person up they try to use the highest and most dignified means of treating the remains? We have lost that concept because (in some ways) we have believed that the "body" is evil and confuse the Greek word *sarx* as meaning body when it often means "sin nature." I can walk either side of the issue personally and say "the body is tainted with sin" and yet still believe "It was still made in the image of God." On both accounts I see the truth.

I heard a guy tell us a few weeks ago that God directed him to read a New Age book because "to the pure all things are pure." That is insane! Knowing the Jewish roots of the faith will get us a new respect for God and the things of God and will strip us of the tendency to profane things just because we have "liberty." Let's start with a book by Marvin Wilson called "Our Father Abraham" and we can work from there. There is so much to say and so little time...

God Bless and Brotherly Love,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/14 17:36

Did you know that Jews (so I have heard told) hold the human body so precious in Israel that when a bomb blows a person up they try to use the highest and most dignified means of treating the remains?

I think you are referring to the acts of kindness squads

I think it may be a providence that I am going to be away for a few days. It will give you time to start without lots of interruptions. ;-)

I respect Art Katz as a man of integrity with a passion for God and a willingness for painful honesty. I have met him on a couple of occasions; the first was when he came to speak at a meeting in my home over twenty years ago, the second time was about 5 years ago when he came to speak in the church to which I now belong. He is bold and vulnerable, without formal style; all these things I love in the man. His theological views on the matter of Israel are another matter; I doubt that we could be further apart.

This could be an 'interesting' thread. I understand that an ancient Chinese curse is 'may you live in interesting times'. ;-) I trust we shall be able to talk together in good humour, mutual respect and that the thread will not be 'interesting' in the 'Chinese' sense.

I must admit to a quiet groan when I saw the thread arise. The topic has the power to be extremely divisive. But perhaps it is time... Let's be diligent to maintain the unity of the Spirit and be willing, often, to resort to that wonderful little phrase of Paul's 'we know in part'.

It will be interesting to see if my reputation for 'balance' can survive this thread. :-o

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 8:48

I was smiling at your post brother because of the many times I have sat in class and wanted to get up and walk out and watched other people strait get up and fold their books and walk out the door in disdain. In time I learned what was happening and it didn't bother me anymore. We have a lot of "concepts" about the Jews that we are so often in "love" with and say things like "we love the Jews... they're God's chosen people." I learned that what we really were in love with was the "idea" of the Jews and not the Jews themselves (how many Christians have heard the term Hassidic?). I learned I knew relatively nothing about them-- I only had my distorted concept of who they were. Bro. Jerry Feldman never tried to console people when they got up to walk out; it was almost like the rich young ruler. Jewish people I have known are generally strait talkers- I think its because of the raucous way that they sat around the dinner table with their doors open- inviting the neighbors to join their dinner conversations. They get loud-- but seem to get over it.

The question for the first 10 years of the Church was "can a gentile be saved?" As the entire Church was Jews. Why has the Church not asked the question as to how that could be possible? The short answer is "The Jews rejected Jesus." How could this be when Christianity began as a sect of the Jews called the Nazarenes (Notzrim)? One of something like 27 different sects of Judaism in the 1st century CE.

I have a pretty good sketch of what has happened. Thats what I hope to discuss. We have to consider that they must know of their Messiah and not our western version of Him. They will reject that and for good reason. The JEWS were faithful to take the Gospel to the Gentiles-- how are we doing in returning the favor? I personally was able to reach a Jewish man on his death bed with the Gospel in a Nursing Home about 3 years ago. I thought all my studies may have been for that one man's soul. Maybe it can find a lodging place here. Most of what I will tell you- you have likely never heard. many of the issues are not even known in the Church. And it will be my prayer, that as we find that balance in wading through the facts and holding to that which is good-- we will at the very least understand that God has not cast away his people, Paul's kinsman according to the flesh.

Romans 11:16-20... if the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. 17And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; 18Boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. 19Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. 20Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not highminded, but fear: 21For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.

I have been careful to "Take Heed" as Paul admonished us. We are grafted in- they are the natural branches. They CAN be grafted back in. did the Jews reject Yeshua? Some did- some did not. The controlling leadership certainly did (for the most part). But I ask a riviting question... did the Gentiles ALL accept Christ? Nay. Some did and some did not. God forgive us for our teachings of dispensationalism that have made us believe that the Jews will be saved in the end... when the Bible teaches that ALL who reject Christ have no hope.

God Bless and Much Brotherly love,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/15 10:06

Hi Robert
what is the root?

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/3/15 10:08

Thanks Robert,

I am looking forward to learning. My knowledge is certainly lacking in this foundational truth.

As you stated:

Quote:
-----We have a lot of "concepts" about the Jews that we are so often in "love" with and say things like "we love the Jews... they're God's chosen people." I learned that what we really were in love with was the "idea" of the Jews and not the Jews themselves

And

Quote:
-----I have a pretty good sketch of what has happened. That's what I hope to discuss. We have to consider that they must know of their Messiah and not our western version of Him. They will reject that and for good reason. The JEWS were faithful to take the Gospel to the Gentiles-- how are we doing in returning the favor? I personally was able to reach a Jewish man on his death bed with the Gospel in a Nursing Home about 3 years ago. I thought all my studies may have been for that one man's soul. Maybe it can find a lodging place here. Most of what I will tell you- you have likely never heard. Many of the issues are not even known in the Church. And it will be my prayer, that as we find that balance in wading through the facts and holding to that which is good-- we will at the very least understand that God has not cast away his people, Paul's kinsman according to the flesh.

Indeed, and as Ron alluded to, it's about time that we began discussing this. It has been pressing on me that very little attention is being given to the Jewish people in modern Christianity (At least in this corner of the world) though The Book is filled with 'our ancestors' and 'our heritage'.

There is so many aspects to discuss and likely it will encompass a broad range of issues and raise many questions.

In reference to the Jewish man that you witnessed to, I can only wonder at the difficulty that may escape many of us in a life that entails.

Yesterday I read a testimony that I can only guess is all too common and have heard of similar stories of the additional hardships that are unique to those of Jewish tradition who have come to faith in their Messiah. Being disowned by your own family not the least of their anguish. Can we imagine that?

Hope this is within the realm of what you wanted to begin discussing here. You lead Brother and we will follow, see if we can keep the sheep in the pasture without wandering off to far.

Mike

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 11:33

Beloved,

Once we trace the history of the early Church up to 135 CE I think we would conclude much differently than post 135 when the Church began drifting from Jerusalem and towards Athens and then Rome. However we decide, we must conclude based on the clear teaching of Romans 11 that we are "wild" branches and grafted in as Gentiles. That is a very sobering thought that escapes our minds. Since I began diving into the "Messianic's" claims personally as any good Berean should (amen?); I found that the half has yet been told. I would get upset and think something like this "If that is true then the Gentiles hijacked the whole thing!" Then I would go to the study library at the huge Nazarene Theological Seminary and check their sources and guess what... I went out of their almost hostile, shaking my head at some of the things that were written by some of the early church fathers (ante nicene). They didn't have to convince me... it was in plain black and white and I was sorely ashamed for and angered at the early Gentile Church! Then I found Luther's tractate about the Jews (which didn't he die a few weeks after writing that? I'll check it out.) and it burnt a lot of my thoughts about him.

Whatever the root is the Jews are "naturally" growing from it- we have been grafted in contrary to nature. So how is it that if we are grafted in, we the "Gentile Church," could be the root?

So little time....

God Bless and Best Regards in Christ,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/15 11:42

Hi Robert,

you write What ever the root is the Jews are "naturally" growing from it- we have been grafted in contrary to nature. So how is it that if we are grafted in, we the "Gentile Church," could be the root?

I could answer this question for you, but it is absolutely essential to the whole of Paul's argument that you know what the 'root' is. If you have not decided what the 'root' is whatever conclusions you come to are just going to be 'castles in the air'.

It's a little bit like someone giving me a route which says I'm not sure where you start but follow the directions and you will get there. No you won't, not unless you know where you are starting from.

It's not a trick question, by the way. The answer is there in Romans.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 12:27

Hello again brother,

Yes, I agree. The theological road we have taken as Gentiles has surely taken us off track. The short answer is of course:

I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh: Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen (Romans 9:1-6)

Jesus Christ (Yeshua) is the ONLY true Israel as HE is the promise, the covenant, the lamb, the priest, etc.

That is pretty clear; but why do the Gentiles now believe the Jews rejected their Messiah and the Gentile Church is now "Israel?" The problem as my studies have led me to see is that God intended that the root remain the root and the remnant of elect Jews would always be the natural branches and the elect Gentiles would be the "grafted in" branches. What we have now is a tree loaded with grafted in (or "taped on" if they are "almost Christians"); but where is the bulk of that remnant?

Let's go back to the first century and begin to see it all play out.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/15 14:04

Robert writes Jesus Christ (Yeshua) is the ONLY true Israel as HE is the promise, the covenant, the lamb, the priest, etc.

I LOVE this statement, although I don't know why you have chosen to call Him by a name that is never used in the New Testament, not even in Hebrews.

You continue That is pretty clear; but why do the Gentiles now believe the Jews rejected their Messiah and the Gentile Church is now "Israel?" The problem as my studies have led me to see is that God intended that the root remain the root and the remnant of elect Jews would always be the natural branches and the elect Gentiles would be the "grafted in" branches. What we have now is a tree loaded with grafted in (or "taped on" if they are "almost Christians"); but where is the bulk of that remnant?

There is no such thing as 'the Gentile church', nor is there a Jewish church, nor an American church, nor a British church, nor a church of the 21st century, nor tomorrow's church. There is just one church; the Church of Jesus Christ. Local expressions of that church similarly cannot be gentile, Jewish, American, or British. If they are genuine churches they are churches where 'two' has become 'one'. To recognise any other identifying features in a church is to make

e the error that Peter made when he was roundly rebuked by Paul.

Here is a simple multiple choice question, you are only allowed to tick one box; Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: 1 Corinthians 10:32 Which group do you belong to?

BTW you have still not defined what you mean by the 'root'. Your statement can make no sense without such a definition.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 14:40

PRAYER

Lord I just ask that you would intervene. Father God, why is it that your Church takes such a posture towards each other? Is this the Love by which we are all to be known? Why are your people looking to beat their swords? Why is it that we cannot have a meaningful conversation without people trying to split every hair and exegete every verb and syntax of a mortal man's words? Lord draw your sword I pray and discern the thoughts and intents of the hearts of those who so handily resist any real and meaningful conversation about your people Yisrael! Oh God how my heart aches for this.....

After posting this prayer I was convicted to tone it down and realize that it's the enemies job to cause us to misunderstand each other and shoot fiery darts into our hearts. We are not wrestling with flesh and blood. God help me be more discerning. Uncle Screwtape and cousin Wormwood are well at work (Screwtape Letters; C.S. Lewis)!

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/15 14:56

Robert

It is best to pray such prayers behind closed doors.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 15:30

You would seek to roadblock a thread that He Himself has laid on my heart to bring an awareness of His people the Jews! (I deleted a few sentences that were a little strong). It was all a misunderstanding.

-Robert

****call unto Me and I will answer thee***

And answer me He did. Again, I felt quite convicted to tone it down and to apologize for my defensiveness. The enemy likes to sow discord among us and twist words into a mess. I think C.S. Lewis would have called this a letter from Uncle Screwtape!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 16:02

Beloved,

Can we realize that we have the identity of Jesus Christ and there is no need to protect our own? Let us go out of the camp following Him... bearing His reproach, for here we have no continuing city. The lepers were put out of the camp and as we follow Christ and take on His identity we will likewise suffer with Him and suffer similar reproach. Why the fear? Why the concern? The truth will set us free and so long as we tell the truth about these issues as well as we know them we can have a fuller understanding of these things.

How bad does the enemy hate the Jews? (6,000,000 dead in WWII). I am of German descent (Wurtz?) and I have known German WWII veterans who denied what happened with the Jews. Many of them see the cross (oh how unfortunate) as a sword dipped in 2000 years of their blood. The history speaks for itself.

I personally believe the enemy would do anything to stop the Church from knowing the plight and history of the Jews and their relationship to the Church and getting to a place where they can WITNESS to them effectively. Knowing the history allows you to be sensitive and knowledgeable to what they already know and it helps understand the obstacles ahead.

. Do you have any Jewish friends?

That is what this thread was started for. Not to debate. When you don't fight the real enemy you will fight each other. I am not here to debate or bicker or argue. I have a God birthed desire to see the Jews won to Christ and I know I have some info that you can use to make it a reality in your circle of relationships.

God bless and Much brotherly love,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/15 16:37

Robert

I have wept my way through Auschwitz (twice) and Mydanek too. You will not need to instruct me on the abominable treatment of the Jewish race. But if you tell me that Christianity ought to be more Jewish you will have to give chapter and verse.

This is a forum not a pulpit, and you will need to be willing to prove your points. 10 times in the Acts it tells us that Paul 'dialogued'. Conversation and discussion are not one way streets. I hold no animosity towards you or your views; God who knows the thoughts and intents of our hearts, is my witness. But you will not serve your cause by increasing the volume if your arguments are weak.

As I may not get back to this thread for a while I will answer my own question. The 'root' referred to by Paul is 'Abraham-type faith'; not a racial progenitor. This was the original obligation of the physical descendents of Abraham. They were required to be circumcised AND to walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised. The natural branches were broken off because of unbelief and can be grafted back in by faith, not because they are physical descendents of Abraham. Likewise people from a Gentile background are grafted in because of faith and can be removed if they do not believe.

In Rom 3:22 and 10:12 tells us that there is 'no difference between Jew and Greek'. The church of Jesus Christ is not an extension of the Jewish church but 'one new man'. In the 'church' the dividing hedge that separated Israel as a nation has been broken down. It is neither Jewish nor Gentile. His is OUR peace who hath made of twain, one new man.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 17:20

Bro. Ron,

I am in no wise here to convince anyone that they should be more Jewish. These things enrich our understanding and give the right context of the early Church. We are and will remain in the calling wherewith the Lord has called us. Is any man circumcised...

I would only add to your comments concerning the "root" that you have described what I would call the "how" or "what" and I described the "who." We are heirs of the righteousness of God that is by faith. For the promise was not unto seeds but unto His Seed, which was Christ (Galatians 3:16). And the Israel of God are those who are in Christ through faith (... you bear not the root, but the root you). Who was that faith in? It was in the promised seed (which was Christ). So we see then it is not faith in our faith... but faith in the promised Seed which was Christ.

There is certainly only ONE Lord, ONE faith, and ONE baptism, etc. My "Gentile Church" (in quotes) caused the confusion admittedly. What I mean is the Church that is almost exclusively Gentile in 2004, while it was 100% Jewish in 40 CE. It has nothing to do with ethnicity- though make no mistake, I believe God desires for the true Israel of God to be (as they have been) a light of the Glory of God in the earth. How do you explain their perseverance otherwise? This does not mean that God is a respecter of persons. But we must realize that the Jews need to hear the Gospel in a way that they will receive it.

My plans were to go out on a limb and demonstrate BOTH sides as for why the majority of Jews are so far from Christ. To the Jew first then to the Gentile... hmmm. not in our generation.

Obviously you have been in some major discussions about this before that have caused you to be somewhat cautious about the post. I appreciate that. I also would prefer not to become the whipping boy :-D for any ill feelings from past arguments. I have been there. Not fun! In other words, I wish not to be a point of contact with which to vent differences with Messianic Judaism. They are who they are. I am a Christian (Pentecostal) and wanting to see Revival and souls saved in ALL camps. :-)

I apologize and repent OPENLY and PUBLICLY for coming across too strong. I don't want to preach. I don't want to argue. YOU Bro. Ron have the knowledge to help make this thread more meaningful than I ever could alone. Lets work together shall we? Were bretheren. Maybe I was acting a bit like James and making a case for the Jews for a minute. But we can balance each other.

God Bless and Much Brotherly Love,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/15 17:56

Robert

you write Obviously you have been in some major discussions about this before that have caused you to be somewhat cautious about the post.

No I haven't been in major (or even minor) discussions but I have been doing some major thinking and meditating on the topic for several decades.

As regards your apology...2Cor 2:10,11. In other words, as much as it lies with me I forgive with all my heart. I am away now for a few days so I won't be able to contribute or interrupt. :-P

Re: the root - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/3/15 18:18

Perhaps we can get back on track here and since we are talking about roots and branches please lets remember that the fruit of the Spirit is love.

Quote:

-----what is the root?

In studying this matter I found the following from Vincents Word Studies on Romans 11:16-17;

Both the first-fruits and the root represent the patriarchs (or Abraham singly, compare Rom_11:28). The holiness by call and destination of the nation as represented by its fathers (first-fruits, root) implies their future restoration, the holiness of the lump and branches...The Jewish nation is a tree from which some branches have been cut, but which remains living because the root (and therefore all the branches connected with it) is still alive. Into this living tree the wild branch, the Gentile, is grafted among the living branches, and thus draws life from the root. The insertion of the wild branches takes place in connection with the cutting off of the natural branches (the bringing in of the Gentiles in connection with the rejection of the Jews). But the grafted branches should not glory over the natural branches because of the cutting off of some of the latter, since they derive their life from the common root. ?The life-force and the blessing are received by the Gentile through the Jew, and not by the Jew through the Gentile. The spiritual plan moves from the Abrahamic covenant downward, and from the Israelitish nation outward?

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 20:23

THE Jewish Freedom Movement

by Robert Wurtz II

Merton Hengel in his book "the Zealots" sheds some light on the scene in the time of Jesus through the works of Josephus and others concerning the unrest that existed in the area of Galilee and other places. As far as I know, the term "Zealot" is first mentioned in the New Testament Gospels. It is found first here before any other writings. Simon the "Zealot" was one of Jesus' disciples. The Zealots were founded by Judas the Galilean and Zadok (Saddok) the priest. Judas of Galilee is mentioned to have been killed by an uprising in Acts 5:37. The "prototype" of the Zealots was Phinehas (Numbers 25:6-13). The Galileans had a reputation for their rebellion against Rome and had a certain accent that gave them away when they spoke (Mark 14:70). When we talk about resistance movements I think we can list at least the: Galileans, Sadducians, and Zealots. Some blur them together, but it is hard to go back and accurately reconstruct each movement. VOLUNTARY was the situation in Israel because of these movements. Some of them believed to pay tribute to Ceasar was paramount to paying him a "tithe" and therefor acknowledging him as deity. That, to them, was a breach of the 1st Commandment. Remember the questions about paying tribute directed towards Jesus? That was part of it. Zealots and Galileans hated the publicans. They collected taxes for Rome and were considered traitors. Imagine how awesome Jesus would have had to have been to keep the peace between all of those men when Matthew was a Publican?

God Bless.

-Robert

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/3/15 21:33

Quote:

-----Shall we get started?

I just read through this entire thread and think there is a need to start. I think its most beneficial in grasping a large subject like this is to look generally at verses and look at as many verses of scripture as possible to get a wider context. It turns into a tunnel-vision discussion when we rest on one or two verses. I personally have been showed some of this awesome truth, It saddens me to talk to an evangelical Christian that basically believes that the Jews are totally seperate then Christians. First off Jesus was a jew, and basically all of the original church gathering were jewish believers also. Jesus came first to save the jews then the gentiles. I will quote some verses from Romans, going in order as best as possible:

Romans 1:16-17 - I am not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for the salvation of everyone who believes: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile. For in the gospel a righteousness from God is revealed, a righteousness that is by faith from first to last, just as it is written: "The righteous will live by faith."

At first glance this above passage seems to say that Jew and Gentile alike come to believe by the means of faith. They obtain 'a righteousness' not of there effort but by an external force, the power of God. And they enter into this righteousness? Christ? who is the true vine?

Romans 2:12-13 - All who sin apart from the law will also perish apart from the law, and all who sin under the law will be judged by the law. For it is not those who hear the law who are righteous in God's sight, but it is those who obey the law who will be declared righteous.

Romans 2:17 - Now you, if you call yourself a Jew; if you rely on the law and brag about your relationship to God;

Paul seems to be saying here that the arguement of the Jews was that they were righteous and special before God because they had the law. But he clearly shows that the Gentiles hearts are a law unto themselves (Romans 2:14-15). So in conclusion he states that having the law doesnt save you make you in better relationship with God. Its obedience to the law of God that makes you righteous and in right-standing with God.

Romans 2:28 - A man is not a Jew if he is only one outwardly, nor is circumcision merely outward and physical. No, a man is a Jew if he is one inwardly; and circumcision is circumcision of the heart, by the Spirit, not by the written code. Such a man's praise is not from men, but from God.

It still seems to me that the Jews are special and set apart to God amongst the nations and salvation is found with the Jewish people in the Old testament. Because a true Jew in God's eyes was one who had a 'circumsized' heart and that action was done by the Spirit of God, God wrought the righteousness of Christ in Jews hearts that walked humbly with their God in faith. We are ingrafted into this circumision of the heart by faith in Christ. We are given that same faith to follow God that Abraham and the other patriachs did.

Revivals And Church History :: The Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith

Well thats Romans 2.. I confess I don't know that much about this subject and please correct me as much as you can. And if my comments are too simplistic, complexisize them :-P

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/15 21:41

And if my comments are too simplistic, complexisize them :-D

I like that! You did quite well! Someone just asked me over my shoulder... "How old is that guy?" :-)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/16 8:15

The Fourth Philosophy: (THE ZEALOTS)

By Robert Wurtz II

In our first lesson we sketched out some of the characteristics of the JEWISH FREEDOM MOVEMENT in the time of Jesus. They would eventually come to be known as the ZEALOTS, but the movement itself developed greatly from the time of the Galileans (Judas of Galilee) until they fled to MASADA and took their own lives. The philosophies of Judaism most important in the time of Christ were the Pharisees, Saducees, Essenes, and the Zealots (fourth philosophy). Keep in mind that all such movements in the first century were both religious and political; not one or the other. However, there was so much dissention within the Zealots as time went on that it is more accurate to call them a "tendency" than a "party." Before it was over they were at war within themselves. According to Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews 18,3 A-18, 23 their main doctrine was as follows:

- 1) Only GOD may be called LORD or ruler (sole rule of God)
- 2) They had an "invincible love of freedom"
- 3) The people must cooperate with God for His intervention and help
- 4) They had a deep and bitter resentment of the Roman census

The history of this sect as we know it began with resentment from the census conducted by Cyrenius in 6-7 CE. It resurfaced again in 48 CE when two of Judas' sons were crucified by Tiberius Alexander and was continued at the beginning of the Jewish war by Manehem (another of Judas' sons. Manehem claimed to be the Messiah). It ended with the mass suicide of the Zealots at Masada and the mass murder of the deadly "sect within the Zealots", called the Sacarii (as sassins) in Egypt in 73 CE. The Sacarii held to the "Sole rule of God" even under extreme torture. Needless to say, when Herod placed a statue (graven image) of an Eagle over the door to the Temple it did not sit well with this movement. The eagle was a divine symbol of the false god Jupiter and of Baal Shamin (sun-god) in Syrian temples (among others. See also Daniel 9:27). This helped keep the fear of the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (a type of the anti-Christ) and his mad behavior in the Temple, ever before their eyes. Judas the Galilean gave this whole struggle a theological implication and that secured in the hearts of many their allegiance to the struggle. Judas the Galilean taught that people could not yield to a ruler who claimed a "divine status" for themselves. To obey the emperor was to break the First Commandment and worship a false idol (or god. See Exodus 22:19).

Josephus was not all too kind to this movement and chose to refer to them most of the time as "robbers" (: Gk word? : or as we might call them "pirates." In Rabbinic literature the Hebrew word used lends to the idea that they were to be feared at night. The Babylonian Talmud calls the "rebels" in Jerusalem by the name Barjone (See Gitt 56a,b. the barjonim is plural). The word literally means "out-laws." This has led a few scholars to believe that Simon was a Zealot based on Matthew 16:17, but there are real problems with this view. However, Simon Peter's overall concept of Messiah was obviously very much effected by the Jewish Freedom Movement based upon the fact that he was willing to die for who he thought was the Messiah (another study) and what the average Jew believed the Messiah would do when He appeared. Satan used Jesus' capture to create confusion in Peter's mind about what was going on. This, in my honest opinion, was the "sifting" that took place. The Greek word for "sift" is Strongs NT:4617 sinjazo (sin-ee-ad'-zo); from sinion (a sieve); to riddle (figuratively). Satan used that contradiction of the reality of what was happening to Jesus and Peter's Messianic concepts to "riddle" his mind that he would loose his faith. Jesus cleared it all up in Luke 24:44A... as it is written... And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

God bless,

-Robert

* None of this information on this page is from Internet sources (not that that is always bad). It is original information in which I have utilized Josephus' Complete Works and Martin Hengel's scholarly work "The Zealots" T & T Clark EDI, NUBURG, c1989 among other sources as well as recollections from past lectures of Dr. Ron Moseley of the AIHLS (American Institute for Holy Land Studies).

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/16 9:03

THE "ROBBERS"

By Robert Wurtz II

The "Robbers" (Gk, les-tes) as we touched on in the previous study was the preferred term to describe participants in the Jewish Freedom Movement by Josephus. This sheds much light on the Gospels and the crucifixion of Jesus. When the temple guards came to get Jesus He asked them the question "48 "Am I leading a rebellion," said Jesus, "that you have come out with swords and clubs to capture me? 49 Every day I was with you, teaching in the temple courts, and you did not arrest me. But the Scriptures must be fulfilled" (Mark 14:48, 49 NIV). Literally the passage says "have you come out against a ROBBER?" The NIV captures the meaning though. The teachings of Jesus were well contrary to the doctrines of the Zealots (Robbers, Sacarii, Barjone, etc.). He taught the people to love each other and not to rebel against Rome. He will be shown to die for the very sins and behaviors he TAUGHT AGAINST. In fact, He said if you are asked to carry a load for a mile carry it two miles (Matthew 5:41). And again... render unto Caesar the things that are Caesars and to God the things that are God's (Mark 12:17). And again I say unto you that you RESIST NOT evil (Matthew 5:39). Many like the teachings that were totally contrary to the Zealot cause. Jesus did MUCH to squelch the Zealot uprising! We will see what they did with Him.

Many wanted to force Jesus into the mold of their own interpretation of prophesy and Messianic concepts of that day. The application I make of this fact for today in my life is thus: Their misinterpretation of key Messianic passages proved to be deadly dangerous in the end for the Zealots and others and speaks to us today that we ought to use caution in how dogmatic we are about the TIMING of the Coming of the Lord. The Jews had the timing... they were in the dark as to the details and purpose of the first coming (and most of them blew it because of their own agendas). We as the Church have the details, but are in the dark concerning the timing and could be in danger of our own agendas causing a similar plight (no need for me to defend this comment... its my own personal position).

Martin Hengel comments on this saying "His enemies, however, had him condemned before Pilate as a messianic pretender who endangered the state and, together with two "robbers", who may have been real Zealots, he suffered the same death as so many members of the Jewish Freedom Movement before and after Him." (Martin Hengel, The Zealots, Edinburg 1989)

In John 18:40 we find Barabbas being referred to as a "robber." And again... A man called Barabbas was in prison with the insurrectionists who had committed murder in the uprising. 8 The crowd came up and asked Pilate to do for them what he usually did. 9 "Do you want me to release to you the king of the Jews?" asked Pilate, 10 knowing it was out of envy that the chief priests had handed Jesus over to him. 11 But the chief priests stirred up the crowd to have Pilate release Barabbas instead. (Mark 15:7-11 NIV) What madness is this? To condemn with lies a man for doing the very thing you know the man you are asking the release of is guilty of? Yes, I believe, Jesus was condemned in Barabbas' place-- the truly guilty one. Barabbas was released as was common with the scapegoat and Christ bore our sin dying for the very things He preached and taught against. Talk about a riddle? How did that riddle Peter's mind? The whole situation was insane. Not only did he have to come to terms with what he thought the Messiah was supposed to do; but He watched Him die for the very things He preached against. Only by the prayer of Jesus and the sovereign grace of God did Peter (Petros i.e. "the rock") not watch his faith be dashed into powder.

God Bless,

-Robert

* None of this information on this page is from Internet sources (not that that is always bad). It is original information in which I have utilized Josephus' Complete Works and Martin Hengel's scholarly work "The Zealots" (T & T Clark EDI, NBURG, c1989 among other sources as well as recollections from past lectures of Dr. Ron Moseley of the AIHLS (American Institute for Holy Land Studies).

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/16 10:20

THE ASSASSINS (Sacarii)

By Robert Wurtz II

In Matthew 24:2 Jesus asked... "Do you see all these things?" he asked. "I tell you the truth, not one stone here will be left on another; every one will be thrown down." (NIV) Jesus knew what was coming and it was total devastation. After the death and resurrection of Christ- the Zealots and the Pharisees were still at work. The Church in Jerusalem was headed (the president) by James the half brother of our Lord and then it was headed by various family members of His after that. The Christians were a new sect called the Notzrim (Nazarenes). According to Dr. Ron Moseley there were around 20 of her mini sects that were likewise out of step with the Pharisees and Zealots and were given the harsh name "the Minim" (All the while the Church is spreading the Gospel and coming under intense persecution-- the Zealots and the other sects were doing their agenda.) The "Minim" is sort of like saying "the heretics." Remember this fact, it will be important in our future studies.

To cut through a lot of details it happens that Felix lied to the leader of the Zealots and lured him into being taken prisoner to Rome. This upset them greatly. They retaliated by forming a group called the SACARII. These men were brutal killers. They carried a short dagger under their clothing and would wade through crowds to assassinate people. Some scholars believe that there was a connection between the sacarii and the Temple leaders in those days and refer to the incident with Paul in Acts 23:12. Their actions are typical of the Sacarii. The fact that Roman guards were taken to protect is good indication that this may have been the case. The Zealots and especially the Sacarii would threaten people with DEATH who would not follow them in their uprising. They had a very believable reputation and track record for doing it, as they were not mere idle threats. FROM these facts we begin to see why Josephus so resented the Zealots and referred to them as "robbers." He saw them as common criminals. Josephus reports that they were scattered around in bands of rebels that would rob and steal and kill like outlaws. They took the property of the rich, killed the owners, and plundered their possessions (Antiquities 20, 185).

Josephus says that the Sacarii (and Zealots) in many cases had a "senseless thirst for blood." They were motivated by greed and desire for spoils and not merely religion. Most of their behavior was cloaked in religion- but had nothing to do with it. This was not true for all, but for many. This is the character of the Zealots.... what will come of them?

God Bless,

-Robert

RE: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/3/16 11:16

Isn't it amazing that Jesus chose from among these different groups for His disciples? What an odd group He put together. Two sets of brothers, Peter and Andrew, and then the sons of thunder, John and James who were probably a bit obnoxious to be around (why else would they be called that?). Then there was another Simon who was a zealot. Matthew a hated tax collector. Some people believe that Judas was most likely a member of the sacarii. Some of His followers had political interests, others like the fishermen did not. Then Jesus also had many women following His ministry, something very unusual for that time.

What a group He put together, calculated not to get along! Guaranteed to get on each others nerves. Only Christ could unite a group like that!

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/16 15:04

Amen to that! He is awesome. And it just occurred to me that if He can keep the peace with that group... we all down here ought to be a cake walk (LOL).

God Bless,

-Robert :-D

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/16 16:09

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE (70 CE)

A very truncated version!

By Robert Wurtz II

It is hard to imagine how beautiful and awesome that the Temple actually was in the first century. So many times we think the "upper room" may have been in someones attic, etc. The Temple was quite a site to behold for those who were there. We, some 2000 years later only have the detailed models and 3D animations to go on. Just seeing them is awe inspiring. Although hostility towards the Notzrim (Christians) increased with each passing year, we must remember that the believing Jews and the non-believing Jews were constantly mingling together both in the Temple and in the local synagogues. This is a very important fact! Paul preached in synagogues and Jesus attended synagogue. It was a main part of their identity as Jews and a means with which to express their religion. To loose the Temple would mean the loss of a common meeting place- both for believing Jews and non-believing Jews alike.

What exacerbated the whole problem were the many men who rose up and claimed "Messiah" status in the Zealot leadership (Jewish Freedom Movement). The believing Jews could not follow them and it alienated the believers from their non-believing family members and friends. They were viewed as traitors of Israel. This is the reality of the "sword" that Jesus said he would bring and set family members at enmity with each other (Matthew 10:34).

McClintock and Strong writes... "During the final struggle of the Jews against the Romans, A.D. 70, the Temple was the last scene of the tug of war. The Romans rushed from the Tower of Antonia into the sacred precincts, the halls of which were set on fire by the Jews themselves. It was against the will of Titus that a Roman soldier threw a firebrand into the northern out-buildings of the Temple, which caused the conflagration of the whole structure, although Titus himself endeavored to extinguish the fire (War, 6:4). Josephus remarks, "One cannot but wonder at the accuracy of this period thereto relating; for the same month and day were now observed, as I said before, wherein the holy house was burned formerly by the Babylonians. Now the number of years that passed from its first foundation, which was laid by king Solomon, till its destruction, which happened in the second year of the reign of Vespasian, are collected to be one thousand one hundred and thirty, besides seven months and fifteen days; and from the second building of it, which was done by Haggai in the second year of Cyrus the king, till its destruction under Vespasian there were six hundred and thirty-nine years and forty-five days." The sacred utensils, the golden table of the shew-bread, the book of the law, and the golden candlestick were displayed in the triumph at Rome. Representations of them are still to be seen sculptured in relief on the triumphal arch of Titus." (from McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia, Electronic Database. Copyright (c) 2000 by Biblesoft)

Josephus reluctantly describes in detail the atrocities that took place. Everyone ought to read those sobering accounts. People resorted to the most horrific means of survival. Hunger has a way of bringing madness to those who are unrighteousness. The Psalmist once wrote... "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread. 26 He is ever merciful, and lendeth; and his seed is blessed. 27 Depart from evil, and do good; and dwell for evermore. 28 For the LORD loveth judgment, and forsaketh not his saints; they are preserved for ever: but the seed of the wicked shall be cut off." (Psalm 37:25-28)

Famine has often been used as an arrow of God's judgment. And as Matthew Henry once put it... "God is never at a loss for a means with which to punish a wicked people... His quiver is always full."

Jerusalem was destroyed and the Temple with it. The city was plowed according to Micah 3. The believing Jews fled to the Mountains of Pella. The Pharisees fled to Yavneh (Yamnia or Jamnia) to begin construction of an academy and forge a whole new "sterilized" Judaism free from all the "min" (minim- heretics) called RABBINIC JUDAISM. The "rebels" fled to Masada where they systematically committed suicide. Rome had built a ramp up the the fortress and when the Jews threw large stones down it... the Romans went into town and got the peoples family members to stand on the front lines. A woman and a few children who had hidden and lived to tell the story. The Sacarii were killed in 73 CE in Egypt. The Sadducees were destroyed with the Temple.

In the next lesson, we will look at how the Pharisees took up the cause of the Zealots. The authority of God will soon be placed into the hands of the "Rabbi's" and the Jewish believers as we once knew them would be persecuted almost out of existence.

Revivals And Church History :: The Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith

God Bless,
-Robert

Some info taken from Funk and Wagnall Encyclopedia 1983. Would recommend the Lumina software for looking at 3D versions of the Temple. Classes can be taken via correspondence from AIHLS on the Temple (2 semesters). Early Christian historians Eusebius and Epiphanius claim that prior to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in A.D. 70 the Jerusalem Christians fled to the Decapolis city of Pella (note also Mark 13:14; Matt 24:15; Lu 21:20-22; cf. 19:43-44 Evidence from Biblical, Historical, Archaeological and Critical Studies J. Julius Scott, Jr. (Web page)).

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/16 17:19

The Birkat ha Minim

By Robert Wurtz II

According to the Encyclopedia Judaica there were 7 different types of Pharisees (Perushim). Two of them were after the order of Abraham and Job and the other 5 were hypocrites (?). The Pharisees that fled to Yavneh would likely have included no Nazarenes as they were deemed a heretical sect within Judaism along with many others.

Note some things mentioned by Daniel Gruber concerning the "minim" (heretics) in his lesson "The Day the Rabbi's Were Wrong."

http://www.beitsimcha.com/s_ser/s_ser_0009.asp

- * Minim may be a shortened, derogatory form of ma'aminim, believers (in Yeshua)
- * Rashi explains the minim referred to disciples of Yeshua (Jesus) "who did not believe in the words of the wise."
- * Determining who is a Jew was a very vital question, since if you weren't a Jew, you had to sacrifice to the Emperor, and if you didn't you were guilty of treason.
- * Minim were a threat because they could draw away followers of Pharisees (soon to be called Rabbis) by their teachings, writings and healings.
- * Pharisees (soon to be called) Rabbis forbade reading the writings of minim and sanctioned burning their books.
- * Birkat ha-Minim blessing (curse) developed and recited daily in every synagogue to weed out unknown Minim and their sympathizers and inculcate popular hatred of them (p. 156).

When Jews assemble to pray they recite the Shemoneh Esreh (Eighteen Benedictions). It is the quintessential prayer in Judaism and is also called the AMIDAH (which means standing). The insertion of a 12th benediction in the late 1st-century against the "minim" (heretics) increased the number to nineteen and thus voided the original name. This benediction was aimed at the many Jews who had accepted the Messiah and is essentially a curse upon them. Under Rabban Gamaliel II there was a question asked if anyone knew a way to deal with the heretics... they found one... it was the Birkat ha Minim (12th ben.). Believing Jews had to endure synagogue services that essentially cursed them! This drove a deep wedge between what would eventually become Rabbinic Judaism and the believing Jews that still tried to coexist with their hostile non-believing friends and family. This addition is no doubt a landmark in the split between the Church and the non-believing Jews.

In our next lesson we will begin discussing how the Gentiles added to the alienation of the believing Jews by their behaviors, etc. Anti-semitism has long been a horrific problem among the Catholic and Protestant Church. Hearing these stories and understanding the issues heretofore presented will no doubt open many eyes to the reality of why so few Jews believe in their Messiah.

God Bless,
-Robert

All references and info is readily available on the web. Just use the various key words.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/17 11:19

Identity and Expression of Faith

By Robert Wurtz II

One of the major problems associated with trying to witness to a Jew is the presence of so much Hellenistic influence that has existed in the Church since the 2nd century. As the Church began moving west the Gentile Christians began interpreting Paul's writings in an Anti-Semitic light and adopting many pagan influences into the Church. The Church over the next 1000 years would be filled with all manner of graven images and pagan concepts of a "mother-son" worship, etc. Many of these things a Jew absolutely could not accept. On top of that there is still a concept that exists that if a Jew is going to "get saved" they have to become a Gentile to do it. In other words they have to cast off their Jewish heritage and stop practicing those things that gave them a Jewish IDENTITY. If a Jew desired to continue to honor the Sabbath day Gentiles would view this as being "under the law." Or is they kept Passover or Yom Kippur or any of the other festivals they would be viewed as being "under the law." What the Gentile Church essentially did was cast off the Jewish holy days as being legalism and then created a whole new bunch of Christian holidays that were in many cases a carry over or redefinition of pagan holidays they celebrated before they were born again. Herein lies the great inconsistency that has plagued the Church since the 2nd century and is a major cause of many Jews being unable to accept Christ. It was not long until artwork depicted Jesus as a westerner and not as Jewish. The last Supper was painted as though the people were sitting at a table and this was in no wise how the last supper (Passover) was conducted. In fact, many Christians do not realize what a Passover service is and how it so points to Jesus Christ. We think of it as the simple communion services we conduct.

In I Corinthians 7 we read... 18 Is any man called being circumcised? Let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? Let him not be circumcised. 19 Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. 20 Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.

God does not expect a Gentile to become a Jew in order to be saved. This was laid to rest at the first Church council meeting in Acts 15. In like manner it is upsurd to think that a Jew should be compelled to cast off their identity as Jews and become Hellenized Gentiles to become a follower in a Jewish Messiah. The first century believers lived as Jews and conducted themselves as Jews in the Temple and in Synagogue. The issue for the reformist is that there is a tendency to thi

nk these things are being done as "works" for salvation, when in reality it is their way of expressing their faith in light of the fullness of the understanding of all these feasts and festivals that POINTED to their Messiah that they now accept by faith (sola fedy). I personally have been in these services in Messianic Meetings and have seen what Passover was like in the First Century. I only celebrated Passover once, but it an awesome thing to experience and it gave a whole new appreciation to the Christ that I had cast in my own image.

To try and set the Old Testament and New Testament into a Greek context is serious error. The Greek aspect of the Gospel is the language of the manuscripts (codex) that were in the common Greek tongue that was spread throughout the world after the conquests of Alexander the Great. Greek was a common language with which the Gospel could be communicated and is not the same as taking on the Hellenistic influences and the full embodiment of the solely Pagan ways of the Greeks. Greek logic and philosophy has been the lens that the Bible was viewed through now for some 1900 years (+ -). Greek logic compartmentalizes truths of scripture and boxes them in to try to make them subservient to Greek logic. But hear what Paul said concerning those things... I Corinthians 1:22 For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom 23 But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; 24 But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. 25 Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men. 26 For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: 27 But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; 28 And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: 29 That no flesh should glory in his presence. 30 But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: 31 That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

The key to this is verse 21 "For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God. Yet the very tools of Greek logic are used to try to interpret scripture (?). I am not saying that we should abandon systematic theology... I have written over 700 pages of materials teaching this very thing for several years; however, we must understand that the "meat" of God's word is spiritually discerned. Intellect is not nearly as important as a pure heart when it comes to knowing God. It is sad that (As Leonard Ravinhill put it) that graduates of Seminary know the word of God, but not the God of the word. The wisdom of man exegetes God's word to form more man made theories and doctrines and ignores the very reason the word exists. Men then began to express their faith by arguing doctrines rather than fellowship concerning the things of God. They identify themselves in terms of "what" they believe as opposed to "wh" at they believe about the who they believe in." Soon the doctrines themselves become their God. I am sorely guilty of doing this and it always would happen when I was growing cold and needed revival. When revival is present, I have a low tolerance for doing such vain things. I have expressed my faith by making apologetically arguments, etc. That is NOT walking in the Spirit and I knew it! It would get me by though until I was ready to repent again. Where is the balance in this? Is God more concerned with how well we understand the things that have been revealed to us in part as He is us walking in those things that are plainly understood. There are some strong rebukes and warnings in scripture against such behavior." This is NOT how Christianity was expressed in the first century. I never read in Acts "oh how they knew their doctrine." Paul said he came knowing nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified? We will find out in time how God feels about the wasted energies and pretense while a lost world is dying and going to Hell and were going to be ashamed.

The Jews will be won to Christ - not when they see Jesus through the eyes of systematic theology; but when they see the glory of God in our lives that provokes them to jealousy and makes the question the very things they believe. When the glory returns the elect will see it and recognize it.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/17 17:45

The Jewish Christians

By Robert Wurtz II

According to Dr. Ron Mosley, dean of the American Institute of Holy Land Studies there were three major groups of Jewish Christians in the First Century: Nazarenes (Notzrim), Messianists, and Ebionites. In his book entitled Yeshua, A guide to the real Jesus he writes; "In examining the Jewish roots of the Church, it is important to differentiate between the Hebrew Christians, such as the Nazarenes and Messianists at the beginning, and the various groups of Ebionites with Judaizing traits, which were active around the turn of the first century. The early Hebrew Church was composed of those who believed in justification by faith as well as those who stressed traditions that involved legalism. Although most Jewish believers continued to keep the Sabbath and the various laws that differentiated them from non-Jews, strictly as an identification code, they did not require it for their non-Jewish converts. This identification as a Jew had nothing to do with salvation, but was kept by Jews as a reminder of the special eternal Covenant that God had made with them as a chosen people. The Covenant reminded God's people that they were the guardians of the Holy Land and were obliged to maintain and preserve the Law (Genesis 15:18, 17:7-10, Deuteronomy 7:6, Psalms 105:45, Ezekiel 16:6, Isaiah 44:1 and Romans 3:1-2).

The Ebionites were a sect that were originally Essenes (the Qumran Community i.e. Dead Sea Scroll community) who had accepted Christ as Messiah after the destruction of the Temple in 66-70 CE. They moved with other believing Jews to Pella and began influencing them into heretical views of the Law and Paul's writings. Some scholars suggest that they openly rejected the writings of Paul and only used the Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew as their N.T. scripture. They would have easily fit the mold of "another Gospel" in Galatians 1.

The term Messianists, according to Dr. Mosley, is derived from the Hebrew word Messiah. Epiphanius' history says that before the believers were called Christians, they were for a short time known by the title Iessaidi, probably derived from the name Jesus, (I) a name saturated with the idea of salvation. The Greek term for Jesus is Isus. It must be remembered that the "J" sound that is ascribed to JEHOVAH and JESUS is a western sound. The original Hebrew renderings of these names would have a "Y" consonant sound. The Tetragrammaton (YHWH) (Yood-Hay-Vav-Hay) has no vowels and many Jews believe that when their Messiah comes He will teach them how to properly say the name of God. In referring to God they often simply say "Hashem" - which means "The Name." Their concept of holiness of the name of God is a lesson we could well use today. They will often do something like: "G-d" to reverence the name.

The People of "the Way"

"The Way" used in Acts 21:14 and 22, was a Messianic term and concept taken from texts such as Isaiah 40:2, which refers to preparing "the way of the Lord." The Nazoraioi is Greek for Nazarenes (Notzrim Acts 24:5) and is derived from Jesus' Jewish hometown of Nazareth. As it is written, "... He shall be called a Nazarene. The term Messianists is derived directly from the Hebrew word Messiah. Modern Jewish believers in Christ refer to Him as Yeshua and call themselves Messianic Jews.

Kevin Kluetz comments on the name Yeshua saying... The name "Jesus" is the Greek form of the Biblical name "Yeshua." The name "Yeshua" is found, among other places, in 1 Chronicles 24:11, 2 Chronicles 31:15, Ezra 2:2 and Nehemiah 7:7. The name is a shortened form of the Hebrew name "Yehoshua" which is the Hebrew form of the name "Joshua", which means "Ya is salvation." The name "Yah" is an abbreviated form of God's name, Yahweh (YHWH), which pr

obably means "I am, I have always been, and I always will be" (see The Stone Edition Tanach, Brooklyn, NY:Â Mesorah Publications, 1996, p. xxv *** his reference***).Â The name "Yehoshua" is the name that Zechariah prophesied would be the name of the Messiah, our priest and king:

Zechariah 6:11-13

11 Â"And take silver and gold, make an ornate crown, and set it on the head of Joshua the son of Jehozadak, the high priest. 12 Â"Then say to him, Â"Thus says the Lord of hosts, Â"Behold, a man whose name is Branch, for He will branch out from where He is; and He will build the temple of the Lord. 13 Â"Yes, it is He who will build the temple of the Lord, and He who will bear the honor and sit and rule on His throne. Thus, He will be a priest on His throne, and the counsel of peace will be between the two offices.Â"

Scholars counseling on the making of "The Passion" also concur with the pronunciation of the name of Christ as "Yeshu, a" or a similar name. As was Yohannan (John) and Keefa (Peter). James in scripture should be "Jacob." It is almost endless.

God Bless,

-Robert

Some notes:

* Ebionites were spoken of frequently after the 1st century by the early church fathers as being heretical. This added to the pressure on the Nazarenes to cast off more of their Jewish identity in order not to identify with the Judaizers. This is unfortunate because the Jewish Christians began losing their identity AND their means with which to reach fellow Jews.

* Google gives 177,000 occurrences for the name "Yeshua"

* <http://www.geocities.com/athens/parthenon/3021/trinity.html>

* Dr. Ron Moseley "Yeshua A Guide to the Real Jesus and the Original Church"

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/18 17:53

Some Notes on the Nazarenes

By Robert Wurtz II

Caught in the middle of a struggle between the Jewish non-believers who were strict in their rejection of Christ as Messiah and quick to appoint false Messiahs and a Church that was filling up with almost all Gentiles who understand Paul's writings to mean that Jew's must forsake keeping the Law and the various rituals; the Nazarenes after 90 CE found few friends on either side. Being rejected by both Jews and Christians they have all but gone into extinction. The Gentiles considered the Nazarenes to be heretics and so did the Jews. As we ponder this issue- we will in our next lesson look at the issues surrounding the Bar Kochba Revolt.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/19 8:14

Rabbi Akiba's False Messiah

By Robert Wurtz II

When it comes to understanding the significance of this particular segment, it is important to realize the impact that "one man" by the name of Rabbi Akiba Ben Joseph has had on modern Rabbinic Judaism and the Jews. I personally believe it would be next to impossible to overstate the negative impact this one man has had on the cause of God in the earth concerning His people the Jews. He is the closest "type" of the the false prophet of the book of Revelation that we have yet to see and his FALSE MESSIAH Simon Bar Kochba has been a "type" of the ANTI CHRIST to the Jews for almost 1900 years.

After 70 CE and the destruction of the Temple, Rome attempted to stifle the Jews desire to revolt by bringing in pagans to strengthen the non-Jewish population and by founding cities with names like Flavia Neapolis and Flavia Lope. There was also a heavy tax imposed by them called the "fiscus iudaicus" on the Jews of Israel and the diaspora. They also minted coins to remind the Jews that Jerusalem had been destroyed which read "Iudaea devicta" or more simply "Juda h Defeated." The Romans then recruited Yohanan ben Zakkai and the group of Pharisees that followed him to help them rule the Jews. This grew into a national government under the Romans. Yavneh, or Jamnia (In Greek), became the center of Rabbinic authority. Gamaliel II joined Zakkai and with the help of Rome ruled the people until they had put down ALL the other competing Pharasiac groups that would compete with them for influence and AUTHORITY.

However, from 90 CE onward rebellion and unrest continued to grow against Rome and ANYONE that competed with them for authority. The non-believing Jews were cursing the Nazarenes and other "heretical" sects (sects not in step with their Rabbinic cause) with the Birkat ha Minim and it would not be long until Rome likewise would be on the receiving end of the academy at Yavneh's thirst for POWER and AUTHORITY.

Over the next 50 years a concerted effort to establish the total rule of the Rabbi's was well towards being completed. Rabbi Akiba ultimately is responsible for driving the last nail into the coffin of the separation of the Jewish Christians (Nazarenes) and the non-believing Jews (and all other competing groups as well). When Akiba exalted Bar Kochba to be Messiah the Nazarenes could not tolerate this and it spelled the end of that relationship. I believe it was an INTENTIONAL act on Akiba's part to ultimately seize authority and alienate the Nazarenes and their influence. It was also strategic in that it exceedingly made the Nazarenes look like they were unpatriotic, etc..

According to McClintock and Strong "BarKochba, son of the star, or SIMEON BAR-COCHBA, was the Jewish false Messiah who applied to himself the prophecy of Balaam (Numbers 24:17), and incited the Jews to revolt against the emperor Hadrian (A.D. 130). He passed himself off for the Messiah, and his pretensions were supported by Akiba, the chief of the Sanhedrin. The better to deceive the credulous Jews, according to Jerome, he pretended to vomit flames, by means of a piece of lighted tow which he kept in his mouth. Bar-Kochba profited by the seditious state in which he found the Jews, and took Jerusalem in A.D. 132. He issued coins having on one side his own name, and on the other "Freedom of Jerusalem." (end of quote) He was a very violent man who was reported to once cut a finger off of thousands of his troops to keep them in subjection. I would characterize him as a throw back from the days of the Saccari. He kept his troops in subjection by vile atrocities. Both him and Akiba were sorely judged for their behavior through unimaginable violent deaths (filleting, etc.)—but the Rabbi's later exalted them as martyrs and heroes. They established an entire system of Judaism founded by a man who had deceived the people that Bar Kochba was the Messiah. This resulted in the death of Israel as the land of God's people for centuries. After the Romans put their uprising down they renamed Jerusalem "Eli a Capitolina" and renamed Israel PALISTINE as a mockery of them before the Philistines. (Palistine is not what the land of Israel was called in the time of Jesus as many bible maps suggest). Thousands were killed and the Jews were evicted from the land until just about the last 100 years. Of all the mysteries in all my studies of the Jews, the greatest one of all is how so many non-believing Jews persecuted the Nazarenes, Ebionites, and Messianists because they said they followed a "false Messiah" and yet they EXALT Akiba over Abraham, Moses, David, and God Almighty and he appointed them

a false messiah Bar Kochba. That is a hypocrisy that can't possibly be explained.

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes:

* No material from this lesson was taken from Internet sources.

* Quotes are labeled from their sources.

* Information is a synthesis of lectures and particularly excerpts from Daniel Gruber's bold and revealing book "Rabbi Akiba's Messiah" (The Origins of Rabbinic Authority). I recommend this book to everyone interested in the issue of why modern Jews do not believe in Christ as their Messiah. It is an integral part of understanding so key issues. It is published by:

Elijah Publishing
Box 776
Hanover, NH 03755

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/19 8:23

Talmudic Revisionism And The Struggle For Authority

(An Introduction)

By Robert Wurtz II

Because of "Talmudic Revisionism," little is left to be known of the various competing sects of Pharisees that struggled and ultimately lost to that elite group of Pharisees within the Pharisees under Yohannan ben Zakkai. Little is ever told about the many "Judaisms" that existed before the destruction of the Temple. History is often told through the eyes of the victor and in this case we already know that the "end" of their movement was an abomination to God in the highest imaginable regard. If the Messiah was standing at the door and knocking to get in to the Church in Revelation, He was thrust straitway out of the city in Rabbinic Judaism and utterly slandered and defamed almost beyond hope of being accepted.

Getting past this deeply entrenched deception of the Rabbi's TOTAL AUTHORITY is perhaps the single greatest obstacle to helping a Jew see Christ for who He is. They were trained from birth to believe in the authority of the Rabbi's.

It may be hard for us as Christians to understand this, but in a very practical way Rabbi Akiba with the help of his disciples had exalted himself and been exalted by his latter followers to a status higher than Abraham, Moses, David, and God Almighty. This is verified in the simple fact that the Rabbi's after his time literally usurped the authority of God in all matters of the word of God. To the Jews, NOT EVEN GOD CAN CONTRADICT A RABBI. They have ultimate authority. It is a vicious circle of deception that kept the Rabbi's in control of God's word through what we will discuss later as the "Oral Law" and later the Talmud through a process of halakah (keeping the Law's of God modernized) that did "way back then" to the Word of God what modern judges have done to the American Constitution- only much worse. This is likely where the whole concept of a "living Constitution" even came from.

The Rabbi's after Akiba began using the word of God to make all sorts of traditions and doctrines of men until the original document (Torah) has almost no real meaning in a LITERAL sense anymore. They call it "A FENCE AROUND THE TORAH", but it is really a shield. It is a shield that keeps the light within the Law of God from being able to convert the soul. What Origin did to butcher many of the literal concepts of the scripture through the hermeneutical practice of ALLEGORY, Akiba took on to the next level and made the Law of Moses utterly of NONE EFFECT by the introduction of a library of halakic rulings and writings.

Beloved, if the VAIL that Paul spoke of on the hearts of the unbelieving Jewish people had a tangible representation it would be the Oral Law and later the TALMUD. In this condition the only hope for a Jew to receive their Messiah is to see the Glory of God in the lives of genuine Holy Spirit filled people whose life is a very expression of the shekinah. It has been said that to read a mere "translation" (KJV, NIV, etc.) of the word of God instead of the word in its original tongues is akin to a man kissing his bride through her veil on their wedding day; but if the reality of that were true, then what the Rabbi's have done would be like kissing your bride through the face shield of a motorcycle helmet. It has NO effect whatsoever.

In our next lesson we will look at the concept "It is not in Heaven."

God Bless,

-Robert W

Notes:

Issues and key words can be used to expand on each of these topics I have introduced. This lesson is extremely truncated and introductory. See previous references for ideas on more sources.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/19 11:22

IT IS NOT IN HEAVEN (Bath Kol)

Compiled By: Robert Wurtz II

There reached a point when the credibility of an "audible voice from Heaven" had to be contended with. An audible voice from God was considered authoritative in all matters in the time of Christ among the Jews. But there were too many cases in the New Testament when this happened and it authenticated the New Testament and Christ (among other things). There was only one way for the Rabbi's to deal with this and it was with one fall swoop of a statement... "IT IS NOT IN HEAVEN!" Consider the commonly told story of how this came about. This adaptation is from Lightfoot Commentary on Mark 8, but is commonly found in many sources:

"On that day, R. Eliezer answered to all the questions in the whole world, but they hearkened not to him. He said therefore to them, 'If the tradition be according to what I say, let this silqua bear witness.' The silqua was rooted up, and removed a hundred cubits from its place; there are some who say four hundred. They say to him, 'A proof is not to be fetched from a silqua.' He saith to them again, 'If the tradition be with me, let the rivers of waters testify'; the rivers of waters are turned backward. They say to him, 'A proof is not to be fetched from the rivers of waters.' He said to them again, 'If the tradition be with me, let the walls of the school testify'; the walls bowed, as if they were falling. R. Joshua chid them, saying, 'If there be a controversy between the disciples of the wise men about tradition, what is that to you?' Therefore the walls fell not in honour of R. Joshua. Yet they stood not upright again in honour of R. Eliezer. He said to them, moreover, 'If the

tradition be with me, let the heavens bear witness.' The Bath Kol went forth and said, 'Why do ye contend with R. Eliezer, with whom the tradition always is?' R. Jonah rose up upon his feet, and said, 'It is not in heaven' (Deut 30:12). What do these words, "It is not in heaven," mean? R. Jeremiah saith, When the law is given from mount Sinai, we do not care for the Bath Kol.

According to Daniel Gruber there is five major things that this story teaches:

1. The Rabbis do not accept the miraculous in determining the correctness of a teaching or tradition. Deuteronomy does warn against following someone with a sign, if they are proclaiming let us go after other gods. So signs can be in an anti-God context. But the issue with Rabbi Eliezer doesn't fall into this category, since he wasn't talking about following other gods. It wasn't a question of idolatry but AUTHORITY. Can proof be brought from a carob tree or a stream of water or a voice from heaven? Scriptures says so. (E.g., Aaron's rod, or blood in Nile, fleece of Gideon.)
2. The Rabbis paid no attention to a heavenly voice (Bath Kol) after Sinai. Rabbi Joshua says, "lo ba-shamayim hi, It is not in heaven." So after Sinai, we pay no attention to a heavenly voice. This is quite convenient considering how God spoke from Heaven concerning Jesus SEVERAL times in the New Testament. The ruling was quite ex post facto. Yet throughout Scripture a voice from Heaven from God speaks out in Job, Psalms, and Ezekiel, God DID speak from Heaven. Indeed, everywhere else in Talmud itself, a voice from Heaven is authoritative.
3. The authority to determine what is acceptable does not rest with God but with the majority. Pay no attention to a heavenly voice (bath kol). Yet in Exodus 23:2, "You shall follow a multitude to do evil," by implication you must follow a multitude to do good. But who defines good? In the story, God didn't know he had decreed this! He didn't know that he'd given up his authority to the majority of Rabbis(?!). In Tanakh (Old Testament), the majority is almost always wrong! Throughout Tanakh, God acts as if he's still in charge, bringing judgment upon the majority when it is in sin.
4. Yet this story portrays God as laughing, "My sons have defeated (outwitted) me!" Yet is God ever portrayed in Tanakh this way? Are men ever smarter than God? It's a humorous story when you read it, but when you think of it, it's not so funny. Contrast Psalm 2 and other references to God laughing, in supreme authority.
5. The Rabbis will excommunicate anyone who will not submit to their decision. This is not normative first century Judaism. It's fitting that it's Rabbi Eliezer the Great that's been excommunicated, circa 115 CE.

Consider these cases in Scripture when a VOICE from Heaven Spoke (bath kol)

Genesis 3:9 And the LORD God called unto Adam, and said unto him, Where art thou?

Genesis 22:11 And the angel of the LORD called unto him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here am I.

Exodus 3:4 And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush, and said, Moses, Moses. And he said, Here am I.

Deuteronomy 4:33 Did ever people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live?

Job 38:1 Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said,

Daniel 4:31 While the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O king Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken; The kingdom is departed from thee.

Matthew 3:17 And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

Matthew 17:5 While he yet spake, behold, a bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.

Mark 1:11 And there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

Mark 9:7 And there was a cloud that overshadowed them: and a voice came out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him.

Luke 3:22 And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased.

Luke 9:35 And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son: hear him.

John 12:28-30 Father, glorify thy name. Then came there a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again. The people therefore, that stood by, and heard it, said that it thundered: others said, An angel spake to him. Jesus answered and said, This voice came not because of me, but for your sakes.

Acts 9:4 And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

2 Peter 1:17, 18 For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.

Revelation 10:4 And when the seven thunders had uttered their voices, I was about to write: and I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Seal up those things which the seven thunders uttered, and write them not.

Revelation 11:12 And they heard a great voice from heaven saying unto them, Come up hither. And they ascended up to heaven in a cloud; and their enemies beheld them.

Revelation 14:2 And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps:

Revelation 14:13 And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from

om henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.

Revelation 18:4 And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.

Notes:

“Five major things” taken from notes and supplemented: "The Day the Rabbis Were Wrong" Yeshiva course at Messiah 2000 taught by Daniel Gruber)

“Consider this list” compiled by: <http://www.mv.com/ipusers/butterfly/rev/bathkol.htm> or philologos.org

Google yields 1,190 entries for “bath kol”

(Encyclopedic Dictionary of Judaica)

Lightfoot commentary can be found at:

<http://www.gospelcom.net/eword/comments/mark/light/mark8.htm>

Daniel Gruber "Rabbi Akiba's Messiah" c. 1999 Elijah Publishing
Box 776 Hanover, NH 03755

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/19 14:56

The Oral Law (Part 1)

By Robert Wurtz II

For fundamentalist Christians the written word of God is the final authority in all matters of life and doctrine. The WRITTEN word of God is infallible and immutable. The 66 books of the biblical canon have been closed definitively since Jerome completed the Latin Vulgate in 405. Before that in January 7, 367 Athanasius bishop of Alexandria wrote, "Inasmuch as some have taken in hand to draw up for themselves an arrangement of the so-called apocryphal books and to interpose them with the divinely inspired scripture...it has seemed good to me...to set forth in order the books which are included in the canon and have been delivered to us with accreditation that they are divine." Much more could be said.

That's what we believe, but that is not the position of Rabbinic Judaism. There is an addition to the Tenach (Old Testament) known as the "Oral Law" that was added to the teachings of the Rabbis in the second century. It is purported that the "Oral Law" was given to Moses on the mount and was to be communicated to each person in leadership down to the people until everyone had been taught it 4 times all the way into the second Century CE. We may find this impossible to believe, but it is a fundamental aspect of Rabbinic Judaism. It is supposed to be an extended interpretation designed to elaborate on the written law. It is also called "A fence around the Torah."

In our next study we will examine the true origins of the Oral Law.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/22 12:35

The Oral Law (Part 2)

By Robert Wurtz II

There are a multitude of arguments that can be presented that refute the authenticity of the Oral Law, but perhaps the most practical one I have come up with is that the thing which the Children of Israel was legally bound to was the written covenant that was written down, rehearsed and agreed upon by the people, and finally the covenant was sealed in the blood of sprinkling. To then offer a "manual" (as it were) for the interpretation of that covenant some 100+ years after Christ is as great of error as to believe in the authenticity of the Book of Mormon. This was supposed to be a covenant that was rehearsed to the people 4 times each and it was to "supposedly" be memorized and transferred to each generation. If the enemy had a "Bible commentary" it would be the Oral Law that he has used to cut the LIGHT down coming off the Old Covenant and the Tenach.

Consider this quote from Menahoth 29b:

Rav Judah said in the name of Rav, When Moses ascended on high he found the Holy One of Blessing, engaged in affixing coronets to the letters. Said Moses, "Lord of the Universe, Who stays your hand?" He answered, "There will arise a man, at the end of many generations, Akiba b. Joseph by name, who will expound upon each tittle heaps and heaps of laws." "Lord of the Universe," said Moses; "permit me to see him." He replied, "Turn around." Moses went and sat down behind eight rows. Not being able to follow their arguments he was ill at ease, but when they came to a certain subject and the disciples said to the master "Whence do you know it?" and the latter replied "It is a law given to Moses at Sinai" he was comforted. Thereupon he returned to the Holy One of Blessing, and said, "Lord of the Universe, you have such a man and you give the Torah by me!" He replied, "Be silent, for such is my decree." Then said Moses, "Lord of the Universe, you have shown me his Torah, show me his reward." "Turn around," said He; and Moses turned around and saw the man weighing out his flesh at the market-stalls. "Lord of the Universe," cried Moses, "such Torah, and such a reward!" He replied, "Be silent, for such is my decree."

This depicts Akiba to be greater than Moses and creates a story with which to pass off the whole farce. It is almost blasphemy of the word of God to suggest a man who believed in a false prophet could actually be "greater" than Moses. The passage itself is an indictment on those who promoted the concept (Akiba, etc.). It wreaks with cultish deception. It is the Oral Law that in a sense codified the traditions that made the word of God of none effect by the Rabbis. To this fact I must sharply disagree with Dr. Ron Moseley in his condoning of such a book or at the least to present it with any validity at all. It is clearly standing in the way of the Jews and the perfect law that converts the soul. The Jews are VICTIMS of such a horrible teaching and this revelation SHOULD NOT be used as ammo to fuel anti-semitic causes! It is for the purpose of bringing an awareness to help win the Jews to their Messiah. There is literally nothing more unChristlike than hatred and especially of the Jews. For us as believers in Christ these things may seem almost laughable; but they are a deeply entrenched and rooted system of beliefs that exist in Judaism and we have to deal with that reality. Putting together

your own personal study of the Oral Law and its falsehood is a vital tool in the hand of anyone trying to lead a Jew to their Messiah. You have to learn their language and you must use caution in addressing the sensitive areas that they are dealing with concerning Christians (in a later lesson we will look at some of those). However, it must begin with the illumination of the Holy Spirit and once that is in place YOUR apologetic will come into play as a necessity to help point them in the direction of truth once their eyes begin to come open.

God Bless,

-Robert

*notes

Daniel Gruber, Rabbi Akiba's Messiah Elijah Publishing c1999

http://www.findarticles.com/cf_dls/m0411/4_49/68738707/p2/article.jhtml?term=

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/23 16:51

The Silencing of the Prophetic Voice

By Robert Wurtz II

Prophets:

The office of the Prophet (nagid) was one in which God sovereignly raised a person up to bring HIS message directly to men through man. The power brought God's message in the Power of the Holy Spirit. The Prophet served as God's prosecuting attorneys calling the people back into the covenant that they had made with Him. As Daniel Gruber so eloquently described the plight of the prophet... "They were independent of, and unsubmitted to, human authority. Usually an outsider, the prophet came alone and unarmed to a fortified, walled city, and commanded it to surrender. Whatever the message (blessing or a curse, encouragement or rebuke), it was not the prophet's own choosing, and often not to his liking either. Prophets resorted to extreme measures to gain the attention of the people. Some were known to lay on the side for over a year and also cook such vile meals as dung cakes to eat in the presence of a wicked people. John the Baptist ate locusts and wild honey and did not associate himself with the people. When they came to hear him it was outside the city. They were highly consecrated and devoted to God and God used them in a mighty way. John the Baptist was a Nazarite (one of three Samson, & Samuel) from birth and even his parents followed the Nazarite oath while he was yet unborn. Consecration to God is not an option for a prophet of God.

Neither the Rabbis nor anyone else believed that the Holy Spirit had departed Israel after the later prophets. What the Rabbis believed is that the Holy Spirit left everyone except them. No one by the Rabbis could prophesy. This is the nature of what was happening with the authority of God. Later when you build a fence around the Law of God (a shield) the people will have no light. First it was the annulment of the authority of the bath kol. Then they sought to stop the mouths of the prophets by declaring only the Rabbis can prophesy. Thirdly was to put a stop to the interpretation of dreams. So the progression went as follows: bath kol, prophesy, and then dreams.

Dreams:

The Talmud makes a remarkable statement, "All dreams follow the mouth (the words of the dream interpreter)." This does not merely mean that different people interpret the same dream differently. It means much more. The Talmud (Berachos 55b-56a) relates a story that could be read on many levels. The jest of the point is that the Rabbis believed that the interpretation itself is what determined how the dream played out in real life. So that whatever the interpreter says is the interpretation... that will come to pass.

These 3 things essentially eliminated God (in their teachings) from supernaturally intervening in the human condition. This is quite destructive because what happens is that the "subjective" experience is replaced authoritatively with the filthy imaginations of man's wisdom. It essentially locked the door from God being able to speak to his people in a non-natural way. They would not hear a voice from heaven if it spoke, a prophet if he/she arrived, or a dream if God sent in into the deep watches of the night. They essentially locked God Almighty out and defamed the very access portals into the persons life. This is again why it is so difficult to reach a Rabbinic Jew because the Rabbis can over rule a bath kol, Prophet, and a dream from God.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/24 8:34

AM HA-ERETZ (Dealing With Those Who Rejected The Rabbis)

By Robert Wurtz II

AM HA-ARETZ

The term Am Ha Eretz means the "People of the Land" as in "the people of the land of Israel. As the Pharisees made their metamorphosis into Rabbis they changed that word to describe people who refused to accept the Rabbis' authority. While the Pharisees were working at Yavneh (Jamnia) a series of events took place in which cooperation with Rome gave the Pharisees great political power as they made to jump (as it were) to Rabbinic Judaism. Most Jews before the Bar Kochba revolt in 135 CE did NOT accept Rabbinic authority so a series of strong arm tactics began to force the Jews into obedience. The authority granted to Yohanan ben Zakkai gave the Rabbis the necessary power to alienate everyone who would not accept their authority. The Sanhedrin, for example, would allow testimonies against an "am ha erez", but would not allow testimony FOR them in their defense. They could not testify for anyone including themselves. They had no rights before the court of the Sanhedrin. The Rabbis then took to publicly shunning those who would not accept their rule, and began to interfere in their personal lives. In Yeb.90b the Rabbis reserved the right to ANNUL any marriage because they were contracted in accordance with Rabbinic statutes. The Rabbis also reserved the right to confiscate their possessions as did Ezra (see Ezra 10:8. Strange how they appeal to the written law when convenient). The Rabbis were so cruel to the people that if anyone desired to marry an am ha erez they considered it as bestiality. They used the reasoning "cursed be anyone who lies with a beast." Dan Gruber quotes R. Meir in this regard saying "... A who ever marries his daughter to an am ha erez is as though he has laid her before a lion." They depicted them as LESS than human. It was even permitted to kill an am ha erez in the holiest of times as though he were a beast (The cruelty is depicted by Gruber on P.135-139 of his book "Rabbi Akiba's Messiah.")

It is important to note that there were MANY Jews and Pharisees that believed in Jesus as their Messiah and that the systematic methodology and travesty of Akiba all but stamped them out in time. Everything under the sun was done, and there was no limit to the madness of the Rabbis in securing their authority and eliminating ANY threats against them. For this cause the numbers of Christian Jews dwindled down and down and down. Soon the Gentiles would begin to believe that the Jews had rejected Jesus. And when this happened the seeds of Anti-Semitism began to be sown and a vicious cycle of abuse towards the Jews came into full swing. The believers in Jesus were hated by the Rabbis and the gentiles despised their Jewishness and stereotyped them all until the fire of evangelism was stamped out into a mere remnant. It

is God's desire to turn this around for His good and the souls of them for whom Christ died—yet they are sorely deceived.

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/25 8:09

DUALISM AND GNOSTICISM

A Brief Introduction

By Robert Wurtz II

Gnostic Dualism

Dualism means twofold. It has several applications, however I wish to deal with the Gnostic philosophy that promotes the concept that all reality boils down to two equal and opposite opposing forces. Many believe that the bible teaches a great struggle between equal and opposite forces of good and evil. This is not the case, it is a Gnostic concept. In pagan Greece *demiourgos* is a word or name that became the technical term for the maker of heaven and earth. In this way it is used by Plato in his writings. Although often employed by the Fathers and others to indicate the Creator, the word never strictly meant "one who produces out of nothing" (for this the Greeks used *ktistes*), but only "one who fashions, shapes, and models". Using the word in this way causes great problems for Jews who know that God created the heavens and the earth from NOTHING. A creator in genuine Christian theology has no place in heathen philosophy, which unlike Christianity always presupposes the existence of matter. Demiurge soon became a common term in Christian Gnosticism. Gnostics saw the Old Testament God as a mean and bad God. For Gnostics, the Demiurge became the personification of the power of evil, the "Satan of Gnosticism", with whom the elect were to battle to the end that they might be pleasing to the Good God of the New Testament. This is a sorely pagan concept that made an influence on early Church Fathers and certain of their concepts and doctrines.

It would not be long until Marcion would totally discard the Old Testament and was later condemned as a heretic. He ignored the fact that the Old Testament was "THE" Bible of the early Church (pre 70 CE) and that converts were won to Christ using the Old Testament in light of the sufferings and teachings of Christ. The Ethiopian Eunuch, for example, was won to Christ by the book of Isaiah. Who among us today could evangelize from the Old Testament? Paul told Timothy that from a child he had known the holy scriptures that were able to make him wise, etc.

The character of the Gnostic Demiurge became still more complicated when in some systems he was identified with Yahweh, the God of the Jews or of the Old Testament, and was brought in opposition to Christ of the New Testament, whom they called- the Only Begotten Son of the "Supreme and Good God." To the Gnostics the purpose of Christ's coming, as Saviour and Redeemer was to rescue us from the power of the Demiurge and the EVIL OF ALL MATTER; the Lord of the world of this darkness, and bring us to the light of the Good God, His Father in heaven. Therefore all that the "Demiurge" created was evil, and this included all matter. It is of little doubt that these concepts were mixed with Paul's teachings about the "flesh" (because it is matter) and used to promote a dualistic and Gnostic concept of spirituality. This is why people used to scourge their flesh because they believed it was evil.

The struggle in scripture is not against an evil that is equal and opposite to good, for to believe this is to believe that Satan is the equal and opposite of God. Satan is a fallen Cherub which led 1/3 of the stars (angels) in the rebellion. By no means are they equal and opposite to God in like fashion to the good and evil described in mythology or even modern shows such as Star Wars. This is heresy. It is rooted in an ancient false belief that a "Demiurge" created all things material and that the good God created all things of the spirit. This naturally leads to the Gnostic belief that one needs to get out of the "flesh" and into the "spirit." On the surface this sounds almost biblical in that we are to die to the flesh and walk in the Spirit; but what is important is understanding what scripture is saying compared to what dualism teaches. We will look more at this in our next study.

God bless,

-Robert

Notes**

For further info on Demiurge see:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04707b.htm>

Gnosticism has made a comeback in certain Charismatic circles by the introduction of mystical New Age concepts of trying to get out of the "flesh" and into the "spirit." This is not the same as walking in the Spirit according to scripture. Prayer in these circles are more akin to TM than biblical prayer.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/25 11:28

IN A NUTSHELL

By Robert Wurtz II

"The Fall of Man"

Man is comprised of spirit, soul, and body. When Adam and Eve walked with God in the cool of the day they were naked and not ashamed. It can be reasoned from scripture that their covering was literally the glory of God that existed because of the communion they had with God on an ongoing basis. We read that Moses' face glowed with the luminance of God when he was on Mount Sinai and there is no reason to think that the same effect would not have been continually upon Adam and Eve when they were in full communion with God. God told them that in the day they eat of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil they would surely die. Death in scripture does not mean annihilation it means SEPERATION. When you die your soul and spirit separate from the body. The second death is eternal separation from God. When they took the fruit of the forbidden tree they suffered immediate separation from God (death) spiritually. This meant that they now could not properly worship God and commune with Him, because true worship is done in spirit and in truth which can NOW, after the fall, only come about in the life of a person who has been regenerated and renewed by the Holy Spirit. The glory departed because of sin and their eyes were at the same time opened to discern the shame associated with nakedness. They hid themselves because they saw they were naked. Nakedness is shameful all throughout scripture and when a person is stripped to be naked in public it is an act of great humiliation. This does not mean that the body itself is evil- for it was created to be good. The problem is the loss of innocence that opened the eyes and the departure of the glory. This required a "replacement" or covering in the eyes of God. That covering could not merely be some fig leaves, but must be the covering of an innocent party. For us that covering must be the white robes of the righteousness of Christ. In Adam and Eve's case God brought them skin coverings and established the requirement of blood sacrifice of a spotless lamb for their covering. The skins covering Adam and Eve showed that something innocent has died to cover their nakedness. Abel accepted this pattern and Cain rejected it.

Not only was their nakedness revealed, but also their nature was corrupted as sin was introduced into them. This is known theologically as the doctrine of ORIGINAL SIN. This expression is frequently used in a twofold sense, to denote the imputation of Adam's first sin to his posterity, and also that native depravity which we have derived by inheritance from o

ur first parents. Most Jews reject the concept of original sin. One thing is certain, God ensured that Adam and Eve were evicted from the Garden of Eden lest they would eat of the Tree of life and live forever. He posted angels with flaming swords to keep the way of the Garden entrance. God did not want man living for eternity as his natural enemy unable to rightly commune with Him. Knowing in advance that man would sin God made the penalty of sin DEATH. And at physical death ALL contracts are off. Slaves are free from their masters as husbands and wives are free from their spouses. At physical death men and women who are regenerated (born again) are freed from the final effects of sin that are in some way still mysteriously attached to the body. Everyone has a SIN NATURE (the A "flesh" GK. sarx) that must be dealt with no matter if you are born again or not. Walk in the Spirit and you will not fulfill the desires of the flesh. That makes no sense if we do not still have a sin nature after regeneration. It is there and will be there until this corruption puts on incorruption and this mortal immortality. This is why Paul said "Oh wretched man that I AM." Not I WAS. He knew that he had to walk in the Spirit and bring his BODY into subjection lest when he had preached to others he himself would become ADOKIMOS. That word is translated in the KJV as castaway, but is otherwise translated as REJECTED (as in rejected nigh unto cursing whose end is to be burned) once and the remaining 6 times as REPROBATE.

Dealing with our sin nature until we die is the plight of all believers. Adam and Eve and Jesus were tempted or tested by Satan from A "without" (externally) because they had no sin nature. WE are continually tempted from within- as the sin nature is always present in some strength. We died to the A "old man" at salvation, so that we were free to be espoused to Christ- and we did this by FAITH and signified it by water baptism. Recon yourselves therefore dead to sin and alive to God. When we die we will be resurrected later on with a Spiritual body that is free from original sin. God will then lead us (as it were) back to the Tree of Life (See final chapters of Revelation) and we shall live forever perfected in Christ. The whole story comes full circle. The issue at hand is dealing with the "flesh" while we are alive. The key to this is found in not "feeding" the sin nature with sin or any manner of portrayal of sins. this causes the flesh that was buried with Christ in baptism to come forth to wreak havoc in our lives.

God bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/25 13:25

The Law of Sin
By Robert Wurtz II

The law of sin is the law that governs the sin nature. It is in our members (Romans 7:23). The law of God is the law that governs the born again nature and it is resident in our A "inward man" (Romans 7:22). The law of the Spirit in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death (Romans 8:2). The law of sin is a mechanism that causes one who is of their father the devil to desire to rebel against EVERYTHING God says. This is why simply being A "under the law" can only serve as a school master to teach us our need for Christ (Galatians 3:24). The law is good if it is used lawfully and that is for the purpose of concerning the soul (Psalm 19). Paul said he was alive once until the commandment came, but when the commandment came sin revived and he died (Romans 7:5-11). What did he mean? He looked real spiritual until God gave Him a commandment and then that law of sin within him revived and he A "died." The laws of God can only give an impenitent sinner something to rebel against. It exposes the fact that Original Sin is present. If God were to tell a person to rest all day on Saturday, even though most humans are LAZY by nature they would and have rebelled against such a rule. Why? Because they are governed by the law of sin. The Law of Moses is holy and just and good, but it has no power to save, it can only reveal the sin nature (law of sin) that is resident in all the unregenerate and is yet present until physical death in the redeemed.

The pattern:

The commandment comes- rebellion rises up and we are exposed as having the nature of rebellion that the devil has. The sin nature braces itself against the laws of God and pushes against them. Hence an impenitent sinner is "fulfilled" by rebelling against God. This is why David said that his sin was against God alone. Everyone else involved were merely innocent bystanders. As for the regenerate who walk in the Spirit (light) our A "meat" is to do the will of our heavenly Father. When the commandment of Christ comes we see it as an opportunity to please our Father and with great desire and compulsion we do His will. A sinner has a nature to rebel. It is OUR NATURE to do the Father's will once we are born again (His seed remaineth in him and he cannot sin because he is born of God). If we do sin, it is no longer I Paul said (the born again person) that does it, but sin that still dwelleth in me. It is that other law (the law of sin) that is working in our members causing us to feel like wretched men and women. This MUST be rightly dealt with as the Children of God. (See section that included the word ADOKIMOS).

Dualism and Scourging

You can beat yourself over the back with a belt, as did many in the Middle Ages and not get the flesh one more inch into subjection. You can sleep on a rock pillow and eat bland food every day and still have trouble with the flesh. You can even sit atop poles for months secluded as did the pole people in the days of Monasticism. Why? Because the problem is not the body it is the sin nature that is attached to the body. The body is the Temple of the Holy Spirit. By analogy it would be like having two operating systems on your computer. The A "old one" and the A "new one." The old one was bent fully towards sin and the new one is bent fully towards righteousness. Its almost like the old one keeps trying to start itself up all the time and you have to keep hitting the cancel button. Would you like to start the flesh... A "YESA" or A "CANCEL." If you keep hitting cancel you'll be ok; but if you are allowing things into your heart that bend your will towards clicking A "Yes" there will be some serious problems. One the flesh starts up- it is often pretty hard to get it shut back down. And if you start running in A "flesh" mode all the time and just clicking back to A "born again" mode when your at church you are that A "Double Minded Man" that is UNSTABLE in all his ways. Double minded means A "two spirited." Stay away from the weights and sins that make you want to click A "YESA" shut down the TV or other devices that are WEIGHING on your decision to do right.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/29 14:44

Robert writes Beloved, if the VAIL that Paul spoke of on the hearts of the unbelieving Jewish people had a tangible representation it would be the Oral Law and later the TALMUD. In this condition the only hope for a Jew to receive their Messiah is to see the Glory of God in the lives of genuine Holy Spirit filled people whose life is a very expression of the shekinah.

Actually its much more simple than this. But to this day whenever Moses is read, a veil lies over their heart; but whenever a person turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away. 2 Cor 3:15,16 NASV

When the heart turns to the Lord, the Lord takes away the veil.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/29 15:03

Hi Robert

you write Everyone has a SIN NATURE (the "flesh" GK. sarx) that must be dealt with no matter if you are born again or not. Walk in the Spirit and you will not fulfill the desires of the flesh. That makes no sense if we do not still have a sin nature after regeneration.

I am a strong believer in the doctrine of original sin, although I prefer to call it congenital. However, to identify Sin which passed into the whole race with 'the flesh' is very confusing. To suggest that we continue to have a 'sin nature' after regeneration is also confusing, to my mind. That would make Christians the only creature in existence that is permanently schizophrenic. It also, as John Wesley would have pointed out, leaves the question as to when this state will ever be put right. The classic reformed position was that 'death did it'; Wesley's reply was that if such were the case it would make death 'a saviour'.

Flesh, is primarily human-ness. Christ was 'made of the seed of David according to the flesh' The Word became flesh and dwelt among us. I know you will have many who regard Romans 7 as Paul's current testimony, but I do not. This is a historic testimony revisited for the sake of illustrating points made in Romans 5.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/29 17:20

Hello Brother,

"Oh wretched man that I am" is in the present sense. I wish not to constrain the word of God to any of these mortal men's decrees and doctrines. They are all men of like passions as we. As Paul said it concerning Peter "whosoever they are it maketh no matter to me, God respecteth no man's person." If the Apostolic days have ended, these men ought not be viewed as the Jews view their Rabbis; that is a great reason why they are in a mess. :-)

I understand your point, and I would have to say Christ is the savior, death was the means by which sin is atoned for though. Death is the enemy. Christ is the savior and gives life-- death was penalty written in the LAW of God (who is the Word?) to which no matter how you say it God gets the glory. He decreed that death would be the penalty. It would be like trying to argue that the nails are the savior or the cat o' nine tails or the spear that pierced His side. To be consistent with this flawed view; death saved us from our sins likewise when He died on the cross. When we discussed the "root" you gave the "what" and I gave the "who"; now we are reversed... you are giving the "who" and I am giving the "what." (Wow, how awesome God works in us to bring understanding with each other!):-)

I deal with this question at length in an earlier study. We in fact have two operating systems in place at once if you will. Which one are you running in? That is the question. The fact that it is there is indisputable- both in biblical and practical terms. I do not ascribe to TOTAL SANCTIFICATION and I do not believe Wesley ever claimed to have attained it either; though certain people in his interviews said they had. Ask them 5 years later I say? "I have not felt the desire to sin for some months" some of the interviews would say. Certainly we can walk in the Spirit to such a level that sin is manageable; but who could possibly claim no inclination to sin? That is sinless perfectionism and I wholly concur with the desire to reach that level and press towards that mark at all times; but have any of us arrived or apprehended? I trow not. :-)

We WILL have to deal with the sin nature until physical death when we will be liberated from its power at the resurrection; when this corruption must put on incorruption. Having begun in the Spirit are ye now made perfect by the "flesh" (sarx)? This is why Paul said it was possible after he preached to others to himself be ADOKIMOS. This verse singlehandedly keeps me from going full bore on eternal security. This word is translated 6 times as reprobate and once as rejected (nigh unto cursing whose end is to be burned) and once in the KJV as "cast away." This is proof that the law of sin IS in our members and must be dealt with. As for how it plays out in technical terms of the "flesh" or "the body" in scripture is not that clear because of the different ways in which the word sarx is used. The dark glass is not so clear as to make a clear distinction. Some have their formulas, but there are still anomalies that render the theory inaccurate. It also makes the word of God subservient to these men's teachings. They are worthy of consideration; but when the word teaches otherwise I must part company. :-)

Peter himself sinned as one quick example and had to be withstood to the face by Paul. The sin was "respect of persons." That sin according to James makes one a "transgressor of the Law." This would not be possible without the inner stru

ggle of a sin nature. We are dead to the law of sin by FAITH and we wait in HOPE for the resurrection, to wit, the redemption of our bodies. But a hope that is seen is not hope; for if a man has what he hopes for; why does he yet hope for it? :-)

God Bless and Much love in Christ,

-Robert:-) :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/30 2:21

Robert, you write "Oh wretched man that I am" is in the present sense. I wish not to constrain the word of God to any of these mortal mens decrees and doctrines. They are all men of like passions as we. As Paul said it concerning Peter "whosoever they are it maketh no matter to me, God respecteth no mans person." If the Apostolic days have ended, these men ought not be viewed as the Jews view their Rabbis; that is a great reason why they are in a mess.

I don't want to jump to conclusions here, but I trust you are not saying that we should disregard apostolic statements. I hope you are referring to the likes of Wesley.

You are correct in saying that Wesley never claimed 'Entire Sanctification' but he preached it and taught it constantly. If hymns are the best record of a revivals path, the Wesley brothers' hymns declare it categorically.

I asked you what the 'root' was because I could see where you were heading. The root was not Israel but Abrahamic faith.

No advocate of 'entire sanctification' that I know of would claim that it means we never sin again. This is a straw man of the doctrine; set up to be knocked down.

We are not 'dead to the law of sin by faith' as you phrase it. The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has freed me from the law of sin and death. It is the consequence of being baptised into Christ Jesus (not baptised into the name of... but into the person of Christ Jesus. In Him, there is no sin.

There are two states which are mutually exclusive; in Adam or in Christ. Genuine regeneration translates a person from one to the other.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/30 8:01

Hello Brother,

Certainly I refer to men apart from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and not the Apostles and Prophets who were the agents of communication of God's truth.

You wrote also "I asked you what the 'root' was because I could see where you were heading." I think it is safe to say that at you "thought" I was heading that way. I have done a lot of study and debate on this topic and I cannot agree with the Messianics on that part and don't have to in order to make a case for the need to understand the Jewish Roots of the Faith. Your original question frustrated me honestly because there are some concepts in the Church that are equally wrong. That's why my retort was "it is certainly not the Gentiles" (paraphrase). The Messianics make the case so strong and in a way that has caused some real backlash in classrooms I have been in. I have seen people get up and strait walk out more than once. I didn't have to agree with them in order to appreciate the wealth of info that they had to offer. I can be pro Messianic and love the Jews with out believing that. The branches are clearly Israel and the grafted branches are the Gentiles. The scripture does not say boast against the root- it says against the branches that were broken off. We are not the root and have no authority to say who is in or out. That is Christ's business WHO is the root whom we are in by that Faith of Abraham (what) who believed in the promised seed (who).

I agree with you on this issue of the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus having made us free from the law of sin and d

eath. We are free from its authority, but not from its influence. This is why we are told "let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body to obey it." It is hard to resist something that no longer exists. And if I might so say it is not a long way from the error of those who said the resurrection was past already. It leaves people to think that we are now free from sin in such a way as to be able to attain a sinless perfection and could overthrow the faith of some by despair. I say this from a position of relative victory. I didn't fall last week or month, etc. and that is influencing what I am saying. I humbly say it from a position of relative victory over sin.

As for the interviews of Wesley and the songs- I have no problem with them singing about something that we are reaching for. I have spent my life striving for perfection also. I sing those songs (or similar) all the time with residents in Nursing Homes who were raised on that. we need to revisit some of those and reinsert some of those lyrics of old.

I enjoy Wesley's works and also Calvin and Luther; but these men were men of like passions as we are. They were wrong on things as we are. The canon is closed and I refuse to constrain myself to their commentaries as do many of the Jews- the Rabbi's constrain themselves to the Talmud. It is commentary- that's it.

Perhaps you would add a little blurb for the sake of the readers to show the connection between that sort of infant version of a second blessing and the eventual teaching on the baptism in the Holy Spirit. That would be awesome! Your knowledge lends me to think you would have a wealth of info on that. I would enjoy it thoroughly. :-)

I have a sarx post to cover the other areas.

God bless and much love in Christ,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/30 8:22

SARX (the "flesh")

By Robert Wurtz II

SARX (Various senses of the word commonly translated as "Flesh")

Strong's Definition:

NT:4561 sarx (sarx); probably from the base of NT:4563: flesh (as stripped of the skin), i.e. (strictly) the meat of an animal (as food), or (by extension) the body (as opposed to the soul), or as the symbol of what is external, or as the means of kindred), or (by implication) human nature (with its frailties and passions), or (specifically) a human being (as such):

Thayers sense #4

NT:4561 4. sarx, when either expressly or tacitly opposed to to pneuma (tou Theou), has an ethical sense and denotes mere human nature, the earthly nature of man apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God;

The body is the exterior appearance of humanity. The words for body and flesh are sometimes used to denote external phenomena in general, as opposed to what is internal or spiritual. When we speak of Christ and the sense of the word flesh, it is the flesh without the contamination of sin. The obvious outworking of this is that He as was Adam was tested externally with sin—we are tempted from within. So, when Christ says to the Jews, "I judge not after the flesh," he means, "the flesh is the rule by which you judge not the rule by which I judge" (John 7:15; compare also Philipians 3:3; II Corinthians 5:16).

The root of this weakness is in dwelling in the flesh (Rom 7:18; 17:20), by which man is divided within himself as well as separated from God, inasmuch as he has, on the one side, the self-conscious spirit, which when quickened by the Spirit of God at regeneration submits to the laws of God, and takes pleasure in this obedience, desiring all that is commanded, and avoiding all that is forbidden. It is the "A spirits," meat to do the will of the Father. Opposing the spirit is the flesh, which, being inhabited by sin and the law of sin is fulfilled by rebelling against God only. The flesh feeds off rebellion. The lusts, desires, and works of the flesh are only sinful (Galatians 5:16; Ephesians 2:3, etc.). To crucify the flesh and the works of the flesh is the great object of the Christian, which he attains through the power of the Spirit of Christ which dwells in him (Galatians 5:25; Romans 8:11). The fleshly mind is the vain mind, leading away from Christ to pride, and consequently to error (Col 2:18,19). When pride arises God resists and failure is imminent. Finally, to act according to the flesh is called to "be sold under sin" and to be a "slave to sin." (Romans 7:12; also compare: 1 John 2:16; Romans 8:3).

Flesh (sarx) does not always denote sinfulness (see Romans 1:3; 9:5; I Timothy 3:16; John 1:14). The flesh, in Christ, was not sinful; God sent him only "in the LIKENESS of sinful flesh" (Romans 8:3). Jesus Christ did not have a sin nature. He possessed an unfallen human nature as did Adam. Again, his trial and temptations were from without; ours are from within. I.e. satan found nothing IN HIM. In other words there was no sin to latch on to or attract to.

We see then, that the meaning of the word "flesh" is, on the one hand, gradually extended from a physical to a metaphorical, and finally to an ethical sense. In the ethical use of the term "flesh" in the New Testament, we do not find the idea of essential sin as necessarily lying in the flesh (body). Flesh in itself is neither bad nor sinful because it was created good. It is the tent or tabernacle of the soul containing within itself the interior and exterior organism of the senses, which, by its union with the soul and spirit, conceives ideas, sensations, desires, and contains the so-called faculties of the soul with their divers functions. In the regenerated state, its whole activity is to be governed by the spirit, and in so far as the latter remains in union with God from whom it proceeds, it is in turn governed by him. But sin, which disturbs this union of the Spirit with God, alters also the power of the spirit over the body. The key to maintaining victory over sin is to remain FULL of the Holy Spirit. Victory over sin is directly proportional to this one element. A person who denies "feeding" the flesh and walks in the Spirit FULL of the Holy Spirit, will succeed in regaining much ground towards total sanctification, but not in bringing back the state of total abnegation and of detachment from the world and sin that Adam and Christ knew. It is only through the action on the part of God through the resurrection that the original relation of the flesh (body) to

o the spirit will be restored. This is the HOPE that we have that we do not have yet (to wit the redemption of our bodies).

McCintock and Strong further comment saying "According to Scripture, it is the heart, the centre of our personality, in which all the influences, both godly and ungodly, meet-in which the choice between them is made. If the heart then gives entrance to sin, permits any doubt of God's truth, any mistrust of his love and kindness, and thus lowers him to put self in his place (Gen 3), the union between God and man ceases; the inner man loses his energy to govern the; the flesh starts in opposition to the divine commands in its feelings and its desires. It asserts its independence. Self is made the centre. Hence hatred, strife, desire for worldly superiority, creating envy, and giving rise to all the lusts of the flesh." (end of quote). Sin in some sense corrupted human nature and could not be repaired it had to be replaced. This is why we MUST be born again.

Paul and Christ make a consistent distinction in the CONTEXT of what they are referring to when simply using the word "flesh" as the body, etc. or as referring to it in the sense of the "sin nature." Whichever of the two is then alluded to when the Scriptures, and especially St. Paul, speak of the nature, the life, or the works of the flesh, as the context will clearly show. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak, is not a verse by Christ to say he had a sin nature; it is a verse that shows that when He was in the place of learning obedience through the thing which He suffered; when in the place of trial as was Adam and Eve, the flesh (untainted human nature) truly is weak. His conquest over sin in spite of a "weak flesh" proves He is worthy that the Father would highly exalt Him and give Him a name which is above every name. He said it was weak not SINFUL. He was the second Adam and He passed the test. The circumstances and opportunities for failure were much greater as sin had made great progress in the earth after the Garden of Eden.

Satan used a similar line to try to defeat Christ as he used on Eve. But because of Christ's HUMILITY and lack of desire to be made of any reputation, the devil had NOTHING to grab on to and deceive Him. Satan's appeal to give all the Kingdoms of the world to Christ is "temptation maximus." But Christ's reply in his teachings was "What would a man gain if he gained the whole world and lost his own soul. Jesus would wash the saints feet His humility and meekness was so great. Jesus was a friend of publicans and sinners. The Pharisees were too proud to make themselves of no reputation—and the devil destroyed them at Yavneh! He took all the pride that was in them and created a religious system that first was void of the grace of God, second, usurped the glory of God and finally desired to usurp the AUTHORITY of God. That is the progression of PRIDE. And it is the number 1 thing in God's list of seven that He hates.

Again McCintock and Strong write: "Sometimes, both are equally active, sometimes the one only to the exclusion of the other." This is the only way in which we can arrive at a true appreciation of the meaning in each case. The translators knew this difficulty. Those who cannot see the distinction in how sarx is translated and consider it as meaning exclusively the bodily, sinful side of human nature, fall into the dualistic error of the Manichoeans (followers of Mani).

The ONLY possible way for a person to live free of the sinful nature in this life before the resurrection is to humble themselves greatly before God to the extent that they acknowledge their sins and need of constant grace. PRIDE, then, does not devour them and cause God to withdraw His grace when He resists the proud. We are STANDING in grace (this grace wherein we stand). And we have a hope of being ultimately liberated from the body of this death at the resurrection. We will walk in victory over sin ONLY when HUMILITY is the reaction to the work that God does in us to make us righteous. As we give Him the glory for HIS WORKMANSHIP He will keep pouring on the grace--- if we get puffed up as if we were righteous in ourselves He withdraws the grace and then we fall and beg for mercy as sinners again in humility. He will not share His glory with another (Isaiah 42:8). I have not seen humility as the key to sanctification through Grace in the writings of the Reformers that I am aware of. Maybe that is why the Jews were written against by Luther and Michael Servetus was killed by Calvin. Those were not acts of humility and love friends. That is sovereignty teaching that make God's sovereignty the driving force in God's character and not his love- which is almost blasphemous and is a result of the Greek concept of God invading the early Church. God acts sovereignly because He is moved by compassion. As Wesley said: better would it be to say that the passages (on election, etc.) made no sense at all- as to say they have a sense such as this (Paraphrased). And it is a horrible stain on Christendom whether it is admitted or not. These men needed a good dose of humility and LOVE as we all do. If you are so proud as to be unteachable and argumentative that you always have to be right; I know from scripture that secret sin is active in your life whether you would argue for Total Sanctification or not. It is reality. God RESISTS YOU and leaves you to stand in your own power vulnerable to all manner of sin. It is why Christians can only go so far in God's work on their life. Pride is the obstacle. Always has been and always will be.

God bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/30 12:16

As a little note to how "total (entire) sanctification" relates to revival I believe we should preach STRONG repentance towards God and expose all of the pretense and "almost Christians" (if there is such a thing) and get people genuinely born again and victorious over sin. However, I must stop short of ever teaching that we would be to a place when we no longer felt the desire to sin. This is a false assumption that leaves one "thinking they stand" and then they do not "take heed lest they fall."

Saying the enemy of our sin nature does not still exist does not help the matter either-- as we all know it does both biblically and experientially.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/30 17:25

Robert, you write I agree with you on this issue of the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus having made us free from the law of sin and death. We are free from its authority, but not from its influence.

Adam, the old man, was finished at Calvary for those who are united with Christ. Rom 6:6 Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

The human race was under a wrong head; it was Sin's body. A new reality is now possible; the new man, and the new man has begun with its new Head. This is Christ's body; the church. We are in one or the other. No man can serve two masters. Regeneration is not a new patch on an old garment; if any man be in Christ he is become a new creation. Old things are passed away behold all things are become new.

If by 'influence' you mean temptation, it is true that while on earth we can be tempted as He was. But temptation is not inevitable. Rom 6:22 But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.

Freedom is not from authority but power. Is the USA free from Britain's authority or its power?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/30 17:30

Robert, you write Saying the enemy of our sin nature does not still exist does not help the matter either-- as we all know it does both biblically and experientially.

It is not a question of whether or not it exists, but where it exists. It still exists in those who are still in Adam. Biblically, it is dealt with by those are now in Christ. I do not acknowledge a 'sin nature' in my experience. (That is not to say I have not sinned). I used to be as a sheep going astray, but I have now returned to the Shepherd, and only want to stay there. By His stripes I have been healed.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/30 17:38

If you are so proud as to be unteachable and argumentative that you always have to be right; I know from scripture that secret sin is active in your life whether you would argue for Total Sanctification or not. It is reality. God RESISTS YOU and leaves you to stand in your own power vulnerable to all manner of sin. It is why Christians can only go so far in God's work on their life. Pride is the obstacle. Always has been and always will be.

Is this me you are talking about?

Re: sin nature - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/3/30 18:37

Quote:
----- Biblically, it is dealt with by those are now in Christ. I do not acknowledge a 'sin nature' in my experience. (That is not to say I have not sinned). I used to be as a sheep going astray, but I have now returned to the Shepherd, and only want to stay there. By His stripes I have been healed.

It's interesting that this term "sin nature" or "old nature" is not used in the Bible. It seems you can't be a Christian very long before this idea of "old nature" and "new nature" comes up and these two natures seem to fight one another constantly.

But as Philologos stated, there is a problem with this line of thinking that the two natures are battling it out because it makes salvation addition instead of transformation. In other words, when I get saved nothing happens to the old nature, I just get a new nature, something new was added. This just doesn't line up with Scripture such as 2Cor 5:17 or Gal 6:15.

So I don't believe a born again believer has two natures but we do still have a problem and that is sin in our flesh. As long as we are human we have sin, but we are new creations in Christ. I think it's important that we view salvation as transformation and not addition.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/31 3:07

So I don't believe a born again believer has two natures but we do still have a problem and that is sin in our flesh. As long as we are human we have sin, but we are new creations in Christ. I think it's important that we view salvation as transformation and not addition.

Hi Ron

As always, thank you for your thoughtful contribution. So many of our difficulties have been caused by using theological terminology rather than biblical. The concept of 'natures' has now been built into some translations of Rom 6:6. Even the NASB has opted for an interpretation 'old self'. I have a suspicion that a new 'self' would not be much of an improvement on an old 'self'. The loss of 'old man' breaks the contrast with the 'new man' of scripture.

Would you develop your quote above a little? In your thinking 'where was Sin before it was in our flesh'? I am blessed by your simple sign off 'In Christ'; is all of you 'in Christ'? or is there some territory not yet under his rule?

Would you distinguish between 'flesh' and 'body'?

When did Paul expect this prayer to be answered? And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1Th 5:23

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 8:16

The acts of the sinful nature are obvious (Galatians 5:19 NIV).

Obvious? Wherein could they not be known?

In response to your question as to who I am referring to with the issue of pride and resistance by God- it is for ANY reader who may think they stand, or pretend to stand, and yet have secret sin in their life. Only you know if this is true; but knowing the word of God as I do I understand full well what it takes to walk in VICTORY over sin. Perchance you would not view it as a rebuke, but an opportunity to change and walk in that victory that we speak of (in concepts and words and theory). From your first post I saw no apology or attempt to reconcile. I sat back and waited. It never came. You have an overly realized eschatology if you believe that we do not have to "put off" the old man my friend. No different than those who believe that sickness and disease must be healed this side of eternity. All things become new? Yes it does and will be completed at the resurrection and we hope and groan for that day. But I still get sick and deal with the effects of original sin. Why would you suggest to readers on this forum that they need not concern themselves with dealing with the flesh when many of them are likely struggling with all sorts of fleshly sins? You speak plainly? I can also. I have debated with men much greater than myself and when they were wrong they were wrong and it made no difference. Ironically you take a somewhat Jewish position on the issue of sin nature.

It is obvious from reading the posts that my arguments have been left as if they were nothing. It took many years for me to come to terms with these issues. Following my well reasoned argument is not something that can be discovered in hours. I am working to the end of dealing with sin as it still exerts a tremendous influence on readers on this forum. Not just EXTERNALLY but also INTERNALLY. Who would disagree?

It is your CHOICE whether you walk in the Spirit and not fulfill the desires of the flesh (Galatians 5). How could you argue that flesh in this sense means sinless human nature when they are attributes that all deal with sin? To preach such is to preach another Gospel (Galatians 1) that Paul that did not preach. He clearly taught to walk in the Spirit and we will not be under the law, etc.. Keep in mind that the term "the flesh" is a biblical one and not my invention. Who could argue from Galatians 5 that there are not two opposing natures that we must choose from?

You say that you have sinned. Then were you tempted from without or within or both? Did the devil himself appear to you and offer you the Kingdoms of this World? Of course not. He didn't need to do that. All he had to do was arouse your sin nature that we RECKON ourselves to be dead to by faith and walk in HOPE of the glory of God. Again, a hope that is seen, why do we yet hope for it?

It is not a glory to God to suggest things are now past that have not yet happened. The restoration of all things is a future event. Who shall deliver me from the body of this death oh wretched man that I am?

If you desire to argue the non-existence of the flesh (sin nature) I will not respond to you directly again. My arguments are already in place and need no further explanation.

One thing to ask yourself. Do you have secret sin? Are you addicted to something and cannot let it go? Do you keep giving way to easily besetting sins? or are you near sinless? Are you proud? How is your love? The wisdom that is from ab

ove is first pure and peaceable and gentle. Full of mercies and good fruits. Is that the tone of your ministry and posts on this forum? Are you motivated by love?

In Christ and In His service,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 8:53

John MacArthur

After we become born again, and we're still in the flesh, is the sin that's still on us, is it like in the wake, following behind us?

Answer

What you're asking is, If I'm regenerated and if I'm a new creation, and God has fitted me for eternity, and He has planted the life of God in my soul, that life has to be perfect, right? Because God cannot give me imperfect life; He cannot give me imperfect regeneration; He cannot give me imperfect righteousness. So that if I am righteous at all, I am righteous period, and that is true. That's why Romans 7 is the key; Paul says, "It is not I that sin; it is sin that is in me. It is not that new creation; it is the sin that is in me." Now what is that sin in me? It is my humanness, so that when that new I sheds that humanness, its perfection is then manifest, see? Now that's the only way you can explain it. Now it's hard because you can't cut you into those clear pieces.

You've all heard people say, "Well, you're body, soul and spirit." And then you ask the person who believes that, what's the difference between soul and spirit, and they can't tell you. Or else they'll say some things are our emotions, and some things are our minds, but if you've ever been able to make a cut between what is your clear thinking and what is your emotion feeling, you can't. So you are a being; you have wholeness as a being. And so you do righteous things, and that's the nature of God working in you. You do unrighteous things; that is the sin that is in you. Paul simply makes a distinction for the sake of theology. And he says that you are a perfect new creation, but sin that is in you, in your humanness still manifests itself. Now you don't want to get to the point where you get a dichotomy going, where you say, "Well that's not me; that's just my sin," so that's what's known as philosophical dualism. And the people who teach that therefore say that when you sin, don't worry about it; it's only your sin. What are you going to do? It's your sin; it's going to sin, right? That's really true. People say, don't worry about sin because that's your old nature. So if your old nature is your old nature, it's going to be your old nature; let it do what it wants. Now I don't think that. I think you're one new nature; you have one new person. You don't have two natures; you have one nature. You live in Christ; Christ lives in you. But there's sin in your humanness, and until you shed your humanness, you can never see the full manifestation of that righteousness.

*** In response to MacArthur***

The acts of the sinful nature are obvious (Galatians 5:19 NIV).

I esteem this man with respect as a great bible teacher. His statements seem in this case to possibly bring some clarity to what we are saying. If I say we deal with a "sin nature" I am referring to sin in our humanness that Paul teaches we must not yield to. But is that not a "nature"? is he not speaking of the "old man?"

Ephesians:

4:22 That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;

4:23 And be renewed in the spirit of your mind;

4:24 And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

This is a deliberate act that we must do and is not automatic. if we must put off the old man which is corrupt according to its deceitful lusts- does that "old man" not have a nature to sin according to deceitful desires? Here the "old man" and the "new man" are contrasted. To make such an argument is to try to merely say we have only one nature now. But we know that it is possible according to James.

"But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed

7 For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord. 8 A double minded man is unstable in all his ways

."

And James 4:8 "Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double minded."

" A double minded man is unstable in all his ways...."

From Strong's Concordance >Â

Double minded > 1374. diqucov dipsuchos, dip'-soo-khosÂ
from 1364 and 5590; two-spirited, i.e. vacillating (in opinion or purpose):--double minded.Â

Unstable > 182. akatastatov akatastatos, ak-at-as'-tat-osÂ
from 1 (as a negative particle) and a derivative of 2525; inconstant:--unstable.

How could a person be DOUBLE minded or two Spirited if one were not the New Man born after of Christ and the other the Old man who is of the devil? Again a deliberate action must be taken to purify and cast down the influence of that other "mind" or "spirit" or else there will be that schizophrenicÂ Christian that was spoken of. He continues, be afflicted and mourn and weep.... these are aspects of brokenness and humility that make it possible to stand in God's grace.. Â

Re: sin and flesh - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/3/31 10:56

Quote:

-----I am blessed by your simple sign off 'In Christ'; is all of you 'in Christ'? or is there some territory not yet under his rule?

I am "dead and hid with Christ in God" however in the course of my daily walk with Him the Lord will bring to my attention areas of my heart that have not been fully surrendered to Him. He then gives grace and strength to overcome that area.

Quote:

-----Would you distinguish between 'flesh' and 'body'?

I would say 'flesh' is the whole man as he is by nature, the 'body' being the physical tent we now dwell in.

Quote:

-----When did Paul expect this prayer to be answered? And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. 1Th 5:23

It seems clear that Paul expects that the whole man is capable of being sanctified and preserved complete until the Lord's coming. Therefore Paul expects this prayer to be answered before death.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 11:33

Sowing to the Flesh
By Robert Wurtz II

When it comes to having the Jews understand the reality of the Gospel, it is important to realize that the "light" of the Law that would be their schoolmaster and lead them to Christ has been veiled by the Oral Law and the Talmud. What light may have seeped out is then governed by the Rabbi's who are in authority in Rabbinic Judaism. So the issue becomes being the "light" that Jesus spoke of that they might see in us what could never be seen in the law and the prophets through the veil of the Talmud.

To understand where a Judaizer is coming from you must know that often it is a knee jerk reaction to antinomianism. This is not always the case. However, as Christians, we must demonstrate a genuine life that fulfills the Law and rightly interprets its precepts in our expression of our faith through its original purpose that all who love the Lord their God will all love their heart, soul, mind, and strength and our neighbor as ourselves. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples in that you have love one to another.

A person who sows to the flesh is sure to reap corruption. This causes Christians to become carnal and walk as men. In an atmosphere of carnality there is little love and there is a "puffed-up" attitude that is detectable because of the absence of the dynamis (I Corinthians 2, 3). Soon spiritual gifts are trying to be manifested by carnal people and all manner of confusion results. The key is LOVE and humility (I Corinthians 13). Love never fails.

Sowing to the flesh is akin to sowing the word of God in our hearts. The seed of the word of God brings forth a harvest of good fruit. The seed of imaginations and high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God bring forth fruit unto death (II Corinthians 10:4-5; Romans 7:5). The seeds we sow to the flesh are the things that we are supposed to be protecting ourselves from. As it is written... Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. He that is in the flesh cannot please God. The way that we avoid walking in the flesh is to keep it subservient to the New Man by sowing to the spirit and casting down the seeds of the flesh or avoiding them as much as possible.

There are lots of different forms of seeds that we can sow to our flesh; but when they conceive they all bring forth death. As it is written... Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death" (James 1:15). Lust conceives when we make provision for the flesh to fulfill its lusts. As it is written... Let us walk honestly as in the day not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof. When we make provision or provide a "seed" for the flesh we are in danger. Blessed is the man that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth (Romans 14:22). We have to lay aside the WEIGHTS and the SIN that does so easily beset us. We must EXERCISE our senses to discern good from evil- that we might protect the heart from which are the issues of life.

The tongue is that one sense (member) that reveals what we have been allowing into our heart. When we start talking everyone gets a clear picture of where our heart is. If we have been sowing to the flesh it will be obvious in our actions and talk. If we have been sowing to the spirit it will likewise be known. Sin is manageable when we CUT-OFF the supply of seed to the flesh and humble ourselves so that we can stand in the grace of God as His workmanship created unto good works. When pride arises or we take HIS glory for HIS work- He will resist us and we are left to fall and then begin the process all over again. This is why I contend that Pride and Victory cannot happen at the same time for long. When there is no humility there will be sin—because God resists us in that condition. And without his grace—sin will abound. Grace abounds when we humble ourselves under Him.

God bless,
-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 11:42

To this I ask; what if you were do yield up the ghost at this very moment? Are you sanctified enough to make heaven? This is a serious question to consider.

To suggest we will be presented faultless in our own sanctification as the basis of what Paul speaks of would be an extreme Arminian view.

Perhaps about 5 semesters of 613 laws would help bring some clarity as to how far we are from being sanctified as it did to me those years. What is worse is that Paul said that whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Anything you do against your conscience is sin TO YOU. Who walks before God with a perfect conscience without an occasional cleansing of it by the blood of Christ. Only the blood can purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. We must do all we can to cultivate a healthy conscience and obey it as the Spirit of God uses it to steer our life; but to suggest that we will reach a level of sanctification that we would be presented faultless apart from being in Christ and having His righteousness is to error greatly in my estimation. No one on earth would make heaven.

There has to be a balance beloved.

Ephesians 1:4 According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.

Twice in this passage Paul sites that our perfection is "In Him." Christ is our righteousness- so long as we walk in the light as He is in the light.

Certainly Paul expects to present us holy and without blame-- IN HIM.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 13:36

Immaculate Christians? Some Practical Notes
By Robert Wurtz II

Knowing the enormity of the requirements of God's holiness should be the starting point for believing in any type of Christian Perfectionism. Like a wrongly placed survey marker, wrong concepts of God's perfection and holiness cause error to beget error.

Holiness is an attribute of God's deity- it is something we can never be apart from Him. This is the purpose of the Holy Spirit. If we are FULL of the Holy Spirit then we can walk in victory over sin and feel a sense of liberty from it-- at least until we are exposed to it and then must by the power of the Holy spirit- resist it. FLEE fornication, as Paul told Timothy is a nonsensical statement if Christian Perfectionism is as was preached by the Entire Sanctification movement (especially Adam Clark). To say that a man could be so wholly sanctified as to not need to "flee" certain sins is to discount the very warnings of scripture.

In 1800 the scenario was much different than today. Sin is on every hand and the flesh is being sown to INVOLUNTARILY in many cases. Who could claim such perfection in this day and age? If it worked then it MUST work now to be consistent; just as a prosperity message must be good in Africa if it is good in America.

These men would find that they DO have a sin nature (NIV flesh KLV) that MUST NOT be sown to if they were to have victory over sin. If the second blessing were such a blessing as they state, we could well live sinless in Sodom and Gomorrah with no need to flee or resist. This is nonsense, both practically and biblically.

Would it be biblical to preach something that you- yourself never could testify to have received? Could I preach Pentecostalism and not have been filled with the Holy Spirit?

What about the thoughts and the intents of the heart? Are the intentions perfect? The Pharisees had a sort of perfectionism also; but the Lord could readily point out their sin. Paul gloried in his infirmities and not his perfection. Had he attained or apprehended-- nay-- he pressed toward the mark. Did he need to bring his body into subjection? Why? Because it was free from sin? No, because he knew he was wretched and could fall to become Adokimos.

"Go sell what you have and give it all to the poor"-- then the rich young man realized rebellion was present- though he was blameless in other areas.

Sin is not relative. God does not change. We do not make up a few rules keep them and then call it ENTIRE SANCTIFICATION. That is upserd. God is searching the hearts and looking to see if all manner of His requirements and motives fit the test. How could a person judge themselves free from sin and entirely sanctified when Paul himself said to judge nothing before the time; because he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness.

What matters is if we THINK we are sinning or act with intent to sin. To us that is sin- though it may not have been biblically, a conscience can also be seared as to leave a person who is hardened in an area thinking they are sanctified. Write down all your sins that you can as Finney asks in Lecture III of his revival series and then ask if you are Entirely Sanctified?

We need revival church!

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/3/31 14:00

Quote:
-----to suggest we will be presented faultless in our own sanctification as the basis of what Paul speaks of would be an extreme Arminian view.

I don't believe anyone here has suggested such a thing.

As you say there must be a balance. I think we can all agree that we are only blameless "in Him". My reason for posting in this thread was simply to remind all that if we trust in God completely then He will work in us to will and to do according to His good pleasure. He will keep us and bring us to fully mature sons and daughters. My concern is that we resign ourselves to never overcoming the "sin nature" and therefore settle for second best. Once we expect God "to will and to do in us" then God will do all for us. But even when failure sometimes comes, if we maintain our trust in God our faith will grow stronger and stronger and we will be kept by God.

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/31 14:06

Robert writes Holiness is an attribute of God's deity- it is something we can never be apart from Him. This is the purpose of the Holy Spirit. If we are FULL of the Holy Spirit then we can walk in victory over sin and feel a sense of liberty from it - at least until we are exposed to it. FLEE fornication, as Paul told Timothy is a nonsensical statement if Christian Perfectionism is as was preached by the Entire Sanctification movement (especially Adam Clark). To say that a man could be so wholly sanctified as to not need to "flee" certain sins is to discount the very warnings of scripture.

Robert

I see you are now prepared to take on the whole "entire sanctification movement". This includes George Fox, Robert Barclay, John and Charles Wesley, John Fletcher, Adam Clark, Charles Finney, Oswald Chambers, Campbell Morgan, Duncan Campbell, Thomas Cook, Barclay Buxton, Paget Wilkes, A B Simpson, Leonard Ravenhill, Paris Reidhead, Maynard James, George North, and last (and least) me. You may have noticed that a few of these people are represented among Greg's contributors to sermonindex.

Your comments seem to take no cognisance of the difference between temptation and predisposition. If you have not done so, I would recommend that you read Clark on Sanctification and Wesley on Christian Perfection. Some of the greatest revivals have taken place in the ministry of some that you denigrate. You are free, of course, to believe what you will. But if you put your beliefs into the public domain you must expect them to be challenged.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 14:27

Beloved,

That is quite a list! Praise the Lord!

I am familiar with these men's teachings and am currently working on a tremendous work of Charles Finney's. These men have influenced my life in a most profound way. I also do know that the great revivals were driven in part from these teachings. I believe we ought to press towards the mark for the prize and live a life as near to perfection as is humanly possible. Look at my teachings and writing on this site. You will find my great desire to see repentance in this land. I preach very straight forward teachings without compromise. However, I do not teach a "Second Blessing" of Total Sanctification in which a person either instantly or eventually is released from any propensity to sin.

As much as I read and have read for years these teachings and have found myself very much in their company of beliefs; I cannot go the distance with them as to say we no longer must deal with the flesh. I can preach and WILL and DO preach strong repentance messages without having to take it to that extent. I will continue to do so and I will also continue to teach on how to have victory over sin and strongholds over the enemy.

There is a real enemy- and it has not disappeared in anyone's life. Please don't suggest I am taking on any of these men. I disagree with them if they hold that particular position. That does not mean- I will not still prove all things and hold fast to that which is good. I like Charles Stanley's messages on certain subjects, but I do not agree with him at all on election. Can we not still be brethren and disagree?

Let us not do with holiness what the hyper-Calvinists did with election and God's sovereignty. Let us not forget that a holy God is also a God of love- and so should we be. We must visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction to be consistent with pure religion-- not just "keeping ourselves unspotted of the world." That is the love element that MUST be our motivation. The Pharisees were "holy." They had no love or compassion. Herein is that balance-- it must all be motivated and seasoned with love.

Best Regards in Christ,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 14:31

Bro Ron,

I think we all agree pretty much here. I don't want to talk past each other or draw lines. I preach and teach holiness. I believe in DEEP repentance. I believe in getting rid of secret sins. I believe we concur.

God Bless and best regards in Christ,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/3/31 14:46

Robert writes However, I do not teach a "Second Blessing" of Total Sanctification in which a person either instantly or eventually is released from any propensity to sin.

Robert,

Neither do I. I preach a regeneration which includes it from the start.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/31 16:35

Bro Ron,

I listened to your message in its entirety and I marvel at how close your teachings are to what I and others in my circle of friends are teaching. It is splitting hairs to try to make a difference between your message and what I teach. You said something like this "there will always be a mystery to regeneration and God will have his prerogative in these things" (paraphrase). That, I think, is what we ought to remember in this. It is a mystery. We try to understand but fall short. You did an excellent job in this message. I concur with your message to an extent I have not heard in other teachers I have listened to in these matters. Praise the Lord!

As you move on into how the flesh and the spirit relate to each other in the born again experience I will be interested to see how you deal with this. Being born again legitimately is what we have been trying to preach and teach for some time. In our circles there is a lot of supposed "backsliding" and in many cases they were not genuinely converted (or whatever term you prefer). Not always, but I have taught strongly on this. I have a message I would like you to hear titled "Getting back To The Love You Had At First." Maybe it will be available at some point.

God bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/1 2:53

I listened to your message in its entirety and I marvel at how close your teachings are to what I and others in my circle of friends are teaching.

Robert

This was No 3 of a series of 4. There is a running in-house joke at the start. You would have to listen to the sessions on Repentance and Justification to appreciate it.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 7:40

Circumcision of the Heart (Is 'death' the savior?)

Part 1

By Robert Wurtz II

For several years I desired to understand the Jewishness of the bible and to place it into its original context. God set my path to cross with Rabbi Jerry Feldman; a man whom I regard very highly for the work he is doing. I also have been greatly influenced by this man. He was a God-send into my life.

I will never forget my first week at the Messianic Institute of Kansas City (now named the Jewish Roots Institute). This is the Institute that Jerry moved from New York City- to Kansas City to start (along with the Adat Yeshua messianic Congregation and Radio show "For Zions Sake"). I arrived in the class a few weeks into the start of the semester and found certain discussion well progressed. I did not know Jerry very well or I had not done what I was about to do. The question was asked "What is circumcision?" None raised their hand. Myself, wholly ignorant of the level of scholarly gentlemen that were present, and being quick to raise my hand and give an answer, gave this response: "Circumcision was an outward

d token of an inward work, in which Abraham had voluntarily decided to cooperate with God in allowing Him to circumcise His heart of the "flesh" so that He (God) could write his laws upon it. God gave him the sign of circumcision as an outward mark so that those who saw Abraham would see and know "this is a man that feareth the Lord." Looking back at the Professor Rabbi Jerry Feldman, who had (among numerous other qualifications) a masters degree from Gordon Cromwell Theological Seminary, asked the class "What is wrong with what he just said?" When he got no response from the class he began to get a bit unsettled and began to say he wished he had been taping the class for rebroadcast on his weekly radio program "For Zions Sake" on AM 760 in KC. He then began asking me questions about myself. "What is your denomination? Answer: "I am Pentecostal Church of God." Are you a dispensationalist? Answer "I agree with some portions of dispensationalism, but not all." From that day forward I understood that he had a lot to say to me that I needed to know. And though he has a way with things, I always enjoyed his teaching. Jerry Feldman as I understand it, had some sympathy with Pentecostals as he was somewhat involved with the Assemblies of God in Springfield, MO. We seemed to get along quite well.

He then began tearing my statement to pieces it seemed and it was all over the use of this one word "flesh." I think he may have saw me, because of what I said, as a "poster child" for the Church and one of many reasons as to why the Jews, in general, don't believe (There are many who do by the way, this is not well known). And that, because, I understood the problem of sin to be with the BODY and not with the Sin Nature. Therefore he cast me into the "the flesh is evil" camp of Gnostic Dualism as if I were keenly aware of such mens teachings in the Nicene era. I knew nothing of these men and had not heard the teaching from anyone that I expressed. It was what I gathered from intense study of scripture. As green as I was at that time (and still am), I had gathered at least that iniquity had entered the human race through Adam and Eve and had corrupted the faculties of man- especially in terms of the senses. In my view the senses were all corrupt and were being used by "the flesh" in a fashion contrary to their intended purpose. For this cause they must be exercised to discern good and evil. I saw the issue as being- Adam and Eve had a corrupt body and needed to be liberated from that body contaminated with Original Sin (I didn't know that doctrine as such then). I believed and still do, that if man was free from the "flesh" He or she was free to serve God without depravity in the new resurrected spiritual body that was governed by the law of God.

This is the whole "Death is Savior" concept that the Total (Entire) Sanctification camp would go to great length to rebut. Adam Clark seemed to be almost a zealot against such a teaching. Death, of course, is not the savior; it is the means by which our Savior Jesus Christ accomplished many things including the atonement. Death is the enemy, and like Pharaoh, God used that enemy to accomplish His purpose. The death of the First Born also set the wheels in motion for the Children of Israel to be liberated from Egypt. Did death save the Children out of the Land of Egypt? Of course not. Likewise a death as savior is a synical retort that is not helpful and ignores the means of God's working in the earth to prove the doctrine of immaculate Christianity this side of the first resurrection. If you read what they believe to be the reason Christ came- you see immediately why they arrived at such teachings. Passages cited are usually II Corinthians 7:1, 11:30; I Thessalonians 5:23; James 4:8, among others. If I might summarize it I would say "to bring man into such a state of holiness as to be as free from sin and its effects on holiness as was Adam and Jesus." This is an awesome concept to try to strive for- but in reality it is overlyrealized eschatology. Always remember; error begets error, and to launch a doctrine based almost exclusively on the holiness of God is no different than launching it from God's sovereignty or from His love (as does the modern church growth movement). There is no balance in this approach and all will lead to error in the end. Think on these results: Entire Sanctification is supposed to yield an "Immaculate Christian," "Unconditional Election makes God the author of Sin." Over emphasis on love leads to the doctrine of "Universalism" and rejects true repentance. The time would fail to tell of whole ministries built on the baptism in the Holy Spirit or healing or prosperity, etc. These types of niche doctrines lead to niche ministries and send the people of God wildly out of balance.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 8:07

Overly realized Eschatology (Is 'death' the savior?)

Part 2

By Robert Wurtz II

When it comes to understanding what God is doing in the earth, man has always tried to have God do things as they see fit and in their own time. But in reality, God will do as He will and in His own timing. Eschatology is the study of "last things" or the end times. Since the Reformation many essential truths have been restored to the original Gospel. The Reformation brought sola feda and sola scriptura. The Anabaptists ("Rebaptizers") sects, though widely varied in beliefs, helped bring back baptism by immersion in harmony with the ritual immersions of the Jews. Wesley and others took Puritan ideas another step towards holiness and came up with the concept of a "second blessing." This was taken and (arguably) evolved into the Baptism in the Holy Spirit as is practiced in Classical Pentecostalism- and reintroduced Spiritual gifts. This was taken up by the tent revivalists in the late 1940's and early 1950's as a "healing in the atonement" was as greatly emphasized. This evolved into the faith movement and the prosperity doctrines.

From Wesley until now there is an element within each of these camps (listed above) that take their doctrines to such extremes as to "go to seed on them." The doctrines themselves in balance have greatly edified the Church; but when taken to their extreme have caused great harm. What these "extreme" teachers do is OVERSTEP the timing of God's promises and begin to reach beyond the first resurrection and begin to pull those promises back into the pre-resurrection world. This is known as an OVERLY REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY. To be consistent in doing such things, all of the post-resurrection promises must be equally in effect with the other. But, how rare is it to find an entire sanctification, healing, prosperity, and restoration convert? Who among us believes a lamb can lie down with a lion and we are like Him as we see Him as he is? The fact is, we have the earnest of the Holy Spirit as a surity that these things will take place after the resurrection (Ephesians 1). And are His workmanship created in Christ Jesus unto good works. To go the extra mile and suggest that a person may reach a level as to no longer be tempted to sin is to err greatly. The PREDISPOSITION to sin is gone because you are born again, but the potential to be tempted and yet be rejected is very great (adokimos). The flesh (NIV sin nature KJV 'flesh' GK sarx) makes temptation from within a grim reality and therefore makes it impossible to be as was Adam and Jesus in this life. Balancing that with a full fledged "pressing to the mark"; even though that goal may be beyond our reach is the DUTY and DESIRE of every TRUE believer.

On Christian Perfectionism

When Christians claim a perfection that will only exist post-resurrection, they are attempting to overly realize God's eschatology. Paul told Timothy to flee fornication and youthful lusts. He told the churches that if the people sow to the flesh they will reap corruption. This requires an understanding on our part that there is a sin nature to deal with (as the NIV translates sarx). No matter if you would call it humanness+ residual sin or the body of sin or any other name- the Greek word sarx certainly demonstrates in Galatians 5 that it is sinful and must not be sown to or we will perish. Paul got his own body in subjection lest he become a reprobate (adokimos). He withstood Peter for the sin of respect of persons. The list goes on and to no profit- but to dispell this myth of immaculate Christianity. What meaneth the multiplied warnings of scripture if man is either instantly immaculate from sin or gradually can become and maintain a continual state of immaculate perfection? I propose that the end to which this doctrine has been taken is somewhat different from Wesley.

As we scale the language barrier I will define what I have read as the ORIGINAL meaning of Entire Sanctification: "

Entire sanctification remains a part of our doctrinal heritage due largely to the enduring influence of the former Evangelist

cal United Brethren Church, Article XI of the EUB Confession of Faith, now part of the United Methodist Book of Discipline (para. 62), includes the following statement:

Entire sanctification is a state of perfect love, righteousness and true holiness which every regenerate believer may obtain by being delivered from the power of sin, by loving God with all the heart, soul, mind and strength, and by loving one's neighbor as one's self. Through faith in Jesus Christ this gracious gift may be received in this life both gradually and instantaneously, and should be sought earnestly by every child of God.

This was the stated goal, but erupted into extreme views of holiness without love. Just as there are now- hyper Calvinists. Is immaculate perfection (as my family has believed for decades) required for salvation? Is it as a woman I met in 1995 at the Independence Manor Nursing Home who was a 70+ year old dear lady who had served God all her life said to me: "Son, I hope I am saved." The woman later lost her mind! Who was responsible for such teachings?! Preaching such teachings as to make the outward standards of mens holiness the focus of rather or not we are saved as opposed to the witness of the Spirit? I assure you they will answer to God for it! Most preachers of such teaching backslide at a horrendous rate. And when you ask them what happened they will tell you "I couldn't live it." They took on that mentality "Preach it until you can live it" and strait backslid and destroyed much of their flock!

On The Guarantee of Healing in the Atonement

When a Christian claims that EVERYONE will be healed this side of eternity and that it is guaranteed in the atonement- they have an overly realized eschatology. Ironically those same people often wear glasses and have sickness, etc. Stories are told of some of these teachers being so adamant about their doctrine that when they get sick they have to go to Mexico for treatment. Does this mean that God does not heal? Of course God heals. My wife was personally healed of Congestive Heart Failure that would have spelled her young death and left me with 6 children, one of which was newborn to raise as a single dad. My cousin Jay Monteer in his book T-11 was shot in the spine by a bow and arrow and was supposed to never walk again- because it hit the spinal chord. He was on Montel Williams show walking as a testimony to a REAL miracle. But does everyone get healed? NO! Not Paul's eyes. Not Timothy's stomach. As a matter of fact, Paul does not even tell Timothy he is praying for the sickness or for him to pray for it. He tells him to take his medicine. Paul left Trophimus at Miletum sick. God heals and sometime He does not. Some people have had enough faith to move mountains and have died sick. Elisha is a prime example.

On Guarantee of Prosperity

When a Christian claims the promises of God as if they were Gold mined from a motherload- they are in left field! Doctrines that teach health, wealth, and prosperity and go to seed on it end up as a reproach on Christ. What happens? They are trying to bring Heaven to earth. They have an overly realized eschatology (among other issues).

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 8:58

Sanctification in Shoe Leather (Is 'death' the savior?)

Some Final Observations 1

By Robert Wurtz II

The Total Sanctification defense of doctrine teachings, I found, were long ramblings of philosophical rhetoric that answered few questions from scripture and have done very little to make me any holier. Repentance teachings based upon the premise that men ought to live holy and get right with God have served to change my heart over the years and especially of late. Charles Finney's Lectures on Revival (especially #3) will prove to change anyones life who follows his suggestions. This is my estimation, is Total Sanctification in Shoe Leather.

Total Sanctification ultimately is a straw man argument that is easy to knock down because we all know no one attains such perfection. To say it is "possible" without any real and lasting and verifiable example of genuine sinlessness (and not some conformity to a simple code such as I quit smoking, drinking, and cussing) is to present a false proposition to people. We can teach on pressig towards the mark without taking the doctrine to its final conclusion. There also needs to be more efforts placed on teaching from the WORD on how to walk in Victory!

True Perfection is to walk perfectly in the will of God which is first of all God's word. Who would claim to attain such perfection to the word of God? Would that not be madness? We all know we need to strive for perfection. BUT that is NOT what the end of these arguments propose. When you make statements as boastful as Adam Clark supposedly made it is a wonder the Church didn't flat revolt. Sometimes trying to correct a problem you can go too far trying to balance the scales and cause error. When I read in his writing about perfect love and I see a total lack of conformity to James 3; what should I think? Hear the word of the Lord...

James 3:14-18

But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

Where is the love in the teachings of Entire Sanctification after Wesley? John Wesley according to Leonard Ravinhill died worth \$30. He built orphanages, etc. What a disservice to this man is done when Entire Sanctification is taught, as it has filtered through the holiness movement, without that great love that he had. It is a travesty! Those people have been some of the meanest people I have ever met in my experience. I know the retort "well that's not the real holiness people." Well, maybe not, but you see what monsters teaching this doctrine unbalanced can produce? It can produce devils like the Pharisees! Paul was blameless concerning the law, but he killed or had killed innocent people in cold blood- think ing he did God a service. So then I ask... where is the peace when you hear such arrogant remarks as "If people would spend as much time seeking God as they do trying to combat the doctrine of entire Sanctification we might get somewhere in the Church." The man had not the wisdom to see that he had indicted himself with the words of his own mouth. He was such a distraction with this teaching that the people were hindered from repentance, seeking God, and getting to where they needed to be. They were provoked to anger- not to love. Why not just say "we agree to disagree on this matter", but let's be brethren and lets seek God or lets love one another so that all men may know we are Christ's disciples? Lets live holy and love one another brethren?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 9:55

Anger and Anointing (Is 'death the savior?')

Some Final Observations 2

By Robert Wurtz II

I find a disturbing sense of ANGER in some teachings and preachings at times that does not work the righteousness of God my friends. We need to know the difference between Anger and Anointing and its sometimes hard for people to tell the difference. They are both A "energy" sources (as it were) and when you lash out in anger you are tapping into the fires of hell. Don't ever preach out of sheer anger. Don't ever be guilty of such a crime. The sword of the Spirit becomes a A "corn knife" to hack people to death rather than to use A "surgically." My pastor was told as a young preacher once in the 1960's A "You really ripped em" from Dan to Beersheeba tonight!" He told that man A "Please don't characterize me like that, I don't want to known as that." When your teachings or preaching does not edify it is at best earthly and at worst demonic. If you are a young preacher reading this- seek the Lord for God's anointing and he will lead you in the right manor as to speak.

The intention of the Total Sanctification movement was quite noble and the results of such teaching were good at first as it sparked revival; but later on, the movement of holiness as it played out became EXTREMELY legalistic. Holiness in our part of the country had reached such extremes (in our circles) that drinking coffee was sin. Playing softball was sin as late as the early 1960's. Fun was sin and on and on and on. I would say that it is quite possible that these teachings took A "holiness" to such a state of legalism as to be somewhat responsible for the rebellion backlash of the 1960's. People who lived in the 1940's in my circle of friends and family speak of a legalistic Christianity that made children feel as though God was nothing but mean and mad. This in turn invoked a knee-jerk reaction among the survivors that now teach children that God is love and neglect to teach them the Fear of God. What a tragedy! And that, because, the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. So we see then, that EXTREME doctrines do nothing but keep the Church's doctrines swinging back and forth from one extreme to another. Then whole denominations would form to focus on these extremes.

To say that a believer can be A "immaculate" in his/her walk with God is to claim beyond even what the Apostle Paul claimed. Knowing that ultimately he must suffer the pains of death by martyrdom according to all that was shown him after the Damascus road; Paul still states A "neither am I perfect." He was pressing to the ultimate goal of His life, which was to be faithful unto the death that He might receive a crown of life. This is what it is to run the race, lay aside every weight and sin, and finish the course having kept the faith and therefore receive the prize. He brought his body into subjection. I bet when he had preached to other he himself would be ADOKIMOS (disqualified). The words A "bring my body into subjection" literally mean to A "hit under the eye" and take away captive. This is hard to do with a Phantom foe. The fight was very real and so was the enemy.

What does it profit to teach A "Perfectionism" and not have a clear cut means of reaching perfection other than to say A "You must be born again" or it happens when you receive the A "second blessing" or you must strive to the death to obtain it day by day. This would be like me arguing doctrinally for the baptism in the Holy Spirit and not being full of the Holy Ghost myself or not being able to lead others to a genuine experience in the truth of God's word. Does anyone know anyone who has so arrived as the Total Sanctification camp so taught? Wesley never claimed it as far as I have read through the years. And if the A "founder" never attained it what are we to make of that? What good does it do to sing about it- if it can't be played out in shoeleather? Lets sing those old hymns! But lets show the people how to live them.

A "Preach it until you reach it"- what kind of philosophy is that? We are not talking about a doctrine that has not been grossly abused here. This doctrine has so caused despair in holiness circles that it is unreal. Why? Did the people get taught how to attain victory from God's word? Did they just despair and quit the church? Some certainly did. Did the ministers believe the flesh had to be dealt with and teach the people how to do it? Were kids shown love in these holiness homes? What is holiness by the way? Last I heard less than 35% of the United Methodist Church have a biblical worldview according to Barna. Is that where Total Sanctification has led them and will ultimately lead us? Lets pray we can balance these teachings and get it right this time around when God sends revival ministers to preach revival once again.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/1 9:58

Sanctification in Shoe Leather (Is 'death' the savior?)

Some Final Observations 1

By Robert Wurtz II

Various comments on Robert's A "Final Observations" quoted here in italics.

The Total Sanctification defense of doctrine teachings, I found, were long ramblings of philosophical rhetoric that answered few questions from scripture and have done very little to make me any holier. Repentance teachings based upon the premise that men ought to live holy and get right with God have served to change my heart over the years and especially of late. Charles Finney's Lectures on Revival (especially #3) will prove to change anyones life who follows his suggestions. This is my estimation, is Total Sanctification in Shoe Leather.

Finney's Lectures on Revival were under-girded by his understanding of scripture generally. I suggest you read The Rev. CHARLES G. FINNEY'S SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY (1851) LECTURE LIX. SANCTIFICATION. I am not a Finney disciple but he deserves your attention if you are going to quote parts of his works.

Total Sanctification ultimately is a straw man argument that is easy to knock down because we all know no one attains such perfection. To say it is A "possible" without any real and lasting and verifiable example of genuine sinlessness (and not some conformity to a simple code such as I quit smoking, drinking, and cussing) is to present a false proposition to p

people. We can teach on pressig towards the mark without taking the doctrine to its final conclusion. There also needs to be more efforts placed on teaching from the WORD on how to walk in Victory!

Your version of Total Sanctification is, indeed, a straw man, but I have already said this previously. Here are some questions for you:

Is He able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, Jud 1:24

Is He able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them. (Heb 7:25 KJV)

Is He able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, (Eph 3:20 KJV)

Is He able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work: (2Co 9:8 KJV)

Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be holden up: for God is able to make him stand. (Rom 14:4 KJV) Is He or isn't He?

For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted. (Heb 2:18 KJV) Is He or isn't He?

That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, In holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life. (Luk 1:74-75 KJV) Is this in heaven when we die, or all the days of our life?

Can He or can't He save His people from their sins?

True Perfection is to walk perfectly in the will of God which is first of all God's word. Who would claim to attain such perfection to the word of God? Would that no be madness? We all know we need to strive for perfection, BUT that is NOT what the end of these arguments propose. When you make statements as boastful as Adam Clark supposedly made it is a wonder the Church didn't flat revolt. Sometimes trying to correct a problem you can go too far trying to balance the scales and cause error. When I read in his writing about perfect love and I see a total lack of conformity to James 3; what should I think? Hear the word of the Lord...

Please quote me one of Adam Clark's boastful statements. Did you never read This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. (Gal 5:16 KJV)

James 3:14-18

But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not, and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. And the fruit of righteousness is sown in peace of them that make peace.

Where is the love in the teachings of Entire Sanctification after Wesley? John Wesley according to Leonard Ravinhill died worth \$30. He built orphanages, etc. What a disservice to this man is done when Entire Sanctification is taught, as it has filtered through the holiness movement, without that great love that he had. It is a travesty! Those people have been some of the meanest people I have ever met in my experience. I know the retort "well that's not the real holiness people." Well, maybe not, but you see what monsters teaching this doctrine unbalanced can produce? It can produce devils like the Pharisees! Paul was blameless concerning the law, but he killed or had killed innocent people in cold blood- thinking he did God a service. So then I ask... where is the peace when you hear such arrogant remarks as "If people would spend as much time seeking God as they do trying to combat the doctrine of entire Sanctification we might get somewhere in the Church." The man had not the wisdom to see that he had indicted himself with the words of his own mouth. He was such a distraction with this teaching that the people were hindered from repentance, seeking God, and getting to where they needed to be. They were provoked to anger- not to love. Why not just say "we agree to disagree on this matter... but let's be brethren and let's seek God or let's love one another so that all men may know we are Christ's disciples?" Lets live holy and love one another brethren?

I could tell you but I won't. Wesley was asked the same. His response was that he would not point to such because those who asked their identity did so from same motive as Herod "to destroy the child". You have accused me of various attitudes in this correspondence; you have been in error every time. However, this paragraph has succeeded in angering me, however I will not return like for like. I think your comments about "monsters" are the most immoderate things I have read for some time; I will leave you to God and your conscience.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 11:40

Some clarifications and edits have been made 4/2/04

Brother this teaching has nothing to do with you. I have savored fond feels of you since hearing your message yesterday- though in past posts we have seemed to be somewhat at odds. I was encouraged that there are people out there teaching the truth. To say... "You have accused me of various attitudes in this correspondence; you have been in error every time. However, this paragraph has succeeded in angering me, however I will not return like for like. I think your comments about 'monsters' are the most immoderate things I have read for some time; I will leave you to God and your conscience." You are reading into this post something I neither seen or intended.

The statement about monsters is in reference to these people:

The intention of the Total Sanctification movement was quite noble and the results of such teaching were good at first as it sparked revival; but later on, the movement of holiness as it played out became EXTREMELY legalistic. Holiness in our part of the country had reached such extremes (in our circles) that drinking coffee was sin. Playing softball was sin as late as the early 1960's. Fun was sin and on and on and on. I would say that it is quite possible that these teachings took "holiness" to such a state of legalism as to be somewhat responsible for the rebellion backlash of the 1960's. People who lived in the 1940's in my circle of friends and family speak of a legalistic Christianity that made children feel as though God was nothing but mean and mad. This in turn invoked a knee-jerk reaction among the survivors that now teach Children that God is love and neglect to teach them the fear of God. What a tragedy!

In what way do you infer or see that I directed that at you? I don't know you brother, apart from this forum and have just yesterday complimented your message. Anger? I would have thought the Ron I heard teaching would have wept at such a thought as this. There are a host of people in my family who were taught holiness until everything was sin and no one was good enough. Is this not a tragedy? Is it not a tragedy that these men would teach holiness at a level they could not live and ended up backsliding? Is this not sanctification gone mad?

Your view of Adam Clark's comments and mine are subjective. So we will not go there. It would be strifes of words to no profit. ***(edit) Moreover, I should have the good sense not to bring a man into the conversation that is not here to defend himself! Sometimes the flesh rises up and I say things I ought not. Not that I don't feel that way, sometimes it is better to just leave it alone. They are as they are in my view and I merely am pointing to what seems clear was a improper method of pressing your points on people (as I view he did it). I did put a quote from Clark in the post- if so be my source is as accurate as I would expect. I do and have used his commentaries. I am simply pointing out the "spirit" that I would see in certain of these men that I did not see in Wesley. Are the statements pure, peacable, gentle? I trow not; but that will remain my opinion. He is a brother who is dead and gone and I must leave from my critic of his behavior as I am no discriminator of hearts. God forgive me. (edit end)***

We are back to where we were... you said it in the beginning and there is no reason for it. (Edit***You also cited a Chinese curse that made me very uneasy.***Edit end) We are bretheren Ron? Must you feel so defensive of these men as to be angered at me when you don't know them? Or would you be defensive of a doctrine that I can never agree with to the place to be angry with me?

I am genuinely hurt that I have been so regarded. It is likely I will not return to this thread and will concern myself to reviv al. it is sad... because I really think a lot of good could have come of it.

God Bless and Farwell,

-Robert Wurtz
1529 Harvard
Independence, MO 64052
816-461-4246

Re: balance - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/4/1 11:50

Quote:
-----Think on these results: Entire Sanctification is supposed to yield an "Immaculate Christian." Unconditional Election makes God "the author of Sin." Over emphasis on love leads to the doctrine of "Universalism" and rejects true repentance. The time would fail to tell of whole ministries built on the baptism in the Holy Spirit or healing or prosperity, etc. These types of niche doctrines lead to niche ministries and send the people of God wildly out of balance.

I agree that there are many 'touchstones' in religion today that get over-emphasized and end up causing division. There are some good things in each of them, but there must be a balance of them all. The classic Calvinist/Armenian debate comes to mind.

It seems these different touchstones are just different facets of the same diamond, so what do we have in God that is different than all those touchstones? Lets talk in practical terms here, what is the proper touchstone that will hold us in balance, that brings significance and relatedness to all the facets?

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/1 11:50

Sometimes it is a sin not to be angry. (Eph 4:26)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 15:16

Bro Ron,

After much consideration over lunch and then listening to part 4 in your series I see why there has been so much conflict in this series of posts. You teach "Instant Sanctification" which is on the farthest extreme of even the Entire Sanctification movement. As a matter of fact, I know of no other sect of Christianity more extreme than this except possibly true Arminianism. Type in key word "Instant Sanctification" in Google and see how extreme the view actually is. That is extreme even by holiness movement standards. No wonder you are so angry!

It was not me attacking you; it was me setting forth what the word teaches. And if I stand against many of those who are featured on this site (which I do not) then one would have to say that your view is in strong opposition to the whole of Christendom. 1 John 1:8 clearly states: "If we claim to be without sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us." To teach people to claim to be without sin it is not only to deceive yourself, but also others.

This "Instant Sanctification" is not revival teaching. And if it were it would be possible only in an atmosphere of extreme revival the like of which has not been seen in 100+ years. We are seeing revival. We are in the streets. We are visiting the fatherless and orphans.

I cannot concur in anywise with such a doctrine. I wonder to what extent others believe as you do and know what you are actually teaching?

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/1 17:03

Robert writes This "Instant Sanctification" is not revival teaching. And if it were it would be possible only in an atmosphere of extreme revival the like of which has not been seen in 100+ years. We are seeing revival. We are in the streets. We are visiting the fatherless and orphans.

I think you should listen to 1 & 2 before you make any more absurd suggestions. As regards 'extreme revival', I suggest you listen to Duncan Campbell's messages on this site. As far as I am concerned this is what Fox, Wesley, Finney, Duncan Campbell saw. If you can settle for something less, I can't. Don't confuse human activity with revival.

I am happy for others to listen to what I am teaching as long as they listen to my telling of it and not yours.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/1 22:05

Brother Raymond

By Robert Wurtz II

Brother Raymond was a Jew who lived at the Independence Manor Care Center in Independence, MO. When I first met him he was a quiet man who sat in a wheelchair with his hands turned in and clinched. We always used to enjoy Brother Raymond as he would get excited and begin to "box" with his clinched hands towards the TV set. Brother Raymond was not always in a wheelchair, as a matter of fact he opened a burger restaurant called "Big Boy" in the 1950's and it is still there today. He had married a Christian woman who to my understanding always served the Lord and prayed for him.

Twice a month our circuit of nursing home's would find us at Independence Manor. We usually would come in and set up our equipment and begin greeting the folks who come to hear. You see some of the dear residents have served God all their life and now they can't go to church anymore. Some are pastors or pastors wives that the church has all but forgotten. Their families often forget them also and they literally die alone. Some simply tell the staff, "call me when their gone."

Others have people handling their legal business and they sometimes fail to ensure that the person in the home even have basic clothing. I have known of people who had millions of dollars in the bank and yet the staff would have to find used clothes to dress the people in. Nurses who are working their shifts may come in to check the residents from time to time and see if they have yet expired. So many of these people die alone.

Bro. Raymond had a good wife. She loved him. She stayed with him until the end. As the years passed Bro. Raymond got weaker and weaker, till one day we came in and said "he's taken a turn for the worst and we don't expect him to live much longer." His wife, who was older herself, simply could not stay up any longer and had to go home to lie down. She asked if I would go in and see him. "He's not responding" she said, "he has been in a coma for nearly a whole day."

When I entered the room some time after his wife left it was as she said. He was in a coma and near to pass away. I simply asked for help from God and He led me through a path to share the Gospel with this man in His language. God had prepared me for 3 1/2 years at the Messianic Institute for that moment. I opened up and began to share. To my amazement when I asked him if he would like to accept Yeshua the Jewish Messiah as his Lord and savior; a man who had been in a coma tried to sit up as if to reach for me and cried out with what strength he had left I believe to accept this Messiah. I said to him Brother Raymond, I believe you are telling me you want to accept your Messiah and he settled himself down and was at complete peace. I prayed another prayer and left the room. I was the last person to ever speak to this man alive.

A strange feeling it is to be that last person. Some would say this or that about what happened. I know God sent me to his room on that night to speak to Brother Raymond, I also believe that I may well have spent those years at the Institute to know the issues with which to deal with and lead that man to his Messiah. Many things I have written in this thread are to that end. Many, many, more things are left to say. There are many hours of valuable information here and I pray that you prayerfully consider it. Messianics may disagree with me and that is fine. My teachers will even disagree with me on some points; but that is because I do not ascribe to the depth of which they may like to draw me into the issues and I respect them for that. I have labored in this thread to synthesize the issues as much as possible.

Some info is for the readers benefit- such as the writings on the Oral Law and are not at all intended to be used in an unchristian way. Friend, I pray you understand that this has been a labor of love for the Jews. We have strayed into areas that I did not intend and have brought me again to terms with issues I had long since settled in my heart; but this is about Jewish Roots and I hope we can stay there.

Every Jew is different and no two are alike. As a matter of fact there was a common little saying that went in the class like this "Ask 2 Jews and we get 3 opinions." They are precious people whom God loves as everyone else. They have suffered terribly at the hands of Christians over the years. God forgive us for not being more attentive to them. May we remember to pray for them and the peace of Jerusalem as you likewise remember all others. these are troubled times.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/4/1 22:11

Quote:
-----Why not just say "we agree to disagree on this matter" ... but let's be brethren and let's seek God or let's love one another so that all men may know we are Christ's disciples?" Lets live holy and love one another brethren?

I have not been reading this thread for about 30 post ago and realized something is brewing and its definitely not ale, not that I would drink it anyhow. It is quite obvious that Ron and Robert you are both at ends in this doctrine and Robert you have been quite clearly laying out alot of what you think is Sanctification and Entire Sanctification. And Also you have been showing what Ron's position is. I personally think this is a great topic and very worthy of discussion, and I believe it would be very edifying to go through some facets of this great truth of Sanctification.

Ron, I would love for you to clearly lay out a brief outline of this doctrine from your standpoint, I have an admiration for 'holiness' preachers as you have declared and at my age and walk in God I am still allowing God to mold me and led me into all truth. I am very excited about this and think its great to know more. I would love for us to continue this in a more open-minded viewpoint without making personal accusations to each others credibility for believing something at this point.

We are going from glory to glory and from image to image. Let us allow God to bring us there and hopefully through our discussions, let them be full of the life of the Spirit.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/2 9:17

Beloved and Brother Ron,

In our discussions it is often difficult to scale the language barrier and understand what each other is talking about because we have understandings of the meanings and use of words that cause us to misunderstand what is being written, In the humblest spirit of shalom I wish to bridge this gap between myself and Ron with love and affection and concede that I have taken terms he has used such as "Instant Justification" and "Christian Perfectionism" and extrapolated from them meanings of my own experience and study. I have listened AGAIN to his part 4 series with the understanding that I may not fully realize what he means by these terms and have come away with a FAR different view.

In fairness to myself I think that it is the immediate reaction of most to use the definitions of words as you know them to be; and cannot know any other definition unless someone explain it. Ron is a tremendous teacher and I am writing this with feelings of extreme fondness for him-- even though our correspondence has been quite sharp. This is a man I would love to sit down and chat with for hours. I say that with deep sincerity because I appreciate his understanding of scripture.

I think we are probably having a "language" issue again with the whole "sin nature" thing; though I don't want to be presumptuous. I will wait to hear him out on that matter and expect based on what I have heard that he will have a deep perspective on the matter.

It is a strange thing that happened last night as I chatted with a friend and tried to come to terms with all this. I talked about the dangers of entire sanctification in an atmosphere where there is no revival. We looked back on our ancestors who were very legalistic and called it holiness. The preachers would preach on high heels and every other thing that you could imagine. I used an inflamatory term "monsters" yesterday that I borrowed from Paris in his Ten Shekels sermon. I tend to borrow people terms I suppose. That was the only way I felt described a person who taught legalism to people under the pretense of holiness because the Spirit of God was not present. then I listened AGAIN to Ron's sermon #4 and at the end heard this statement (which in my flusteration or business I missed yesterday):

"It is one of the persistent dangers of the holiness movement that it denegrates into legalism. What was lived almost effortlessly in a life empowered by the Spirit. If that consciousness begins to ebb and is no longer evident, people try to hold the standard and hold it by producing great lists of how long your skirt must be, etc." (Ron Bailey Regeneration sermon # 4).

This is EXACTLY what I mean. When they wrote Ichabod over the door years ago at some of the Pentecostal Churches here in Missouri they got out a list and started making up laws. That was not holiness and a lot of people rebelled against it. It gave the Gospel a real black eye. It was a travesty to tell you the truth. Of the preachers who preached this that I'm aware of (and there were many) every one of them fell but 1. The difference? He really wanted to be holy and the others had a bad spirit that sought to put the people in bondage and be overbearing.

Sort of like talking with the Jews, when people have been used to terms meaning one thing, even when they have an actual and different meaning- they understand them as they are used in the common language of their people. this can cause great misunderstanding.

The key to this is to explain what is meant and while I would (for example) wait for clarification, give you the benefit of the doubt. I did not do that concerning your "Instant Justification" term. I apologize openly and publicly. I would also ask that you help me not to perceive your writings as hostile by showing a more loving tone. This may be my weakness and it is not your fault. A soft answer will turn away wrath. I will also agree to take this tone towards you. :-) We are brethren and it is a shame that you could not hardly tell it by this thread.

God Bless and Much Brotherly Love,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/2 14:41

**The Church Heads West
An Introduction to the Issues (Part I)**

Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

Hellenism (A Few Issues)

When Alexander the Great conquered the then known world the language of Greek spread throughout. This was convenient for the spread of the Gospel and was prophesied through Nebuchadnezzar's dream centuries before. Jews from the Diaspora were living in a Greek culture and were speaking the Greek language. This gave rise to a new term that we must concern ourselves with at this time called Hellenism. Hellenists are Greek speaking Jews. Hellenism is a blanket term to describe Greek ideas, style, and culture.

The Greeks were pagan and very superstitious (Acts 17). It was actually a culture of paganism. They had many gods and mythologies too numerous to even begin to discuss. One thing stands out about the Greeks as it pertains to the Jews that had made for a great concern among those who followed scripture; and it was that of "Emperor Worship." A major change came with Alexander the Great. He seems to have wished to be treated as a god in his lifetime, and the Hellenistic monarchies followed suit.

Certain leaders received what are called isotheoi timai (honors equal to the gods'): priests, sacrifices, an image among those of the gods. Political tribes named after them, their birthday and day of ascension are celebrated like religious holidays. The kings assumed titles associated with their godlike actions: ktistes (founder), euergetes (benefactor), soter (savi

or). To what extent they were really considered gods is unclear, but the Jewish Freedom Movement participants would view this as a breach of the 1st commandment. From a Jewish standpoint, this is totally unacceptable. The Galileans rose up over the census- likely because it would be for tax purposes. This led to one revolt after another over the next centuries. Those zealous Jews (see previous teachings on the Jewish Freedom Movement) refused to be under Roman dominion in a fashion that made the emperor out to be a god. Taxes in their minds equaled paying tithe and to pay tithe is to give homage to someone or something.

Josephus writes concerning these things saying:

All sorts of misfortunes sprang from these men, and the nation was infected with this doctrine to an incredible degree. One violent war came upon us after another, and we lost our friends, which used to alleviate our pains. There were also very great robberies and murder of our principal men. This was done in pretense indeed for the public welfare, but in reality for the hopes of gain to themselves; whence arose seditions, and from them murders of men, which sometimes fell on those of their own people (by the madness of these men towards one another, while their desire was that none of the adverse party might be left), and sometimes on their enemies. Famine also came upon us, and reduced us to the last degree of despair, as did also the taking and demolishing of cities; nay, the sedition at last increased so high, that the very temple of God was burnt down by their enemies' fire. Such were the consequences of this, that the customs of our fathers were altered, and such a change was made, as added a mighty weight toward bringing all to destruction.

Josephus seemed to blame the Zealots and called them robbers. But there is something underneath these ideas on Jewish Freedom that carried over for centuries and to this day. If the Jews viewed the Romans as being pagan- and revolted against them, what would come of the Church when it began move toward Rome and a trend for adaptation of Greek holidays, etc. (Hellenism) began to greatly influence the Church? What would happen when there seemed to be a carry over of many Greek Pagan ideas and practices into the Church?

The Septuagint (LXX)

Septuagint (sometimes abbreviated LXX which means "70") is the name given to the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. The Septuagint was completed in Alexandria, Egypt between 300-200 BC. Many Jews spread throughout the empire were beginning to lose their Hebrew language so the Septuagint became widely used among Hellenistic Jews.

The process of translating the Hebrew to Greek gave many non-Jews their first look at the Word of God. According to an ancient document called the Letter of Aristeas, 70 to 72 Jewish scholars were commissioned during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus to carry out the task of translation. The term "Septuagint" means seventy in Latin, and the text is so named to the credit of these 70 scholars. According to Ptolemy II Philadelphus, King of Egypt (287-47 BC) had recently established a valuable library at Alexandria. He was persuaded by Demetrius of Phalarus, chief librarian, to translate a copy of the sacred scriptures of the Jews.

To win the grace of this people, Ptolemy, by the advice of Aristeas, an officer of the royal guard, an Egyptian by birth and a pagan by religion, emancipated 100,000 slaves in different parts of his kingdom. He then sent delegates, among whom was Aristeas, to Jerusalem, to ask Eleazar, the Jewish high-priest, to provide him with a copy of the Law, and Jews capable of translating it into Greek. The embassy was successful: a richly ornamented copy of the Law was sent to him and seventy-two Israelites, six from each tribe, were deputed to go to Egypt and carry out the wish of the king. They were received with great honor and during seven days astonished everyone by the wisdom they displayed in answering seventy-two questions which they were asked: then they were led into the solitary Island of Pharos, where they began their work, translating the Law, helping one another and comparing translations in proportion as they finished them. At the end of seventy-two days, their work was completed and agreed in remarkable fashion (Adaptation from New Advent; See footnote).

** Notes**

http://www.ualberta.ca/~csmackay/CLASS_378/Emperor.Worship.html

Â"The Life and Epistles of St. Paul" by W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, Eerdmans

<http://www.septuagint.net/>

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13722a.htm>

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/3 10:44

**The Church Heads West
An Introduction To the Issues (Part II)
Compiled By Robert Wurtz II**

PHILO JUDAEUS Â"Philo of Alexandria" (20 BCE - 50CE)

Philo Judaeus was a Jew and a contemporary of both Jesus and Paul. He was a native of Alexandria, Egypt. He received the best Jewish education, and was trained also in gentile learning-grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, geometry, poetry, music. Having been wealthy he was enabled to devote his career to scholarship. The Alexandrian Jews wielded great influence in the contemporary Roman Empire. In the winter of 39 AD - 40 AD, he was spokesman of a letter sent to Rome to protest against "Emperor worship." The mission failed. Caligula would not heed grievances, which would cease worship of himself. Keep in mind, the period between 30 BCE and 70CE saw many additions to the most momentous epoch in history.

Philo was a Jew by nationality and nurture, an oriental mystic by accident of residence. He was a Greek humanist by higher education and professional study, an ally of the Roman governing classes, familiar with their intellectual perspective. Moreover, he dedicated himself to two tasks and tried to weld them into unity. On the one hand, he wrote for educated men in Greek-Roman society, attempting to explain, often to justify his racial religion before them. The ancient state religion was growing weak and Philo taught Jewish faith as the "desire of all nations." On the other hand, he confronted his "orthodox" Jews and their separatist traditions. He went a long way towards blending Judaism with Greek culture to further the process of Hellenism among the Jews. Most scholars agree that he was not familiar with the Hebrew Bible and did most of his work in the Greek translation known as the SEPTUAGINT.

Philo blended Greek Philosophy with Jewish thought and Scripture. He tried to remain true to the dogmatic deductions found in scripture; but that tends to be difficult when there is a mixture of two exclusive religions or philosophies. Taking t

he Old Testament he applied the "allegorical" hermeneutic that Origen would later champion. Philo taught that the Scriptures contain two meanings: a "lower" meaning, obvious in the literal plain sense of the text; and a "higher," or "hidden" meaning, perceptible to the "initiated" alone. This was not a new concept even then, but would eventually evolve into what we know today as Gnosticism. In this way he found it possible to reconcile Greek intellectualism with Jewish belief. Philo's writings were preserved by the Christian church. Many Jews thought his writings were suspect because they reflected Greek philosophy rather than Hebrew tradition, while the church viewed his works as close to the thoughts of the church fathers. Many Christian writers saw parallels between Philo and the Gospel of John, for example-especially in his idea of the Word, or Logos, of God being in the beginning with God (John 1:1). Some have gone as far as to say that Philo is the father of NEO-Platonism, but this cannot be said dogmatically. From Plato to Philo and on to Neo-Platonism we see developing one of the great threats to early Christianity and a great cause of separation even farther from its Jewish Roots. From this point we might say that Christianity in terms of its foundation had moved from Jerusalem to Ephesus; it would not be long until it would pack its bags once again and moved to Rome.

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes

McClintock and Strong Encyclopedia, Electronic Database. Copyright (c) 2000 by Biblsoft)

Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, Copyright (c) 1986, Thomas Nelson Publishers

G.H. Box THE JEWISH ENVIRONMENT OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY Edited By Brent Walters C. 1993 Brent S. Walters

<http://31.1911encyclopedia.org/N/NE/NEOPLATONISM.htm>

Re: Beloved and Brother Ron, - posted by Delboy (), on: 2004/4/3 12:20

Dear Robert, BIG respect for your reply and post to Ron

I too have been reading the vaeious posts along the way,It seems you and your family have had some experiences along the way on wrong Holiness teaching(to use a phrase)

Lets look ahead to the forthcoming debate with anticipation!

Bless you ,for your honest post

;-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/4 15:37

A Little About Myself

(Why I Teach a Balance)

By Robert Wurtz II

Dear Brother and Beloved,

I am 34 years old and I live with my wife and children in Independence, MO. I was born September 29, 1969 in Kansas City, Mo. I have 6 children ranging in age from 15 years down to 3 years old. I am a manager by trade and a youth pastor and out reach minister by calling.

My families religious roots trace back to Methodism. My great, great, Grandparents on my Mother's side were Methodist's. They were extreme holiness people as Methodists. It is said of my Great, Great, Grandmother Amy Ann that when she walked into the room the hair would stand up on your arm- because she walked so close to God. Maybe it was just conviction of sin that they felt because she was salt and light in the world. Her grandchildren tell that they never saw her ankles or her wrists all the time they were children.

She (Grandma Amy Ann) was a street corner preacher in Cole Camp Missouri. Before she died she called certian family members into the room to pray for them and some were saved before they died. I am told that out of curiosity they attended a Pentecostal meeting at the Union Church in Cole Camp Missouri in the 1930's and eventually became Pentecostals. The "fire" fell and there was revival on a limited scale. For some reason the next generation began to teach "holiness" in a fashion of life that tried to emulate the likes of my Grandma Amy Ann. In an atmosphere of desiring to get close to God you can do that. But when you try to make the "holiness teachings" a means to the end it will not work and did not work. You see, I don't watch TV so I can appear holy and impress people; I do it so that I can get closer to God and I can hear His voice. If I have something the people are looking for and desire then I can tell them how I got there. If I don't have the salt and light that attracts the people- they will hear nothing but rules.

I have to preach on genuine sin and let God deal with the people. Oh, I point out the pitfalls of TV. But, to condemn people when they are cold and hard over TV and such things will bring a revolt and is merely a symptom of a larger problem anyway. If I preach a Gospel that none can live then I have done God an extreme disservice. I believe this happens when repentance preaching is taken to the people week after week after week. Soon they get so cleaned up that you have to start measuring skirts and splitting hairs. This is not the object of revival in God's sight- it is so we will live as Christ in our behavior. A lot is said about holiness and victory over sin-- but who is teaching us how to get there and have victory over strongholds? If we can't put those boots on the ground all of our theologes are in vain. What can we put into action? Lets be perfect and be as Christ and love; but lets show people how to get there.

Maybe Grandma Amy Ann's children may have thought; if we teach our kids to do what Grandma Amy Ann did they will be anointed like her. Seems reasonable right? But, all the kids did was rebel and by the time we extend out two more generations there was about 1 in 5 of the kids serving God. Holiness became a list of the commandments of men and did nothing to make the kids like Jesus Christ. That is true holiness by the way. Nothing more and nothing less. because when the convictions of men become the doctrines of men it is not long and they become the commandments of men. What do I look for to see Spirituality, I look for love for God and for our neighbor. That is the end of all we are doing. When I was first back to God I desired to hear "rip it up" sermons and sometimes they are a necessity; where I would err was when I began to glory in the way people would hand their head in the service as if it were a victory. God Forgive me for that. God have mercy on me. We need tough preaching and we need to balance it with love for God and our neighbor. Other

wise our ministry is just "reactionary" to what else is happening, Joel Osteen says that his Dad wanted to preach a positive message to counter the holiness, hell fire preaching in that day. Now he is out of balance on the other end because his ministry is a "reaction" to what once was. Many of those men backslid and we ought to really concern ourselves with why that was. I have and I do.

My Father's side was a mix of things- that eventually resulted in my grandparents becoming Pentecostal. My dad turned from God and God delivered him of 25+ years of alcoholism. He is now a dedicated deacon of the church to God be the glory! His story contains many cases where he can show where teachings of "holiness" and the like turned him off to God in a bad way when young.

You see, beloved, when the kids see their Mom or Grandma praying and crying before God and then they get right up and grab a green switch and tear your legs up with it- because you picked an apple off the apple tree to eat when hungry it sends a profaned message. That is not love. That is what was happening and the like in certain KEY areas of the family (not as this on my dad's side). That was the picture of holiness that much of my family saw and it was a contradiction. People then began to confuse stoicism with holiness and a generation went by without hardly telling their kids they loved them. I speak for my experience only.

My heart's cry is for God to bring us into balance in revival, as it comes, so that we can preach deep repentance as needed and get people truly born again; and then go on to perfection not laying that foundation over and over. What has happened in my family and in my limited circles of friends and associates, especially in the generation that would land people to be about 70+ years old right now, is that they were taught "holiness" that was not Jesus Christ. This is where I think the error has been with revivals in the past in our part of this country.

I was sent by my mother and dad to Church on the van from a very early age. I cannot remember a time when I did not know God or call upon Him in prayer. As a teen I strayed from God in some key areas that left my life almost in ruin. He protected me totally from alcohol and drugs; but I had vices in my life that were just as bad. They caught up to me eventually.

On Easter Sunday 1991, I came home to the fathers house. I had been gone for about 2 years or so depending on how you look at it. From the time I was a child I studied the scriptures out of fear of the rapture and prayed out of fear of my father; but now I was baptized in the Spirit and it was an unquenchable hunger and thirst.

Too many details to tell all; but my favorite subjects are reaching the lost, Nursing Home ministry, revival, Jewish roots and apologetics (strange mix?). I want to see the saints walk in love AND victory over their sins and have made the bulk of my studies to that end. I studied theology on my own over the years and attended the Messianic Jewish Institute of K.C. to complete my Church History Studies and to get back to the roots of the early church. If I am anything I am HIS workmanship and everything I am NOT has been my own doing. My life belongs to God. I am His servant. As far as reaching the Jews... That is what this thread is about. I pray someone can use it to familiarize themselves with the issues.

To God Be the Glory.

God Bless and Much Brotherly Love,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/4 15:58

Brother Derek,

I understand what you are saying and I would receive it as an encouragement to seek the Lord more than anything else. My hearts desire is to come with an olive branch of peace extended. I want to walk in love. I don't want to pit myself against anyone and will refuse such. Shalom!

One way to get my "dandruff up" is for me to come in and see two or more of my children fighting or bickering. Remember that post that says something like "Daddy come down and bring your belt"... well, if we keep this stuff up it will happen. I have taken the belt quite a bit so to speak the last 3 months and I'm not trying to get anymore whippings (If you know what I mean). :-D I know one thing, I never ask them (my children) who was right... I want it stopped and reconciled. :-) Are we not brethren? Daddy come with the belt?:- (Let Him come as He wills, but please lets not let it be because His children were in to it with each other. :-)

God Bless and much Love in Christ,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/5 9:33

Glossary of Jewish Terms

As we continue our study from here it may be necessary, or at least helpful, to have a glossary of terms for some of the issues we will discuss. It would be very impractical to place such a list on this thread (this glossary is about 60 pages of text). Here is a link to a glossary that can be referred to as needed. Some terms we will discuss are not in this glossary; those I will define as we go.

This site itself has a few views I disagree with; though the main objective I do agree with. If you stick to just this glossary it will serve my intended purpose for our study

<http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/gloss.html#a>

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/5 14:05

The 613 Laws of the Old Testament

By Robert Wurtz II

Paul said that if righteousness could have come by the law it would have; but it cannot. As it is written... Galatians 3:21 "Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." All the law can do is lead us to Christ and teach us about God's ways. Paul said that he pressed towards the "mark" for the prize. Here we read... "Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; concerning the law, a Pharisee; concerning zeal, persecuting the church; concerning the righteousness which is in the law, blameless." (Philippians 3:5,6). We know that this mark was not perfection of the law because he counted all his works of righteousness as dung that he might win Christ (Philippians 3:8). "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." (Galatians 2:21)

As we begin to take a closer look at the issues its good to realize that the Jews codified the Law of Moses into 613 laws. It is a law that contains the unchanging personality of God in what it means to be holy and love, etc. Jesus said that all of the law and prophets could be summarized into just 2. Love the Lord with all your heart, soul, mind, and strength, and your neighbor as yourself.

There are plenty of resources to at least take a look at what the laws are. I am hesitant to suggest anyone look on the net for these things because of the extreme views of some of the sites out there. Therefore I would say go to the public library and look them up in the Encyclopedia Judaica.

What studying these laws did for me at the Institute was to make me realize that I don't understand what God means when I conceptualize the meaning of "Love the Lord your God" or "Love your neighbor as yourself, etc." My preconceived ideas of what those concepts were- were often lacking in the meaning of God's terms. Paul said that the law is good if it is used lawfully.

The law of God exposes sin- plain and simple. It converts the soul by showing us our need for Christ. It was not written for the righteous but for sinners. And it was added because of transgressions. It exposed the law of sin that is in our members. As Paul said it- when the commandment came sin revived and I died. So we see then that it is a schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. Bro. Ron Bailey did an excellent job dealing with this issue in section 4 of his series called "Adoption." The law was in fact a light that would light the path to Christ; but the people would not that the glory of that law should shine upon them; hence by analogy, the veil that was placed over the face of Moses is still upon their hearts. They would not that the "light" (glory) of the law be shone upon them.

When the people that sat in darkness saw a great light, they were seeing the Glory of the Law of God embodied in the living Word of God (John 1). When you are in sin as an impenitent, you do not desire to see this light as it is contrary to those who love darkness because their deeds are evil. As it is written... men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil.

The first laws given to man (In Jewish tradition) were the "Noachide Laws". This was a series of 7 laws that dealt with the basic categories of sin. Then came the 10 Commandments. then the Jews codified the law in 613 laws. This is not the whole law- but covers most of the issues. Some of them deal with the nation or the priesthood, etc. Others are relevant for understanding how God defines certain behaviors.

In Acts 15 we see a short list of commands being put on the Gentiles Christians. The Jewish Christians were zealous of the law and many continued to keep it as an identification of who they were as God's people and not for salvation (Acts 21:17-25; Acts 24:13-20). There is proof of this else where especially in Galatians when certain came from James and Peter to a "law approach" and left the Gentiles fellowship. Again, not for salvation, but as their culture and identity. We are gentiles and we are commanded to abide in the calling that we are called in (I Corinthians 7:18).

Since that time the Oral Law has been codified (in the 2nd century) and now there is a "shield" over the law. This Oral Law in significant ways keeps the Jewish People from having the light they need to lead them to Christ. Dealing with this issue alone is one of the greatest challenges facing the Jews in my opinion. Others such as horrendous behavior from Christians towards them over 2000 years are the beginnings of understanding where they are coming from so that we can try to let God lead us as to how we deal with them. It is part of the study to show ourselves approved.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/7 8:14

Healing in His Wings

The tallit and tzitzit in Messianic Concepts

By Robert Wurtz II

The LORD said to Moses, "Speak to the Israelites and say to them: `Throughout the generations to come you are to make tassels on the corners of your garments, with a blue cord on each tassel. You will have these tassels to look at and so you will remember all the commands of the LORD, that you may obey them and not prostitute yourselves by going after the lusts of your own hearts and eyes. Then you will remember to obey all my commands and will be holy to your God. I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of Egypt to be your God. I am the LORD your God.'" (Num. 15:37-41)

Jesus, no doubt, as an observant and law abiding Jew, would have worn a garment that contained 4 tzitzit. Tzitzit is a chord that has been tied with a series of knots as a reminder of the law of God. They were placed so that when the garment was put on the tzitzit would be at each corner of the body. Hence, whatever direction they turned they were reminded of the laws of God. Some have said that the tzitzit are tied into a knot sequence that makes up the number 613 corresponding to the 613 laws. For many centuries the chords were not made from the prescribed blue dye that the law required. This was due to the formulation and snails required to get the blue color being lost. The snails have been recently rediscovered and the tzitzit made with the prescribed blue dye can be purchased again.

Many orthodox Jewish men even today observe this commandment by wearing tassels (tzitzit, pronounced ZEET-zeet) affixed to a garment under their shirts, with the tassels deliberately showing so that they are obvious both to himself and those around him. Others don't wear them all the time, but in worship they wear a prayer shawl (tallit) to which tzitzit are attached. In ancient times, women may have worn them as well.

The tallit (prayer shawl) would be draped over the head to form a personal "prayer closet." And from here a person could pray in secret and the Lord would reward openly. This must be done as not to make a show- or the reward is the praise of the people. For this cause it is good to get alone to pray as did Jesus—away from the crowds and people, etc. A prayer shawl is NOT needed to pray, but this is a practice that is still performed by practicing Jewish men (and some women).

men) today.

HEALING IN HIS WINGS

In Jesus' day, Jewish men wore a simple tunic both at home and at work. The tunic (tallit) served as protection from cold and rain. Hanging from the end of each of its four corners (wings) was a tzitzit in obedience to the biblical command. Through the centuries, during times of persecution, Jews were often forbidden to wear the tzitzit on the outside of their garments. This forced them to wear a small four-cornered tallit under their shirts. This is a thin garment rectangular shaped with a large hole in the center. When the "mini-tallit" was under the clothes it served the same purpose as was originally prescribed—as a reminder of the laws of God.

During the first century there were a few Messianic concepts and scriptures associated with the tzitzit concerning the Messiah. One was that these knotted fringes possessed healing powers. The tunic was worn and when in prayer it would be draped over the head as if under the "Lord's Wings." This made for the thought that the corners of the tallit (tunic) were "wings." This tradition has its roots in the prophecy of Malachi 4:2 where the Messiah is said to be coming with healing in His wings.

Certainly the woman with the issue of blood knew of these traditions, which would explain why she sought to touch the corner (the wings) of Jesus' prayer garment. The same word used in Numbers 15:38 for corner is used in Malachi 4:2 for wings. With this understanding in mind, an ancient Jew under the prayer shawl could be said to be dwelling in the secret place of the Most High and under His wings (Psalm 91:1-4). When one realized the significance of this concept to the first-century Hebraic mind, it becomes clear why this woman was instantly healed. She was expressing her faith in Jesus as the Son of Righteousness with healing in His wings and declaring her faith in God's prophetic Word.

God Bless,

-Robert

** Notes**

<http://www.rbooker.com/roots/articles/hisgarment.htm>

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/8 10:09

Not Enough Pens- Nor Enough Paper

(A Brief Look Into Jewish Persecution)

Introduction

By Robert Wurtz II

When many Jews see the Cross they do not savor warm feelings of forgiveness and love that characterizes the love of Jesus Christ and God the Father who sent Him to die for sins. Because of the severe atrocities that have been heaped up on the Jewish people over the last 1900 years; they view the Cross often times as a SWORD dipped in 1900 years of Jewish blood. This is a travesty. In this new section we will begin exploring some of many crimes that have been committed against the Jewish people in the name of Christianity. We will look at how the love that God intended to characterize the Church began to fade after the death of John the Revelator. We will look at the crusades, counsel rulings, synagogue burnings, forced conversions, and the writings of Martin Luther against the Jews and their relationship to Adolph Hitler. We will discuss issues such as forced baptism, the badge of shame, and the Spanish Inquisition. There were expulsions and ghettos that Jews were forced to. In fact, there are so many issues to cover and to begin to lay the groundwork for Jewish persecution that we will have to focus on the major ones. Many issues you have never heard about. I would encourage you to investigate these issues in your own study time to discover their truth and gain a grasp as to why many Jews exhibit a great coldness towards Christianity in general.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/9 8:34

"On the Jews and Their Lies"

(Martin Luther Sowing Seeds of Anti-Semitism)

By Robert Wurtz II

When I first heard of the tractate "On the Jews and their Lies" by Martin Luther I was overcome with disbelief. It caused me to somewhat question a lot of teachings and things about him that I had held so dearly. But the thing that you must consider is that there are no "Comic Book" figures in scripture. God has allowed nearly every man and woman of God in scripture to be shown in the light of their humanness and frailty. God did not hide David's sin, nor did He hide Moses' smiting of the rock. God told us about Elijah's trip to the cave and Samuel's sons who "knew not the Lord." This list is almost as long as all the names in scripture. God never allows us to view his servants as anything more than what they are- humans with a fallen nature. Paul and Barnabas' split could have been hidden and so could have Peter's respect of persons that Paul refers to in Galatians. Men after the apostolic age are no different. They all had issues of some sort or another.

When it comes to past believers and teachers of truth after the apostolic age, there are some issues that immediately come into the limelight to demonstrate that we can never look back and try to emulate what these men were- and that, because God has consistently been leading Christ's bride (the Church) to perfection and getting Her ready for His return and these were imperfect men. We learn from them and appreciate the progress that God brought through them; but they are not where Christ wants us.

Since John the Revelator passed on the Church has lacked an emphasis on Love. As you follow the creeds, councils, and controversies of the ante-nicene era you see a Church almost preoccupied with refining theological concepts. The Church moved to Ephesus (as it were) and then on to Rome. From there a struggle against those who oppose Christendom began. Even fighting in the later centuries with Muslims. It is as though the Catholic Church at one point took up the whole "Jihad" philosophy and began Crusades and other violent acts. I am told that the passage to justify these acts were "The Kingdom of Heaven suffers violence and the violent take it by force." This is wildly out of context. We know that this was not the "Remnant Church" acting and doing these things; but you must know that they were done in the name of Christianity and we are to some degree tainted by their iniquity many of the Jews eyes.

John Calvin and Martin Luther are who I wish to focus on in this immediate study. John Calvin had Michel Servetus burned alive at Geneva because of his heretical teachings. No matter what you say about Calvin's contributions to Christianity- this act stands out like a sore thumb. No one can give a biblical justification for such an act in scripture. Paul turned such people as this over to Satan so they would learn not to blaspheme. In the end Paul said "Alexander the Copper Smith has done me much evil, the Lord reward him according to his works." It is a meekness that acknowledged God's sovereignty as being in control of the affairs of men. Paul's method is what scripture teaches is to be done- not applying fire

as did the Catholics to the Lollards at Smithfield and elsewhere. The Catholic's applied fire and later did the Protestants.

Martin Luther has a vile stain upon his life that has caused more pain and suffering than Calvin could have ever done by burning Severtus. He wrote a tractate called "On the Jews and the Lies." The Nazis used this tractate in inferences and such in their philosophy of the "Final Solution." I have read a good portion of this translated work and could read no further. It is readily available for all to read and see discussed by simply typing in key words "On the Jews and the Lies" into google or any search engine. The connection between this tractate and the holocaust is clear. Protestants who have never heard of this will likely be shocked, these were mortal men and do not deserve to be idolized as we often do. That does not please God. We have tried to hide their sin, but God never did that. You must understand that this is one of the great obstacles to sharing the faith with the Jews. They see the Cross as a Sword dipped in 1900 years of Jewish blood in many cases. I will leave you to your own studies.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/9 10:50

The Cross as a Sword
Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

In 312, the Roman Emperor Constantine I the Great was in Trier, Germany where he had a vision of a cross (X) that appeared in the sky with the words, "In hoc signum vinces" ("By this You Will Conquer"). The Emperor was greatly influenced by the apparition and encouraged his 20,000 troops for the upcoming bloody battle against Maxentius and his 100,000 men. Marcus Aurelius Valerius Maxentius, more commonly known as Maxentius, was the child of the Emperor Maximianus Herculeus and the Syrian Eutropia; he was born ca. 278 A.D. Constantine's soldiers, the majority of whom were pagans, placed the sacred image of the cross (X) on their shields. The two military forces clashed near the Milvian Bridge over the Tiber River. Maxentius succumbed in the Tiber on October 28, 312, while his fierce legions were soundly routed.

This caused an extensive emphasis on the cross after that. Soon the Catholics would adopt the signing of the "Cross" at baptism. Father Charles M. Mangam writes... "Emperor Constantine decreed in the 313 Edict of Milan that the worship of God performed by the Christians was from henceforth tolerated and that Christianity was the official religion of the Roman Empire. Furthermore, the victorious leader did not seek revenge against his enemies but instead treated them with justice. Constantine, particularly when facing a huge obstacle, placed his trust in Christ and His triumphant Cross. The lesson is clear: Jesus won over evil. We embrace His Cross when we cheerfully accept the myriad and multiple agonies present in our lives, realizing that when humbly yielded to, these "crosses" help to usher us into the reign of God that has no end."

Before the Cross was used officially as a sign of a Christian the ichthus symbol was used < or fish symbol. In the ante-Nicene era, when Christians had to be afraid of persecution by the Roman empire, the fish symbol has been used as a secret sign to know each other.

Today we as believers, in general, cherish the Cross as a symbol of the finished work of Christ, the Cross has been spoken of in song and sermon alike for God's glory. The Jews, in many cases though, see it as a curse because the scripture says "Cursed is everyone that hangs on a tree." This is part of the Gospel explanation to them. As it is written... "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangs on a tree." (Galatians 3:13 KJV).

Personally, I do not feel that the excesses of some and their atrocities ought to dampen our use of that symbol- if only as a mark of identity. I am not dogmatic on the matter in any wise- other than to say that if the MESSAGE of the Gospel is being compromised and the crosses are removed as a result- that I do have a problem with. However, it MUST NOT be used in an idolatrous form as though it contained special powers, etc. It is a symbol, take it or leave it. Many Messianics refuse to display a Cross because of its associated meaning to the Jews. I have no problem with that. To deny a symbol in this context is not to deny Christ.

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes

<http://www.catholic.org/featured/headline.php?ID=351>

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/9 15:11

PLUNGED INTO DARKNESS
By Robert Wurtz II

When we talk about the world plunging into darkness it can only happen for one reason--- there is an absence of LIGHT. The Word of God is a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our pathway. When the Word of God was being lived out in the lives of believers in the ante-Nicene era there was a light in the Word to the unbelievers. However, when the Canon was finally completed and the scripture was set to be placed into the common language, the completion of that book would dictate the fate of the world for the next 1000 years. This version is known as Jerome's Latin "Vulgate" of 405 CE. It was a tremendous work of great magnitude. Actually, it was almost too good. The translation was such that it was deemed by the Universal Church (Catholic) to be unacceptable to try to change it. So when the language changed and the people no longer spoke Latin- the Bible was then relegated to the monasteries (Monastic Orders). In time people would literally be purged at the stake for teaching their children the Ten Commandments in English. The reason for this is simple; it gives the people a Bible in their common language and they will interpret it as the Spirit wills and not them. It was all about control.

The common people could neither read nor understand the Bible any longer. The people became dependent on the Monks or religious people to interpret and teach them the Word of God. This is why it is imperative to always have an accurate version of Scripture in the COMMON language of the people. This is what drove Tyndale to make the notorious remark to the religious leaders "If the Lord spare my life ere many years... I will cause a boy that driveth the plow to know the scriptures better than thee!" How was that? They did not have Bibles as we do today. The Word of God was utterly precious in those days. Tyndale made good use of Gutenberg's printing press and the rest is history.

When the Bible is not in the common tongue all sorts of manipulations can happen from within a corrupt leadership. This is why there was ultimately a need for the Reformation. The Church was so off track that God had to Reform the whole thing. The people only knew what they were taught. In an atmosphere of ignorance a lot of things can be done by well meaning people. The people only knew what their leaders taught them. This is still no excuse though because everyone is born with a conscience.

The only way to handle Jewish mistreatment is to say the killings and persecution of innocent people was wrong and un

acceptable; PERIOD. No buts, what if's, or anything else. It was sin and it was a travesty.

From Jerome to Wycliffe there was a deep darkness upon the earth. The time would fail me here to discuss the formation of the English Bible; but it was certainly a Godsend. As God's word has been proliferated- we have seen an increase in light- but not always an increase in love. With the word of God in hand many have still rebelled against its precepts to love. Some of the worst wars and human atrocities in the history of the world have happened since the printing press. It is not the hearers of the work- but the doers of the work that we are to be.

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes

The Vulgate is the version of the Latin Bible, primarily translated from Hebrew and Greek by St. Jerome, used by the Roman Catholic Church for more than 1000 years. In 382 Pope Damasus commissioned Jerome, the leading biblical scholar of his day, to produce an acceptable Latin translation of the Bible from the several divergent translations then in use. His revised Latin translation of the Gospels was delivered to the Pope in 384. Using the Septuagint Greek version of the Old Testament, he produced new Latin translations of the Psalms (the Gallican Psalter), the Book of Job, and some other books. Later, he decided the Septuagint was unsatisfactory and began translating the entire Old Testament from the original Hebrew, completing it 405 CE.

Vulgate (from the Latin editio vulgata meaning "common version")

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/10 18:16

The Yellow Badges

Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

The Jewish Badge of Shame

Antisemitism is alive and well in the world despite the millions of Jews who were mercilessly massacred in the last 65 years. Who will ultimately be judged for the holocaust? Who will be judged for the antisemitic laws that had been passed for centuries driving the Jews from Christ? Individuals? Nations? When I think about the horrible persecution of the Jews for over 1900 years of the common era (not to mention the centuries before that) it is difficult to comprehend how human beings with a God given conscience could treat their fellow human beings with such heartless hatred. The only thing I have even been able to figure is that they simply stopped viewing them as human beings and then the door was open to nearly anything and everything evil coming out of them. This is a great picture of Total Depravity. How could a human being look into a child's eyes and abuse and kill them? How could a person be so depraved that they no longer felt the prick of their conscience when they killed women and the elderly? The pictures will remain forever in our minds as a haunting reminder. Every one of those people had a story. They were someone's son or someone's daughter. Some mother gave birth to them and some mom and dad raised them. The black and white images of Jewish persecution somehow tend to disconnect us from the reality that they were people like you and me. They felt pain and hunger and sorrow. They felt so much torment of the mind and body.

A side note to this is how they were treated when they were allowed to live. God has always blessed the Jews. They have excessive accomplishments to be such a small nation. Albert Einstein was a Jew and so were many other accomplished people who contributed to society. They always seem to be blessed, and the bitter envy because of it has led to sore crimes against humanity. For centuries Jews were made to wear yellow badges in Europe.

Some Origins of the Marking

Pope Innocent III summoned the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Although a delegation of Jews from southern France attempted to ensure that no anti-Jewish decisions were taken, the Council focused on negative Jewish legislation which would be carried out for centuries and later reinstated by the Nazis. The council determined that the Jews must be prevented from taking excessive interest from Christians. The Jews were not to appear in public at Easter, or on days of Christian lamentation, because they were in the habit of dressing up and railing at Christians on such occasions. Then they insisted that converts to Christianity must desist from Jewish observances. This was a common problem for many Jews, as they knew that God had called them to be unique in the earth through their keeping of the Law. The early Jewish Christians were quite zealous for the Law; though they did not trust it for salvation.

This was not the first time that Jews were ordered to wear a distinguishing badge to indicate that they were Jews. During the first Muslim Conquest, Omar II ordered all Jews and Christians to wear a distinctive badge. Sultan Al-Hakim enforced the rule rigidly. For 500+ years Jews wore special badges on their chests in Christian Europe and later were forced again to wear them by the Nazis.

In England, the badge was in the shape of two tablets. In some communities it was a yellow badge with a red bull's-eye. In Italy, Jews were forced to wear a coarse red cape. French Jews, until their expulsion, wore a red and white circle on their chests.

The most common badge was a circle of yellow cloth, at least a handsbreadth in diameter, which was called the "badge of shame."

Although the law went unenforced during the modern years of enlightenment, Hitler reinstated the order, forcing all Jews to wear a yellow Magen David (shield of David, or as it is more commonly known, the Star of David) on their clothes with the word "Jew" written on it. For that reason, many Jews remain sensitive about a yellow Magen David as decoration. Today the star of David is the emblem on the Israeli National Flag.

Some Yellow Badge Pictures:

<http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/Holocaust/badges.html>

As we continue our study it is my desire to see a heart change in Christians concerning the Jews. That the insensitive jokes about them would be utterly stopped and a grief the likes of which Paul had for the Jewish people would seize upon us. When was the last time we wept over the Jews or any lost souls for that matter? Reading over just a few of the multitude of crimes against the Jews ought to stir the fallow ground of our hearts concerning God's people that he foreknew. Perhaps this study if nothing else will leave us with a contrite heart concerning the very nation of the Jews from which Christ came. They are His kindred according to the flesh. Jesus was a Jew. Paul and Peter were Jews. When we see Jews we ought to think of Christ and desire to show mercy through the Gospel unto them.

God Bless,

-Robert

** Notes**

<http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/Judaism/star.html>

<http://www.us-israel.org/jsource/History/med.html>

http://www.jewishgates.com/file.asp?File_ID=95

Illustrated World Encyclopedia C. 1970

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/13 8:10

The New Covenant

Part I (The Sign of Circumcision)

By Robert Wurtz II

Abrahamic Faith

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

This is Abrahamic faith in a nutshell. We as born again believers are of the true circumcision because we walk in the steps of faithful Abraham which he walked- being yet uncircumcised (Romans 4:9-11). According to Philippians 3:3 this entails worshipping God in the Spirit (which presupposes walking in the Spirit), rejoicing in the finished work of Christ (the promised seed), and having no faith in the flesh (GK. sarx; sin nature of fallen human nature). The Greek word for "confidence" is *peitho* and it is translated in the KJV as agree, assure, believe, have confidence, make friend, obey, persuade, trust, and yield.

Because Abraham trusted or had confidence (*peitho*) in God and not the "flesh" He was called the friend of God (James 2:23). This is how righteousness is imputed to us. It requires that we transfer our confidence and friendship from the flesh (GK. Sarx, Sin Nature) and unto God. When we shift our confidence from the flesh to the promised seed (Jesus Christ; Galatians 3:16) through genuine repentance we become an heir to the righteousness of God which is by faith (Hebrews 11:7).

The 'Seed' was first spoken of to Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden during the pronouncement of judgment upon them (Genesis 3:15; the one seed who shall bruise the head of the serpent; protevangel; see also Romans 16:20). The Promised Seed is the object of our Abraham like faith - to the exclusion of the "flesh" (GK sarx; sinful human nature). Paul refused to TRUST in the "flesh" even when he was able to uphold the law blamelessly (Philippians 3:6). Why? Because "... no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for, The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them (Galatians 3:12-13).

Obedying the ordinances of the law in our own human power is to again TRUST in the "arm of the flesh." So we see the reason that Abraham was given the sign of circumcision as a sign that he had put off trusting in his fallen human nature and had placed his confidence in God and His Christ (Compare Galatians 3:16 and Romans 16:20). This is known as CIRCUMCISION OF THE HEART (Deuteronomy 10:16; Jeremiah 4:4).

Circumcision of the heart must be done or we will not love God. As it is written "... And the LORD thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live (Deuteronomy 30:6). Why? Because the flesh is governed by the LAW OF SIN- which is simply a state in which, because of original sin, it REBELS against anything and everything that God says to do or not to do. It is a knee jerk reaction of the sin nature to rebel against God. It is the very nature of Satan himself.

How could anyone possibly love God and be governed by a "law" (law of sin) that is hostile to and hates God? The law of Moses was added because of transgressions in order to EXPOSE the sin nature in everyone and in turn point them to Christ when they see the utter impossibility of loving and serving God in the "flesh." However, in spite of that, many pridefully made the laws appear to be kept- while Christ continually pointed to the people's sins in their hearts. This the religious people did not like or tolerate very well.

To remain uncircumcised of the TRUST in the sinful human nature (the 'flesh') is to always be resisting to Holy Ghost (Acts 7:51). To have uncircumcised ears is to HEARKEN to the sin nature instead of God (Jeremiah 6:10). Therefore they that are in the "flesh" cannot please God (Romans 8:8). Why? Because to live after the flesh is to TRUST and OBEY the flesh and the result is death (Romans 8:13). There are 2 sides to the "flesh": LICENSE and LEGALISM. Both are characteristics of the sin nature as both are birthed out of pride. License seeks to rebel against all God has commanded and legalism seeks to show God that man can be just as holy as God apart from God.

God gave Abraham the outward sign of Circumcision as a token of the inward work that had taken place when his heart was circumcised of the friendship and trust (Greek *peitho*) in the fallen human nature and was transferred to God (Romans 4:10). Circumcision was given to Abraham after he was already circumcised in heart so that others would see the identification mark that He was a man that trusted the Lord and had no confidence in the flesh.

The reason why Gentiles don't have to be circumcised is because it is an outward token of an inward work of grace performed by God (Deuteronomy 30:6). The "sign" or "token" does nothing for the heart. Many had the outward symbol as did the people who stoned Stephen, but they were uncircumcised in heart AND ears (Acts 7:51).

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/13 11:02

The New Covenant

Part II (The Conscience)

By Robert Wurtz II

This brings us to the New Covenant.

Hebrews 8:10-13 (See also Jeremiah 31:33)

For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord: I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away (Hebrews 8:10-13).

God begins to write HIS laws upon our CIRCUMCISED HEARTS once we are genuinely born again- having trusted Christ with an A'Abrahamic FaithA', that rejects TRUSTING the A'fleshA' (GK Sarx Sin Nature). Once our heart is A'exposedA' with open face (as it were) it can then be changed into the image of Christ from glory to glory by the Spirit of God (II Corinthians 3).

It was a life thing for God to form man out of the dust of the earth; it would prove to be a great work to form Christ in us (Galatians 4:19). This is the true essence of sanctification- that Christ would be fully formed in us.

The writing of the laws of God upon our heart or the changing of our hearts into His image from glory to glory is a process that requires several things to happen. First, we have to deal with our CONSCIENCE. And that, because the end of the commandment is going to be (among other things) a pure conscience. As it is writtenA... Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a GOOD CONSCIENCE, and of faith unfeigned (I Timothy 1:5)A... and againA... Holding faith, and a GOOD CONSCIENCE; which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck (I Timothy 1:19)A... and againA... The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a GOOD CONSCIENCE toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ (I Peter 3:21).

Our CONSCIENCE is that unaffiliated member of our being that God has placed in us to speak on HIS behalf. It is a double or joint knowledge, namely, one of a divine law or rule, and the other of a man's own action. It calls our actions against the laws written upon the heart-- exactly as it sees them.

The conscience in its God given form is used by the Holy Spirit to convict us of sin (John 8:9). It is the mechanism of moral judgment which men/women pass on the morality of his/her own actions, and as to their purity of his/her motives. It is the secret testimony of the soul, whereby it approves things that are good, and condemns those that are evil without partiality. The will of God is the only rule that should immediately bind the conscience. No one has authority over the conscience but God. Man can sear their conscience; but they cannot make it call evil good and good evil.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/13 15:12

The New Covenant

Part III ('States' of the Conscience)

By Robert Wurtz II

The GUILTY conscience is a primary obstacle to us coming to the throne of grace or to do His service (Hebrews 9:9). The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sins- nor did it have the power to PURGE the conscience of its guilt. For this cause of a guilty conscience- people under the Law lived their whole lives in fear of death (Hebrews 2:15). However, we read in Hebrews 9:14A... 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 GodA... and again Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water (Hebrews 10:22).

Of an EVIL conscience there are several kinds. When our conscience has lost its sense of right and wrong to one degree or another this could be called a polluted or defiled conscience. This comes about from false criteria with which the conscience judges. The mechanism may work, but the 'laws' written in the heart may have been non-biblical teachings that should have been 'cast down' as they exalted themselves against the knowledge of God. The conscience is A'evilA' when it gives either none or a false testimony as to past or present actions. Likewise, when reflecting upon our own sin and wickedness, our conscience feels no pain, it is EVIL, and said to be seared or hardened (I Timothy 4:2). This is caused by our deliberate quenching of it when the Spirit of God would seek to bring correction to our life. A A'dullA' spot develops in the area that the conscience is continually quenched or seared. It is also EVIL when, during the commission of sin(s), it remains silent.

A GOOD conscience is one that has been purged by the blood of Christ and is utilizing the laws of God written upon our hearts BY GOD as a reference point for its moral decisions. Everyone is born with certain A'defaultA' laws upon our hearts in so much as to render every human being who ever lived as guilty before God for their sins (Romans 1:28). Moreover, the process of writing the laws upon our hearts is demonstrated to the circumcision by Paul concerning the Gentiles. As it is writtenA... For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another. In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel. (Romans 2:14-16). So we see then that the rulings of our conscience will be front and center even in the judgment.

A WEAK conscience is one in which there are residual rules and regulations of men that have nothing to do with God, but yet are present in the heart and are used by the conscience to make ruling for good or evil. This is seen in great detail in Romans 14. As it is writtenA... Accept him whose faith is weak, without passing judgment on disputable matters. One man's faith allows him to eat everything, but another man, whose faith is weak, eats only vegetables. The man who eats everything must not look down on him who does not, and the man who does not eat everything must not condemn the man who does, for God has accepted him. Who are you to judge someone else's servant? To his own master he stands or falls. And he will stand, for the Lord is able to make him stand (NIV).

This is true in all sorts of disputable matters. The issue is, does the person have a pure biblical justification in their conscience for what they are doing. If so then they are acting in faith. If a person believes that what they are about to do is sin it is sin unto them (Romans 14:23). Why, because they cannot do it in a pure conscience.

This is not to say that God has a different set of rules for everyone because He does not. The issue has to do with our growth and having been built up in the knowledge of Christ (Ephesians 4:13). It takes time for God to erase things like "old wives fables" and "legalistic laws" and add HIS LAW in their place. There are also times when we may be vulnerable to certain sins and the Holy Spirit will CONVICT us to stay away from the things that make us fall.

We have a lot of traditions as did the Pharisees that make the Word of God of no effect (Matthew 15:3). And that because we use a lot of "taste not, touch not, and handle not" teachings exist that have cropped up in the last 200 years. As it is written... Therefore, if you died with Christ from the basic principles of the world, why, as though living in the world, do you subject yourselves to regulations -- "Do not touch, do not taste, do not handle," which all concern things which perish with the using -- according to the commandments and doctrines of men? These things indeed have an appearance of wisdom in self-imposed religion, false humility, and neglect of the body, but are of no value against the indulgence of the flesh (Colossians 2:22,23 NKJV). Change comes when we prayerfully spend time in God's Word seeking to know the truth of God.

Many people believe a lot of legalistic things that they have been taught or has been passed down from their families that are unbiblical; God will correct these wrongs in our conscience as the Holy Spirit (our teacher) leads us into all truth. And when this happens we may feel at liberty to do certain things that we once viewed as sin or we may feel convicted to stop doing something we once thought alright; however, we must use great caution here as not to be using liberty as an occasion to the flesh or legalism as a means of our Christian expression. Some people get 'revived' or 'on-fire' and become very critical in an unhelpful way. This is different than feeling a sorrow for the spiritual state of the Church, etc. which is normal behavior of a true believer when things are unChristlike. License and legalism are the two enemies of the true Christian life.

On Liberty:

As it is written... For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another (Galatians 5:13). It is possible to do things that other Christians view as sin and cause them to stumble in the faith. As it is also written... Therefore let us not judge one another anymore, but rather resolve this, not to put a stumbling block or a cause to fall in our brother's way. I know and am convinced by the Lord Jesus that there is nothing unclean of itself, but to him who considers anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean. Yet if your brother is grieved because of your food, you are no longer walking in love. Do not destroy with your food the one for whom Christ died (Romans 14:13-15). So then the summation of these things is found in Romans 14:21-23A... It is good neither to eat meat nor drink wine nor do anything by which your brother stumbles or is offended or is made weak. Do you have faith? Have it to yourself before God. Happy is he who does not condemn himself in what he approves. But he who doubts is condemned if he eats, because he does not eat from faith; for whatever is not from faith is sin (NKJV).

The end of the commandment is to love God with all our soul, mind, and strength and our neighbor as ourselves. If we are not attaining to this end we need to reevaluate what we are doing in our relationship with God.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/14 15:49

ESTABLISHING THE LAW

(On Judaizing and Antinomianism)

By Robert Wurtz II

One of the hardest things it seemed for many of the circumcision to understand during the first century is how that a Gentile could "establish" the law without being UNDER the law. It is a understanding of the TRUE gospel that frees us from the Old Covenant and all of its carnal ordinances that were imposed on the people until the time of reformation. The goal with the Old Covenant was not to bring about righteousness or help the righteous; it was to expose sins in the unrighteous. That would include all of us.

Upon seeing our sin we would then turn to the New Covenant which saves us from the wrath of the Old Covenant or the general wrath of God that is revealed against all who hold the truth in unrighteousness (Romans 1:18); and in turn establish in us a new nature after the very nature of God (John 3:3).

His Seed Remaineth In Him

I John 3:3-10 tells us plainly that those who are born of God are manifest by the fact that they live righteous lives that are characterized by purification of our hearts- which extends outward; and in turn, perfects our love for God and one another. To those things scripture tells us; there is no law against. As it is written... "But the Fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, Meekness, temperance, against such there is no law" (Galatians 5:22, 23). This requires that we walk in the Spirit- which is the topic of our next study.

Judaizer

A 'Judaizer' can be defined as a person who insisted that Gentiles keep the Law of Moses in order to maintain fellowship with Jewish believers. This belief was not uncommon among the early Church as the Jews who accepted Christ continued to keep the law and many were in fact zealous of the law (Acts 21:20). They followed the teaching of Christ who stated... "Do not suppose that I am come to destroy the Law, or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. But, whoever shall do them and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 5:17, 19). As time went on and a clear understanding and balance came to the Church- it was not long until many began to believe they were under no law at all. Paul address this in Romans 6:1 & 15, etc..

Antinomian

The belief that Christians are under no requirements before God concerning law is called ANTINOMINIANISM. Antinomianism is the heretical doctrine that Christians are exempt from all the obligations of moral law. The term first came into use at the, when it was employed by Martin Luther to designate the teachings of Johannes Agricola and his secretaries, who, pushing a mistaken and perverted interpretation of the Reformer's doctrine of justification by faith alone (sola-feday) to a far-reaching but logical conclusion, asserted that, as good works do not promote salvation, so neither do evil works hinder it; and, as all Christians are necessarily sanctified by their very vocation and profession, so as justified Christians, they are incapable of losing their spiritual holiness, justification, and final salvation by any act of disobedience to, or even by any direct violation of the law of God.

The concept of antinomianism is not new as Paul battled it with the notorious question in scripture "Shall we sin that grace may abound? And like questions" Paul continued in discussing what Christ taught saying... "Do we then make th

the Law void through faith? May it never be! Rather, we establish the Law" (Romans 3:31). The fact is, it is impossible to establish the law under the Old Covenant as it was helpless to anything more than cause a person's sin nature to rise up. It contained many carnal ordinances imposed upon the people until the time of reformation (Hebrews 9:10). The New covenant was brought about to accomplish the goals of the Old Covenant in establishing God's personality in our hearts that we might be Pure from the heart.

God Bless,
-Robert

Some additional notes and Scriptures from various sources:

Johannes Agricola (1494-1566) was a Protestant theologian and friend of Luther who fell into the latter's disfavor for developing a version of antinomianism. He saw insistence on the Law -- for example the Ten Commandments (aka the "Decalog") -- as a case of the Catholic emphasis on good works. "The Decalog belongs in the courthouse, not the pulpit.... To the gallows with Moses!" he once declared. Following Luther's treatise "Against the Antinomians" (1536), Agricola eventually recanted, but the position he gave up has repeatedly been taken up by minority voices

Titus 1:14 Not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men, that turn from the truth. I Timothy 1:4 Neither give heed to fables and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying which is in faith: so do

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/15 6:43

Robert writes God gave Abraham the outward sign of Circumcision as a token of the inward work that had taken place when his heart was circumcised of the friendship and trust (Greek peitho) in the fallen human nature and was transferred to God (Romans 4:10). Circumcision was given to Abraham after he was already circumcised in heart so that others would see the identification mark that He was a man that trusted the Lord and had no confidence in the flesh.

If this is true, why were Isaac and Ishmael and the whole of Abraham's household circumcised at the same time as Abraham? And why were Hebrew males circumcised as infants? And why did God threaten to kill Moses because Moses' sons had not been circumcised?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/15 10:40

Whose Praise Is Not Of Men

Hello Bro Ron,

Great question! Paul answers this in Romans 4:9-12 saying:

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. 10 How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. 11 And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: 12 And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.

Simply being circumcised; whether it were Isaac or Ishmael or anyone else did not guarantee the person salvation- though God may have commanded it. I think that Abraham understood what the significance of the sign of circumcision was and passed that meaning on to his children. They personally had to choose if they would "walk in the steps of faithful Abraham" their father. If they did they were of the true circumcision- if they did not keep the covenant it was empty of its significance and their circumcision became "uncircumcision". In demonstration that the people were actually uncircumcised in heart and ears- God added the law to expose the sin nature as the ruler of their lives-- as opposed to Abraham who placed His trust-- not in the 'flesh' but in God and His promised Seed (which was Christ).

For us as Gentiles we read... In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ (Colossians 2:11-13).

In answer to the question I think that it is good to bring it up as the Jews in the time of Jesus believed they were guaranteed salvation by virtue of "birthright." This is the origin of the whole issue of ELECTION. God later told the Gentiles throu

gh Paul in Ephesians 1 that they were also ordained from the foundation of the world that we should be holy and without blame before Him in love; having predestinated us... etc. That predestination or election is in Christ. (Not that I want to discuss that). If you are circumcised or uncircumcised and "In Christ" you are predestined. If you are uncircumcised or circumcised and NOT in Christ you are damned. From here we move on to adoption which you did quite well teaching in section 4 of your series.

Abraham's sons were not saved because they were circumcised of their foreskin. As it is written... "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing; but the keeping of the commandments of God" (1 Corinthians 7:19).

Jesus said it more plainly when he told the people not to think it a great thing that they were children of Abraham; for God was able of the rocks on the ground to raise up Children unto Abraham (my paraphrase). Paul expands on this in Romans 2:25-29 saying... For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. 26 Therefore if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? 27 And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? 28 For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: 29 But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.

Stephen preached to the Jewish religious leaders that they were uncircumcised in heart and ears and always resisted the Holy Spirit. That is a clear indication that though they were circumcised the 8th day of the stock of Israel they had nowhere to glory- for righteousness does not come by these things- but by submission to the Holy Spirit to regeneration and the circumcision of the "sin nature" with the circumcision made WITHOUT hands- through faith in Christ and His finished work (sola fedy). Can a man trust both God and the flesh (sin) at the same time? No; as no man can serve two masters. To turn ones faith from the flesh and sin to Christ and His righteousness encapsulates repentance. Paul said that if any one had wherein to trust in the "flesh" He had more. So we see again that the "fles" is flesh whether is in legalism or license. The issue is walking in the Spirit so that we are not under the Law.

Much more could be said to expand on this topic. I hope this is enough to clarify the issue. I don't want to overlyrealize all that was available to Abraham before the cross- but I do believe that for those who had abrahamic like faith they circumcised their children in faith believing that through training them up in the way they should go they would walk in like faith before God and be saved. The just have ALWAYS lived by faith. When there is a trust in the flesh- God has to introduce law to expose where the trust is being placed. This is a great mystery, but God has revealed it to us in the New Testament to a great extent.

I guess it was no different that God threatening the people to kill them if they did not keep the Sabbath. it demonstrates how severe the law is when a person refuses to be justified by faith.

*** Edit Further Clarification***

The token was originally made between God and Abraham.

Genesis 17:11 and ye have circumcised the flesh of your foreskin, and it hath become a token of a covenant between Me and you.

However, in time it became a symbol that the Jews would look for to determine where they stood with God. Paul circumcised Timothy to keep him from being rejected by the circumcision. I am not condoning the practice of determining that circumcision of the foreskin be the determining factor in a person being in or out as far as the circumcision was concerned. I am only pointing out that it was a definite issue and practice among the Jews.

In time though, even under the law the prophets would tell the people of their need to circumcise their hearts- though they did not cease the practice of circumcision of the flesh.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/4/15 16:01

Hi Robert

I think that circumcision for Abraham and all that was his was more 'elemental'. A brand in his flesh that he belonged to God, as did all that was his. As such it is a symbolic statement of 'no confidence in the flesh', meaning that God's purposes, particularly in the raising of the promised seed, could never be realised by man's energies. Not primarily because the flesh is evil (this is Hebrew thought-patterns we are touching) but that it was 'weak' (unable).

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/15 16:23

Thanks Brother. Now it is starting to come together even better. When you said that I immediately related it to the "seal" (GK. Sphragis) of the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 1) which enables us (through the Holy Spirit) to do all things through Christ who strengthens us. Instead then of having the sign of circumcision (for those who would not) they have "this seal" -- the Lord knoweth them that are His (Ephesians 1:13, 4:30; II Corinthians 1:22; II Timothy 2:19).

I don't know why, but I never really thought of it that way. You may have circumcision, but do you have the 'seal' (the Holy Spirit). I understand that part; but I just never put it together. We have "no confidence in the flesh" we are "empowered by the Holy Spirit."

That is a tremendous means of dealing with a person who does not believe in Original Sin. We still would have to convince them though that they were sinners (that is the Holy Spirit's job I know). But we would need a message or an answer on that.

Another piece in this puzzle! Praise God!

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/17 16:11

WALKING IN THE SPIRIT

Introduction

By Robert Wurtz II

Since the beginning, God's Holy Spirit has been striving with man to see them brought to repentance. We read in Genesis 6:3... Then the LORD said, "My Spirit will not put up with humans for such a long time, for they are only mortal flesh. In the future, they will live no more than 120 years." (NLT)

The religious leaders in power after the resurrection of Christ were recipients of the message of Stephen who told them they do always resist the Holy Spirit, as their fathers did, so did they (Acts 7:51). They went so far in resisting God that they likewise killed the prophets. As it is written... O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. (Matthew 23:37,38 KJV)

The greatest key to living a victorious life is our willingness to accept the free gift of the fullness of the Holy Spirit. The reason people refuse to be full is because they refuse to surrender control. Who do you want in control? You or God?

God used several different analogies to demonstrate this in His word. Perhaps one of the great Old Testament examples is Ezekiel 36:27... And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. KJV The New Testament uses a similar passage saying... For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure (Philippians 2:13).

The Coming of the Paraclete

In John 14:16 we read: "I will pray the Father, and he will give you another Comforter, that he may be abide with you for ever, even the spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him"... And again in I Corinthians 6:19... "What! Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God?"

Old Testament Example

In Leviticus 26:12 we read... 'I will walk among you and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.'

Standing in the Power of God

My message and my preaching were not with wise and persuasive words, but with a demonstration of the Spirit's power, so that your faith might not rest on men's wisdom, but on God's power. (I Corinthians 2:2-5 NIV) Paul tells us plainly that man's wisdom is impotent to try to energize us to sustain us in our Christian lives.

When a person is "Full of the Holy Spirit" they are energized by the dynamis of God. Walking in the Spirit will keep a person from fulfilling the lusts of the flesh. As it is written... This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. 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. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. (Galatians 5:16-18)

This is the great struggle with Christians. Every man is tempted when he/she is drawn away of their own lust and enticed

(James 1:14). This is the lust of the flesh that is lusting (a desire that seeks to take control) against the Spirit. This lust is revealed to be of sin in that Paul said he had not known 'lust' except the law had said "thou shalt not covet." This is one of the Ten Commandments. 'Lust' is a strong desire that seeks to control a person.

When we begin to 'drift away' from God and we cease in our efforts to be "full" of the Holy Spirit, an authority vacuum begins to form. The 'flesh' will seize the opportunity to try and take control- if but for a moment. This is why we must be FILLED with the Holy Spirit (Ephesians 5:18). This is why we must not quench the Holy Spirit. (1 Thessalonians 5:19) Quenching the Spirit starts us down a path to grieving the Holy Spirit. Do you go into temptations against the strivings of the Holy Spirit in your conscience? Then you are quenching and grieving the Holy Spirit. When He sees us heading towards temptation, He warns us by pricking us in the heart (Acts 2:37). In this way He will lead us into all truth (John 16:13). If we cooperate in this leading of the Spirit we are not under the law. In our next study we will look at how a person can place him/herself at a great disadvantage in the fight against sin (the good fight of faith) by "sowing to the flesh" or by ignoring the mandate to be filled with the Spirit. The outcome of the battle is greatly determined by these two factors. Do you sow to the flesh? Do you seek to be filled with the Spirit? If you can answer yes to those two Christians the chances are great that you will have victory in your Christian life; if you answer NO to either of them you are likely struggling with sin and in a "sin-ask forgiveness" - "sin-ask forgiveness" state of Christianity.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/19 16:12

WALKING IN THE SPIRIT

Part 2 (Don't Sow to the Flesh)

By Robert Wurtz II

The tendency among some is to believe that the only solution for getting people to live righteously is to place them under a 'law.' When we see this an understanding of walking in the Spirit must again be taught.

It is impossible to do with the law (Old Covenant) what only being dead to the 'law of sin' can do. The law was weak through the flesh because it only has the power to revive rebellion in our hearts against God. You can't die to the law of Moses unless you likewise die to the 'law of sin.' If you are in the 'flesh' you come under the law- but if you walk in the Spirit you are free from the law.

If we submit ourselves to God and turn to trust in Him in genuine repentance- we will be born again. The 'old man' is dead as is signified by baptism and buried with Christ. We come out of the water to walk with Christ (as it were) in the power of His resurrection- knowing Him also in the fellowship of His sufferings. When we do these things we have not destroyed the law- but we fulfill it and establish it.

OBSTACLES TO WALKING IN THE SPIRIT

The following are not legalistic 'laws' to impose on oneself, but are biblical methods to advise us in our control of the flesh.

"I Can Handle It?"

I heard the story once that a man who was once an alcoholic wanted to show the devil after he was born again that he could 'handle' the bottle now. So, he carried a bottle of whiskey in his back pocket as a show of strength. "I'm going to show the devil I'm stronger than this bottle." Well, you guessed it, it wasn't long until the top was popped on the bottle!

Whether that story was ever real or a parable, a lot of Christians do the exact same thing in their lives. They think they can show the devil that they can handle certain things that have always been a stumbling block to them. This is not a show of strength; it is utter foolishness. If you make provision for the flesh to fulfill its lusts- the flesh will take what you give it.

We are warned in Hebrews to do two things:

- 1) Lay aside EVERY weight
- 2) Exercise your senses to discern good from evil

LAY ASIDE EVERY WEIGHT

If there are two things defeated Christians do it is to refuse to lay aside weights. They know the need to throw their VCR, DVD player, or Internet service into the trash and won't do it. Some may not need to, but others know they need to. They know they need to trash their wine collection and won't do that either. Or they may know they need to stop calling that certain friend who is a serious hindrance; but again, they find an excuse (as with the other weights) to keep calling them (or keeping the weights around).

If you are allowing stepping stones to exist in your life you know that you will walk that path in a time of weakness! When you are hungry, angry, lonely or tired- you are VULNERABLE to the flesh (C. Stanley h.a.l.t.). Having some BIG gaps back to you sins allows God time to provide a way to escape. When you have your sin beside your bed or in the 'fridge' it is kind of hard to maintain victory. The devil wants you to be able to sin SO QUICK that you have already sinned before your conscience can kick in.

These are your BESETTING sins I am referring to. True Christians have a general HATRED of sin. Sometimes strongholds still exist and have to be dealt with. It is foolish to try to tempt yourself by making all kind of provisions for the flesh. Blessed is the man that condemneth not himself (herself) in the thing that he/she alloweth.

EXERCISE YOUR SENSES

Nothing sows to the flesh like allowing instruments of sin in our homes and then we activate them like a seed spreader sowing seeds to the flesh. Before long the flesh rises up into a GIANT and we feel helpless to do anything. Our appetite for sin increases and our appetite for God decreases. Can this happen to Christians? Sure! That is why Paul said he had to bring his body into subjection (literally in Greek... punch his flesh under the eye) lest when he preached to others he himself would be disqualified (adokimos). Control your senses. Control what goes in your eyes and ears and mouth, etc.

Exercise your senses to discern good and evil and you will better control your tongue to speak good and not evil. Your tongue gives you the print out of the inside of your heart. What comes out of my mouth?

Talking about sin in a nonproductive and helpful way is dangerous! Talking suggestively with little catch slang or nasty talk is very dangerous. The tongue is the rudder that is guiding the ship. Control the senses and control the tongue.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/20 17:02

THE HEIRS

(A Brief Look at Church Leaders Before 135 CE)

Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

According to Dr. Ron Moseley of the American Institute for Holy Land Studies, the first fifteen bishops (presidents) of the Church at Jerusalem were relatives of Jesus. All of whom are of Hebrew descent, and according to Eusebius "was A" to have received the knowledge of Christ in purity, so that they were approved by those who were able to judge of such matters, and were deemed worthy of the episcopate."

The entire Church prior to Acts chapter 10 was comprised of believing Jews who also kept the law (the Nazarenes). The first, then, was James, the half brother of the Lord; the second, Simeon; the third, Justus; the fourth, Zacchaeus; the fifth, Tobias; the sixth, Benjamin; the seventh, John; the eighth, Matthias; the ninth, Philip; the tenth, Seneca; the eleventh, Justus; the twelfth, Levi; the thirteenth, Ephrem; the fourteenth, Joseph; and finally, the fifteenth, Jude. These are the bishops of Jerusalem that lived between the age of the apostles and the Bar Kochba Revolt (135 CE). After the death of James the half brother of Christ we see the dynastic succession of the Jerusalem Church. Only relatives of Jesus (termed de sposynoi, or "the heirs") were appointed to the bishop (president) position.

After 135 CE and the Bar Kochba revolt the Jews were banished from Jerusalem and the city was renamed Aelia Capitolina. The Jews were forced to leave for 100 years. During this time the Church was turned over into the hands of non-Jews and the quest to rid the Church of all things Jewish began. The first non-Jewish leader of the Church was Mark. This was nearly the middle of the second century.

The Church would meet from house to house while James was still alive and James chaired the first Church council meeting in Acts 15. This meant two things: 1) that there was definite leadership in the early Church and 2) the Church would fellowship in their own houses. They would likewise find themselves worshipping in the synagogues as Jesus said that they would be beaten in those synagogues (as they were). Paul always preached in synagogues when he could. When the division finally came the Jewish Christians scattered to the Mountains of Pella. Once the birkat ha minim curse was devised at Yavneh (Jamnia) the separation between the circumcision and the believing Jews (Nazarenes) was inevitable. When the split between the Jews and the Synagogue had taken place and the Temple was destroyed the church began drifting towards Rome. Much persecution was happening in the Roman world against Christians also. The question in our day- which is one only God knows is A... what does God want the Bride to look like? Does He want it to look like the early Church pre 70 CE? As we continue in our discussions it is interesting to note that some see a return to the A"book of Acts" style Church to also include Messianic Jews in leadership- as they were in the book of Acts in Jerusalem. Although there were many non-Jews in the Church outside of Rome it can be argued that they were all in submission to Jerusalem as is evident in Acts 15.

God Bless,

-Robert

*** Notes***

Eusebius History of the Church (HE 4:5:3-4; 5:12:1-2)

Moseley, Ron. "Yeshua" A guide TO The Real Jesus And The Original Church. Ebed Publications c 1996

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/4/21 13:11

One "Yachid" or One "Echad"

(A Brief Look at The Trinity)

Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

Eloiyim is a plural noun. When we recognize that the Shema tells us that God is ONE we may understand God to be a plural unity when we know the meaning of A"echad.A". The Shema reads:

Shmai Yisrael Adonai Eloheynu Adonai Echad.

Hear OÂ' Israel the Lord your God is ONE.

The Hebrew language has two words that can be translated "ONE": echad and yachid. Whereas yachid (yah-keed) refers to the number one (i.e., absolute unity), echad (ek-kawd) refers to a composite unity. An example of this is in the book of Genesis chapter 2, verse 24, where it says that a couple joined together in marriage shall become one flesh. Since the Shema uses the word echad, not yachid, it is reasonable to say that God's essence or nature is that of a composite unity.

Echad:

Jesus teaches us that His desire is that believers be A"echadA" (plural unity) even as He and the Father are A"oneA" (plural unity). In his prayer found in John 17, Jesus prays, "... A"that they may be one, as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one, in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (vs. 21) The manifestation of this echad, this binding together in unity, should result in love for the Lord and for each other. "That the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them." (vs. 26) Jesus is our example of echad with God. If a person says that he is echad with God but does not manifest love, then by definition, echad could not exist. To be one with each other we must walk in step with God and His will. To do this we must walk in the power and influence of the Holy Spirit.

Eloiyim:

It is not sufficient to say that the term Eloyim simply means the plurality of God's greatness and majesty as it forms a bias against the clear biblical teaching that God exists as one substance and 3 persons. This issue that we would have trouble with is understanding unity in the sense that the Godhead is in absolute one mind and one accord. This is where our understanding of what Jesus meant when He prayed that we would be "one", even as He and the Father are "one". When we say God is three persons we do not mean the "three headed god" concept that is often thrust upon the doctrine, but a triunity of persons that exist in perfect harmony.

Gary Hedrick writes: "Each Person of the Godhead was in eternal fellowship with the other two Persons before the world was created. All three were actively involved in the Creation: the Father (Genesis 1:1), the Son (John 1:1; Colossians 1:16), and the Ruach Hakodesh, or Holy spirit (Genesis 1:2).

For centuries, the rabbis have struggled with Genesis 1:26, where God says, "... Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: The plural noun Elohim (God), used in conjunction with the plural pronouns "us" and "our," argues persuasively for the existence of a plurality within the Godhead.

But doesn't the idea of divine plurality contradict the Jewish Shema, which declares that "... The LORD our God is one LORD" (Deut. 6:4)? Not when we realize that the Hebrew word echad (one) is often used to designate a compound unity rather than a simple unity. Note that the same word is used in Genesis 2:24 when Adam and Eve were married and became *basar echad*, or "one flesh." This is not intended to be an exhaustive study but will serve to introduce you to some of the issues from a Messianic Jewish viewpoint.

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes:

Gary Hedrick "Seven Things God Was Doing Before Genesis 1:1"

<http://www.cjf.org/pages/7things.htm>

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/5/6 15:55

Ritual Immersion

(The Origin of Christian Baptism)

Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

Many thousands of people have died over the issue of water baptism. It is not my intent to further such strife within the Church. With great reluctance I wish to consider baptism as it was formerly known as 'ritual immersion'.

The Innovation for Novation (the Origin of 'Clinical Baptism')

Pope Cornelius I wrote that as Novation was about to die, "he received baptism in the bed where he lay, by pouring" (Letter to Fabius of Antioch; cited in Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, 6:4311). Dr. Roy Blizzard writes, "From the beginning, baptism had been by immersion for the remission of sins. Novation, at an adult age, grew sick. Nigh unto death, he called for baptism. He received only clinical baptism by sprinkling, only on the condition that, if he got well, he would be properly baptized. Following his recovery, he was ordained to the priesthood and rose to the highest rank in the Roman clergy. The controversy arose over whether one unscripturally baptized could attain to such an office." N.H. Pius in his book "An Outline of Baptist History" writes... "Having raised baptism to a sacrament, it was but natural that these church authorities should insist upon baptism under all conditions. So that when immersion in water was not possible, some form as near to immersion as possible was to be administered. While there would be no baptism without immersion, they felt that something must be done, hence, when there was not sufficient water in which to immerse, they poured water upon the head. Now as baptism had been vitiated as to its fundamental principle, other innovations soon followed. In the third century we find the introduction of clinic baptism (from *kline*, a couch), the baptism of sick persons confined to their beds. Of this Cramp says: "It was not Baptism, properly so-called, as they were only sprinkled with water or had water poured on them. The reason alleged for this departure from apostolic practice was the necessity of baptism to the salvation of the soul, and the consequent danger of depriving it, lest the sickness should terminate in death. Thus one error led to another. If those clinics recovered they were not baptized afterwards, but they were not admitted to the ministry. Novation, however, was an exception to the rule. He had been sprinkled or received a pouring on his head, when his dissolution was hourly expected. After his recovery, his eminent qualifications for the ministry induced the churches to deviate from the established custom, and he was ordained." ANY exception to a law soon become THE law as has been found in many cases throughout history and practical life. Sprinkling was sanctioned by the Church at the council of Ravenna in 1311 C.E. and the choice was offered between sprinkling and immersion.

History of the Jewish Mikveh

The term mikveh in Hebrew literally means any gathering of waters, but is specifically used in Jewish law for the waters or bath for the ritual immersion. The building of the mikveh was so important in ancient times it was said to take precedence over the construction of a synagogue. Immersion was so important that it occurred before the high Priest conducted the service on the Day of Atonement, before the regular priests participated in the Temple service, before each person entered the Temple complex, before a scribe wrote the name of God, as well as several other occasions.

Josephus tells us that even during the years of war (66-73 A.D.) the laws of ritual immersion were strictly adhered to (Josephus Wars, 4:2:05).

Immersion was required for both men and women when converting to Judaism. There were three prerequisites for a proselyte coming into Judaism: Circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice (Maimonides, Hilkh. Iss. Biah xiii. 5). Immersion was required after a woman has her monthly cycle (Leviticus 15:28). This quite possibly was what was happening with Bathsheba when David saw her. The timing of the pregnancy concurs with such a proposition. Immersion was also required for pots and eating utensils manufactured by a non-Jew (Encyclopedia of Jewish Religion p-263).

The Water Restrictions

There were basic restrictions on the water used in the mikveh including such rules as:

(1) the mikveh can not contain other liquid besides water, (2) The water has to be either built into the ground or be an integral part of a building attached to the ground. (3) The mikveh cannot be flowing except for a natural spring, river or ocean. (4) The water can not be manually drawn. (5) The water cannot be channeled to the mikveh by anything unclean. (6)

The mikveh must contain at least 40 sa'ah or approximately 200 gallons of water.

The term sa'ah is an ancient Biblical measurement equivalent to approximately five gallons. All six requirements come from the original Hebrew words found in Leviticus 11:36. Rabbi Yitzchok ben Sheshes said the amount of 40 sa'ah was derived from the idea that the largest normal human body has a volume of 20 sa'ah, therefore the amount of water needed to "nullify" this body is double this amount or 40 sa'ah.

Why Be Immersed?

To the ancient Jew, the mikveh was a process of spiritual purification and cleansing, especially in relation to the various types of Turmah or ritual defilement when the Temple was in use. Although God has not revealed all the meaning of the mikveh, it is obvious because of the amount of space given to it in Scripture, and the effort of Jesus to fulfill it, the command is of utmost importance.

How Immersion Was Done

Jewish baptism has never been taken lightly, but in ancient times immersion was to be performed in the presence of witnesses (Yebam. 47b). The person being baptized made special preparations by cutting his nails, undressed completely, and made a fresh profession of his faith before the designated "fathers of the baptism" (Kethub. 11a; Erub 15a). The individual stood straight up with the feet spread and the hands held out in front. The candidate would totally immerse themselves by squatting in the water with a witness or baptizer doing the officiating. Note the New Testament points out the fact that Jesus came up straightway out of the water (Matthew 3:16).

The earliest drawing of Christian baptism was found on the wall of a Roman catacomb in the second century showing John standing on the bank of the Jordan helping Jesus back to shore after self-immersion.

Ancient sages teach that the word mikveh has the same letters as Ko(v)Meh, the Hebrew word for "rising" or "standing tall," therefore we see the idea of being baptized "straightway."

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes:

Ron Moseley; Lecture notes from Arkansas Institute for Holy Land Studies (Jewish Culture, History of the Church, Jewish Roots).

Dr. Ron Moseley "Yeshua" A Guide to the Real Jesus and the Original Church: Ebed publications C. 1996

Josephus Works "Wars of the Jews"

Dr. Roy Blizzard; "Heresies, Controversies, and Schisms in the Early Church" Part II

<http://docsouth.unc.edu/church/pius/pius.html>

http://www.catholic.com/library/Baptism_Immersion_Only.asp

Re: Ritual Immersion - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/5/7 4:17

Robert

thank you for this comprehensive introduction to Novation's innovation etc. I have been chatting with Jeremy regarding the Didache. This non-bible book is fascinating and gives a wonderful glimpse into life at the end of the 1st century. It seems to be much earlier than Ignatius in its church government, hence my statement that it is late-1st century.

The Didache (paragraph 174:7) has some instructions regarding baptism; that it was to be performed "in running water, But if you have no running water, then baptize in some other water; and if you are not able to baptize in cold water, then do so in warm. But if you have neither, then pour water on the head three times..."

The Greek for 'running water' is literally 'living water' an original Hebrew idiom. I can't help but link it to the Lord's words to the Samaritan woman. The pouring three times appears to be the earliest reference to the Christian use of a mode of baptism other than immersion. In my imagination I see condemned prisoners being 'baptized' in such a way. It was only valid when 'proper baptism' was unavailable.

Edersheim, in the Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah has some valuable details on Jewish baptism of Proselytes that is also very instructive and clearly, full immersion.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/5/7 8:33

Bro Ron,

That is a great resource you have there (Didache). I have heard of people being baptized in bathtubs (somehow).

At the Jewish Roots Institute there was a lot of talk about ritual immersion. The topic seemed to come up all the time. I have seen lots of photos of modern excavations that show the mikveh as part of the peoples homes and how the rain troughs would fill them up. I don't know why it seemed to be such a big deal to them- but finding them seemed to be a sort of vindication of sorts (?). Some even contend that Bathsheeba had a mikveh and it was there where David saw her. They kind of look like the foundation of a house but a lot smaller. The people were said to dip themselves straight down into the water and come back up under their own power. They call John the Baptist "Yohannan the Immerser."

Its all interesting. Personally I always approach baptism from a different angle. I believe we should be immersed; at the river if ones around, but where ever you can find enough water to do it.

My view is thus:

Jesus said "My MEAT (nourishment) is to do the WILL of Him that sent me." And in another place He said "I have meat to eat that you know not of."

He told us "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled." That person who hungers and thirsts for righteousness is a person BORN of the Spirit. New born babies don't have to be begged to eat. They come out wanting something to eat and we best have it or its going to be a long night! (My 6 children all did at least). The milk of God's word are the simple things that are fit for a babe in Christ. What could be more 'simple' than to give a command "be immersed in water" in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? Anyone no matter how much you know about God can do that simple thing.

The baptism of Christ is different from John's baptism- (Christ's baptism, as I see it is baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus). They can call the name of Christ also if they want- but everything we do (as Spirit Full believers) we are doing as unto Christ and in His name as His ambassadors anyway. The 'Jesus name only' (UPC) group miss this as a distinction between John's and Christ's baptism and baptise in "Jesus name only." They forget that there was only about 2 months or so between Mark 16 and Acts 2. The formula for baptism don't change in 2 months I suggest.

So then, baby is born and it desires to do the WILL of the Father because of their new nature. It used to be their "meat" to sin against God- now it is their "meat" to do the will of Him of whom they are born of. The first drops of milk (as it were) is to HEAR the commandment of baptism and then be a doer of the work. Not when they hear, but when their new nature desires to straitway obey (be a doer of) this command it is evidence of their regeneration. Phillip straitway baptized the Ethiopian Eunuch (the Messianics say he was not a Eunuch, but anyway), BECAUSE he says something like "There's some water, lets do it NOW." Phillip then left and He went by tradition and helped establish (along with Mark) the work in Alexandria Egypt. If he was good enough to go that he desired to OBEY Christ straitway- with an Isaiah scroll in hand he was good to go. That DESIRE allowed Phillip to leave the man to himself. Far different from us having to constantly beg people to obey a lot of times!?

How do we know that the Eunuch was good to go? He had an immediate hunger and thirst to fulfill ALL righteousness- even as Christ. So what I do is- when a person is saved I IMMEDIATELY offer water baptism- if they say YES lets do it- I feel confident that there was conversion- if not, I see no cause to look further as they have no real desire to do what Christ commanded. This is NOT to suggest baptismal regeneration; but I would have to wonder why a person would say NO to that offering of baptism if they believed it was their Lord's will. Some were never offered baptism. What shall we say to them? Do what the Holy Spirit is convicting. I have gone back and done a lot of things that had no real bearing on my salvation. I just wanted to be a doer of the work. It is my MEAT.

God Bless and Best Regards in Christ,

-Robert

<http://www.christianitytoday.com/history/features/ask/2001/sep14.html>

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/5/7 13:54

Robert,

I agree that the biblical precedents concerning baptism within the New Testament indicate that people were mostly baptised immediately when they received Christ as Lord and Saviour.

My church also baptise people as soon as possible, as long as we discern genuine faith. We are sometimes accused by others for holding a doctrine of baptismal regeneration; it is an unfortunate misunderstanding.

I suppose the practice in church history (2nd century and onwards?) of having **catechumens** go through a period of instruction before being accepted to communion has lingered on until even today.

Have you ever read the works of N. T. Wright? His exposition of Paul is superb, especially in finding the connections with Paul's Jewish background and training. I find fresh insights from his books.

Agent001

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/5/7 14:28

Hi Agent 001,

Actually I am not familiar with N.T. Wright other than what I quickly found in a search. I have used the works of David Stern as it pertains to Messianic Jewish Commentary.

The issues of baptism are enormous. There is a whole perspective on the subject from a Messianic point of view that correlates baptism to betrothal to Christ. Woe, if we ever got into that one we would be here a while!

The fear seems to always be that if I get baptized then I'm abandoning sola fide because it is a 'work.' But we must remember it is not the work that saves we are saved unto good works. It is the desire of the regenerated to do God's will. And if Christ was baptized and He was sinless- why would we not do likewise after He has taken away our sins? It seems a lot of baptism issues have been birthed from the vantage point of assuring we are not trying to be saved by 'works." I have a cousin who is so "faith alone" that he believes that to preach repentance is to preach heresy and he tries to build a good case for it. It all stems from a misunderstanding about what is happening.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/6/4 9:09

BLOCK LOGIC

(An Introduction to Hebrew Thought)
Compiled By Robert Wurtz II

Hebrew thought was perhaps the last topic I would have ever expected to really open my eyes as to why so many problems with understanding scripture have developed over the last 2000 years. Every culture has a certain paradigm. The Greeks used a linear logic that flows in steps from premises to a conclusion. Each step linked closely to the next in a coherent, rational, logical fashion. The conclusion is almost always limited to one view- a human beings limited perspective on reality. It takes into account only things that can be understood within the finite minds of the human cranium and stutters and stumbles at realities beyond its comprehension. Man has ever thirsted to understand things too wonderful for him; and in so doing, often grossly limits the true reality of issues by reducing them to the size of his or her own mind. This is why we are told not to lean on our own understanding, but in all our ways acknowledge Him and He will direct our paths. The Angel that announced the birth of Sampson asked the parents, "Why is it that you ask me my name seeing it is beyond your comprehension?" If an angel's name could be beyond our comprehension- why would we continue to reduce the truths of God with the sword of Greek logic? Greek logic is man's attempt to understand something that is spiritually discerned. It is like putting your faith in a strait jacket. John Wesley once remarked concerning unconditional election and God being the author of sin, "A Better would it be to say that it made no sense at all than to say that these passages made a sense such as this." (Paraphrased) But man is not content to say, "It makes no sense at all!" Why? Because pride desires to know things too wonderful for us. We prefer to lean upon the arm of understanding rather than the arm of FAITH.

Do a study on the Jews. You will find that they have the highest amount of accomplished scientists of any other group. Take some facts from science: Did you know that Albert Einstein was a Jew? Did you know about all the Nobel prizes? Their contributions to society to be such a small group are enormous! Could part of it be that while men were thinking Newtonian Physics - the Jewish mind saw a deeper and perhaps wonderful possibility for the building blocks of all creation? While the high school science books were depicting the atom in a Newtonian solar system looking atom- while it was really acting like a wave? Quantum physics took us into the electronics and nuclear age. There comes a point when logic runs out- and you have to step out in faith. Not to say that God is not logical- His logic is too wonderful for our comparatively weak and beggarly models of thinking.

One of the great tragedies of the last 2000 has been the influence of Greek philosophy upon interpretation of scripture. Greek logic falls wildly short of being able to understand God and His word and for this cause when Greek logic is used to understand scripture the reader is filled with all manner of feelings of contradiction. This is one of the great arguments that Messianics have had against the Gentile dominated Church is that they have a Hellenistic view of scripture. Greek logic leaves much to be desired in terms of understanding scripture and tempts man to venture into places that God never intended Him to go. Have you ever wondered why there arose so many heresies in the first 4 centuries? People were trying to understand scripture through the ill equipped framework of Greek logic and all sorts of madness developed.

Block Logic
by DR. Marvin Wilson:

The biblical authors never argue the existence of God; they only assume it. God is not understood philosophically, but functionally. He acts. The Hebrews primarily thought of him pictorially, in terms of personality and activity, not in terms of pure being or in any static sense. That is, to express the divine attribute of love, the Hebrews would normally think in terms of a "loving God" (i.e., a God who loves), rather than a "God is love." Certainly, therefore, the Hebrew mind-set of Bible times would find little or no interest in many of the issues the Church has debated over the centuries. These issues include theoretical arguments for the existence of God, the nature of the Godhead, free will and predestination, the specifics of the life to come, and the precise way in which the divine and human mesh in the inspiration of Scripture.

The Hebrew knew he did not know all the answers. His position was "under the sun" (Eccl. 8:17), so his words were few (5:2). He refused to oversystematize or force harmonization on the enigmas of God's truth or puzzles of the universe. He realized that no one could straighten what God has made crooked (7:13). All things, therefore, did not need to be fully rational. The Hebrew mind was willing to accept the truths taught on both sides of the paradox; it recognized that mystery and apparent contradictions are often signs of the divine. Stated succinctly, the Hebrews knew the wisdom of learning to trust in matters that they could not fully understand.

While philosophical and structural divisions of learning obviously have an important role to play in contemporary education, our Western culture—especially on most levels of secular and Christian instruction—has provided little understanding concerning the nature of Hebrew thought. Thus we have the natural tendency to impose more rational and systematic categories of thought on the Bible. The Bible, however, tends to reject most carefully worked-out charts and thoroughgoing attempts at schema-tization. Neither God nor his Word may be easily contained in a box for logical or scientific analysis. Both God and his Word have a sovereign unpredictability that defies rational, human explanation. The Christian dogmatic tradition has much to learn from the Jewish community at this point.

The Semites of Bible times did not simply think truth—they experienced truth. Truth is as much encounter as it is proposition. This experiential perspective on reality explains, in part, why Judaism never really developed vast systems of thought. It also allows us to understand how Judaism could live with the tensions and paradoxes surrounding block logic. To the Jew, the deed was always more important than the creed. He was not stymied by language that appeared contradictory from a human point of view. Neither did he feel compelled to reconcile what seemed irreconcilable. He believed that God ultimately was greater than any human attempt at systematizing truth. "Walking in the truth" (2 John 4) and "living the truth" (1 John 1:6) were a higher priority than rationally analyzing the truth.

Wilson, Marvin "Our Father Abraham" c. 1989 Eerdmans

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/6/4 10:20

O the nuggets you find around here!

One of these days I am going to get caught up on this whole thread, but I just had to respond to these comments:

Quote:
-----Jesus said "My MEAT (nourishment) is to do the WILL of Him that sent me." And in another place He said "I have meat to eat that you know not of."

Quote:
-----He told us "Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after righteousness for they shall be filled." That person who hungers and thirsts for righteousness is a person BORN of the Spirit. **New born babies don't have to be begged to eat. They come out wanting something to eat and we best have it or its going to be a long night!**

Amen! And boy how the taste buds get developed, especially after eating some really poorly cooked 'food'
:-)

Quote:
-----So then, baby is born and it desires to do the WILL of the Father because of their new nature. It used to be their "meat" to sin against God- now it is their "meat" to do the will of Him of whom they are born of.

Joh 6:27 "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed."

Quote:
-----with an Isaiah scroll in hand he was good to go. That DESIRE allowed Phillip to leave the man to himself. Far different from us having to constantly beg people to obey a lot of times!?

!!!

Quote:

-----Some were never offered baptism. What shall we say to them? Do what the Holy Spirit is convicting. I have gone back and done a lot of things that had no real bearing on my salvation. I just wanted to be a doer of the work. It is my MEAT.

Amen to that, my experience as well, don't think I have followed anything close to what might be considered 'normal' as his salvation has progressed, it was five years before baptism for one. In all, a pretty un-orthodox path back to orthodoxy and miles to go! :-)

Re: The Jewish Roots of the Christian Faith - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/8/23 15:02

ATHEISM AMONG THE JEWS

(Deadly Depictions of God)

By Robert Wurtz II

I was recently troubled by an article that brought to my attention the high overall percentage of atheism among the Jews. As a result, I did some digging and found that the statistics are quite alarming. Based upon 2001 statistics compiled in the AJIS REPORT (see footnotes) 17% of the "core Jewish Adult population" holds beliefs that would be deemed as either atheist or agnostic. Even among those who considered themselves "Jewish by Religion" the statistics were 14%. According to the AJIS report this is 14 to 17 times the number found among the American non-Jewish adults. Though other statistical sources agree with these numbers- the more liberal estimates for the total percentage of atheists and agnostics compiled by the Barna Group for America places the total number at 8%. Either way we are looking conservatively at a difference of at least double the national average.

Is Jewish History a Testimony to the Absence of God?

In doing research into this matter I found a most disturbing question coming from certain Jews, "Can I be a Jew and an atheist at the same time?" One particular Jewish writer placed himself in two separate categories of atheism (Marxist and Rationalist). The Marxist portion for me was a bit tough to swallow, but the rationalist element came as no surprise simply because of the extreme amount of secular education that the average Jew is exposed to. But this begs the question, "Is Jewish history a testimony to the absence of God?" This for me is impossible due to the survivability of the Jews in terms of their existence, culture, and identity. A host of other reasons could be named also. But for this young man, he could not see God's providence due to the overwhelming amounts of suffering that the Jews have suffered over the centuries.

Can Atheism Be Borne from Adversity?

Some atheists are known as "neurotic" atheists. That is, something has happened in their life to cause them to think it is impossible that there "could" be a God. This can happen when someone in the Church who is supposed to be emulating God, for example, abuses a child, and the child is not of an age of understanding. The child grows up having a stigmatized reality of God. This is why Jesus said that it would be better for a millstone to be put around the neck of the offender and they were drown in the depth of the sea than to offend the least of these. Children at a young age are having their ideas of God shaped into whom they believe Him to be- and that conception is often far from the reality.

Rabbis of the Synagogues and Priests of the Universal Church

If there is one thing that men lust for it is POWER and AUTHORITY. More than goods or money, more than anything. This is lust for power is rooted in pride. Pride goes before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall. This is the opposite of meekness and is the quality of the Devil himself. The Rabbis struggled in the years just beyond the Academy at Yavneh to seize all authority over the Jewish sects and eliminate them one by one until all were under their supreme authority. They used the Roman government to accomplish this. Having seized all authority, including that with which to interpret dreams, give prophecies, or even overrule a bath kol (audible voice from Heaven); the Rabbis were in the drivers seat of all that the Jews would learn and believe about the One True God all the days of the peoples lives.

The priests of the Universal Church and the higher leadership also utilized this tactic- only in a much more merciless and forceful fashion. The Iron Fist of the Papal authority left the Word of God locked up in the dead language of Latin until darkness spread over the earth like a plague. Their pride and arrogance eclipsed the Glory of God until multiplied millions died without any real knowledge of God. They had all but made the swords drunk on the blood of their opponents. And the fires that would burn the reformers are a testament to the madness of men's lust to retain their control over people.

Modern Leaders in the Kingdom of God

In our generation we are heading for a similar plight of those who have gone before us. A generation that is hungry for money and praise has all but locked God out of His own house. Christ is standing at the door and knocking in this generation that is manufacturing atheists like never before.

This apostasy is not new. God dealt with it in Jeremiah's day. Here we read, "My people have committed two evils: They have forsaken Me, the fountain of living water, to hew out for themselves cisterns, broken cisterns that cannot hold water." (Jeremiah 2:13) Daniel Gruber in his article, "Whatever happened to the Kingdom of God" describes this condition. Here we read, "The fountain of living water is an inexhaustible, fresh supply of life. It cannot be contained in the forms men make. It will not submit to the authority of the keepers of the cisterns. It will not reside in their broken cisterns. God is the fountain of living water, not a finite, captured supply. He wants people to drink directly from Him, not from the residue in man-made forms. The man-made forms enable people to live a religious life without God. That is their great evil. The Scriptures establish, for the individual, family, community, and world proper values and standards, permitted and prohibited behavior, justice and injustice, individual and community welfare, the proper and improper use of authority and power, the rights and responsibilities of wealth and property, and the proper training of future generations. In sum, they teach the correct purpose and course of human existence. What can men pretend to add? (End of quote)

Provoking The Jews To Jealousy

My heart is torn for the nation to whom are the covenants, promises, and the word of God. That nation that God the GOD OF ISRAEL planted and kept for Himself as a witness to all nations in the earth has for the most part forgotten Him and we as the Gentiles have failed to provoke them to return to their God. The Rabbis may shut down a bath kol, they may reserve the right to interpret dreams, they may even put to silence the words of a modern day prophet, but how could they veil the glory in the lives of the true Church? Would to God that we once again would walk in that glory- and perchance enlighten the conscience of many. Who will walk in that Divine favor? Who will walk in the fullness of Christ? Art Katz expands on these thoughts in his article "Some Thoughts on Romans 10"; here we read, "Israel unbeknownst to themselves waits upon such "sent" ones; but what do the sent ones themselves wait? Nothing less than that which constitutes a postolic sending, namely an expression of the body constitutive of that reality as typified by Antioch in the first instance of such a sending in Acts 13. Here again, in the mystery of God, the issue of Israel's restoration is the issue of the Church, but Church of an ultimate kind. Until such preaching comes, until such preachers can be sent, how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard and how shall they call except they believe? And what are the eschatological implications if they don't?"

Notes:

About 14 percent of respondents who identified themselves as Jewish by Religion could be classified as atheists or agnostics. Among those who indicated Jewish parentage and/or upbringing, but who profess no religion, about 26 percent can be characterized as atheist or agnostic. In other words, about 623,000 adults out of a total of the approximately 4 million who comprise what has been called the "core Jewish" adult population (about 17 percent) hold beliefs that can be described as atheist or agnostic- "those who might be described as the "hard-core seculars." Such a state of non-belief is found in about 1 percent of all American non-Jewish adults.

It is further instructive to note that a substantial minority of those who profess a belief in God nevertheless do not believe that God performs miracles or that God helps them. About 30 percent of those who identify their religion as Judaism and profess a belief in God disagree somewhat or strongly with the proposition that "God helps me." Among those who are of Jewish parentage or upbringing but say they have no religion - "though they profess a belief in God - " about 47 percent disagree somewhat or strongly with the proposition

AJIS REPORT (Egon Mayer, Barry Kosmin, Ariela Keysar. Center For Jewish Studies 2001 American Jewish Identity Survey P. 38)

www.barna.org

<http://culturaljudaism.org/ccj/news/3>

Rabbi Akiba's Messiah (The Origins of Rabbinic Authority) Daniel Gruber. Elijah Publishers 1999

Very interesting topic, on: 2004/9/4 15:43

Dear Brother Robert,

I've waited several days before responding to this thread you initiated, mulling what my heart wanted to say, and I say God bless you, dear one. My name is Neil, I'm a Jewish believer, raised Jewish, sent for many years to Hebrew school, bar-mitzvahed. Then I went thru a period where the faith was not predominant in my heart, a long period. God took mercy on me, and spoke into my heart, and I was saved about two and a half years ago, baptized in the Spirit, and seeking holiness with the ardency of a saved sinner. (meaning seeking is seeking, I smile as I write that)

Before I got saved, I never really knew any of the intricacies of the Christian faith, I didn't even know there was a REAL difference between Catholics and Protestants, just different 'kinds' of Gentiles. To me now, that is so funny, as I have been graced to study church history.

Being in an Assemblies church now, (though I am theo-philosophically NON-demonational..."one church, one baptism, one Christ") I see some of the interesting ways that new Jews view old Jews, meaning how the Blood bought children of Abraham view the descendants of Moses. Interesting ways, you will hear a lot of this, "I have a heart for the Jewish people....I love the Jewish people". But woe if this Jewish person actually speaks, or breathes an opinion about the faith.

Thru a glass darkly, humankind and their opinions about God, so flawed, so imperfect.

I wasn't able to read thru all your offerings, but two things stick out in my mind, one are the Ebionites, fascinating! For some reason, I feel that the Essenes were very much tied to the ministry of John the Baptist and to the earthly ministry of the Lord....do you remember when Jesus told the disciples to look for the man bearing water in the Jerusalem? Could this have been a celibate urban commune of Essenes? I always felt that a good portion of early believers came from the Essenes, as well as the Am Ha-aretz. Good stuff, and it's not too far a stretch to think that Paul would be a "stench" unto them. I must be honest, until about 9 months ago (something like that) when the Lord opened my eyes, Paul was not my favorite writer of Scripture. (hahaha) Now, I love that man. I always crack up, when I listen to ole Leonard Ravenhill saying that if we come across him and Paul deep in conversation in Heaven to leave them alone for a couple thousand years.

I also enjoyed you describing your family background, great stuff.

May the Lord bless you is my continuing prayer,
Neil

Re: Very interesting topic - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/9/4 16:03

Hi Brother Neil,

I am grateful that you have found this site and would enjoy conversing through these threads perhaps from time to time to get to know a little more about you. :-)

My hope with this thread was to create an awareness to the non-Jews that believe in Christ that God has not cast away His people which He foreknew and that there are many issues that are left undiscussed that if made known would at least create a sense of urgency to pray for ourselves first (that we would live lives that reflect the glory and majesty of God) and for the Jews and educate ourselves as to how to reach them as opportunities arise.

This thread just introduced some of the issues. I have a heart to see the Jewish people know their Messiah. My instructor (professor) at the Jewish Roots Institute was Jerry Feldman and he was an Assemblies of God missionary to the Jews (if I recall correctly). I wonder if there is something we can learn in terms of a commonality as to what drew you and him to Christ?

Wondered where you are from and where you live now? I would enjoy you sharing all that is on your heart!

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Rich Redemptive Roots - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/19 11:57

Shalom ... I have read just a few posts in this specific thread. It may take several weeks before I am able to digest all that is here. However, I want to offer our Jewish understandings to those Believers whose heart, mind and resources have been inspired, informed and instructed by RUACH HaKODESH (GOD's Spirit) to bless and pray for my people, both in Yisrael and throughout the Dispura. Our congregation is Simchat Torah Synagogue. Love and Prayers,

Shalom. . . - posted by lwpray (), on: 2004/11/19 12:09

It would be of great interest to sit down to listen to what you have to say regarding this vital and central issue of our common faith.

Welcome to this fellowship of saints and faithful.

Lars W.

Re: Shalom. . . - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/19 13:56

Thank you ... Look forward to participating both in learning and teaching. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/19 14:08

Quote:
-----It would be of great interest to sit down to listen to what you have to say regarding this vital and central issue of our common faith.

Amen! It has been my hope that this thread would shed some light on the topic of the Jewishness of the Faith with the hope that an interest would arise to reach the Jewish people with the message of the Messiah.

Re: Jews Not Monolithic Just as "christians" Are Not - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/19 14:47

Shalom ... Sources can be problematic, especially when trying to categorize my Jewish brothers and sisters. Our inside joke is that when there are two of us in a room, you have at least three opinions. Jewry, worldwide, is estimated at 12 million, roughly half in Israel and about 6 million in the U.S. Jews comprise less than 2% of the world's population. It is known that 80% of us Jews are ignorant of our own Hebrew Scriptures. The Orthodox community is growing. Reform Jews, the 'liberal' wing of Judasim is declining mostly through assimilation. The opportunity Believers have, Jewish or non-Jewish, is to be able to share Messiah in the Messages of the Moedim - GOD's Appointed Times (The ten LORD's Festivals) as detailed in Scripture (Leviticus 23, Esther and John chapter 10). Jews and non-Jews can and should celebrate these ten LORD's Festivals as a building bridge of relationship for witnessing and disciple-making. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/19 15:14

welcome friend,

Quote:
-----Jews and non-Jews can and should celebrate these ten LORD's Festivals as a building bridge of relationship for witnessing and disciple-making.

'can and should'?
:-o *there may be trouble ahead...*
just joking... for now. ;-)

Re: The LORD's Festivals - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/20 17:58

Shalom ... help me to understand your "joke for now" when I am encouraging and equipping the Body of Believers through the celebration of The LORD's Festivals. These ten Festivals embrace the GOD-given relationship with each generation. The opportunity to witness and make disciples over a celebration complete with visuals, sounds and tastes is, I submit, a divinely inspired, instructed invitation to make His Word known to each generation. So, help me get the joke, because the punch line is beyond me? Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/20 18:12

Hi Bro. Eukel,

Bro. Ron was writing concerning the admonition that Christians, especially non-Jewish Christians, 'should' or 'ought' to participate in the festivals (May he correct me if I am wrong). His "just kidding for now" comment relates to a potential debate over the necessity of the Jewish festivals for Gentile believers. I have put my hand in that 'fan' before in other ways, so I want to at least establish a buffer zone as we head into more Jewish Roots discussions (One of my favorite subjects).

As a background of history on this topic on this forum, it has been very sensitive due to certain claims that Messianic Jews, such as Art Katz, have made concerning eschatological postures that the Gentils ought to be actively pursuing in the 'last days.' Bro. Ron has met Art personally and I have been to his conference. We do not all agree on the particulars of the roles between Jews and Gentiles and if you begin at the first part of this thread you can see how quickly it shot out of control. I am still trying to mend fences over the early parts of this thread, as the Lord allows. It has been a very sensitive topic. If I might lovingly request, please read through the correspondences on this thread (not necessarily the articles) if you have not already to get a feel where everyone is coming from as we RE-start our discussion. It will help us all not make false assumptions about where one another is coming from. :-)

God Bless!

-Robert

Re: - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/20 18:42

Shalom, Robert ... I appreciate cautious beginnings. Seasoned Believers are careful about argumentation that leads to separation, as the Wisdom Writings of Scripture clearly instruct. The purposeful selection of my words "can and should" as you correctly discern is not the word "must" or "necessity" as you used. It is sad that some apologists need to be "right" rather than righteous. ADONAI's Wisdom challenges us to both walk and talk in a style and substance that does not diminish, dilute or destroy those He has made in His image. It is a challenge. The thread and articles for "Jewish Roots of our Faith" as you know, Robert, is lengthy. It will take some time to digest. However, if new participants are to be encouraged and equipped by such a meaningful exploration as the "Jewish Roots" I would suggest that the moderators and early thread entrants from time to time compile a synthesis of what has been fruitful in previous discussion. Perhaps, because "it shot out of control quickly" it would be wise also to compile a synthesis of discussion threads that have proved not fruitful. I look forward to both the process of learning and teaching "Messiah's Messages in the Moedim." Love and Prayers, Rabbi DF Eukel, Ph.D.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/20 18:49

Sir,
Grace and peace.

Quote:
-----Shalom ... help me to understand your "joke for now" when I am encouraging and equipping the Body of Believers through the celebration of The LORD's Festivals. These ten Festivals embrace the GOD-given relationship with each generation. The opportunity to witness and make disciples over a celebration complete with visuals, sounds and tastes is, I submit, a divinely inspired, instructed invitation to make His Word known to each generation. So, help me get the joke, because the punch line is beyond me? Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

It's something of an 'in-joke'. Robert has pointed to some of the earlier collisions on this kind of topic, and he and I took a fair while to recover our poise! :-o I am very happy with the 'can' of your comments. Any situation 'can' be used as an opportunity to share the love of God. As long as they do not compromise conscience I am happy to share cultural experiences with any ethnic groupings and to seek the opportunities that the Lord gives at such times.

The 'can' is fine. It was the 'should' that reminded me of the choppy waters at the start of this thread.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/20 19:09

Quote:
-----Perhaps, because "it shot out of control quickly" it would be wise also to compile a synthesis of discussion threads that have proved not fruitful. I look forward to both the process of learning and teaching "Messiah's Messages in the Moedim."

Amen. Say, you are in Mount Vernon? I live in Independence, MO and used to go to Jewish Roots Institute with Jerry Feldman in Overland Park KS.
:-)

I would like to compile a synthesis, but I'm so busy keeping up. I'll have to put it on the list.

There were some choppy waters in the beginning as Bro. Ron stated. I heard a definition of tact recently; "it's the ability to light a fire under a person without making their blood boil." I suppose I didn't have as much tact as I needed.

Blessings,

-Robert

Messiah's Messages in the Moedim - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/20 19:11

Shalom, Ron (philologist) ... I trust that you will continue to give room for other Believers who may select words different from your own. Words do convey ideas. Ideas may be conveyed by those words that need the loving correction of Seasoned Believers who have developed the Scripturally required relationship to be able to effectively speak into that person's life and values. It seems, as one who is just entering the "Jewish Roots" thread, that some "poise recovery" is still occurring. I am reminded of the early growth stage of the talmidim. They wanted to come down hard on those who were not on the "inside or part of" their group. YESHUA constrained not the "outsiders" but the "insiders." Rav Sha'ul, as the emissary to the goyim, had a similar seasoned understanding as YESHUA about those who preach-teach out of wrong motives. He wrote, "so what ... Moshiach is preached." I will openly confess here that Rav Sha'ul's seasoned understanding on this point challenges me. I want purity in words, ideas and motives. Then I am reminded of the leadership development of our father Avraham and Moshe. I will curtail additional thoughts, for now, Ron. I am looking forward to the process of both learning and teaching "Messiah's Messages in the Moedim." I trust that you see the waters no longer choppy, but YESHUA's Shalom spoken. Love and Prayers, Rabbi DF Eukel

Location Location Location - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/20 19:22

Shalom, Robert ... Yes, I had noted earlier that we are in close proximity. Besides our home in Mount Vernon we also have an investment home in Grandview that we are working on to sell. Feldman is of UMJC, correct? I am sure you are also familiar with R' Wolkenfeld of Or HaOlam? Joel Chernoff and his daughter, Sharon, will be celebrating in concert Erev Shabbat with that congregation next week. Robert, I am sure you are learning to give and receive GOD's Great Grace with each relationship building opportunity He requires of you. As I have written before, I look forward to the process of both learning and teaching "Messiah's Messages in the Moedim." Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Location Location Location - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/20 19:30

Actually I studied under Rabbi Jerry Feldman from about 1997-2001 (give or take). I don't know all the folks you mentioned as I have been out of those circles for a while. No problems, it was really a logistical issue. I enjoyed the teachings for the most part. I attended a 1st century Passover service and Yom Kippur. He has a radio program on AM 760 unless that has recently changed. That's how I got involved with the ministry.

I also look forward to you sharing insight into the issues. This thread has died down, but it's good to see it alive again. I think there are a lot of helpful things we can learn.

Messiah's Messages in the Moedim - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/20 19:42

Shalom, Robert ...So we have established a calmness on the waters it appears. How good and pleasant it is when brothers dwell together in unity (echad - I noticed on one of your responses early on in this thread you have the correct understanding of the difference between echad and yachad) ... for it is there The LORD's blessings are forever! Tehillim 133. I look forward to the process of both learning and teaching "Messiah's Messages in the Moedim." Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Perpetual Jewish Roots Glossary (I) - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/20 21:31

- 1) Tehillim 133 (Psalm 133)
- 2) Rav Sha'ul (Paul the Apostle)
- 3) goyim (the non-Jews; Gentiles)
- 4) YESHUA (Jesus in Hebrew)
- 5) Moshiach (Messiah)
- 6) talmid(im) (to teachers who are being taught)
- 7) 'im' (denotes plural)
- 8) Shalom (simply: peaceful well being)
- 9) Moedim (Appointed Times)

Shalom:

King of Salam= King of Peace
JeruSALEM = City of Peace

Messiah's Messages in the Moedim - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/20 21:53

Shalom, Robert ... Let me add to your "Perpetual Jewish Roots Glossary (1)
9) Moedim (Appointed Times)

The term Rav Sha'ul, actually means Dear Rabbi/Rebbe Sha'ul. Yes, he is more widely known as Paul the apostle. Shalom, is not "simply" peaceful well being as one might say "hey/hello" in a friendly greeting. "Shalom" is GOD's Peace, His whole and holy peace. And yes, Y'rushalayim is the city of peace. Shaloo Shalom Y'rushalayim. Pray for the peace of the city of peace. Tehillim 122:6
Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Messiah's Messages in the Moedim - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/20 22:12

Quote:
-----Let me add to your "Perpetual Jewish Roots Glossary (1)

Added it. :-)

Thanks,

-Robert

Jewish Roots Enfoldng Israel Intercession Injunction - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 10:38

Shalom, Robert, Ron and Community ... I accept the efficiency of moving the "Israel Intercession Injunction" discussion thread here, under "Jewish Roots." This is where I began, but the '5 Posting' on Account Review limited this thread from re-appearing and I lost it. Have learned since then I can do an Advance Search under by Name (RabbiEukel) and pull up all my postings (now numbering 35, 5 more and I get another star!?) I noted that when I also did an Advance Search under "Forums - Jewish Roots" that I could see the many postings under that topic. It will take some days to pick-up the various discussion points (some of which I expect to re-visit). I will also accept the counsel to more carefully review the 'history' of the community forums in order to enlarge the possibility that one or more particular threads of discussion, e.g., Jewish Roots, might 'show-up' by someone doing a search engine function on 'Jewish Roots' and thereby be lead to this opportunity (although unless it shows up on the facing entry page of sermonindex.net I don't know that the typical online searcher will know to 'enter.' I certainly would not have).

Might I ask, again, that someone or several who have been discussing, learning, teaching, contending in the "Jewish Roots" forum threads offer a simple outline of the main/sub points already discussed. By the way, Ron, I expected with your sharp wit that you would have responded to the Jewish humor I offered in the thread "Israel Intercession Injunction." Electronic forums are some of the toughest audiences to know whether the humor is received with a laugh, smile or moan, unless some direct response is made or like-humor is reflected. Surely in the vast repartee you have, you also have a great sense of British humor? Thanks Ron for your willingness to synthesize previous discussions and personality insights. It has helped me see this forum as I perceived before - and opportunity to both learn and teach. It is true that on a weekly basis my teaching-preaching responsibilities rarely offer the polemics these forums thrive to make alive. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Jewish Roots - Rich & Redemptive and Not Replaced! - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 11:05

Shalom ... okay now I have some significant reading to do to see where this discussion has been and with whom. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Brief Outline of Previous Topics - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/24 11:27

Hi Bro. Eukel,

Here is a list of some of the topics already listed in this thread.

- 1) "On the Jews and Their Lies" (Martin Luther Sowing Seeds of Anti-Semitism)
- 2) A Little About Myself (Why I Teach a Balance)
- 3) AM HA-ERETZ (Dealing With Those Who Rejected The Rabbis)
- 4) Anger and Anointing (Is 'death the savior?') Some Final Observations 2
- 5) Brother Raymond
- 6) Circumcision of the Heart (Is 'death' the savior?) Part 1
- 7) DUALISM AND GNOSTICISM
- 8) ESTABLISHING THE LAW (On Judaizing and Antinomianism)
- 9) Healing in His Wings (The tallit and tzitzit in Messianic Concepts)
- 10) Identity and Expression of Faith
- 11) IT IS NOT IN HEAVEN (Bath Kol)
- 12) Not Enough Pens- Nor Enough Paper (A Brief Look Into Jewish Persecution) Introduction

- 13) One "Yachid" or One "Echad" (A Brief Look ay The Trinity)
- 14) Overly realized Eschatology (Is 'death' the savior?) Part 2
- 15) PLUNGED INTO DARKNESS
- 16) Rabbi Akiba's False Messiah
- 17) Ritual Immursion (The Origin of Christian Baptism)
- 18) Sanctification in Shoe Leather (Is 'death' the savior?) Some Final Observations 1
- 19) SARX (the "flesh")
- 20) Sowing to the Flesh
- 21) Talmudic Revisionism And The Struggle For Authority
- 22) THE "ROBBERS"
- 23) The 613 Laws of the Old Testament
- 24) The acts of the sinful nature are obvious (Galatians 5:19 NIV).
- 25) THE ASSASSINS (Sacarii)
- 26) The Birkat ha Minim
- 27) The Church Heads West An Introduction to the Issues (Part I)
- 28) The Church Heads West An Introduction To the Issues (Part II)
- 29) The Cross as a Sword
- 30) THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE (70 CE)
- 31) The Fourth Philosophy: (THE ZEALOTS)
- 32) THE HEIRS (A Brief Look at Church Leaders Before 135 CE)
- 33) THE Jewish Freedom Movement
- 34) The Law of Sin
- 35) The New Covenant Part I (The Sign of Circumcision)
- 36) The New Covenant Part II (The Conscience)
- 37) The New Covenant Part III ('States' of the Conscience)
- 38) The Oral Law (Part 1)
- 39) The Oral Law (Part 2)
- 40) The Silencing of the Prophetic Voice
- 41) The Yellow Badges

42) ATHEISM AMONG THE JEWS
(Deadly Depictions of God)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Jewish Roots Enfolded Israel Intercession Injunction - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/24 11:33

Quote:
-----By the way, Ron, I expected with your sharp wit that you would have responded to the Jewish humor I offered in the thread "Israel Intercession Injunction." Electronic forums are some of the toughest audiences to know whether the humor is received with a laugh, smile or moan, unless some direct response is made or like-humor is reflected. Surely in the vast repartee you have, you also have a great sense of British humor?

Where folks have 'sensitive skin' it is best to use 'sharp wit' with caution.

Jewish Sensitivities Not a Signal of Wilting but of Wariness - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 12:27

Shalom, Ron ...

Below is a quote that you may have seen from Mark Twain, a native son of Missouri.

'If the statistics are right, the Jews constitute but one percent of the human race. It suggests a nebulous dim puff of star dust lost in the blaze of the Milky Way. Properly the Jew ought hardly to be heard of; but he is heard of, has always been heard of. He is as prominent on the planet as any other people, and his commercial importance is extravagantly out of proportion to the smallness of his bulk.

'His contributions to the world's list of great names in literature, science, art, music, finance, medicine, and abstruse learning are also way out of proportion to the weakness of his numbers. He has made a marvelous fight in this world, in all the ages; and has done it with his hands tied behind him. He could be vain of himself, and be excused for it.

'The Egyptian, the Babylonian, and the Persian rose, filled the planet with sound and splendor, then faded to dream-stuff and passed away; the Greek and the Roman followed, and made a vast noise, and they are gone; other peoples have sprung up and held their torch high for a time, but it burned out, and they sit in twilight now, or have vanished.

'The Jew saw them all, beat them all, and is now what he always was, exhibiting no decadence, no infirmities of age, no weakening of his parts, no slowing of his energies, no dulling of his alert and aggressive mind. All things are mortal, but the Jew; all other forces pass, but he remains. What is the secret of his immortality?'

-- Mark Twain, "Concerning the Jews,"
Harper's Magazine, 1897

Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, Not Replaced & Resolute - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 12:35

Shalom, Robert ... 42 topic areas! Thank you, my friend for offering both the list and your reasonable service. I look forward to reading and then, responding. I trust that as we begin/revisit this work you and others will be able to join me in prayer, "LORD bless the work of our hands, yes bless the work of our hands." Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Jewish Sensitivities Not a Signal of Wilting but of Wariness - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/24 13:46

Mark Twain wrote:

Quote:
-----'The Jew saw them all, beat them all, and is now what he always was, exhibiting no decadence, no infirmities of age, no weakening of his parts, no slowing of his energies, no dulling of his alert and aggressive mind. All things are mortal, but the Jew; all other forces pass, but he remains. What is the secret of his immortality?'

Paul teaches that all the world is witness to the works of God. Mark Twain, a non-believer, confirms Scripture.

Ezekiel wrote:

Ezek. 36:22 "Therefore say to the house of Israel, 'Thus says the Lord GOD: 'I do not do this for your sake, O house of Israel, but for My holy name's sake, which you have profaned among the nations wherever you went. 23 And I will sanctify My great name, which has been profaned among the nations, which you have profaned in their midst; and the nations shall know that I am the LORD,' says the Lord GOD, 'when I am hallowed in you before their eyes. 24 For I will take you from among the nations, gather you out of all countries, and bring you into your own land. 25 Then I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you shall be clean; I will cleanse you from all your filthiness and from all your idols. 26 I will give you a new heart and put a new spirit within you; I will take the heart of stone out of your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. 27 I will put My Spirit within you and cause you to walk in My statutes, and you will keep My judgments and do them. 28 Then you shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; you shall be My people, and I will be your God. 29 I will deliver you from all your uncleannesses. I will call for the grain and multiply it, and bring no famine upon you. 30 And I will multiply the fruit of your trees and the increase of your fields, so that you need never again bear the reproach of famine among the nations. 31 Then you will remember your evil ways and your deeds that were not good; and you will loathe yourselves in your own sight, for your iniquities and your abominations. 32 Not for your sake do I do this,' says the Lord GOD, 'let it be known to you. Be ashamed and confounded for your own ways, O house of Israel!'"

Ezek. 36:33 "Thus says the Lord GOD: 'On the day that I cleanse you from all your iniquities, I will also enable you to dwell in the cities, and the ruins shall be rebuilt. 34 The desolate land shall be tilled instead of lying desolate in the sight of all who pass by. 35 So they will say, 'This land that was desolate has become like the garden of Eden; and the wasted, desolate, and ruined cities are now fortified and inhabited.' 36 Then the nations which are left all around you shall know that I, the LORD, have rebuilt the ruined places and planted what was desolate. I, the LORD, have spoken it, and I will do it."

Ezek. 36:37 "Thus says the Lord GOD: 'I will also let the house of Israel inquire of Me to do this for them: I will increase their men like a flock. 38 Like a flock offered as holy sacrifices, like the flock at Jerusalem on its feast days, so shall the ruined cities be filled with flocks of men. Then they shall know that I am the LORD.'"

The will of men could never build or destroy a nation that has been in the Potter's hand, reaping the blessings and curses because of His name. His covenant cannot be broken.

15 "In those days and at that time
I will cause to grow up to David
A Branch of righteousness;
He shall execute judgment and righteousness in the earth.
16 In those days Judah will be saved,
And Jerusalem will dwell safely.
And this is the name by which she will be called:
THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS."

Jer. 33:17 "For thus says the LORD: 'David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel; 18 nor shall the priests, the Levites, lack a man to offer burnt offerings before Me, to kindle grain offerings, and to sacrifice continually.'"

Jer. 33:19 And the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah, saying, 20 "Thus says the LORD: 'If you can break My covenant with the day and My covenant with the night, so that there will not be day and night in their season, 21 then My covenant may also be broken with David My servant, so that he shall not have a son to reign on his throne, and with the Levites, the priests, My ministers. 22 As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the descendants of David My servant and the Levites who minister to Me.'"

Jer. 33:23 Moreover the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah, saying, 24 "Have you not considered what these people have spoken, saying, 'The two families which the LORD has chosen, He has also cast them off'? Thus they have despised My people, as if they should no more be a nation before them.

Jer. 33:25 "Thus says the LORD: 'If My covenant is not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, 26 then I will cast away the descendants of Jacob and David My servant, so that I will not take any of his descendants to be rulers over the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will cause their captives to return, and will have mercy on them.'"

If day and night cease to exist then His covenant will cease to exist with the nation Israel.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: The Beloved - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/24 14:07

Agapetos Adelphos

By Robert Wurtz II

And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; (II Peter 3:15).

In this passage we are given a glimpse of the relationship that Peter, or Shimon Keefa, (as he was known in the Hebrew tongue) and Paul the Apostle or "Shaul" (as the Lord referred to him on his way to Damascus when He spoke to him in the Hebrew tongue in Acts 26:12-20), had in the advanced stages of their lives and after the confrontations of the past (Galatians 2:11). Peter refers to Paul as agapetos adelphos or as the King James version translates it, "Our beloved brother Paul."

In an age where confrontation with leaders for the Gospel's sake is almost unheard of, the great confrontation of Peter by Paul had left no permanent scar on their relationship. What a lesson we could learn today? If we just allow leaders to do what they will and don't confront them then it proves our love. Nonsense! That is passivism. That is mediocrity.

What was Peter doing that ruffled Paul so much? We take up the story in Galatians 2:9-13: And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do. But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. .

Peter was acting clearly in a way that was against what he knew to be right. The implication here is that he felt the pressure of those, such as James, who, as were many other believing Jews, "a zealous for the law." This was not uncommon as we read Acts 21:20. "Thou seest, brother, how many MYRIADS there are of Jews who have believed, and all are zealous of the law, ..." (YLT). This, according to James, is known as, "respect of persons" and it made one whom practiced such "a transgressor of the Law."

Here was a man (Paul) that persecuted Christians and compelled them to blaspheme correcting a seasoned believer and Apostle of the Faith. The same man that would also write I Corinthians 13 and compel the brethren to works of love, grace and mercy over all. Here was a man that was feared by Christians. Here is a dreadful foe of the faith, not just preaching the messiah he once rejected, but now calling others who were in the faith while he was persecuting on the carpet for their inconsistencies! What a sight that would have been! Talk about repentance. He defended the faith with the same valiance that he once destroyed it.

I can almost hear those who stood by and heard this; Peter are you angry? I have always wondered what was going through his mind at this moment. What a stunning scene! If ever they doubted that Paul was legit, he sealed the deal with this move! On top of that stripes beyond measure and stonings and persecutions of utter hatred.

Tell me Peter! Tell me what you think now! "Account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you." Peter said all we needed to hear in this statement. With Paul on his mind he thinks of longsuffering. Feelings of agape love flowed from his lips- I believe full of all the phileo one could muster in the Holy Ghost; and yet, he took it a bit farther and acknowledged the supremacy of His understanding of spiritual things. That is humility! That is Agapetos Adelphos. Would to God that we would love each other like that! Not in an overbearing authoritarianism, but in meekness- preferring one another.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/24 15:13

Agapetos Adelphos

There is a gentle touch in Paul's rebuke that I sense too. If you imagine Paul's gestures and the eyes of the listeners. Think how folk would be reacting at different times of Paul's protest. (Gal 2:14-18 KJV)

thou
But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

At this point every eye would have been on Peter. He stands alone and accused. They are watching Paul's finger and it is pointing squarely at Peter and they are watching Peter's every reaction.

we
We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

Now Peter is no longer alone. Paul has added himself to himself to his explanation and 'thou' has become 'we'. Can you 'see' Paul's hand now as he opens his arms to include himself and Peter in the same breath; maybe he has his arm around Peter's shoulder. Now the eyes are watching them both.

I
For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.

Now Paul has done an extraordinary thing; he has set himself up as the offender. Of course, Paul had no intention of 'building up again the things he had destroyed'. I would have loved to have seen this. I think he knew his words had found their mark and there was no need to add to Peter's pain, so Paul makes himself the target. Now where the eyes of the listeners? I can guarantee it; every one was looking at Paul. Peter is not being pilloried. His re-education is complete and Paul knows it. Paul needs to finish what he is saying but he doesn't need to aim it at Peter. Paul's hands are on his own breast.

Now if we could find the way to bring necessary rebukes in this spirit... thou, we, I... Paul was not winning an argument but a brother.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/24 15:17

Quote:
-----Can you 'see' Paul's hand now as he opens his arms to include himself and Peter in the same breath; maybe he has his arm around Peter's shoulder. Now the eyes are watching them both.

There is a love that existed in the early Church that we must recapture. Oh for the days when it was said, "Oh how they love one another!"

How can we get back there?

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, Resolute, Not Replaced and Rejoined - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 15:41

Shalom, my dear friends ... it appears again that GOD's Spirit Who works in each of us had brought together the spirit of reconciliation under this banner (thread/forum). How ironic and fitting that the reconciliation of those contending should find rejoinder in this setting. Certainly we have much more to consider, and it should be considered vigorously, but we have a moment of respite to celebrate the unity of GOD's redemptive plan as He spoke it into creation from the moment He breathed His Spirit into us. He is worthy of our praise and thankfulness. His timing is impeccable. GOD has and GOD continues to bless the work of our hands . Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel
Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, Resolute, Not Replaced and Rejoined.
Robert you do good work, my friend!

Jewish Roots and the Side by Side Google Ads on Sermon Index - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 16:02

Shalom ... Reading our posts of today in "Jewish Roots" my eyes caught one of the Google ads here on sermonindex. It is an ad from aish.com a Jewish source, however, clearly not a Messianic Jew source. The particular ad would be classified as "anti-missionary." It is initially titled, "Why Should Jews Believe in Jesus?" But when you get to that web site it now reads, "Why Should Jews NOT Believe in Jesus!" Here is the argument from some Jews (not all) about why Jesus is not The Messiah:

In the wake of Mel Gibson's phenomenally successful film and the production company's ambitious plans to market the film worldwide to "the faithless," taking advantage of what is perhaps "the best Christian outreach opportunity in 2,000 years," it is important for Jews to understand why we don't believe in Jesus.

The purpose is not to disparage other religions, but rather to clarify the Jewish position.

Jews do not accept Jesus as the messiah because:

- 1) Jesus did not fulfill the messianic prophecies.
- 2) Jesus did not embody the personal qualifications of the Messiah.
- 3) Biblical verses "referring" to Jesus are mistranslations.
- 4) Jewish belief is based on national revelation.

But first, some background: What exactly is the Messiah?

The word "Messiah" is an English rendering of the Hebrew word "Mashiach", which means "Anointed." It usually refers to a person initiated into God's service by being anointed with oil. (Exodus 29:7, I Kings 1:39, II Kings 9:3)

Since every King and High Priest was anointed with oil, each may be referred to as "an anointed one" (a Mashiach or a Messiah). For example: "God forbid that I should stretch out my hand against the Lord's Messiah ..." (I Samuel 26:11. Cf. II Samuel 23:1, Isaiah 45:1, Psalms 20:6)

Where does the Jewish concept of Messiah come from? One of the central themes of Biblical prophecy is the promise of a future age of perfection characterized by universal peace and recognition of God. (Isaiah 2:1-4; Zephaniah 3:9; Hosea 2:20-22; Amos 9:13-15; Isaiah 32:15-18, 60:15-18; Micah 4:1-4; Zechariah 8:23, 14:9; Jeremiah 31:33-34)

Many of these prophetic passages speak of a descendant of King David who will rule Israel during the age of perfection. (Isaiah 11:1-9; Jeremiah 23:5-6, 30:7-10, 33:14-16; Ezekiel 34:11-31, 37:21-28; Hosea 3:4-5)

Since every King is a Messiah, by convention, we refer to this future anointed king as The Messiah. The above is the only description in the Bible of a Davidic descendant who is to come in the future. We will recognize the Messiah by seeing who the King of Israel is at the time of complete universal perfection.

1. JESUS DID NOT FULFILL THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES

What is the Messiah supposed to accomplish? The Bible says that he will:

- A. Build the Third Temple (Ezekiel 37:26-28).
- B. Gather all Jews back to the Land of Israel (Isaiah 43:5-6).
- C. Usher in an era of world peace, and end all hatred, oppression, suffering and disease. As it says: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall man learn war anymore." (Isaiah 2:4)
- D. Spread universal knowledge of the God of Israel, which will unite humanity as one. As it says: "God will be King over all the world -- on that day, God will be One and His Name will be One" (Zechariah 14:9).

If an individual fails to fulfill even one of these conditions, then he cannot be "The Messiah."

Because no one has ever fulfilled the Bible's description of this future King, Jews still await the coming of the Messiah. All past Messianic claimants, including Jesus of Nazareth, Bar Cochba and Shabbtai Tzvi have been rejected.

Christians counter that Jesus will fulfill these in the Second Coming, but Jewish sources show that the Messiah will fulfill the prophecies outright; in the Bible no concept of a second coming exists.

2) JESUS DID NOT EMBODY THE PERSONAL QUALIFICATIONS OF MESSIAH

A. MESSIAH AS PROPHET

The Messiah will become the greatest prophet in history, second only to Moses. (Targum - Isaiah 11:2; Maimonides - Ya d Teshuva 9:2)

Prophecy can only exist in Israel when the land is inhabited by a majority of world Jewry, a situation which has not existed since 300 BCE. During the time of Ezra, when the majority of Jews refused to move from Babylon to Israel, prophecy ended upon the death of the last prophets -- Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.

Jesus was not a prophet; he appeared on the scene approximately 350 years after prophecy had ended.

B. DESCENDENT OF DAVID

According to Jewish sources, the Messiah will be born of human parents and possess normal physical attributes like other people. He will not be a demi-god, (1) nor will he possess supernatural qualities.

The Messiah must be descended on his father's side from King David (see Genesis 49:10, Isaiah 11:1, Jeremiah 23:5, 33:17; Ezekiel 34:23-24). According to the Christian claim that Jesus was the product of a virgin birth, he had no father -- and thus could not have possibly fulfilled the messianic requirement of being descended on his father's side from King David. (2)

C. TORAH OBSERVANCE

The Messiah will lead the Jewish people to full Torah observance. The Torah states that all mitzvot remain binding forever, and anyone coming to change the Torah is immediately identified as a false prophet. (Deut. 13:1-4)

Throughout the New Testament, Jesus contradicts the Torah and states that its commandments are no longer applicable. For example, John 9:14 records that Jesus made a paste in violation of Shabbat, which caused the Pharisees to say (verse 16), "He does not observe Shabbat!"

3) MISTRANSLATED VERSES "REFERRING" TO JESUS

Biblical verses can only be understood by studying the original Hebrew text -- which reveals many discrepancies in the Christian translation.

A. VIRGIN BIRTH

The Christian idea of a virgin birth is derived from the verse in Isaiah 7:14 describing an "alma" as giving birth. The word "alma" has always meant a young woman, but Christian theologians came centuries later and translated it as "virgin." This accords Jesus' birth with the first century pagan idea of mortals being impregnated by gods.

B. SUFFERING SERVANT

Christianity claims that Isaiah chapter 53 refers to Jesus, as the "suffering servant."

In actuality, Isaiah 53 directly follows the theme of chapter 52, describing the exile and redemption of the Jewish people. The prophecies are written in the singular form because the Jews ("Israel") are regarded as one unit. Throughout Jewish scripture, Israel is repeatedly called, in the singular, the "Servant of God" (see Isaiah 43:8). In fact, Isaiah states no less than 11 times in the chapters prior to 53 that the Servant of God is Israel. When read correctly, Isaiah 53 clearly refers to the Jewish people being "bruised, crushed and as sheep brought to slaughter" at the hands of the nations of the world. These descriptions are used throughout Jewish scripture to graphically describe the suffering of the Jewish people (see Psalm 44). Isaiah 53 concludes that when the Jewish people are redeemed, the nations will recognize and accept responsibility for the inordinate suffering and death of the Jews.

For further reading, go to: <http://www.jewsforjudaism.org/web/faq/faq-ss.html>

4) JEWISH BELIEF IS BASED SOLELY ON NATIONAL REVELATION

Throughout history, thousands of religions have been started by individuals, attempting to convince people that he or she is God's true prophet. But personal revelation is an extremely weak basis for a religion because one can never know if it is indeed true. Since others did not hear God speak to this person, they have to take his word for it. Even if the individual claiming personal revelation performs miracles, there is still no verification that he is a genuine prophet. Miracles do not prove anything. All they show -- assuming they are genuine -- is that he has certain powers. It has nothing to do with his claim of prophecy.

Judaism, unique among all of the world's major religions, does not rely on "claims of miracles" as the basis for its religion. In fact, the Bible says that God sometimes grants the power of "miracles" to charlatans, in order to test Jewish loyalty to the Torah (Deut. 13:4).

Of the thousands of religions in human history, only Judaism bases its belief on national revelation -- i.e. God speaking to the entire nation. If God is going to start a religion, it makes sense He'll tell everyone, not just one person.

Maimonides states (Foundations of Torah, ch. 8):

The Jews did not believe in Moses, our teacher, because of the miracles he performed. Whenever anyone's belief is based on seeing miracles, he has lingering doubts, because it is possible the miracles were performed through magic or sorcery. All of the miracles performed by Moses in the desert were because they were necessary, and not as proof of his prophecy.

What then was the basis of belief? The Revelation at Mount Sinai, which we saw with our own eyes and heard with our own ears, not dependent on the testimony of others... as it says, "Face to face, God spoke with you..." The Torah also states: "God did not make this covenant with our fathers, but with us -- who are all here alive today." (Deut. 5:3)

Judaism is not miracles. It is the personal eyewitness experience of every man, woman and child, standing at Mount Sinai 3,300 years ago.

For further reading: "Did God Speak at Mount Sinai?"

WAITING FOR THE MESSIAH

The world is in desperate need of Messianic redemption. And to the extent we are aware of the problems of society, to the extent we will yearn for redemption. As the Talmud says, one of the first questions asked of a Jew on Judgment Day is : "Did you yearn for the arrival of the Messiah?"

How can we hasten the coming of the Messiah? The best way is to love all humanity generously, to keep the mitzvot of the Torah (as best we can), and to encourage others to do so as well.

Despite the gloom, the world does seem headed toward redemption. One apparent sign is that the Jewish people have returned to the Land of Israel and made it bloom again. Additionally, a major movement is afoot of young Jews returning to Torah tradition.

The Messiah can come any day, and it all depends on our actions. God is ready when we are. For as King David says: "Redemption will come today -- if you hearken to His voice."

For further study visit: [Jews for Judaism](#)

See also:

"You Are My Witness: The Traditional Jewish Response to Christian Missionaries" A booklet in pdf format by Yisroel C. Blumenthal

"The Real Messiah," by Rabbi Aryeh Kaplan

"The Path of the Righteous Gentile," by Chaim Clorfene and Yakov Rogalsky

FOOTNOTES

1. Maimonides devotes much of the "Guide for the Perplexed" to the fundamental idea that God is incorporeal, meaning that He assumes no physical form. God is Eternal, above time. He is Infinite, beyond space. He cannot be born, and can not die. Saying that God assumes human form makes God small, diminishing both His unity and His divinity. As the Torah says: "God is not a mortal" (Numbers 23:19).

2. In response, it is claimed that Joseph adopted Jesus, and passed on his genealogy via adoption. There are two problems with this claim:

a) There is no Biblical basis for the idea of a father passing on his tribal line by adoption. A priest who adopts a son from another tribe cannot make him a priest by adoption;

b) Joseph could never pass on by adoption that which he doesn't have. Because Joseph descended from Jeconiah (Matthew 1:11) he fell under the curse of that king that none of his descendants could ever sit as king upon the throne of David. (Jeremiah 22:30; 36:30)

To answer this difficult problem, apologists claim that Jesus traces himself back to King David through his mother Mary, who allegedly descends from David, as shown in the third chapter of Luke. There are four basic problems with this claim :

a) There is no evidence that Mary descends from David. The third chapter of Luke traces Joseph's genealogy, not Mary's.

b) Even if Mary can trace herself back to David, that doesn't help Jesus, since tribal affiliation goes only through the father, not mother. Cf. Numbers 1:18; Ezra 2:59.

c) Even if family line could go through the mother, Mary was not from a legitimate Messianic family. According to the Bible, the Messiah must be a descendent of David through his son Solomon (II Samuel 7:14; I Chronicles 17:11-14, 22:9-10,

28:4-6). The third chapter of Luke is irrelevant to this discussion because it describes lineage of David's son Nathan, not Solomon. (Luke 3:31)

d) Luke 3:27 lists Shealtiel and Zerubbabel in his genealogy. These two also appear in Matthew 1:12 as descendants of the cursed Jeconiah. If Mary descends from them, it would also disqualify her from being a Messianic progenitor.

For more on "The Passion" see:

Gibson's Blood Libel

Jews and Christians after The Passion

The Passion: The Movie and the Aftermath

Mel Gibson and the Jews

The Passion: A Historical Perspective"

Published: Sunday, March 07, 2004

See more articles by Rabbi Shraga Simmons

Rabbi Shraga Simmons spent his childhood trekking through snow in Buffalo, New York. He has worked in the fields of journalism and public relations, and is now the Co-editor of Aish.com in Jerusalem.

Re: Jewish Roots and the Side by Side Google Ads on Sermon Index - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/24 16:47

Quote:

-----Jews do not accept Jesus as the messiah because:

- 1) Jesus did not fulfill the messianic prophecies.
- 2) Jesus did not embody the personal qualifications of the Messiah.
- 3) Biblical verses "referring" to Jesus are mistranslations.
- 4) Jewish belief is based on national revelation.

These (and many others not listed) are common objections and issues that we would debate in class at the Institute. At first glance the whole article appears to be an enormous literary work to try to scale; but early in the text there are tell tale signs and symptoms of eschatological selectivism that was common even in the time of Christ. However, when you consider just how far the Academy at Yavneh was willing to go to try to disprove the truth of the various Minim (heretics) that threatened their power it is no wonder they could produce a work that would seem colossal.

The Perushim (Pharisee's)*, as I once heard, could not qualify for their role unless they could prove a false doctrine from scripture. Their lust for power was great! They were willing to try anything to create a scenerio where they could disprove Christ as the Messiah. One of the more notorious is concerning the Bath Kol. Click here for: (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1959>) IT IS NOT IN HEAVEN.

This may be a good place to start in trying to understand the length to which they were willing to go to discount Yeshua (Jesus) as Messiah.

God Bless,

-Robert

Notes:

* According to the Encyclopedia Judaica there were 7 types of Pharisees. Most of which were impious.

Re: Jewish Roots and the Side by Side Google Ads on Sermon Index - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/11/24 16:50

Quote:
-----Shalom ... Reading our posts of today in "Jewish Roots" my eyes caught one of the Google ads here on sermonindex. It is an ad from aish.com a Jewish source, however, clearly not a Messianic Jew source. The particular ad would be classified as "anti-missionary." It is initially titled , "Why Should Jews Believe in Jesus?" But when you get to that web site it now reads, "Why Should Jews NOT Believe in Jesus!" Here is the argument from some Jews (not all) about why Jesus is not The Messiah:

Yikes!! I use a software proxy that filters out all advertisements while I'm browsing so I never see those google ads but this has me wondering just how many other sites are advertised here that do not honor our Lord Jesus Christ.

This is a serious matter of concern.

In Christ,

Ron

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/24 18:13

Shalom ... Ron this may be particularly addressed for you, however I suspect you may have a following here. Early in my participation on this thread, "Jewish Roots," you, Ron, made a statement that surprised and puzzled me. I am not taking the time here to search the thread and re-post it here (I know you can do that quickly to be sure that your meaning is rightfully captured). You said, in effect, that Old Testament currency ended, has been replaced by the New Testament. I just read in a thread on "Divorce and Re-marriage" where you attempt to broaden everybody's understanding of marriage, before it can be defined, and then also define divorce. During that "broadening" you again make the statement that the OT no longer has currency and in fact ended at Gal 3:19. Question: If it is true that OT no longer has currency when YESHUA, the seed, came (Gal 3:19) then why did YESHUA each and every time He went to the synagogue and Temple did He Himself reference Scripture - the 22 scrolls of the Ta NaKh (Hebrew Scriptures)? If the "OT" has no currency then why would we reference it at all? When Rav Sha'ul writes to his spiritual son (whom he had circumscised) in 2 Timothy 3:16 that "all Scripture is inspired ...," what Scripture is Rav Sha'ul referring to? Could it be, my dear beloved Brother, that the First Covenant has in fact not ended but been fulfilled/completed in YESHUA as the Pesachal Lamb of GOD thereby the need for blood animal sacrifice is completed/fulfilled? And yet, GOD's Redemptive Plan is not yet fully complete until He sends His Son to "get Your bride!" Happy Thanksgiving everyone. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/24 18:24

Quote:
-----You said, in effect, that Old Testament currency ended, has been replaced by the New Testament.

I almost certainly referred to the Old Covenant in the sense of the Sinai Covenant. If you dip into the Abraham thread you will discover that I hold the Old Testament scriptures very highly, but find their definitive exposition in the New Testament scriptures. The reference to the Seed coming, of course, is to the whole of His arrival. He brought the Old Covenant to an end by fulfilling it. It is no longer operative. It would need priests, and the blood of the red heifer, and a temple... Anything less than this would be a blemished sacrifice. I presume you don't still keep the Levitical Day of Atonement?

Now I think its time you answered some of our questions. Would you like me to make a list of all the questions you have ignored so far?

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Certainly Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/25 8:20

Shalom, Ron ... In the United States of America we celebrate as citizens, this Day of Thankfulness. We trust you will receive our "Happy Thanksgiving Day," greeting in the spirit in which it is given.

It appears, your "boisterous spirit" is rising up again.

Yom Kippur, a perpetual day of holy remembrance of YESHUA's Atonement and Redemption is certainly celebrated in every Messianic Jewish home and can and should (but not must or necessary) for every Believer. Teaching illustrations, parables and wisdom riddles are still a common technique in Jewish schools. Every yeshiva boy delights in the tangible techniques of teaching that brings alive his ancestry of more than 3500 years.

The term "Messianic Jew" is a clear signal that we celebrate The LORD's Festivals dramatically different from rabbinic Judaism. Our Jewish relatives would obviously recognize the Jewish celebrations in our Messianic Jewish homes and synagogues. At the same time our Jewish relatives would recognize the radical departure as we center the celebrations in YESHUA, The Messiah, GOD's Only and Uniquely begotten Son. For those who recognize that Leviticus 23 has not "ended" (but are fulfilled through YESHUA, He is the focus and Honored Guest) these Festivals of the LORD were observed by YESHUA, a Jew who was submissive to GOD's Torah and fulfilled the Wisdom of GOD's Redemptive Plan for eternity.

Ron, if it would be helpful to you to list questions that you feel were ignored, please do so. I would ask that you be patient about the timing of response and respectfully recognize that Rabbi Eukel is not under any obligation for every question posed (just as I try not to establish a box for your rhetoric that frames your remarks on my terms). Our rabbinic training & teaching tradition, as you too use, often answers questions by asking questions. Your pastoral depth has taught you well. Many Jewish scholars would appreciate the vigorous viewpoints you offer. Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Question & Answer from John MacArthur - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/25 10:29

Question

Which Jewish holidays, such as Purim, Passover, Hanukkah, would be appropriate for a Jewish believer to still celebrate, and which if any, would no longer be appropriate?

Answer

Well, essentially from the vantage point of the New Testament, there are no Jewish holidays that are still a part of the Christian faith. There are certain holidays that don't have anything to do with the Old Testament: Hanukkah, the Jewish New Year has nothing to do with the Old Testament; I think Purim has nothing to do with the Old Testament; the Feast of Lights is more of a traditional feast than an Old Testament Biblical feast, or festival. But as far as the New Testament is concerned, all of the ceremonies were set aside and we know that because Jesus indicated to us in His attitude with the Scribes and the Pharisees a certain indifference to that, and most particularly, Jesus made the transition from the Passover, which was the main celebration, to the Lord's Supper--it was at a Passover meal, the night of His betrayal, that Jesus took the bread, which had once been in reference to the Passover in Egypt, which was the great historic indication of the power of God to deliver His people and became the basis of the Passover, it was to be a memorial and God instituted it there in Egypt. But Jesus took the elements: the bread and the cup that were connected to the Passover, and said, "From now on, this bread doesn't represent the unleavened bread of the Passover in Egypt--it represents My Body. And this wine, is no longer representative of deliverance in Egypt, and the blood put on the door and the lintel, it is representative of My Blood shed for you. So Jesus Himself transitioned out of the Passover, as such.

When you come into the Book of Acts, in the Jerusalem Council, in the 15th chapter of Acts, the believers there were instructed, however, not to offend the Jewish people, with regard to some of those remaining ceremonies. And in Romans 14 and 15, there is even some instructions about, if people have certain, I suppose you could say scruples, if they have certain convictions, and they are not free to violate those because they don't yet understand their freedom, even as Christians. If they are still holding to, let's say, the Sabbath, or they are still holding to a certain dietary law, the Apostle Paul says, "Don't offend them, don't force them into liberties which their conscience doesn't yet allow them to do--they need to be instructed and they will come to a point where they will better understand the terms of the New Covenant, and they will leave those things aside.

So the objective is, Jesus ends the Old Testament ceremonial law, as such, and with the ceremonial law, go essentially, all the feast and festivals that were a part of it. Then in the Book of Acts there is a gradual sort of disconnect with that, and we know that because as the church was being built under the leadership of, particularly the Apostle Paul, those things were never instituted in the church--they were left to the past. When you get into the Epistles, it becomes very specific and the texts that I would...well, one in the Book of Acts, Acts 10 where there is a vision that Peter has and on this she

et that he sees, a sheet coming down from heaven, there's all kinds of animals, clean and unclean, you know, kosher and non-kosher, and Peter is told, "Rise Peter, kill and eat." And he says, "I can't do that. I can't eat the unclean animals." And the Lord says to him, "Don't you call unclean what I have cleansed." So there is no more distinction between clean and unclean, and that's just an illustration of the break with the past.

When you come into the Epistles, and I would draw your attention to one particular Epistle, and that's Colossians, and the 2nd chapter of Colossians. The Apostle Paul is showing us how things have dramatically changed; he says this in verse 16, Colossians 2:16, "So let no one judge you in food," that is, in any dietary law, "Let no one judge you in drink; Let no one judge you regarding a festival or a new moon or Sabbaths." Now, no dietary regulations; no religious observances, and the festivals were essentially Pentecost, Passover, Feast of Tabernacles--all of those. "No new moon," and that was the point at which the monthly sacrifice was made--on the first day of each month--the new moon. "No Sabbaths," that's the weekly celebrations. So, annual celebrations, monthly celebrations, weekly celebrations--he says, "Don't let anybody hold you to those things," verse 17, "which are a shadow of things to come, but the substance is of Christ." They were shadows, and now the substance has arrived, and the shadow has no more place.

And so, as far as we are concerned in the Church: Jewish Christian, Gentile Christian, there is no necessity to observe any of those things from the standpoint of our Christian faith. However, within the framework of tradition, within the family, there's nothing wrong with participating in those events--nothing wrong with the traditional family celebration of Passover; nothing wrong with other traditional Jewish celebrations: the Jewish New Year, Yom Kippur, whatever it is, and in fact, as a Christian you can bring into that kind of celebration a much richer understanding of the reality of which those things were but a shadow. That's one of the reasons why it is problematic to have what we call, "Messianic Synagogues."

There has been a movement for a number of years and I have addressed it throughout the last, probably, fifteen years, where Jewish people, who are believers, have established, rather than Churches, what they call Messianic Synagogues, and they observe all of the Jewish customs, all of the Jewish traditions, whether it is the annual feasts like Pentecost, Passover, and so forth, whether it is the New Year, the Day of Atonement, the monthly New Moon Sabbath, they observe the weekly Sabbath, they observe it on Saturday, they go through all of that ritual, and in a sense, they are like the Judaizers of the New Testament, who are running around, trying to impose Jewish custom, Jewish ceremony, Old Testament ritual on Christians. I think it is wrong to do that. I don't think that's what the New Testament intends. I think the flow of the New Testament is that is what you are trying to do is to teach those people who come out of that background that they no longer need to hold to those things, but that they can let them go because of their freedom in Christ.

So I think that is the best passage to take people to who are asking that kind of question. We are not under obligation to maintain any of those things, and the most notable of all of them is the Passover. You celebrate the Passover because of God's redemption--the Redeemer comes and the Passover is over and now you have the Lord's Supper. You celebrate Pentecost, which is "first fruits" and the last Pentecost, legitimately celebrated, was the Pentecost at which time the Holy Spirit came--remember it was the day of Pentecost the Spirit came--it was the great harvest feast and the Spirit came on that day, and in a sense put an end to the shadow, because now the Holy Spirit had come and the great harvest, as it were, of souls, began.

So I think that it is best to see no Biblical obligation at all for any of those things, but I think that it is wise, if you are in a Jewish context to graciously participate in those kinds of traditions understanding that they all point to the reality, who is Christ.

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Certainly Not Replaced - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 11:00

Quote:
------(If you have seen 'Fiddler on the Roof' -still my favourite film - you know the mood. If you haven't seen it, I recommend it. Take your hanky.)

Two Jews and Three Opinions

By Robert Wurtz II

My American, midwest, upbringing, fitted with all manner of personalities, has found it difficult to come to terms with conversations I have had on the topic of Jewish Roots, whether here on this forum or in the classroom. Generally, I have never seen conversations escalate like I have in these circles without a brawl breaking out. People have been thrown through windows in these parts for saying less. ;-) Remember, a man just shot and killed 6 men over a deer stand north of us. That's an extreme example, but you see how well people tolerate debate around here.

He Opened Up a Battery on Me!

When I sat in the Jewish Class for the FIRST time the dean, Jerry Feldman, took me on handily. I seem to recall he did not like my interpretation of circumcision. He was getting loud and inciting others in the class to take me on also and they would not. I recall saying that physical circumcision was an outward expression of an inward circumcision of the heart of the flesh. When a person had their heart circumcised of the flesh they were circumcised of the influence of the flesh. When a gentile (goyim) saw this sign (physical circumcision) he would know that this is a man that "fears the Lord." As Finn ey would say, Feldman opened up a battery on me. He started asking me questions; what denomination are you? are you a dispensationalist? etc.

Where is My TAPE RECORDER?

He even said he wished he could have recorded it all for playback on the radio. Think about this, he was about to take it public! I was not offended. I held my ground. It wasn't the first time he let me have it; because the first time was in a phone conversation and I didn't call back for a while. I finally got the courage up and called back with a less "typical" Christian question. By the way, never call and ask a Rabbi about the Wilderness Tabernacle. So he toned it down a bit and invited me to his school; the rest is history.

I'm Out of Here!

He was a plain spoken man. He would tell you straight what he thought. I was not used to this at all. I was used to the gentle pastoral fuzzy stuff. He would tell people things about Jewish Roots and they would stand to their feet, deliberately fold their books, do an 'about face' (almost military style) and march out. Jerry Feldman just looked them off as they went out. It reminds me of a Russian military display when the soldiers march swinging the arms with their heads turned. This behavior was shocking to me!

Life in New York

It then started to make sense when he would talk about his life in New York City among the Hasidim (Orthodox Jews, etc.) and would make references to Fiddler on the Roof. He talked about people walking down the street and just going into peoples homes to fellowship and eat dinner. The conversations would be so loud and boisterous that you could hear them yelling down the street with the doors and windows open. Were they fighting? They WOULD have been here in Missouri! In fact, the police would have been at the house. He says that this is how they related to each other in many cases and that there were no ill feelings, but it was normal Jewish life. It was an expression of their familial love and relationship as I suppose.

Inigmatic Personality

I watched conversations go down in which it seemed that he and others were debating two different sides of an issue at once! I said, these people are just argumentative! But in time, I realized that they refused to simplify the issues and leave an anomaly un-dealt with. They were tearing their ownself to shreds with everyone else. They wanted to know the truth. Just like here; I see the same type of discussions. When we engage one another in a way that challenges certain things we always held true, sometimes there is a refining work that is happening. Sometimes we are trying to come to terms with issues we have long wrestled with and wish someone would answer us.

Talking to Ourselves, While Others and Listening

When the right person comes along, that can be a real 'sounding board' with which to discuss an issue, I have found, that we talk to that person like we talk to ourself when we debate within our own heart. It is a tactless conversation often times. If we can remember this in our wording and in our hearing we can have a more peaceable conversation. We can realize that a great amount of 'respect' as it were is being afforded mutually in the fact that the conversation has been taken to such a level.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Certainly Not Replaced - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/25 11:30

Quote:
----- The term "Messianic Jew" is a clear signal that we celebrate The LORD's Festivals dramatically different from rabbinic Judaism. Our Jewish relatives would obviously recognize the Jewish celebrations in our Messianic Jewish homes and synagogues.

So you are not really celebrating the Day of Atonement but rather remembering the ancient ritual of the Day of Atonement? In a similar way to the way folks might 'celebrate' Christmas? The celebration is not a spiritual reality but just a token of remembrance, not dissimilar to breaking bread? The celebration then has no warrant in scripture but is just a memory of a previous Covenant?

I am presuming that as a believer, I will use the biblical term here so as not to cause confusion, you believe that the New Covenant has arrived in Christ and that we who are joined in One Spirit with Him have become beneficiaries of that New Covenant. It seems axiomatic to me that the Old and the New Covenant cannot coexist so I find a preoccupation with personal ethnic history a little strange. Christ's people, have been redeemed 'out of' every kindred and tongue and people and nation. The English word 'out of' is the Greek word 'ek' (or ex). So in my relationship to Christ and to the redeemed I am 'ex' many things. I am ex-kindred (phule), i.e. no longer of this tribe or that clan. I am 'ex-language' (glossa) i.e. no longer finding my affinity in a language group. I am 'ex-people' (loas) i.e. no longer finding my affinity in a people or national group. And finally, I am ex-nation (ethnos) i.e. no longer of this race or ethnic group.

This is quite a list but for myself I can translate this into personal terms. I am ex-Bailey; my spiritual affinities are not orientated according to my family. I am ex-English, in the sense that my spiritual affinities are not orientated towards my

language group. I am ex-British; as regards my spiritual affinities I will instinctively side with the saints of God rather than with the Brits. And I am ex-white European descent. On our census forms I refuse to indicate what 'ethnic group' I belong to. I always state simply that I belong to the new nation of Christ's people.

So there's my list of ex-es. I wonder what you are 'ex'. My instinctive affinities are towards the people of God not towards family, language, nation or race. In a hypothetical situation where you might have to choose between **...Jews... Gentiles...the church of God** (1Co 10:32 KJV) which group would you instinctively join. This is really a re-wording of my question 'do you regard yourself as a Christian Jew or a Jewish Christian?'

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/25 11:41

Hi Robert

Quote:
-----I watched conversations go down in which it seemed that he and others were debating two different sides of an issue at once! I said, these people are just argumentative! But in time, I realized that they refused to simplify the issues and leave an anomaly undealt with. They were tearing their ownself to shreds with everyone else. They wanted to know the truth. Just like here; I see the same type of discussions. When we engage one another in a way that challenges certain things we always held true, sometimes there is a refining work that is happening. Sometimes we are trying to come to terms with issues we have long wrestled with and wish someone would answer us.

This sounds very much like the 'destruction testing' that I often ask for. The key thing however is that it is the ideas which are being 'destruction tested' not the person who holds them. :-D

I know that some are troubled by the market place but as long as there is genuine respect and no recourse to underhanded debating tactics the exercise can be very valuable. I have had to sharpen my own thinking in many areas as a result of the 'destruction testing' my 'interesting ideas' have received at the hands of my fellow Slers.

As you know I try to operate along the lines of others who have had 'interesting ideas'. I told you I loved the Finney quote. This is another favourite from William Tyndale *If I shall perceive either by myself or by the information of another, that ought be escaped me, or might be more plainly translated, I will shortly after, cause it to be mended.*

Soft hearts and hard heads - is the way.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 11:42

Quote:
-----And so, as far as we are concerned in the Church: Jewish Christian, Gentile Christian, there is no necessity to observe any of those things from the standpoint of our Christian faith. However, within the framework of tradition, within the family, there's nothing wrong with participating in those events--nothing wrong with the traditional family celebration of Passover; nothing wrong with other traditional Jewish celebrations: the Jewish New Year, Yom Kippur, whatever it is, and in fact, as a Christian you can bring into that kind of celebration a much richer understanding of the reality of which those things were but a shadow. That's one of the reasons why it is problematic to have what we call, "Messianic Synagogues."

Hi Nasher,

If we remember that there are Jews who will refuse to become like a gentile to be saved, we understand why Messianic Synagogues are necessary. This is not a push to make Gentiles Jews, we are trying to see the Gospel presented to them in a way that does not contain Roman influence. You have to get this or you will never win a Jew to Christ. Jews are more offended at 'Christian' terms that they feel are Hellenistic and pagan than we are at words like Rabbi, Synagogue, Sabbath, etc. In fact, many commonly used themes have their roots in paganism and NOT biblical faith. The reformers filtered a lot of it out, but there is still a lot there.

To be true to your above statement you have to allow the liberty of what you imply and not set a limitation on that liberty. "Let no man judge you in meat, drink, etc..." is a passage that cuts both ways. If a Jew wants to keep Sabbath they have all the rights in the world to do it so long as they do it lawfully; and if a Gentile wants to work they can do that. Christians esteem Sunday as the new Christian "Sabbath." Why is that? Most evangelicals will question your spirituality if you do not recognize Sunday as the "Lord's Day" or the "First day of the week." Most preachers preach tithes and not circumcision? Hmmm? Isn't that Judaizing?

Most Christians would also look at you strange if you did not celebrate Easter and Christmas. Are you a Jehovah's Witness or something? Who would question what I say here? We all know it is true; especially the Jews. How did they suddenly make pagan holidays into Christian holidays when God has already given them days to remember if they wanted them? If I were a Jew, I would want a clear answer to that one! :(That is not to say I can't celebrate Christmas because I can and will. That is MY liberty and if they want to not celebrate it and celebrate the festivals; that is their liberty.

Yes, the festivals have been replaced by the Church; but with what? Yes, Sabbath has been replaced by the Church, but with what? Removing these things creates a serious vacuum that has to be filled. These things don't bother us, but they are a stumblingblock to the Jews that is unnecessary. From AD 135 to Wycliff the Church was taking hit after hit from the paganism of the Greeks. Soon there were idols of Mary in the Church and all sorts of madness. Yet, there is an entrenched mindset in the Church that allows them to believe that celebrating all what we do is pious, yet if a Jewish Believer wants to celebrate Passover or suggests that we ought to give it a try they are somehow Judaizing. You say, I don't want to! Well, you don't have to. Just don't tell someone they can't.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/25 11:52

Quote:
-----Most Christians would also look at you strange if you did not celebrate Easter and Christmas. Are you a Jehovah's Witness or something? Who would question what I say here? We all know it is true; especially the Jews. How did they suddenly make pagan holidays into Christian holidays when God has already given them days to remember if they wanted them? If I were a Jew, I would want a clear answer to that one!

I am a Christian, and I would like a clear answer on that one too. ;-) I think we have to differentiate between a true biblical Christianity and a Christianized Heathenism usually called Christendom. I don't believe that Catholic propaganda that Catholicism represent authentic Christianity.

Quote:
-----Yet, there is an entrenched mindset in the Church that allows them to believe that celebrating all what we do is pious, yet if a Jewish Believer wants to celebrate Passover or suggests that we ought to give it a try they are somehow Judaizing. You say, I don't want to! Well, you don't have to. Just don't tell someone they can't.

I haven't heard anyone say "they can't". I have heard Dr Eukel say 'we should' and I will oppose such Judaizings as strongly as I can.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 12:29

Quote:
-----I seems axiomatic to me that the Old and the New Covenant cannot coexist so I find a preoccupation with personal ethnic history a little strange. Christ's people, have been redeemed 'out of' every kindred and tongue and people and nation. The English word 'out of' is the Greek word 'ek' (or ex). So in my relationship to Christ and to the redeemed I am 'ex' many things. I am ex-kindred (phulE), i.e. no longer of this tribe or that clan. I am 'ex-language' (glossA) i.e. no longer finding my affinity in a language group. I am 'ex-people' (loas) i.e. no longer finding my affinity in a people or national group. And finally, I am ex-nation (ethnos) i.e. no longer of this race or ethnic group.

Hi Bro. Ron,

I agree with this to an extent, but would like to suggest that the primary thing that we are called out of is this world system. For the sake of those who don't already know let me backtrack and say; The Greek word for Church is ekklesia, which essentially means "called out". It's where we get the English word "ecclesiastical" (clergy). In ancient Greece it meant an assembly called out by the crier. Christ called us out. But out of what?

You listed many things; but I would say that in the case of the Jews there are certain things which were still valid expressions of their faith in God in which God allowed them to take with them. They would find little meaning for us, but they are

e part of their own personal identity as a Jews. There is "neither male or female" also, but there still must be a distinction so that the male can maintain his identity as a 'male' and so on. Here we read; Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God. (I Corinthians 7:18,19)

We see then, that the objective is to walk in the Spirit and in so doing fulfill the "spirit of the Law." But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter. What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." (Romans 7:6,7)

Understand, I do not recognize Rabbinic Judaism or Pharisaical Judaism in any way to be accurate depictions of Biblical Judaism. The Nazarenes were the only valid sect within Judaism in the 1st Century. The Ebionites were too "Essene like" and radical to fit the biblical pattern of genuine faith. This is what the Messianics MUST come to terms with. They must resist the compulsion to become like the Rabbi's of today and emulate a post-biblical version of the Messiah and His Ekklesia. That is just as much a danger and provocation to Christ as anything worldly that could be done in the Church. I share the concerns that you express; but I am somewhat in the middle. I think we need to split the horns of this issue and find a Christ honoring, Biblical, position.

Jews are taught from a child in many cases to shun nearly everything about the Church. Centuries of this, some with warrant, and some with not, has created a difficult situation for us in reaching them unlike any other group.

Let me share one last story to make my point; A Messianic Believer I know told us a story of how he became a Christian and went back to see his Jewish parents. He was talking at one point to his father and opened his wallet only to have his student ID card from the seminary he attended fall to the floor. When his dad looked at it his countenance fell. He looked at his son as if to say; My son is dead!... My SON is DEAD!. The picture on the id was one of a sword shaped cross and the motto blazed across it, "THE CRUSADERS"

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 12:33

Quote:
-----I haven't heard anyone say "they can't". I have heard Dr Eukel say 'we should' and I will oppose such Jusaizings as strongly as I can.

Brother Ron,

A person could tell me we "should" all they want and because I have celebrated Passover before I must say "I can't." The food does not match what I can commonly eat. :-? And with that, I had to just listen to the explanations. I know I looked silly, but wheeew! I still enjoyed the remembrance and all. ;-)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/25 13:23

Quote:

-----To be true to your above statement

Sorry Robert, I didn't mean to confuse you but this is not my statement, it was a question from someone answered by John MacArthur.

Quote:

-----If we remember that there are Jews who will refuse to become like a gentile to be saved

No-one has to become like a gentile to be saved, every person must yield their life to Christ to be "saved".

Therefore I ask the question "why are Messianic Synagogues "necessary"?"

Quote:

-----This is not a push to make Gentiles Jews, we are trying to see the Gospel presented to them in a way that does not contain Roman influence. You have to get this or you will never win a Jew to Christ.

Robert, who is presenting the gospel here with Roman influence?
My task is to preach the gospel, it is the Holy Spirit who does the rest.

Quote:

-----If a Jew wants to keep Sabbath they have all the rights in the world to do it so long as they do it lawfully

What do you mean "lawfully"? Which law?

Quote:

-----Christians esteem Sunday as the new Christian "Sabbath."

Not this one.

Quote:

-----Most evangelicals will question your spirituality if you do not recognize Sunday as the "Lord's Day" or the "First day of the week."

The "Lord's Day" and the Sabbath Day are/were different things.

Quote:

-----Most preachers preach tithes and not circumcision?

Not this one.

My Summation:

Colossians 2:6

As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/25 13:43

Quote:

----- The Nazarenes were the only valid sect within Judaism in the 1st Century.

Valid to whom? My understanding is that Nazarene is simply what orthodox Jews called Christians. The term was originally used of Jewish converts but perhaps later applied to all 'Christians'. **For we have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes:** (Act 24:5 KJV) The Greek for sect is 'heresy' but 'heresy', in Greek, means a sectarian group rather than a doctrinal aberration. I understand that 'Nazarenes' were not officially excluded from synagogue worship and branded 'heretics' until the Bar Kokhba revolt of 135AD. I understand that the 'Nazarenes' refused to take part in the Bar Kokhba revolt.

This single reference to Nazarenes in the New Testament is significant coming as it does in a passage where it comes from the lips of a hostile witness. Both 'Nazarene' and 'Christian' were derogatory accusations in their first usage.

I think the Nazarenes were tolerated in Judaism rather than validated. There must have been a fascinating variety of gatherings in the early days of the church. There was variety but unity. Paul split the believers away from the synagogue in Ephesus; **And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus.** (Act 19:8-9 KJV) In James the expected hearers are in a synagogue; **For if there come into your synagogue a man with a gold ring, in fine clothing, and there come in also a poor man in vile clothing;** (James 2:2 ASV) Some synagogue congregations were plainly moving in one direction while others were moving in the opposite direction.

The Ebionites are an interesting group who might well have called themselves Messianic Jews had they been familiar with the phrase. Not that I am accusing Messianic Jews of Ebionite error. I am referring to their determination to hold on to their heritage that isolated and ultimately doomed them. There seems some evidence from textual criticism that they had their own translated versions of some New Testament documents and no doubt their insistence upon their historic terminology further separated them from their Gentile brethren.

My position on this is really quite simple. I believe there is only One Church. I do not believe there is a Gentile church and a Jewish church; in fact, I think that view would be heresy. I don't believe there is an American church either or a British church. I don't even accept Wesley's separation into the 'church militant' and the 'church triumphant'; there is One Church. From the two He made One, not One of two halves but One. This is not a weld but a new alloy which includes each and does not add one group to a previously existing group. This is new. I will build my church (ekklesia) must have been an astonishing statement to Jews who already regarded themselves as part of the ekklesia (of Qahal) of

f God. I oppose children's church and youth church, because the idea of such a thing militates against One Body and One Church. I am not in favour of an English church in Jerusalem nor of a Hebrew church in New York; any such defining adjectives undermine the concept of One Church.

It was Peter's action in establishing a pattern of separate meetings that provoked Paul's action recorded in Galatians. **For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles; but when they came, he began to withdraw and hold himself aloof, fearing the party of the circumcision.** (Gal 2:12 NASB) The NASB tries to capture the mood here with its tenses but in fact the tenses I have underlined are all 'imperfect tense' which translates as 'was eating, was withdrawing, was setting himself apart'. A new pattern was emerging and Paul took it by the throat! If he hadn't, the result would have been two churches throughout Galatia; Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. What a travesty that would have been to God's intention to 'make both one'.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 14:00

Quote:
-----Therefore I ask the question "why are Messianic Synagogues "necessary"?"

Hi Nasher,

They are necessary within the context of reaching the Jewish people in a Jewish way. Synagogues in the 1st Century were a Jewish place of worship and do not resemble what we see today. The final split between the unbelieving Jews and the Believing Jews probably began with the (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1954>) The Birkat Ha Minim. The word synagogue is used to identify with the Jewish people. The name "Church" is stigmatized beyond repair to the non-Believing Jews.

Quote:
-----No-one has to become like a gentile to be saved, every person must yield their life to Christ to be "saved".

You and I may believe this; but there are many who would say that a Jew has to cease to be Jewish to become a believer in Christ. To cease to be "Jewish" in terms of Biblical identity is to become a Gentile.

Quote:
-----Robert, who is presenting the gospel here with Roman influence?

Understand that I am not saying "you are" per se, I am saying this is what is generally found in the Church. The environment here at SI is a lot different than main stream Christendom.

Quote:
-----What do you mean "lawfully"? Which law?

This is in reference to I Timothy 1:8. But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; That would be according to the revealed will of God as it pertains to the issue. In this case to do so within the framework of Christian liberty.

Quote:
-----The "Lord's Day" and the Sabbath Day are/were different things.

This is true, but even in Finney's writings he refers to Sunday as "the Sabbath Day."

Keep in mind that there are two primary reasons why we study Jewish Roots:

- 1) To understand the issues in order to be equipped to give an answer for the hope that lies within us for the purpose of evangelism.
- 2) To discover the effects on modern Christendom of Greek influences and discover the purest form of 1st century Christianity.

Personally, I want to walk with Christ as did the Apostles and to do that I have to allow the Holy Spirit to "filter out" certain traditions and misconceptions that may be hindering that walk. On a daily basis, there are certain things that are still with me since I left the Institute. Many things I have let go, other things I have not. Of the things I know are essential to the issues I have been faithful to share in this thread. Some of them are very, very challenging for an unbelieving Jew. Others have proven very challenging to Believers. I have tried to be as true as I possibly can.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 14:33

Quote:
-----Valid to whom?

Hi Bro. Ron,

Valid in terms of authentic Biblical faith in the purpose of God as He intended it to be among the Jews. The Nazarenes were the Jewish part of the remnant that God always keeps for Himself.

Certainly the leadership were called minim (heretics) and as you rightly stated both Nazarene and Christian could be considered derogatory terms. The Pharisees wouldn't validate anyone that rejected their authority. I wrote on this in" (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewcategory&cid113&page1>) Talmudic Revision and The Struggle For Authority.

Quote:
-----I understand that the 'Nazarenes' refused to take part in the Bar Kokhba revolt.

This is where I tend to focus in understanding what has brought the Jews to where they are today. See: (<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?viewarticle&aid1957>) Rabbi Akiba's False Messiah.

Quote:
-----Not that I am accusing Messianic Jews of Ebionite error. I am referring to their determination to hold on to their heritage that isolate and ultimately doomed them. There seems some evidence from textual criticism that they had their own translated versions of some New Testament documents and no doubt their insistence upon their historic terminology further separated them from their Gentile brethren.

Their refusal to assimilate into what would eventually become the Universal Church is not without warrant. It did not take long for error to enter in. There is plenty of circumstances that are involved with plenty of blame to go around. The unbelieving Jews almost always reacted hostilely to Paul, etc. The writing of people like Marcion and others were clearly anti-semitic. There is a pattern of this that I have traced in both counts. In the end I believe it was the enemy at work; yet, God still has a remnant somewhere.

The Ebionites were strict Judaizers (to say the least) and were heretical in many theological views. The history is too sketchy to be sure exactly what they believed. There are some "Messianic's" that would be in the category of Ebionite. I don't question that at all.

Quote:
-----A new pattern was emerging and Paul took it by the throat! If he hadn't, the result would have been two churches throughout Galatia; Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians. What a travesty that would have been to God's intention to 'make both one'.

I agree that they should be one. I don't disagree at all. The key issue is that of assimilation. Should a Jew be compelled to assimilate? I know that many Messianic's have assimilated and married non-Jews. :-o

I simply don't have all the answers. I believe God will work it all out as He always does.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/25 14:40

I'll be out until at least Saturday. I'll try to return to any issues then.

God Bless!

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/25 14:44

Quote:
-----The word synagogue is used to identify with the Jewish people. The name "Church" is stigmatized beyond repair to the non-Believing Jews.

I understand this, but it just seems like another title for a Jewish Church which concept I believe to be a serious error.

I can see the place for a Chinese Christian Fellowship in Reading. We have one; it does a good work. But I hope it is not regarded as the Chinese Church in Reading or the Church for the Chinese in Reading. There is no Chinese Church in Reading, only The Church. There isn't even a Chinese church in China, just the Church. The churches, as local expressions of The Church, surely must have the same principle at work. I think Messianic Synagogue is another name for Jewish Church; please persuade me otherwise. (I mean it; I would like to be persuaded otherwise)

To put anything 'in front of' church to me is distressing. a Methodist Church, a Pentecostal Church. Do I have to become a Methodist or Pentecostal to join these gatherings?

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/26 6:54

Quote:

-----Quote:

No-one has to become like a gentile to be saved, every person must yield their life to Christ to be "saved".

You and I may believe this; but there are many who would say that a Jew has to cease to be Jewish to become a believer in Christ. To cease to be "Jewish" in terms of Biblical identity is to become a Gentile.

Galatians 3:28

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

Perhaps we need to define what a Jew, a Hebrew, and an Israelite is?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/26 7:28

Quote:

-----Perhaps we need to define what a Jew, a Hebrew, and an Israelite is?

Yes, this is the central issue in the current development of this thread.

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/26 7:43

and perhaps what a gentile is and what a Christian is?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/26 9:14

There is an interesting website called Judaism 101: <http://www.jewfaq.org/index.htm>

Perhaps others will like to suggest similar or better resources. It has the question "Who is a Jew?" and answers...

"A Jew is any person whose mother was a Jew or any person who has gone through the formal process of conversion to Judaism.

It is important to note that being a Jew has nothing to do with what you believe or what you do. A person born to non-Jewish parents who has not undergone the formal process of conversion but who believes everything that Orthodox Jews believe and observes every law and custom of Judaism is still a non-Jew, even in the eyes of the most liberal movements of Judaism, and a person born to a Jewish mother who is an atheist and never practices the Jewish religion is still a Jew, even in the eyes of the ultra-Orthodox. In this sense, Judaism is more like a nationality than like other religions, and being Jewish is like a citizenship."

The danger would be, of course, of importing this definition back into the scriptures and then making conclusions as to 'Jewish' identity and destiny. It is good to have such rule-of-thumb definitions but what we need is a biblical definition. We also need to ask the question 'are the terms Jew, Israelite, Israeli, Hebrew, The Circumcision... synonymous terms biblically?'

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/26 10:28

This springs to mind:

Philippians 3:

4 Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more:

5 Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee;

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, & Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/26 16:52

Shalom ...

Please know that when Jewish sites are offered to help define, "Who is a Jew?" such recommendations ignorantly serve this electronic community unless one knows that the site is Orthodox, Lubavitchers, Reform, Conservative, Reconstructionist, Messianic or even secular. For example: Orthodox Jews define, "Who is a Jew?", based on the father's ancestral heritage. Reform Jews take the mother's ancestral heritage to define, "Who is a Jew?" The secularist, such as the first Prime Minister of the State of Israel, defined, "Who is a Jew?", by whomever self-identified with the Jewish plight. Some Christians define, "Who is a Jew?", as everyone who has accepted Jesus as The Christ. Messianic Jews define, Who is a Jew?, by either mother/father or grandparent Jewish lineage. The State of Israel's Supreme Court defines, "Who is a Jew?", for the Right of Return with two qualifications, primarily. Because the Supreme Court of Israel is dominated by the Shas Party (Orthodox and ultra-Orthodox rabbis) they define, Who is a Jew?, by the father's lineage and secondly, one who has never accepted another religion. Messianic Jews are specifically denied aliyah under the Right of Return for every other Jew. Another words, for me, as a Messianic Jew, I must deny YESHUA (Jesus) as the Jewish Messiah to enjoy aliyah under the Right of Return for every other Jew.

I wonder in the theological confines of some, whether their obsessing on definitions has any reality with what Believing Jews, many of who identify themselves as "Messianic Jews," must contend with. Who among the Christians in our westernized civilizations have had their family members literally conduct a funeral when their son/daughter accept Jesus and betray their people? Are you even aware of this? Does not your heart hurt because the veil that continues to shroud many of my Jewish relatives emotionally, physically and spiritually prevents them from hearing your "arguments" which wholly lack the fruit of GOD's Spirit? GOD's Grace continues forever. I have not been able to disciple even one Believer (Jew or non-Jew) in 47+ years without first building a bridge of relationship that wholly and holy embraces The Central Command. I have won lots of debates that leaves me painfully empty because I realize that person has not been "won" through GOD's Spirit but laborious argumentation of theological wannabes who made the choice of not earning advanced degrees - and then disrespect those who have. Please, Brothers ... Israel's Survival is tied like an umbilical cord to America's Revival. Where is the Saturating presence of ADONAI ELOHEYNU in the midst of this nuanced debates? Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, & Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/26 18:19

Shalom ... Some, I trust most, of you are familiar with Promise Keepers and the founder Coach Bill McCartney. Coach has begun a new ministry thrust, "The Road to Jerusalem." The mission is to encourage gentile Believers in Jesus Christ to embrace the Messianic Jewish community. Events will be scheduled to celebrate "together-together" the Hebraic heritage of our faith. The breaking down of the walls of many years of ignorance, indifference and insensitivities toward the Messianic Jewish community is clearly a healing cry from our Father's Heart and Hand. Jew and Gentile will sing praises as one in Messiah. The first event is December 3, 2004 in Palm Springs, CA USA. You might want to visit this organization's web site at roadtojerusalem.org Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, & Not Replaced - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/26 18:47

Quote:
-----I think Messianic Synagogue is another name for Jewish Church; please persuade me otherwise. (I mean it; I would like to be persuaded otherwise)

Hello Bro. Ron and others,

I have given this question much thought and want to make a defense for doing such things based upon what Paul tells us in I Corinthians 9.; What, then, is my reward? -- that proclaiming good news, without charge I shall make the good news

of the Christ, not to abuse my authority in the good news; for being free from all men, to all men I made myself servant, that the more I might gain; and I became to the Jews as a Jew, that Jews I might gain; to those under law as under law, that those under law I might gain; to those without law, as without law -- (not being without law to God, but within law to Christ) -- that I might gain those without law; I became to the infirm as infirm, that the infirm I might gain; to all men I have become all things, that by all means I may save some. And this I do because of the good news, that a fellow-partaker of it I may become;. (YLT)

I want to focus on this portion and I became to the Jews as a Jew, that Jews I might gain; to those under law as under law, that those under law I might gain; to those without law, as without law . We know that there were times in Acts when Paul kept Pentecost and took a vow. We are not told why he took one of the vows; And Paul having remained yet a good many days, having taken leave of the brethren, was sailing to Syria -- and with him Priscilla and Aquilas -- having shorn head in Cencheria, for he had a vow; and again in Acts 21:23,24 `This, therefore, do that we say to thee: We have found our men having a vow on themselves, these having taken, be purified with them, and be at expence with them, that they may shave the head, and all may know that the things of which they have been instructed concerning thee are nothing, but thou dost walk -- thyself also -- the law keeping. He went to celebrate Pentecost in Acts 20:16.

I think from these references we can glean a pattern of Paul's theology concerning liberty. Sometimes it seems he took a vow because it was something he needed to do between him and God. In the other case it seems he did so to show the Jewish Believers that he was not against the Law for Jewish Believers. And in the case of Pentecost, he seems to just want to go to celebrate with them or maybe share the Gospel at that opportunity.

If we believe the latter to be highly probable and consistent with his whole life then we can understand also how Bro. Eukel would desire to share with us some truths about how we might do what Paul did. If we don't know how to "become a Jew to the Jews" or "To those under the Law become as one under the Law" then we have lost opportunity to preach the Gospel to "the Jew first". Making a Messianic Synagogue is doing what Paul did. It is affording a people the 'means' by which to exercise their liberty in its fullest expression and reach the Jews who would never in a million years attend a Church.

Why did you do this Paul? You took beatings from the Jews in your day for refusing to take sides! You were stripped of your Jewish identity for 1500 years, though you often identified with them during your ministry. Why did you not just pick a group and align yourselves with them!? He tells us here again; I have become all things, that by all means I may save some. And this I do because of the good news, that a fellow-partaker of it I may become;.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/26 19:02

Quote:
----- I have won lots of debates that leaves me painfully empty because I realize that person has not been "won" through GOD's Spirit but laborious argumentation of theological wannebes who made the choice of not earning advanced degrees - and then disrespect those who have.

We can win an argument and loose a soul. Beloved let us love one another (Philostorgos). This is true also when debating with atheists and agnostics. We can converse with each other here as "Iron sharpeneth Iron", but we will only ever win the lost through Christ living out His life in us as we do what He would do if He were here.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, & Not Replaced - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/26 19:02

Quote:
-----I wonder in the theological confines of some, whether their obsessing on definitions has any reality with what Believing Jews, many of who identify themselves as "Messianic Jews," must contend with.

It may seem like 'obsessing on definitions' but unless I understand the words that you use how can I understand what you are saying? By my definition of what it means to be a Jew, I am one; are we happy with that? I doubt it.

Quote:
-----I have won lots of debates that leaves me painfully empty because I realize that person has not been "won" through GOD's Spirit but laborious argumentation of theological wannabes who made the choice of not earning advanced degrees - and then disrespect those who have.

I'm sorry but I have no idea what this sentence means. Unless it means that people with advanced degrees are more likely to know the truth; I hope it doesn't mean that.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/26 19:15

Quote:
-----It is affording a people the 'means' by which to exercise their liberty in its fullest expression and reach the Jews who would never in a million years attend a Church.

Hi Robert

I understand what Paul was doing and am not objecting to it although I know some Christians have in the past. But what a person does as an individual and what a person does as a representative are different. I cannot believe that Paul would have created a Jewish Church in New York or anywhere else. That was what Peter was doing and it drew Paul's legitimate rebuke.

I still want to understand where De Eukel stands in all this. Paul saw clear distinctions otherwise his statements make no sense. In the light of **Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God:** (1Co 10:32 KJV) I still say, please tick a box.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/26 19:39

Quote:
-----I cannot believe that Paul would have created a Jewish Church in New York or anywhere else. That was what Peter was doing and it drew Paul's legitimate rebuke.

Hi Bro. Ron,

If a Messianic Congregation would not allow non-Jews to enter into their fellowship or if they somehow were compelling Gentiles to live as the Jews it would warrant a rebuke. This has not been my limited experience around Messianics. However, there are some in the congregation who are quite hostile to the Church for various reasons and you have to keep your guard up with those people. A sort of, "How dare you celebrate Christmas, a Pagan holiday?!" or sort of smugly say "We don't have a Christmas tree in our house." 8-)

Most of those folks were not naturally Jewish anyhow from what I could tell. I just ignored it. It was not the position of the school to rebuke the Gentiles (well, we took a lot of rebukes), but they did not compel us to live as the Jews; they compelled us to study and appreciate Jewish Roots.

The sharpness that we see on this thread was a dialy thing for us in class for everyone who was new to the setting. I just started sitting towards the back and watched the fireworks. I say that lovingly. Sometimes I would chime in when I saw folks talking past each other and stuff, but by and large it takes some time for everyone to understand where each other is

coming from. Its like a bad scene from the Old Western days when everyone in the room had their guns out, cocked, and pointed at each other. A man thrws three plates in the air and shoots em all down and blows the tip of the pistol. The next guy throws up three plates and pulls a gun from his boot and hits them all. Right now, I'm just watching the smoke clear.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/27 3:26

Quote:
-----If a Messianic Congregation would not allow non-Jews to enter into their fellowship or if they somehow were compelling Gentiles to live as the Jews it would warrant a rebuke. This has not been my limited experience around Messianics.

Hi Robert

Paul itemized two aspects of Peter's behaviour. I have previously mentioned the fact that this are in the imperfect tense which indicates a continuing pattern; they were were not isolated instances.

The behaviour which earned the rebuke was

1. Withdrawing - hupostellō; to draw back, let down, lower
2. Separating - aphorizō; Thayer Definition:
 - 1) to mark off from others by boundaries, to limit, to separate
 - 1a) in a bad sense: to exclude as disreputable

The first must almost inevitably lead to the second. I see you are saying that Messianic Congregations are usually not to be 'blamed' for the second. That still leaves the first charge.

Jewish Roots: Rich, redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/27 6:24

Shalom ...

Let us re-visit Scripture, particularly 1 Corinthians 10: 32, which may not faithfully be divorced from the context Rav Sha'ul is teaching about freedom, liberty and conscience ... Rav Sha'ul is, of course, responding to a series of questions the Believers in Corinth have raised (the Messianic congregation in Corinth, it should be clearly noted is comprised of both Jews and non-Jews who have come to faith in YESHUA under the discipling of Rav Sha'ul. Furthermore, make no mistake about it, the congregation's place of gathering, if not a private home, would be known ONLY as a synagogue, at least until after 135 A.D., then perhaps the more dominant in numbers both in leadership and adherents Greek-speaking Believers would have used the Greek word for "called out ones, " - from which we derive the English word, ecclesiastical - of a church or clergy). 1 Cor 8 begins a lengthy discussion about food - what freedom, liberty do we as Believers - especially Jewish Believers during this period of "go-make disciples", have. Rav Sha'ul as a Hebrew of Hebrews, a rabbinic scholar who advanced ahead of others before the seniority system would have elevated him, is "perfectly"

way, observant and submissive to the "kosher" teachings GOD first instructed through His leader Moshe in the First Covenant (not the "old" as if it were no longer applicable, or has currency - a distorted understanding that some here in this electronic community embrace, as if it were "replaced", i.e., done away with, when the New Covenant is canonized).

Some here in this electronic community want to superimpose on Rav Sha'ul's teachings that 10:32 sets up three little boxes that determines from then on whether you are "Jew" "Gentile" or "church of GOD." If you "tick" the "wrong" box (don't tick the Jew or Gentile box, some might caution, because then you are somehow outside THE box).

Let us look at what Rav Sha'ul is saying from the Complete Jewish Bible in 1 Cor 10:32,33 and 11:1 "Do not be an obstacle to anyone - not to Jews, not to Gentiles, and not to GOD's Messianic Community. Just as I try to please everyone in everything I do, not looking out for my own interests but for those of the many, so that they may be saved; try to imitate me, even as I myself try to imitate The Messiah."

Is Rav' Sha'ul making a threefold division of humanity, as some here in this electronic community reason? No, clearly in the context of Rav Sha'ul's teaching beginning at chapter 8, he has NOT come up with a new strange teaching that classifies the then known world into three neat little boxes, Jews, non-Jews (Gentiles) and the Messianic Community (Jews and non-Jews who are Believers in YESHUA). Frankly, Rav Sha'ul's previous persecution of Believers before his Damme sk dialogue with YESHUA, The LORD, he understood his narrow world was Jews and those who blaspheme. That is it just two choices of a box to tick - strict observant Jew or "others" who should be jailed, whipped and even stoned to death! Notice that the goyim, peoples of other nations, are in this strictist of observing Jews view of no consequence. As Rob

ert of this electronic community has been pointing our for some time on this thread, the first question of the Jerusalem Council for Messianic Jewish Believers was whether the goyim, gentile, could be a part of the Kingdom of GOD. ADONAI helped kosher-keeping Kefa recognize that what GOD has created is clean. Kefa's vision was about food. But then, of course, we now know as he comes to know later, that it was not about food specifically, but about the goyim, Gentiles, who are enfolded into the community of Believers by GOD's election as evidenced by the manifestation of RUACH haKODESH enveloping Cornelius' household, just as He did on the Day of Shavu'ot (Pentecost). No Jewish eye or ear would have missed the divine parallel of the day of Shavu'ot in which RUACH HaKODESH manifests His Presence as fire enabling the Jewish Believers to speak The Word as a light to the goyim (nations). The parallel to the giving of The Word 50 days after the Pesach on Mount Sinai with the manifestation of fire, trembling, shaking would not have been missed by the Jewish eye and ear who had been given the grace to have the trust/faith to see and hear GOD's Heart and Hand. The fullness of understanding, to be sure, would take place later and be revisited in the open dialogue between Kefa and Rav Sha'u'l (on this point I was particularly blessed with the careful insight of both our Brothers Ron and Robert here in this electronic community as they pictured the dialogue dramatically. Ron's pastoral insight reaches a zenith I had not seen before in his writing).

I have engaged in more side-bars than initially intended. Forgive me if you feel submerged in all this laboring of words. Let me state the point, as does David H. Stern, Ph.D, in his seminal work, "Jewish New Testament Commentary." Salvation does not wipe out identity as a Jew or a Gentile. Careful observation of Rav Sha'u'l's other writings makes it clear he refers to saved Gentiles as simple "Gentiles" (Ro 11:13; Eph 2:11) and to saved Jews as "Jews" (Gal 2:13). He still referred himself as a Pharisee (Act 23:6) which obviously has no meaning to a first century hearer except within the Jewish community. GOD's Kingdom, therefore consists of saved Jews who remain Jews and saved Gentiles who remain Gentiles. The Israelite community from Avraham and Moshe, you will recall, also had "foreigners" among them who were fully grafted into the cultured Olive Tree (would you deny the harlot Rahav's place in the ancestral lineage of King David and The Messiah)! Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/27 10:00

Quote:

-----1. Withdrawing - hupostellō: to draw back, let down, lower

Hi Bro. Ron,

Sorry, I thought of this after I had gone home for the night. Actually, the congregation and Messianic Jewish people that I have known did not draw back from fellowship with the non-Jews. They encouraged everyone in the Church to come to service and the leader had a Radio program on Christian Radio to invite folk. That's what made me aware of the congregation. They also invited Jews to come on a secular program on the AM dial. I can't recall if I ever seen any of the Hasidim come in.

I would listen to the program and think, "Wow, I wonder what it would be like to attend service with Jews who believed in Jesus?!" Later I found out that they were Pentecostal Messianic Jews and that was a real eye-opener. I would be interested to discuss (hear) what it is about the Pentecostal denominations that we find the Jewish people drawn to, and what we can learn from that.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/27 14:36

Br Robert wrote:

Quote:

-----I agree with this to an extent, but would like to suggest that the primary thing that we are called out of is this world system. For the sake of those who don't already know let me backtrack and say; The Greek word for Church is ekklesia, which essentially means "called out".

Haggai

11 "Thus says the LORD of hosts: 'Now, ask the priests concerning the law, saying, 'If one carries holy meat in the fold of his garment, and with the edge he touches bread or stew, wine or oil, or any food, will it become holy?'"

Then the priests answered and said, "No."

Hag. 2:13 And Haggai said, "If one who is unclean because of a dead body touches any of these, will it be unclean?"

So the priests answered and said, "It shall be unclean."

Hag. 2:14 Then Haggai answered and said, "So is this people, and so is this nation before Me," says the LORD, "and so is every work of their hands; and what they offer there is unclean."

This is the essence of what makes us one in Christ. His bride consists of those who are "called out." There have always been those who have been "called out." One can not escape what is unclean unless God calls them out. Then the essence of faith establishes this separation for God has determined:

"...But the just shall live by his faith." Habakkuk 2:4

We see this precept throughout Scripture:

Ezra 6:21 Then the children of Israel who had returned from the captivity ate together with all who had separated themselves from the filth of the nations of the land in order to seek the LORD God of Israel.

The work of God is the same. The vessel molded by the Potter's hand is His creation. The workmanship will always resemble the "separation of His people unto Himself."

This "separation" does not affect what God has planned for the nation of Israel to come.

Hag. 2:20 And again the word of the LORD came to Haggai on the twenty-fourth day of the month, saying, 'Speak to Zerubbabel, governor of Judah, saying:

'I will shake heaven and earth.

22 I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms;

I will destroy the strength of the Gentile kingdoms.

I will overthrow the chariots

And those who ride in them;

The horses and their riders shall come down,

Every one by the sword of his brother.

I am listening RabbiEukel.

In Christ

Jeff

Jewish Roots: Rich, redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/27 21:53

Shalom ... Avraham was "called out" separated from the land of his father to go to a place GOD would show him. Yitz'chak was "called out" to not choose a wife/bride from the nations surrounding him, but from the relatives of the homeland of his father. Ya'akov was "called out" to receive the birthright of the first born because Esav, his brother despised it. Moshe was "called out" to lead his people Israel out of the enslavement of Egypt's sins and to The Promised Land GOD had spoken to Avraham, Yitz'chak and Ya'akov. The children of Israel are "called out" to be a light to the nations (goyim) to show Or HaOlam (The Light of the world). Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, Not Replaced & RUACH HaKODESH - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/27 22:18

Shalom ... The Messianic Jewish community in America is represented by two large organizations: MJAA and UMJC. MJAA members do have more representation of those who have a charismatic/pentecostal background or experience. MJAA adherents, like many charismatic/pentecostals, tend to be people moved by The Spirit with less theological training. MJAA publications are widely popular but not, generally speaking, scholarly. The UMJC Messianic Jewish community attracts professors and writers who strongly feel the need to give a reasoned argument for their faith and links to the sages of our people. Like many other movements, denominations and religious organizations not everyone who refers to himself/herself as a "Messianic Jew" is in harmony with the Statements of Faith of the MJAA/UMJC. Even those who may align themselves as a part of a Messianic Jewish congregation that warmly welcomes both Jews and non-Jews who are Believers and non-Believers do not all sing in the same key if they are at least singing the same psalm. Certainly the process of disciple-making is as much a concern of the congregational leadership, rabbis & elders, as this "working out our salvation" is part of the ongoing struggle and process in a church. Yes?

What attracts Messianic Jews to a pentecostal expression of our faith? I trust that it is the same for non-Messianic Jews. We sense The Presence of GOD, RUACH HaKODESH, and we want to celebrate in the midst of His Saturating Presence. We want for ourselves, our family and our grandchildren to experience in all the vibrancy our ancient traditions teach us, that revival fire that renews, restores, and reverberates deeply through our spirit as we connect again to ADONAI through His Only and Uniquely begotten Son, YESHUA The Messiah. Is it different for you Brother? Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/29 2:23

Quote:
-----Rav Sha'ul as a Hebrew of Hebrews, a rabbinic scholar who advanced ahead of others before the seniority system would have elevated him, is "perfectly" way, observant and submissive to the "kosher" teachings GOD first instructed through His leader Moshe in the First Covenant (not the "old" as if it were no longer applicable, or has currency - a distorted understanding that some here in this electronic community embrace, as if it were "replaced", i.e., done away with, when the New Covenant is canonized).

Please explain the following verses:

Hebrews 8:13

In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

Hebrews 10:9

Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by RabbiEukel (), on: 2004/11/29 5:00

Shalom ... Messianic Jews (Hebrews) 8:13 and 10:9 which you quote in KingJimmy must be explained, at least, within the context of the section 7:1-10:18. Verses 8b-12 of chapter 8 itself is the longest citation from the TaNaKh (First Covenant/Hebrew Scriptures) in the New Covenant/Testament. Greek uses two words for "new" - "kainos" and "neos." "Neos" as you know, means something which has never before existed. "Kainos" means freshness, renewal of something which has existed. This distinction is clearly captured by the Jewish disciple of YESHUA, Mattityahu (Matthew) at 9:16, 17 when he records YESHUA's teachings using the illustration of patching (adapting) an old coat with a fresh cloth and new (neos) wine in fresh (kainos) wineskins. With that preliminary, but brief, groundwork of understanding and your agreement of the understanding that the verses you quote in KingJimmy (8:13 and 10:9) cannot be removed from the context of the section 7:1-10:18, then we can slowly move on. Do we have agreement so far? Love and Prayers, Rabbi Eukel

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 6:12

Quote:
------(Hebrews) 8:13 and 10:9 which you quote in [KingJimmy](#) must be explained, at least, within the context of the section 7:1-10:18.

I would like to request a little more respect for this honoured translation. In the UK it is known as the Authorised Version (AV) and elsewhere as the King James Version (KJV). As a person who evidently sets much store by correct titles, I'm sure you won't mind this little courtesy. Thank you.

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/11/29 7:12

Quote:
-----Greek uses two words for "new" - "kainos" and "neos." "Neos" as you know, means something which has never before existed. "Kainos" means freshness, renewal of something which has existed.

How do you explain this:

Hebrews 8:8

For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah:

Hebrews 12:24

And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

Re: the second covenant has replaced the first - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 7:15

Do I understand that your position is that the New Covenant is actually a Renewed Covenant rather than something a Brand New Covenant? Surely this would miss the strong point of Jeremiah **Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith Jehovah.** (Jer 31:31-32 ASV)

The original Sinai Covenant was inaugurated by the shedding and sprinkling of the blood of bullocks which had been consumed in burnt and peace offerings. (Ex 24:5) That outworking of that covenant was external; all its rituals were external. The law was written on stone, the blood was sprinkled externally, the Spirit of God came upon people, water was used in ablutions, wine was poured out. It was an external covenant captured by Jeremiah in the phrase 'I took them by the hand'; and idiom that has no New Covenant counterpart. Later came the promise of Emmanuel; God with us. This was the essence of the Sinai Covenant and is beautifully defined in the words of Christ concerning the Spirit; **And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.** (Joh 14:16-17 KJV) The New Covenant is internal.

Jeremiah's New Covenant is boldly set out as a New Covenant **But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people:** (Jer 31:33 ASV) This is clearly not the Covenant in being when Jeremiah gave the prophecy otherwise the time-shifts, after those days, makes no sense.

The Sinai Covenant brought into being the qahal of Jehovah. The idea first emerges of Israel as God's 'qahal' in the instructions for the Passover as a preliminary to the nations becoming God's special nation. The Sinai Covenant had this clearly in focus; **Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.** (Exo 19:5-6 ASV) I think the first use of the phrase 'qahal Jehovah' is **and they assembled themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and Jehovah is among them: wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the assembly of Jehovah?** (Num 16:3 ASV) I can find the phrase in Nu 16:3 20:4 De 23:1,2,3,8 Jud 21:5 1Ch 28:8 Mic 2:5.

In the Septuagint qahal was usually translated by the word 'ekklesia' which was a very appropriate word meaning the 'outcalled'. As a result of their deliverance from Egypt and the enactment of the Sinai Covenant the nation of Israel became the 'outcalled', unique, people of God. That Covenant was given the infrastructure of a priesthood with very specific rituals and celebrations. The Covenant and the priesthood were inseparable. When Israel incurred sin the only basis upon which God would continue in their midst was through the annual Day of Atonement which could only be carried out by priests. If priests sinned there was an emergency sacrifice of the ashes of the red heifer, but the ashes of the red-heifer could only be prepared by a cleansed priest. This established a close cycle of events which when broken could never be re-established. Catch 22. You can't cleanse the priest without the sacrifices and you can't perform the sacrifices without a clean priest. Israel's 'holiness' was ceremonial, and to use my previous word, external. (I am not talking about individuals and their walk with God but about the nation)

We can imagine the astonishment with the disciples heard the words captured in the inspired record as **And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.** (Mat 16:18 KJV) For men who already regarded themselves as an integral part of the 'qahal' of 'ekklesia of God' these words must have taken their breath away. This is not the 'church (qahal) of God but the church of Christ. There is no indication that this is a refreshed 'church of God' but speaks in the future tense of an intention then future.

The letter to the Hebrews speaks of a contrast between a system of animal sacrifice which Christ did not come to 'refresh' but of a once-for-ever sacrifice. God's pleasure was not in 'burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin' but in the One who fulfilled all the ancient types by His own death. Having contrasted the old sacrificial system and Christ's own perfect fulfilling of the Father's will the scripture continues **Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law; Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;** (Heb 10:8-12 KJV) The era of the perpetual sacrifices and standing priests was over; the new era of one sacrifice and a sitting priest had been inaugurated. The writer sums up this in his phrase **Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.** (Heb 10:9 KJV) I don't use the phrase 'replacement theology' myself but if ever there was a definition of 'replacement theology' it is here. He takes away the first; the system of animal sacrifice which was part of the infrastructure of that 'first' Covenant. Step One. The Greek behind the word 'that' is 'iva'. This word is part of the strict logic of Greek thought; it is described as a primary conjunction denoting purpose, definition or result; in order that, that, so that: - the NASB expresses it **then He said, "BEHOLD, I HAVE COME TO DO YOUR WILL." He takes away the first in order to establish the second.** (Heb 10:9 NASB) The ESV translates it **then he added, "Behold, I have come to do your will." He abolishes the first in order to establish the second.** (Heb 10:9 ESV) The ESV is not too strong here. The verb 'takes away' is anaireo which is defined as to take up, that is, adopt; by implication to take away (violently), that is, abolish, murder: - put to death, kill, slay, take away, take up. In the KJV it is usually translated 'put to death' or 'slay'.

The first had to come to a complete end in order for the second to be established; this is its meaning to stand something up in a specific place. The 'place' of course is the place where the first covenant had stood. This is not coexistence or progression but replacement. The Second Covenant replaced the First Covenant; it did not refresh it but replaced it.

Re: R.C. Trench: Synonyms of the New Testament - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 7:23

Quote:
 -----Greek uses two words for "new" - "kainos" and "neos." "Neos" as you know, means something which has never before existed. "Kainos" means freshness, renewal of something which has existed.

Contemplate the new under the aspects of time, as that which has recently come into existence, and this is "neos". Thus the young are continually "oi neoi", or "oi veOteroi", the generation which has but lately sprung up... But contemplate the new, not under aspects of time, but quality, as new, as set over against that which has seen service, the outworn, the effete or marred through or marred through age, and this is "kainos": thus "kainon imation" (Lk 5:36), "

a new garment", as contrasted with one threadbare and outworn; "kainoi askoi" "new wineskin" (Matt 9:17 Lk 5:38) and in this sense "ouranos" (2Pet 3:13) "a new heaven", as set over against that which has waxen old, and shows signs of decay and dissolution (Heb 1:11,12)

Joseph laid the body in a new tomb "kainon" unused though it may have been hewn out long before.

neotEs (1Tim 4:12) is youth, kainotEs (Rom 6:4) is newness or novelty

We may take for example the "neos anthrOpos" (new man) of Col 3:10 and the "kainos anthrOpos" (new man) of Eph 2:15. Contemplate under aspects of time that mighty change which has found and is still finding place in the man who has become obedient to the truth, and you will call him subsequently to this change "neos anthrOpos". The old man in him, and it well deserves this name, for it dates back as far back as Adam has died; a new man has been born, who therefore is fitly called "neos". But contemplate him again, and not now under aspects of time, but of quality and condition, this same mighty transformation; behold the man who, through long contact with the world, inveterate habits of sinning, had grown ourworn and old, casting off the old conversation, as the snake its shrivelled skin, coming forth again "a new creation" (kainE ktisis) from his heavenly Maker's hands, with a pneuma kainon given to him (Ezek 11:19) and you have here the kainos anthrOpos, one prepared to walk in newness of life (en kainotEti zOEs Rom 6:4) through the anakainOsis of the Spirit (Tit 3:15)

quoted from the Synonyms of the New Testament

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/29 7:51

Quote:

-----Is it different for you Brother?

Hi Bro. Eukel,

What sparked this question is that it seems I once heard my instructor say that he had gone to a Pentecostal Church as Orthodox Jew (for whatever reason I am unsure) and it was all quite in conflict with what he believed as a Orthodox Jew, but he sensed the presense of God there and knew God was among the people. It (as I recall) was this sensing of the presence of God that led to a deeper search for Truth in the Messiah. In other words, it was not a well reasoned argument that convinced him, but was conscious awareness that God was near. (my rendition of his explanation)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/29 8:32

Quote:

-----The ESV is not too strong here. The verb 'takes away' is anaireO which is defined as to take up, that is, adopt; by implication to take away (violently), that is, abolish, murder: - put to death, kill, slay, take away, take up. In the KJV is it usually translated 'put to death' or 'slay'.

Hi Bro. Ron,

The common argument in Messianic circles is against "destroying" the law and the prophets. Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. (Matthew 5:18) As I understand it the word for destroy is Kataluo. The word then for fulfil is Pleroo. I tend to think about it like lecture notes that I used to get that had all kinds of blanks to fill in as the Instructor spoke (I suppose to both make it easy for us and yet make us stay awake). When I put the last word in the last 'blank' the notes were 'fulfilled.' Jesus filled in all the blanks and brought the Old Covenant

t to completion; but did not destroy it as it still has some uses if it is used lawfully. One of those uses is to look at what it really means to love each other and to act righteously. We can learn about God's holiness and righteousness etc.,

I think the problem was not the contents of the covenant in terms of God's revealed holiness and righteousness; but the means by which the Law was to be carried out. We CANNOT come under the Law for righteousness because we are carnal and sold under sin. Even though we are Born Again we still cannot come under that covenant because there is something in us that causes sin "to revive." yet, the righteous characteristics of the Law must be established in us as we walk in the Spirit.

The ceremonial things of the law teach us a lot; but God is interested in justice and the love of God; the things that many of the Pharisees ignored. They are the 'weightier' things. As Born again believers, these are a few things we ought to establish. As Paul wrote; Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law. (Romans 3:31) Do we kenoo the Law by faith? Do we empty it or make it void? God forbid! We Honour the Law. We stand it upright, not by the keeping of carnal ordinances, but by walking in the Spirit.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 9:04

Quote:
-----The common argument in Messianic circles is against "destroying" the law and the prophets. Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. (Matthew 5:18) As I understand it the word for destroy is Kataluo. The word then for fulfil is Pleroo.

Hi Robert

He did fulfil the law and the prophets. All that was spoken of Him in His first advent He fulfilled. He was Israel who did what Israel had never done. We are not talking here about the 'righteousness requirements' of the law by its institution. Hebrews, contrasting their priesthood with His says {b} Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh a way the first, that he may establish the second. (Heb 10:9 KJV) Please tell me what you think is meant by the 'first' and the 'second' because whatever it is we are talking about we have some kind of 'replacement theology' here.

The word for 'take away' is probably best captured in the English phrase 'done away' with. The word is used here

Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wrath, and sent forth, and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wise men. (Mat 2:16 KJV)

And there were also two other, malefactors, led with him to be put to death. (Luk 23:32 KJV)

Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: (Act 2:23 KJV)

Which thing I also did in Jerusalem: and many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them. (Act 26:10 KJV)

There are more but this gives sufficient evidence to show how the word was used.

The reason I am drawing attention to the sacrificial system is that it was the essential function of the priesthood which in turn serviced the Sinai Covenant. The Sinai Law and the Aaronic Priesthood cannot be separated; they are inextricably linked. **For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.** (Heb 7:12 KJV) 'Change' here is properly 'transfer'

By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God. (Heb 11:5 KJV)

And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. (Heb 12:27 KJV)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/29 9:31

Quote:
-----Please tell me what you think is meant by the 'first' and the 'second' because whatever it is we are talking about we have some kind of 'replacement theology' here.

Hi Bro. Ron,

It goes without saying that the sacrificial system is abolished. The Temple was destroyed and so were the Sadducees. What has 'replaced' the Temple procedures for the Hasidim in my understanding is known as tzedekiah (acts or works of righteousness). This is done by a system of halakah, which is a method of making the Law relevant to today. Yet, it is well beyond all this because the main focus (in my experience) is not the Old Covenant or the 613 Laws per se; but the Mishna and Talmud. This is like adding a layer of steel to an already concrete bunker.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/29 12:09

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----Do I understand that your position is that the New Covenant is actually a Renewed Covenant rather than something a Brand New Covenant? Surely this would miss the strong point of Jeremiah Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith Jehovah. (Jer 31:31-32 ASV)

The covenant that was made with Israel in the days that they lived in Egypt is described in the book of Ezekiel chapter 20:

Ezek. 20:5 "Say to them, "Thus says the Lord GOD: "On the day when I chose Israel and raised My hand in an oath to the descendants of the house of Jacob, and made Myself known to them in the land of Egypt, I raised My hand in an oath to them, saying, "I am the LORD your God." 6 On that day I raised My hand in an oath to them, to bring them out of the land of Egypt into a land that I had searched out for them, "flowing with milk and honey," the glory of all lands. 7 Then I said to them, "Each of you, throw away the abominations which are before his eyes, and do not defile yourselves with the idols of Egypt. I am the LORD your God." 8 But they rebelled against Me and would not obey Me. They did not all cast away the abominations which were before their eyes, nor did they forsake the idols of Egypt. Then I said, "I will pour out My fury on them and fulfill My anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt." 9 But I acted for My name's sake, that it should not be profaned before the Gentiles among whom they were, in whose sight I had made Myself known to them, to bring them out of the land of Egypt."

This is the covenant that is spoken of in Jeremiah 31.

Back to Ezekiel chapter 20:

Ezek. 20:10 "Therefore I made them go out of the land of Egypt and brought them into the wilderness. 11 And I gave them My statutes and showed them My judgments, "which, if a man does, he shall live by them." 12 Moreover I also gave them My Sabbaths, to be a sign between them and Me, that they might know that I am the LORD who sanctifies them."

Here we see that after God brought them out of Egypt, He gave them the law that Moses received on Mount Sinai.

So when Jeremiah writes of a new covenant, he is referring as Rabbi Eukel taught a renewing of the oath that God gave to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Listen to this Scripture that supports this idea.

Jer. 16:14 "Therefore behold, the days are coming," says the LORD, "that it shall no more be said, 'The LORD lives who brought up the children of Israel from the land of Egypt,' but, 'The LORD lives who brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north and from all the lands where He had driven them.' For I will bring them back into their land which I gave to their fathers.

Do you see what Scripture teaches? Not only does the Scripture in Jeremiah 31 pertain to the times of the church of Acts, but also to the time of God bringing back His people from Babylon during the times of Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive, Not Replaced & RUACH HaKODESH - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/29 12:16

Rabbi Eukel wrote:

Quote:
-----We sense The Presence of GOD, RUACH HaKODESH, and we want to celebrate in the midst of His Saturating Presence. We want for ourselves, our family and our grandchildren to experience in all the vibrancy our ancient traditions teach us, that revival fire that renews, restores, and reverberates deeply through our spirit as we connect again to ADONAI through His Only and Uniquely begotten Son, YESHUA The Messiah.

Can you teach about the RUACH HaKODESH in the ancients?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 13:19

Quote:
-----The Temple was destroyed and so were the Sadducees. What has 'replaced' the Temple procedures for the Hasidim in my understanding is known as tzedekiah (acts or works of righteousness).

This is pretty much what Paul roundly condemned **For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.** (Rom 10:3-4 KJV)

I might argue a case with the Hasidim that there is no warrant for this alteration of Covenant Law. In fact I might argue the same case with the Messianic Jew. Law cannot be altered in this manner. In the Sinai Covenant the law and the Aaronic priesthood were an integrated whole. We cannot disconnect part of this and then add our own substitute. Is it only the sacrificial system which is abolished or is it the Sinai Covenant?

Do you agree that it is the Sinai Covenant that was in mind as the contrast when Jeremiah said that the New Covenant was not like the Old Covenant?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/29 13:42

Quote:
-----Do you agree that it is the Sinai Covenant that was in mind as the contrast when Jeremiah said that the New Covenant was not like the Old Covenant?

It has always been my understanding that we were dealing with the Old and New covenant. I am still thinking through the issues that Bro. Jeff brought up. However, a word of caution here. I believe these things are long settled and are not up for grabs. To me its settled in stone.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 13:48

Quote:

-----To me its settled in stone.

Hi Robert

Even things written in stone can be changed. ;-)

A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. (Eze 36:26 ASV)

I'm not quite sure what you mean when you say these things are long settled and not up for grabs.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 14:12

Quote:

-----This is the covenant that is spoken of in Jeremiah 31.

There are two covenants referenced in Jeremiah 31:31 **Behold, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband unto them, saith Jehovah. But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jehovah: I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people:** (Jer 31:31-33 ASV)

This passage declares the fact of the Sinai Covenant in which God became as a husband to them. This terminology is used in the beautiful passage of Ezekiel 16:9 **Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was as the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness: yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord Jehovah, and thou becamest mine.** (Eze 16:8 ASV) This 'thou becamest mine' is a clear reference to the initial gathering at Sinai when God says **Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel.** (Exo 19:5-6 ASV)

But this passage also speaks of a New Covenant which would be **not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.** In other words NOT like the Sinai Covenant. This states quite plainly that not only is the New Covenant NOT a 'refreshed version' of the Sinai Covenant, it is not going to be 'according to' that Covenant. It was not going to be that kind of covenant at all.

Marking the clear distinction between the Covenants God says **But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days..** That 'but' again makes the contrast all the more plain. The whole point of this passage is to show that the New Covenant is distinct from and subsequent to the Sinai Covenant. This is why the earlier is called Old and the later New. In fact the writer to the Hebrews says that it was this declaration of God's future intention that actually made the Sinai Covenant 'old'. **In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.** (Heb 8:13 KJV) This uses the perfect tense of the verb 'to make old'. It became 'old' from the 'moment' God began to speak about the 'new'. It is very plain that we are not talking about 'refreshed' covenants but redundant ones.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/29 14:22

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----This passage declares the fact of the Sinai Covenant in which God became as a husband to them. This terminology is used in the beautiful passage of Ezekiel 16:9 Now when I passed by thee, and looked upon thee, behold, thy time was the time of love; and I spread my skirt over thee, and covered thy nakedness: yea, I swore unto thee, and entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord Jehovah, and thou becamest mine. (Eze 16:8 ASV) This 'thou becamest mine' is a clear reference to the initial gathering at Sinai when God says Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. (Exo 19:5-6 ASV)

Ezekiel 16 and 20 are the same. Look again to Ezekiel 20.

When does Scripture say God made the covenant with Israel?

6 On that day I raised My hand in an oath to them, to bring them out of the land of Egypt into a land that I had searched out for them, "flowing with milk and honey," the glory of all lands. 7 Then I said to them, "Each of you, throw away the abominations which are before his eyes, and do not defile yourselves with the idols of Egypt. I am the LORD your God." 8 But they rebelled against Me and would not obey Me. They did not all cast away the abominations which were before their eyes, nor did they forsake the idols of Egypt. Then I said, "I will pour out My fury on them and fulfill My anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt." 9 But I acted for My name's sake, that it should not be profaned before the Gentiles among whom they were, in whose sight I had made Myself known to them, to bring them out of the land of Egypt."

The Law was given after they, the people Israel had disobeyed His voice. How often do we disobey His voice?

Believe the Scriptures and not the traditions of men.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/29 14:24

Quote:
-----I'm not quite sure what you mean when you say these things are long settled and not up for grabs.

Hi Bro. Ron,

If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law. (Hebrews 7;11, 12)

We know that the Old Covenant at Sinai Could not bring man to salvation. If righteousness could have come by the Law verily it would have.

For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

To me it is quite clear that the New Covenant does what the Old could not. In short it is the Spirit Filled life; where we are the Temple of the Holy Spirit. To me this is the aspect of Christianity that many are missing. They are not living the New Covenant life. They have a version of the Law or something that they are trying to conform to, but its not genuine Christianity. Nothing short of all that entails walking in the Spirit can be considered the fruit of the true Gospel.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/29 14:30

To what generation is this promise given?

Ezekiel 11

16 Therefore say, "Thus says the Lord GOD: 'Although I have cast them far off among the Gentiles, and although I have scattered them among the countries, yet I shall be a little sanctuary for them in the countries where they have gone.'"
"17 Therefore say, "Thus says the Lord GOD: 'I will gather you from the peoples, assemble you from the countries where you have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel.'"
18 And they will go there, and they will take away all its detestable things and all its abominations from there. 19 Then I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within them, and take the stony heart out of their flesh, and give them a heart of flesh, 20 that they may walk in My statutes and keep My judgments and do them; and they shall be My people, and I will be their God. 21 But as for those whose hearts follow the desire for their detestable things and their abominations, I will recompense their deeds on their own heads," says the Lord GOD."

Can the law given on Mount Sinai take the heart of stone out of this generation?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/29 14:40

Scripture teaches that God's promise is given in each generation.

7 And I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you in their generations,

How does this precept, "in their generations," manifest itself in our understanding of His ways?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/29 14:48

Quote:
-----herefore say, "Thus says the Lord GOD: 'Although I have cast them far off among the Gentiles, and although I have scattered them among the countries, yet I shall be a little sanctuary for them in the countries where they have gone.'

Hi Bro Jeff,

This is generally the passage cited to demonstrate the Biblical history of the Synagogue and the institution of the Scribes .

The middle section has been dealt with in some of the Eschatological threads.

Quote:
-----Can the law given on Mount Sinai take the heart of stone out of this generation?

The law in my opinion was written on stone tablets as a symbol of their stoney hearts. You can only write so much on stone. It would stand to reason that if it was limited in what it could do in that it was weak through the flesh- it could never make anyone perfect; especially as pertains unto the conscience. People used to fear death under the Old Covenant. Only the blood of Christ can purge the conscience and only a life of Walking in the Spirit can keep that conscience clean. These are what make up the end of the commandment. Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned (I Timothy 1:5) The Law taught us what love is and is not; yet under the Old Covenant we cannot find how to perform that love. The conscience could likewise never be purged by the blood of goats and calves. Unfeigned faith is the means that all this comes about; not by the works of the Law. For by the works of the Law shall no one be justified.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Jewish Roots: Rich, Redemptive & Not Replaced - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 15:34

Quote:
----- Greek uses two words for "new" - "kainos" and "neos." "Neos" as you know, means something which has never before existed. "Kainos" means freshness, renewal of something which has existed. This distinction is clearly captured by the Jewish disciple of YESHUA, Mattityahu (Matthew) at 9:16, 17 when he records YESHUA's teachings using the illustration of patching (adapting) an old coat with a fresh cloth and new (neos) wine in fresh (kainos) wineskins. With that preliminary, but brief, groundwork of understanding and your agreement of the understanding that the verses you quote in KJV (8:13 and 10:9) cannot be removed from the context of the section 7:1-10:18, then we can slowly move on.

I have posted earlier on the distinction between the words 'kainos' and 'neos' but I want to further say why 'kainos' cannot bear the unique weight you are laying upon it. The Revelation John writes **And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.** (Rev 21:1 KJV) This is 'kainos'. While it is certainly true that there had been a heaven and earth before that which John sees is not 'renewal' but 'regeneration'. It has the familiar signs of regeneration; the old heaven and earth have 'passed away'. In other words the use of 'kainos' here is very instructive being joined as in Hebrews with the word for 'first'. **Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.** (Heb 10:9 KJV) This use of 'kainos' is sustained in Paul; **Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.** (5:17 KJV) Here again the new creation produced in regeneration is not the 'old' refreshed but the 'old' replaced.

In Paul, the old passes away and the new creation is brought in.
In Hebrews He takes away the first that He may establish the second,
In the Revelation He takes away the old creation and brings in the new (kainos).

The new is not built upon the old, and is not the 'old' refreshed. There had been a previous covenant so 'kaivos' is entirely suitable for 'replacement' theology but to say 'kainos' implies a 'refreshed' covenant is not sustainable.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 15:37

Quote:
-----The Law was given after they, the people Israel had disobeyed His voice. How often do we disobey His voice?

Believe the Scriptures and not the traditions of men.

I don't know what traditions you are referring to. But can you not see that there are plainly two covenants contrasted in Jeremiah 31:31?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 15:40

Quote:
-----Can the law given on Mount Sinai take the heart of stone out of this generation?

Of course not that is why it is the promise of a new work of God referred to by Jeremiah as a New Covenant and by Ezekiel as 'God making them His people'; this is not the Sinai people of God, qahal of God, but the New People of God, the church of Christ.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/29 15:42

Quote:
-----Scripture teaches that God's promise is given in each generation.

7 And I will establish My covenant between Me and you and your descendants after you in their generations,

How does this precept, "in their generations," manifest itself in our understanding of His ways?

I agree with you that this is a vital part of the Abrahamic covenant, but the Abrahamic Covenant is not the same as that established on Sinai.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/29 18:24

Br. Robert wrote:

Quote:
-----This is generally the passage cited to demonstrate the Biblical history of the Synagogue and the institution of the Scribes.

Nehemiah 1:

8 Remember, I pray, the word that You commanded Your servant Moses, saying, "If you are unfaithful, I will scatter you among the nations; 9 but if you return to Me, and keep My commandments and do them, though some of you were cast out to the farthest part of the heavens, yet I will gather them from there, and bring them to the place which I have chosen as a dwelling for My name." 10 Now these are Your servants and Your people, whom You have redeemed by Your great power, and by Your strong hand. 11 O Lord, I pray, please let Your ear be attentive to the prayer of Your servant, and to the prayer of Your servants who desire to fear Your name; and let Your servant prosper this day, I pray, and grant him mercy in the sight of this man."

Nehemiah identifies the generation of his time as fulfilling the promise of spoken to Ezekiel. "Now these are Your servants and Your people, whom You have redeemed by Your great power, and by Your strong hand."

Also in Haggai 2:

4 Yet now be strong, Zerubbabel," says the LORD; "and be strong, Joshua, son of Jehozadak, the high priest; and be strong, all you people of the land," says the LORD, "and work; for I am with you," says the LORD of hosts. 5 "According to the word that I covenanted with you when you came out of Egypt, so My Spirit remains among you; do not fear!"

Hag. 2:6 "For thus says the LORD of hosts: "Once more (it is a little while) I will shake heaven and earth, the sea and dry land; 7 and I will shake all nations, and they shall come to the Desire of All Nations, and I will fill this temple with glory," says the LORD of hosts. 8 "The silver is Mine, and the gold is Mine," says the LORD of hosts. 9 "The glory of this latter temple shall be greater than the former," says the LORD of hosts. "And in this place I will give peace," says the LORD of hosts."

Did not the second temple exceed the first? And there will be another latter temple.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/30 8:44

Hi Bro. Jeff,

Yes, these Jews are typically what we know as the Diaspora. They went into nations building little temples or synagogues. Each synagogue needed their own Torah scroll. This brought in a new institution known as the scribes. They were copy experts. There are some awesome historical things about this that I may deal with at some point. The synagogues were to be built on the highest possible hill in the town as to be easily seen.

Quote:

-----Did not the second temple exceed the first? And there will be another latter temple.

I would say it did not. I seem to recall that the people wept when they compared Zerubabel's Temple to Solomon's. When the foundation was laid, the old men, who had seen the "first house" (Solomon's temple), wept for sorrow (Haggai 2:3), but the young men, who had been born in exile, shouted for joy (Ezra 3:12) Eschatologically, I believe there will be another temple rebuilt. There have already been 3 temples not including The Body of Christ or the Temple in Heaven or the Wilderness Tabernacle.

There was Solomon's and then Zerubabel's (Your Haggai passage deals in part with it). Then there was Herod's Temple that was never completed. I believe the final Temple will be rebuilt prior to the advent of the AntiChrist. I don't really fit the Tim Lahaye and Hal Lindsey mold in this, but I think a Temple will be necessary to bring this age to a close. Hope we don't have to get into all that. :-?

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/30 8:59

Quote:

----- Yes, these Jews are typically what we know as the Diaspora. They went into nations building little temples or synagogues. Each synagogue needed their own Torah scroll. This brought in a new institution known as the scribes. They were copy experts. There are some awesome historical things about this that I may deal with at some point. The synagogues were to be built on the highest possible hill in the town as to be easily seen.

There is a fundamental difference between a Temple and Synagogue. The Temple was built to house God, synagogues were built to house people. The first was a Palace for a King, complete with Throne and chief ministers. The second was a meeting house for people.

Quote:

-----There have already been 3 temples not including The Body of Christ or the Temple in Heaven or the Wilderness Tabernacle.

Have you noticed that God only ever has one official residence on earth at a time? Tabernacle, Solomon's Temple, Zerubabel's Temple, Christ, The Church. Zerubabel's and Herod's Temples were really empty shrines the Ark of the Presence having disappeared at the destruction of Solomon's Temple in 587 BC. From this time too the majority of Jews have lived outside the Promised Land as the Diaspora - the dispersed. **The Jews then said to one another, "Where does this man intend to go that we will not find Him? He is not intending to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks, is He?"** (Joh 7:35 NASB)

The largest number of Jews in the Roman Empire lived outside the borders of the Holy Land. Known as the Diaspora, or the Dispersion, they were found in almost all of the large cities from Babylon to Rome and in many of the smaller settlements also, where-ever commerce or colonisation had taken them. The scattering of the Jewish people began with the captivity of the northern kingdom on 721 BC when Sargon of Assyria deported the inhabitants of Israel and settled them in new colonies in Assyria. The southern kingdom of Judah was conquered by Babylon in 597 BC and many of the upper class were carried away to Babylon. A second and third deportation followed, leaving only the poorest people of the land unmolested. Although several thousand returned from exile in the restoration under Ezra and Nehemiah, a large number chose to remain in the land of their captivity where they had established themselves and had begun to prosper.

From that time on the Presence was never present in the Temples of Zerubbabel and Herod, but gloriously so in Christ and in His Church.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/30 9:03

Quote:
-----Have you noticed that God only ever has one official residence on earth at a time? Tabernacle, Solomon's Temple, Zerubbabel's Temple, Christ, The Church. Zerubbabel's and Herod's Temples were really empty shrines the Ark of the Presence having disappeared at the destruction of Solomon's Temple in 587 BC.

From that time on the Presence was never present in the Temples of Zerubbabel and Herod, but gloriously so in Christ and in His Church

Good point!

Say, I was in class once and heard a discussion on the Temple and Tabernacle, etc. as models for the Heavenly Temple. One point they made is that as you would walk into the Tabernacle towards the Holy of Holies that there was a feeling of ascending- more like the horizontal Temple was a type of a vertical approach to God.

Have you ever heard that?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/30 9:16

Quote:
-----Say, I was in class once and heard a discussion on the Temple and Tabernacle, etc. as models for the Heavenly Temple. One point they made is that as you would walk into the Tabernacle towards the Holy of Holies that there was a feeling of ascending- more like the horizontal Temple was a type of a vertical approach to God.

The Tabernacle of course had no floor. Its construction with its bars and rods suggests that the ground upon which it was pitched would need to have been fairly level.

There were certainly steps in Herod's Temple. Solomon's palace had steps **And there were six steps to the throne, with a footstool of gold, which were fastened to the throne, and stays on each side of the sitting place, and two lions standing by the stays:** (2Ch 9:18 KJV) but the wonderful thing about our approach to God is that we can come at the level we are at, as long as we come through the torn veil.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/11/30 9:32

Sorry Bro, what I meant to say was that when you are walking through the Tabernacle it was a verticle demonstration of ascending into the Heavens up to God's throne, though the ground was flat.

Thanks,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/30 9:58

Quote:
-----Sorry Bro, what I meant to say was that when you are walking through the Tabernacle it was a verticle demonstration of ascending into the Heavens up to God's throne, though the ground was flat.

OK. certainly it is a symbol of approach, outer court, inner house, inmost house. It is a chieftains mobile palace. His people have access to the outer courts of his tent. His chief servants have access to the ante-throne room; here they stand to minister... God alone is permitted to sit in the throne room.

This symbol of segmented approach to God is throughtout heathendom. I remember teaching a group of Tibetans and ex Hindus in N India about the Tabernacle. I created a courtyard with hymnbooks and 'stepped' them through approach to God, watching all the time to see if they were understanding what I was saying. I confess I thought some of the concepts would be new to them.

Afterwards one of their leaders took me out to deserted village with an abandoned and ruined Hindu temple. It OK to come in said. As I approached he said this is the courtyard where the people were allowed to stand. As we moved further in he said this is the inner house where only the priests were allowed to come. In the centre of the ruined room there was a small square shrine. He said can you see who is within it? It was Ganesh the hideous elephant God. Only 'god' he said was allowed in the innermost house.

I shook my head in disbelief. We understood what you were telling us, he said. We have lived with it.

Even the wicked distortions of the Vandal cannot obliterate every truth. But what a wonder as types and shadows take their rightful place and through the torn veil we access God's own glorious being and presence. **Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, By a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; And having an high priest over the house of God; Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.** (Heb 10:19-22 KJV)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/30 11:29

Brothers:

Listen to the promise God gave those whom He caused to return from their captivity.

Jeremiah 29:

10 For thus says the LORD: After seventy years are completed at Babylon, I will visit you and perform My good word toward you, and cause you to return to this place. 11 For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, says the LORD, thoughts of peace and not of evil, to give you a future and a hope. 12 Then you will call upon Me and go and pray to Me, and I will listen to you. 13 And you will seek Me and find Me, when you search for Me with all your heart. 14 I will be found by you, says the LORD, and I will bring you back from your captivity; I will gather you from all the nations and from all the places where I have driven you, says the LORD, and I will bring you to the place from which I cause you to be carried away captive."

The books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Haggai, and Zechariah speak of this time.

Now listen to the result of the Lord's work in that generation:

9 They shall come with weeping,
And with supplications I will lead them.
I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters,
In a straight way in which they shall not stumble;
For I am a Father to Israel,
And Ephraim is My firstborn.
10 "Hear the word of the LORD, O nations,
And declare it in the isles afar off, and say,
'He who scattered Israel will gather him,
And keep him as a shepherd does his flock.'
11 For the LORD has redeemed Jacob,
And ransomed him from the hand of one stronger than he.
12 Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion,
Streaming to the goodness of the LORD—
For wheat and new wine and oil,
For the young of the flock and the herd;
Their souls shall be like a well-watered garden,
And they shall sorrow no more at all. "

Again listen:

14 I will satiate the soul of the priests with abundance,
And My people shall be satisfied with My goodness, says the LORD."

How does God satisfy these people?

What does this mean?

Jeremiah 31:22

22 How long will you gad about,
O you backsliding daughter?
For the LORD has created a new thing in the earth—
A woman shall encompass a man."

What is this **new thing in the earth**?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/11/30 13:59

Quote:

-----What is this new thing in the earth?

It is the new thing made possible by a change in the heavens. **And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, Write: for these words are true and faithful.** (Rev 21:5 KJV)
Revelation 4 & 5 expounding John's earlier promise; **"He who overcomes, I will grant to him to sit down with Me on My throne, as I also overcame and sat down with My Father on His throne.** (Rev 3:21 NASB) John then sees this acted out in **and one of the elders *said to me, "Stop weeping; behold, the Lion that is from the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, has overcome so as to open the book and its seven seals."** (Rev 5:5 NASB)

The throne of God, in Rev 4, has become the throne of God and of the Lamb in Rev 5:13. (7:10,17) The theme of Revelation becomes that of God and the Lamb. This heavenly event referenced in Hebrews **Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had b**

y himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; (Heb 1:3 KJV) is the theme of Peter's pentecost message. God has taken the victor into the throne. God hath made Him both Lord and Christ. He hath poured forth this which ye now see and hear...

It was only when the throne became the Throne of God and of the Lamb that the river issued forth from it; **And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb.** (Rev 22:1 KJV) This is Peter's message, and that of Hebrews and in its own way that of Jeremiah.

Hebrews declares **for where a covenant is, the death of the covenant-victim to come in is necessary, for a covenant over dead victims is steadfast, since it is no force at all when the covenant-victim liveth,** (Heb 9:16-17 YLT) The New Covenant was 'in His blood' until that blood was shed in the death of the covenant victim the New Covenant was not 'in force'.

It would be only 'in those days' (Jer 31:29) that the power of congenital sin would be brought to an end. The heart would no longer be **graven with the point of a diamond' and be 'crooked and incurable' (Jer 17:1, 9) but would have the law of God written on it. Christ looked forward to it and said 'in that day'. Peter declared it with all the power of the herald.. this is that. The Day of Pentecost had fully come.**

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/11/30 18:14

Br Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----In would be only 'in those days' (Jer 31:29) that the power of congenital sin would be brought to an end. The heart would no longer be **graven with the point of a diamond' and be 'crooked and incurable' (Jer 17:1, 9) but would have the law of God written on it. Christ looked forward to it and said 'in that day'. Peter declared it with all the power of the herald.. this is that. The Day of Pentecost had fully come.**

I see that Scripture in Jeremiah 29 through 31 speaks to the nation Israel that is held captive according to God's will. The book of Hebrews states that Christ offers this New Covenant to the Jews who are in Jerusalem during the time the Epistle is written to them. What I do not understand is this: There was no return of the captives during the time the book of Hebrews was written.

Do you have any thoughts on this matter?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/1 12:44

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----The throne of God, in Rev 4, has become the throne of God and of the Lamb in Rev 5:13. (7:10,17) The theme of Revelation becomes that of God and the Lamb. This heavenly event referenced in Hebrews Who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high; (Heb 1:3 KJV) is the theme of Peter's pentecost message. God has taken the victor into the throne. God hath made Him both Lord and Christ. He hath poured forth this which ye now see and hear...

In terms of rulership when did Christ rule according to Psalm 2:

Psa. 2:1 Why do the nations rage,
And the people plot a vain thing?
2 The kings of the earth set themselves,
And the rulers take counsel together,
Against the LORD and against His Anointed, saying,
3 "Let us break Their bonds in pieces
And cast away Their cords from us."
4 He who sits in the heavens shall laugh;
The LORD shall hold them in derision.
5 Then He shall speak to them in His wrath,
And distress them in His deep displeasure:
6 "Yet I have set My King
On My holy hill of Zion."
7 "I will declare the decree:
The LORD has said to Me,
"You are My Son,
Today I have begotten You.
8 Ask of Me, and I will give You
The nations for Your inheritance,
And the ends of the earth for Your possession.
9 You shall break them with a rod of iron;
You shall dash them to pieces like a potter's vessel."
10 Now therefore, be wise, O kings;
Be instructed, you judges of the earth.
11 Serve the LORD with fear,
And rejoice with trembling.
12 Kiss the Son, lest He be angry,
And you perish in the way,
When His wrath is kindled but a little.
Blessed are all those who put their trust in Him.

In terms of your thoughts as to when the Hebrew experiences the redeeming work of Christ, does the promise to enter in to His rest speak of the New Covenant?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/1 14:16

Br. Robert wrote:

Quote:
-----The law in my opinion was written on stone tablets as a symbol of their stoney hearts. You can only write so much on stone. It would stand to reason that if it was limited in what it could do in that it was weak through the flesh- it could never make anyone perfect; especially as pertains unto the conscience. People used to fear death under the Old Covenant. Only the blood of Christ can purge the conscience and only a life of Walking in the Spirit can keep that conscience clean. These are what make up the end of the commandment. Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned (I Timothy 1:5) The Law taught us what love is and is not; yet under the Old Covenant we cannot find how to perform that love. The conscience could likewise never be purged by the blood of goats and calves. Unfeigned faith is the means that all this comes about; not by the works of the Law. For by the works of the Law shall no one be justified.

Based on what you wrote, how then did the OT saints receive a circumcised heart?

Listen to Ezekiel 44:

Ezek. 44:4 Also He brought me by way of the north gate to the front of the temple; so I looked, and behold, the glory of the LORD filled the house of the LORD; and I fell on my face. 5 And the LORD said to me, "Son of man, mark well, see with your eyes and hear with your ears, all that I say to you concerning all the ordinances of the house of the LORD and all its laws. Mark well who may enter the house and all who go out from the sanctuary.

Ezek. 44:6 "Now say to the rebellious, to the house of Israel, "Thus says the Lord GOD: "O house of Israel, let Us have no more of all your abominations. 7 When you brought in foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in My sanctuary to defile it—My house—and when you offered My food, the fat and the blood, then they broke My covenant because of all your abominations. 8 And you have not kept charge of My holy things, but you have set others to keep charge of My sanctuary for you." 9 Thus says the Lord GOD: "No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart or uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter My sanctuary, including any foreigner who is among the children of Israel.

The ordinance of God required that those who served in the Temple have a circumcised heart. Now if God required it how did God make provisions for man to obey this ordinance?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/1 14:18

Quote:
-----In terms of your thoughts as to when the Hebrew experiences the redeeming work of Christ, does the promise to enter into His rest speak of the New Covenant?

I'm not sure I understand the question. I make no distinction between Hebrew and non-Hebrew. But in the terms of "rulership" indicated at the beginning of your post, I would see that as being from the time that the Father "made Him both Lord and Christ" at His ascension and enthronement. **This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, Until I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.** (Act 2:32-36 KJV)

We have a linear sequence of events here; rejection, resurrection, ascension, enthronement, outpouring. The rejected stone has become the head of the corner; **God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.**

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/1 15:12

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----ut in the terms of "rulership" indicated at the beginning of your post, I would see that as being from the time that the Father "made Him both Lord and Christ" at His ascension and enthronement.

Does your view uphold the doctrine of the trinity?

When the writer of Hebrews writes:

Heb. 4:11 Let us therefore be diligent to enter that rest, lest anyone fall according to the same example of disobedience.

"

Is this exhortation of entering His rest a result of the work of the New Covenant?

Quote:
-----We have a linear sequence of events here; rejection, resurrection, ascension, enthronement, outpouring. The rejected stone has become the head of the corner; God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.

Is the person of Jesus in the Godhead contained within our linear thought of time?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/1 15:30

Quote:
-----Is the person of Jesus in the Godhead contained within our linear thought of time?

I would have to answer that by saying that time is a creation of God and whether or not the answer is yes it would have no bearing on the doctrine of the Trinity because God does not exist within one dimension of (linear) time. This is where we cease to fully comprehend, but yet can apprehend the Trinity. Mathmatically we can add a variable to either time or space and all sorts of things become possible. Add two dimensions of time and two deminsions of space and you could be in two places at once. :-?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/2 3:31

Quote:
-----{Quote:

ut in the terms of 'rulership' indicated at the beginning of your post, I would see that as being from the time that the Father 'made Him both Lord and Christ' at His ascension and enthronement.

Does your view uphold the doctrine of the trinity?

I believe it does. The wonder of John 1:14 is that the Word has become (and remains) flesh (human). The Eternal stepped into history and in His manhood has a linear history. His manhood continues and it is as 'the man Christ Jesus' that He continues His mediatorship (1Tim 2:5). In fact it could not be otherwise, as priests have to be taken from 'among men' (Heb 5:1). The judgement will also be in the hands of 'that man whom He has ordained' (Acts 17:31). Hebrews tells us that this identification with our race was absolutely necessary. Without incarnation there could be no such priesthood.

Therefore, He had to be made like His brethren in all things, so that He might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people. For since He Himself was tempted in that which He has suffered, He is able to come to the aid of those who are tempted. (Heb 2:17-18 NASB)

If you follow the reasoning in those verses you will see that having a linear history, in which He became man, was the only way in which He could enter into priesthood. He is only 'able' because He 'became'. This is where your view constantly breaks down. For you Christ cannot 'become' He can only 'be'. The question is not does my view uphold the doctrine of the trinity but does your view uphold the doctrine of the incarnation?

His continuing priesthood requires his humanity, but his humanity had an historical point of entry and that point in history marks the traceable history of Christ which continues to this day.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/3 11:52

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
----- For you Christ cannot 'become' He can only 'be'. The question is not does my view uphold the doctrine of the trinity but does your view uphold the doctrine of the incarnation?

John 8:58 Jesus said to them, "Most assuredly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I AM."

Jesus became man so that we would have knowledge of the way, the truth, and the life. The things He suffered was His demonstration of the love He has for us. It is nothing for Him it is all for us, so that those who obey Him will glorify the Father.

"And having been perfected, He became the author of eternal salvation to all who obey Him." Hebrews 5:9

He is the one who created eternal salvation. He is the "I AM." You are correct in describing my understanding.

Quote:
-----For you Christ cannot 'become' He can only 'be'

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/3 13:55

oops double posted :-?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/3 13:55

Quote:
-----He is the one who created eternal salvation. He is the "I AM." You are correct in describing my understanding.

But the mysterious glory of the incarnation is that the **I am** genuinely **became** flesh. God **became** what He had not been. There are scriptures which indicate that this is not the end of that story; **And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.** (1Co 15:28 KJV)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/3 17:59

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
----- There are scriptures which indicate that this is not the end of that story; And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. (1Co 15:28 KJV)

You are correct in stating this is the end of the work that God does through Christ. However all men have fallen under the work of Christ. Listen to the verses just prior to your quote.

21 For since by man came death, by Man also came the resurrection of the dead. 22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive. 23 But each one in his own order: Christ the firstfruits, afterward those who are Christ's at His coming."

When Paul writes, "even so in Christ all shall be made alive," is he referring to only those who died after Christ died? What men would make up, "those who are Christ's...?"

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/4 2:38

Quote:
-----When Paul writes, "even so in Christ all shall be made alive," is he referring to only those who died after Christ died? What men would make up, "those who are Christ's...?"

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. (Rom 8:9 KJV)

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/12/4 3:07

Quote:

rookie wrote:
When Paul writes, "even so in Christ all shall be made alive," is he referring to only those who died after Christ died? What men would make up, "those who are Christ's...?"

I am sensing a serious case of dejavu, is that biblical? 8-) The dejavu part I mean.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/4 3:22

Quote:
-----I am sensing a serious case of dejavu, is that biblical?

Question: Did I tell you my deja vu joke?

Answer: No

Question: Did I tell you my deja vu joke? 8-)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/4 16:21

Br Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----In would be only 'in those days' (Jer 31:29) that the power of congenital sin would be brought to an end. The heart would no longer be **graven with the point of a diamond** and be **'crooked and incurable'** (Jer 17:1, 9) but would have the law of God written on it. Christ looked forward to it and said 'in that day'. Peter declared it with all the power of the herald.. this is that. The Day of Pentecost had fully come.

Based on what you have said of the heart condition, would these who partake of this covenant have a circumsized heart? Would these who partake of this covenant "enter His rest?"

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/5 2:26

Quote:
-----Based on what you have said of the heart condition, would these who partake of this covenant have a circumsized heart? Would these who partake of this covenant "enter His rest?"

Yes, but these states require maintenance.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/5 14:36

The writer of the book of Hebrews states:

Heb. 4:6 Since therefore it remains that some must enter it, and those to whom it was first preached did not enter because of disobedience, 7 again He designates a certain day, saying in David, "Today," after such a long time, as it has been said:

"Today, if you will hear His voice,
Do not harden your hearts."

This **rest** was offered to those whom the gospel was preached, but many of them did not enter in because of unbelief. The writer is teaching that the offer to enter in to His rest was also available prior to Christ's incarnation.

My family listened to a David Wilkerson sermon today, listen to his teaching of this subject.

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid=613>

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/5 15:12

Quote:
-----This rest was offered to those whom the gospel was preached, but many of them did not enter in because of unbelief. The writer is teaching that the offer to enter in to His rest was also available prior to Christ's incarnation.

Jeff

I have to admit that I grow very weary of our conversations. We just go over the same ground again and again. I don't suppose either of us has moved an inch since we started them. I feel badly when I stop answering your questions because it almost seems rude but I think we have to ask the question again; is there really any point in it?

In the days of His flesh Jesus offered 'rest'. **Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.** (Mat 11:28-30 KJV) The word for rest is 'anapousis' it means to take a brief respite, a 'breather' as we might say over here. Just a pause in the daily grind.

The word for 'rest' in Hebrews 3 & 4 **For if Joshua had given them rest, He would not have spoken of another day after that. So there remains a Sabbath_rest for the people of God. For the one who has entered His rest has himself also rested from his works, as God did from His.** (Heb 4:8-10 NASB) is different. 'Sabbath_rest' is an entirely different word and concept, but the word for 'rest' used throughout Hebrews 3 & 4 is not the 'anapousis' of Matt 11 but 'kata pousis'. The prefix 'kata' means 'down' or 'thoroughly'; pinO is to drink, katapinO is to swallow. This rest is not the breath respite of Matt 11 but an entering into God's own rest. verse 4 above translates this word as Sabbath_rest (sabbatism)

os).

God 'rested' on the Sabbath because the work of creation was finished. It is fascinating to think that Adam was created on the 6th day and the very next day he entered into God's rest. This was just a picture of the coming reality in which a new creation would come into being. Christ's triumphal cry of 'it is finished' means that something not previously finished was finished at this point in time. In the events of His death and resurrection the foundations of the new creation and covenant were established. Man can now 'enter into His Sabbath rest' of a new creation.

And with this I end my discussions on the your recurring theme of the Old Covenant being no different to the New, the Old Testament being a fuller revelation than the New, Christ's Melchizedek priesthood not having begun but always existing and the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost has introducing nothing new to God's order.

Please forgive me when I say I do not mean to be rude only that I am convinced that our conversations have been a waste of time, and I don't feel I can spend any more time on this topic.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/5 15:32

Quote:

-----My family listened to a David Wilkerson sermon today, listen to his teaching of this subject.

I think David Wilkerson is mistaken in his understanding of Gal 3:8 **and the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the nations on the principle of faith, announced beforehand the glad tidings to Abraham: In thee all the nations shall be blessed.** (Gal 3:8 Darby) The word translated 'preached before the gospel' is 'proeuaggelizomai'. It means as Darby has expressed it above. It is a pre-announcement of good news. It is the promise of a blessing that is 'not yet' but is most certainly going to come. In fact, Paul tells us the 'good news' that was pre-announced to Abraham was specifically 'In thee all the nations shall be blessed.' This good news was 'not yet'.

All these died in faith, without receiving the promises, but having seen them and having welcomed them from a distance, and having confessed that they were strangers and exiles on the earth.

(Heb 11:13 NASB)

I think he is mistaken too in his interpretation of 1 Pet 3:20. I respect David Wilkerson highly but this is speculation.

I think also that you have misunderstood the intent of the referenced sermon. David Wilkerson is using Abraham and Joshua as types.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/5 19:52

Heb. 4:6 Since therefore it remains that some must enter it, and those to whom it was first preached did not enter because of disobedience, 7 again He designates a certain day, saying in David, "Today," after such a long time, as it has been said:

"Today, if you will hear His voice,
Do not harden your hearts."

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:

-----The word for 'rest' in Hebrews 3 & 4 For if Joshua had given them rest, He would not have spoken of another day after that. So there remains a Sabbath_rest for the people of God. For the one who has entered His rest has himself also rested from his works, as God did from His. (Heb 4:8-10 NASB) is different. 'Sabbath_rest' is an entirely different word and concept, but the word for 'rest' used throughout Hebrews 3 & 4 is not the 'anapousis' of Matt 11 but 'katapousis'. The prefix 'kata' means 'down' or 'thoroughly'; pinO is to drink, katapinO is to swallow. This rest is not the breath respite of Matt 11 but an entering into God's own rest. verse 4 above translates this word as Sabbath_rest (sabbatismos).

The rest that Hebrews 4:6-7 speaks to the same rest that Hebrews 4:8-10 speaks of. There is no difference in what was offered over and over again to each generation that proceeded from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Brother Ron, I don't understand what you are trying to cloud the discussion with the rest that is spoken of in Matthew 11.

Quote:
-----And with this I end my discussions on the your recurring theme of the Old Covenant being no different to the New, the Old Testament being a fuller revelation than the New, Christ's Melchizedek priesthood not having begun but always existing and the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost has introducing nothing new to God's order.

Now I remember times when you corrected me for misquoting you. What you have said here is not true.

I was hoping that you would also discuss how God circumcised the hearts of those who lived before the incarnation of Jesus Christ. I don't think you have at anytime discussed this issue.

Quote:
-----Please forgive me when I say I do not mean to be rude only that I am convinced that our conversations have been a waste of time, and I don't feel I can spend any more time on this topic.

I guess I'll just have to continue sharing. Whether you are weary or not interested, that is your choice brother. I however, have a passion that grows as I learn from Scripture the hand of God and how He works through Christ in all men.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/5 20:23

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----I think also that you have misunderstood the intent of the referenced sermon. David Wilkerson is using Abraham and Joshua as types.

A theologian describes the examples given to us in the OT Scripture as types and shadows. I believe what many call types and shadows in the OT are also types and shadows in the NT. It is only through understanding the precepts, ordinances, commandments, judgements, statutes, and testimonies of God does one begin to know the experiences that Scripture speaks to.

You see, the Holy Spirit, our counselor, does not speak on His own authority, but that which proceeds from Christ. The main thoughts that one will learn about is: the righteousness of Christ, the wickedness of Satan and his world, and our own sin that separates us from Him.

The bible school started by David Wilkerson states as part of its mission:

"God is raising up laborers after His heart, people who will know who they are in Christ and know the voice of God for themselves. This is part of the vision of Mt. Zion: to raise up laborers who are fully yielded to the Lord and walking in love relationship with Him. In the beginning stages of Mt. Zion School of Ministry, the class was small but was also hungry to s

seek God and know His heart. God has been faithful to fulfill His Word, as those very same students, who came seeking nothing but to know and love God fully, have been sent out to various nations sharing the love of God."

This is just part of the mission statement for this school. The point of listing it is to highlight this precept: "people who will know who they are in Christ and know the voice of God for themselves." It is the voice of God that brings unity in Christ.

To understand that all faith must come through Christ is to understand that no faith can exist without Christ. And faith comes by hearing the word of God.

Brother Ron you disagree with many not just a few. May Christ gives us all understanding that would cause us to die daily and be filled with His words.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/13 15:57

Br. Robert wrote a few pages ago:

Quote:
-----Quote:
The law in my opinion was written on stone tablets as a symbol of their stoney hearts. You can only write so much on stone. It would stand to reason that if it was limited in what it could do in that it was weak through the flesh- it could never make anyone perfect; especially as pertains unto the conscience. People used to fear death under the Old Covenant. Only the blood of Christ can purge the conscience and only a life of Walking in the Spirit can keep that conscience clean. These are what make up the end of the commandment. Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned (I Timothy 1:5) The Law taught us what love is and is not; yet under the Old Covenant we cannot find how to perform that love. The conscience could likewise never be purged by the blood of goats and calves. Unfeigned faith is the means that all this comes about; not by the works of the Law. For by the works of the Law shall no one be justified.

Paul writes this to Timothy:

2Tim. 1:3 I thank God, whom I serve with a pure conscience, as my forefathers did, as without ceasing I remember you in my prayers night and day,..."

What forefathers is Paul referring to? Who possesses a pure conscience and by what means do one come to possess this testimony?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/13 16:29

Hi Bro. Jeff,

The question in this verse to me is how should apo be translated and situated in the sentence. Bro. Ron could probably give us the scoop on the verse. I know it is generally not translated as is the NAS.

I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers in a pure conscience, how unceasing is my remembrance of thee in my supplications, night and day (ASV)

I am thankful to God, whom I serve from my forefathers with pure conscience, how unceasingly I have the remembrance of thee in my supplications night and day, (DBY)

I thank God, whom I serve from my forefathers with pure conscience, that without ceasing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day; (KJV)

I am thankful to God, whom I serve from progenitors in a pure conscience, that unceasingly I have remembrance concerning thee in my supplications night and day. (YLT)

We have to also consider that it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could cleanse the conscience. If the first covenant had been faultless there had never been a need for the second. Count the number of times the word "better" is used in Hebrews:

Heb 1:4 -

Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

Heb 7:7 -

And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better.

Heb 7:19 -

For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

Heb 7:22 -

By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

Heb 8:6 -

But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises.

Heb 9:23 -

It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

Heb 11:16 -

But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city.

Heb 11:35 -

Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:

Heb 11:40 -

God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

Heb 12:24 -

And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

Everything is better about the New Covenant. The objective of the making of the spirits of just men perfect stays the same it is the means or covenant that had to be changed.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/13 16:51

Br. Robert,

What does: "whom I serve from my forefathers in a pure conscience," mean to you?

Also, 2 Timothy 1:

9 who has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before time began,

When was the promise of life in Christ Jesus established? What does Scripture say to those who share in His inheritance?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/13 17:17

Heb 1:4 -

Being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they.

Jesus has a better name than the angels.

Heb 7:7 -

And without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better.

Abraham was blessed by God.

Heb 7:19 -

For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God.

We all know that the law condemned. Only through faith can we come near to God.

Heb 7:22 -

By so much was Jesus made a surety of a better testament.

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

Heb 8:6 -

But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises."

2 Timothy 1:9 who has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given to us in Christ Jesus before time began, "

Who can partake of His promise in Christ?

Heb 11:16 -

But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city."

Who had this desire?

Heb 11:35 -

Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:

What women received this better resurrection?

eb 11:40 -

God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.

When will we be made perfect with them?

Heb 12:24 -

And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.

Only those who entered into His rest received the promise.

Heb 9:23 -

It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.

Rom. 3:21 But now the righteousness of God apart from the law is revealed, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, 22 even the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe. For there is no difference; 23 for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, 24 being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,

Paul writes that the Law and the Prophets witnessed the righteousness that is of God, and that all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.

"But the just shall live by his faith." Habakkuk 2:4

These people were justified by whom?

In Christ

Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/13 17:25

Hi Robert

Paul's references to his conscience are challenging. It was one of the aspects in my mind when we talked about conscience in another thread. He professes that his conscience was always pure, apparently even when his actions were causing havoc to whole families.

And Saul was consenting unto his death. And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles. And devout men carried Stephen to his burial, and made great lamentation over him. As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison. (Act 8:1-3 KJV)

And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, And desired of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem. And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: (Act 9:1-3 KJV)

Act 23:1, Act 24:16; Rom 9:1; 2Co 1:12; 1Ti 1:5, 1Ti 1:19;

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/16 10:45

Br. Ron,

Br. Robert asked for your assistance in translating the verse in question. If you have the time, please give us a sense of what Paul speaks to. I have added the following Scriptures so that one can view the statement of Paul in context with what he is writing to Timothy about.

2 Timothy 1:4 greatly desiring to see you, being mindful of your tears, that I may be filled with joy, 5 when I call to remembrance the genuine faith that is in you, which dwelt first in your grandmother Lois and your mother Eunice, and I am persuaded is in you also.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/16 11:04

Hi Bro. Jeff,

Quote:

-----These people were justified by whom?

I'm not quite sure what you are driving at brother. I do believe that the Old Testament Saints were saved by faith. They looked forward to the Cross we look back. Sorry for such a cliché type answer but that's how I see it. They looked forward to the promised Seed and that Seed was Christ. They died and found their abode in 'Abraham's Bosom' as heirs with him of the same promises. These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off and embraced them, etc. Faith was the substance of what they hoped for. They just have always lived by faith.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/16 12:34

Br. Robert,

If you have time, listen to a sermon on what it meant to Abraham being justified.

<http://www.sermonaudio.com/download.asp?ID=11160412017>

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/16 14:25

Quote:

----- Br. Robert asked for your assistance in translating the verse in question. If you have the time, please give us a sense of what Paul speaks to. I have added the following Scriptures so that one can view the statement of Paul in context with what he is writing to Timothy about.

This was a reference to 2 Tim 1:3 and I'm not sure what I am supposed to be finding that isn't plainly in the translations that Robert quoted. Robert referred to the preposition apo. The preposition means 'away from' and can be used in the sense of point of departure. I would think Paul is simply saying that his serving God with a pure conscience has been from 'his beginning'. In that way he is simply saying that his service of God began in the manner of his forefathers. I presume that means in the keeping of the law. In that law keeping his conscience was pure.

Why would he say that at this point in the letter? I think probably because he is about to trace Timothy's spiritual inheritance

tance through his grandmother and mother. As he thinks about God's faithfulness in Timothy's family perhaps it reminds him of God's faithfulness in Paul's family. The NASB has opted for a paraphrase here (it's surprising how often the NASB does this when it is supposed to be a literal equivalence translation) **I thank God, whom I serve with a clear conscience the way my forefathers did, as I constantly remember you in my prayers night and day, (2Ti 1:3 NAS B)** The result is the same as my reasoning that Paul is thinking of the manner of service of his forefathers, and sees his own faith as a continuation of that.

Paul refers in the next verses to unfeigned faith (faith without pretence) which dwelt in Timothy's grandmother and mother. There is the same thought flow here. Paul did not see the New Covenant as an innovation but as the prophesied fulfillment and completion of the Old.

I think the point about conscience is that Paul's keeping of the Old Covenant was never from a wrong motive. Even his 'voting for the death' of the Christians was not from a wrong motive. This is the trouble with the conscience, it can be both pure and wrong at the same time.

Gill has a different slant:

whom I serve from my forefathers with pure conscience; the apostle served God in the precepts of the law, as in the hands of Christ, and as written upon his heart by the Spirit of God, in which he delighted after the inward man, and which he served with his regenerated mind; and also in the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, in which he was very diligent and laborious, faithful and successful: and this God, whom he served, was the God of his "forefathers", of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of Benjamin, of whose tribe he was, and also of his more immediate ancestors. The Ethiopic version renders it, "from my original"; for though he preached the Gospel of Christ, and asserted the abrogation of the ceremonial law, yet he worshipped the one, true, and living God, the God of Israel, and was not an apostate from the true religion, as his enemies would insinuate: and this service of his was performed with a "pure conscience": every man has a conscience, but the conscience of every natural man is defiled with sin; and that is only a pure one, which is sprinkled and purged with the blood of Christ; and whereby a person is only fitted to serve the living God, without the incumbrance of dead works, and slavish fear, and with faith and cheerfulness; and such a conscience the apostle had, and with such an one he served God. For this refers not to his serving of God, and to his conscience, while a Pharisee and a persecutor; for however moral was his conduct and conversation then, and with what sincerity and uprightness soever he behaved, his conscience was not a pure one. He goes on to observe what he thanked God for, I think he means that Paul saw his post-conversion service of God as a continuation of the faithful service of his ancestors. This view would not accept that Paul's conscience was pure before his regeneration.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/16 14:56

Hi Bro. Ron,

Quote:

----- This is the trouble with the conscience, it can be both pure and wrong at the same time.

Yes. I was looking to see if the verse suggested Paul had a pure conscience before conversion. I know he said that concerning the righteousness of the law he was blameless (Philippians 3:4-6). In another place he said he did things ignorant ly in unbelief and therefor obtained mercy.

My 'truncated' view of the conscience is simply this- it is the mechanism by which right and wrong is judged based upon what is believed to be truth. If you have a 'weak' conscience you have not come to faith in certain truths and therefor your conscience will use the criteria of what you believe to be true as the canon by which it judges. Some 'act' may not be sin, but if you think it is- and your conscience is violated in your participation in the act, it is sin to you. Now, I understand that ignorance does not mean exemption from punishment. I know there is problems with this view; but I am working to come to a better understanding of EXACTLY what the 'conscience' is and in what way we are accountable for how we respond to it.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/16 15:35

Thankyou Br. Ron for your input. You mentioned how Paul responded to Timothy's faith as being unfeigned. That reminds me of another Scripture where Paul writes to another church and declares that Timothy has a faith that no one else lives by. Paul declared that Timothy's faith and Paul's faith in a sense was one in Christ. All other's served for their own-self to one degree or another.

Br. Robert wrote:

Quote:
-----My 'truncated' view of the conscience is simply this- it is the mechanism by which right and wrong is judged based upon what is believed to be truth. If you have a 'weak' conscience you have not come to faith in certain truths and therefore your conscience will use the criteria of what you believe to be true as the canon by which it judges. Some 'act' may not be sin, but if you think it is- and your conscience is violated in your participation in the act, it is sin to you. Now, I understand that ignorance does not mean exemption from punishment. I know there are problems with this view; but I am working to come to a better understanding of EXACTLY what the 'conscience' is and in what way we are accountable for how we respond to it.

Thankyou for your thoughts. It seems to me as I have mentioned of Timothy's faith, we are all within a continuum of going from a corrupt conscience, (because of lack of understanding the truth) to something of a more pure conscience as we follow Christ in faith.

God Bless
In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/17 11:26

Br. Robert,

I don't know if you had time to listen to the sermon on Abraham and his justification. But this is the point I am myself trying to come to an understanding.

Abraham was justified because he believed God. The sermon describes two aspects that make justification whole as a doctrine. First, because Abraham believed God, God declared him righteous. Secondly, one's faith justifies what he believes. In Chapter 11 of Hebrews we are given witness of a multitude of OT saints whom were of the seed of Abraham. All of these saints had one thing in common, a faith that justified their beliefs.

Now Paul tells us how faith is created: Romans 10:

16 But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah says, "LORD, who has believed our report?" 17 So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

So faith that justifies finds its' root in the word of God that one hears. Now we have the Holy Scriptures as a foundation of revelation from God. What did Abraham have? Abraham did not have the Scriptures. God spoke to him and gave Him an oath to him. Then Abraham witnessed the faithfulness of God to uphold His promises. This is the seed from which faith sprouts.

The example of Abraham is given to us as an illustration of a life that experiences the fruits of justification. It is the learning of God's righteousness that enables us to do good works. It is the learning of God's righteousness that enables us to experience the joy of fellowship.

As Br. Ron pointed out in another thread, Jesus is the revelation of God to man. (I hope I did not misquote Ron, I don't want to risk losing this post) It is the Word who taught Isaiah the gospel. It is the Word that showed Abraham the glories of His day.

How does this apply to this Jewish Roots thread? If one begins to search for understanding of the depths of what the oath meant to Abraham, one will begin to see for himself or herself the treasures of revelation in the OT Scripture. One will see the gospel that Isaiah preached. One will begin to know that faith springs forth by hearing God as He builds our understanding.

erstanding of His truth. It is this Truth that cleanses our conscience from the pollution of this world.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/17 11:51

Hi Bro. Jeff,

Quote:
-----One will see the gospel that Isaiah preached. One will begin to know that faith springs forth by hearing God as He builds our understanding of His truth. It is this Truth that cleanses our conscience from the pollution of this world.

And the blood of Christ cleanses the transgressed conscience from guilt. Again, I think that it is important to allow the Holy Spirit to do the work as we seek God in prayer and study the word. It would be easy to mess up our own conscience with a bunch of non-sensical beliefs.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/17 13:08

Br. Robert wrote:

Quote:
-----And the blood of Christ cleanses the transgressed conscience from guilt.

The power of the blood to cleanse us of guilt is not only a saying that we repeat in a song. It is not only a thought that we parrot because we heard someone else say it. The power of the blood is what keeps the door open so that we may partake of His mercy and His grace. It is His words that gives us the path by which we come to know Him. Eternal life comes to those who walk with Him because He speaks through the Holy Spirit.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/17 13:15

Quote:
-----It would be easy to mess up our own conscience with a bunch of non-sensical beliefs.

What I meant to say here is that we can mess up our conscience by making commandments and doctrines of men into commandments of God in our own heart. Pretty soon everything is seen as sin at the expense of liberty. I have to really guard myself from that one. :-?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/17 13:27

Br. Robert,

Quote:

----- Pretty soon everything is seen as sin at the expense of liberty. i have to really guard myself from that one.

What is the essence of liberty according to Scripture?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/17 13:34

Quote:

-----What is the essence of liberty according to Scripture?

Hi Bro. Jeff,

To be honest I am in a serious state of brain fatigue right now. Let me come back to that one. ;-) I am trying to concentrate on annihilationism for one of the other threads.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/17 13:40

Quote:

-----...one's faith justifies what he believes...All of these saints had one thing in common, a faith that justified their beliefs.

Hi Jeff

I'm just eavesdropping here! Can you explain this point, thanks.

BTW I can't get the link to work. Can you give it a try?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/17 13:51

Br. Ron,

Br. Rahman turned me onto this site. The link works only if you first establish a membership. It is free, just an email address and some other info.

In terms of your question, the sermon sited will clarify the thought I posted better than I can.

The site name is Sermonaudio.com.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/17 17:46

Quote:
-----Abraham was justified because he believed God. The sermon describes two aspects that make justification whole as a doctrine. First, because Abraham believed God, God declared him righteous. Secondly, one's faith justifies what he believes. In Chapter 11 of Hebrews we are given witness of a multitude of OT saints whom were of the seed of Abraham. All of these saints had one thing in common, a faith that justified their beliefs.

Hi Jeff

I have listened to the sermon. You have misunderstood what he is saying. He is not saying that 'faith justifies their belief'. The phrase he uses is 'works justify faith'. He is simply saying that 'justification' is used in different ways. The Gen 15: 6 pattern, where 'God justifies the ungodly', this is what we would normally call 'justifying faith'. He then goes on to say that faith itself must be 'justified' (or vindicated or authenticated) by works. This is the James use of justification. The reality of the 'deeds' thereby justifying (or vindicating) the authenticity of the the original justifying faith.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/20 11:16

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----You have misunderstood what he is saying. He is not saying that 'faith justifies their belief'. The phrase he uses is 'works justify faith'.

You are right, I used the word "faith" when I should have used the word "works." Faith is the substance that motivates us to good works. What we believe will be evident by what we do. If we say we love God, then our love will manifest itself in a way that the world will see the witness of that love.

Br. Ron,

Is there a difference between Abraham's faith and our's? Does it not spring from the same fountain of living water?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/20 15:46

Hi Jeff

Quote:
-----Is there a difference between Abraham's faith and our's? Does it not spring from the same fountain of living water?

Are you going for some kind of record, to find out how many different ways this question can be asked? :-D :-D

I do not regard myself as a dispensationalist in the way the Darby, Scofield, Hal Lindsay, LeHaye, or Art Katz might be described as 'dispensationalists'. If you want super-dispensationalism the man to turn to would be Bullinger. However without splitting life into, usually 7, dispensations I do see that different covenants are identifiable in the scripture. The Covenant designated 'New' is introduced in Jeremiah **Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: (Jer 31:31 KJV)** The use of the tenses shows plainly that Jeremiah is looking 'forwards' to this covenant which has not yet been established at the time of Jeremiah.

It is this use of the term 'New' that redesignates the 'Sinai' covenant as 'Old'. **In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away. (Heb 8:13 KJV)** Hebrews tells us two things about that Sinai Covenant; it is now 'old', and it is at the point of 'disappearance' when Hebrews was written.

Before Abraham had entered into any kind of Covenant with God, he had entered into faith. Faith/obedience generally precedes covenant. Abraham entered into 'justifying faith' (Gen 15:6) at least 15 years before he entered into the Covenant whose mark was circumcision. I am not saying that these two events need to be separated in time, but they must be separated in understanding. At the time of Abraham's 'justifying faith' the Lord 'made a covenant with Abraham concerning 'his seed', but the personal covenant between God and Abraham was not established until Gen 17:2 and was 'signed in blood' by Abraham's circumcision. This was NOT the 'Old' Covenant but an Abrahamic Covenant the terms of which were unique to him (and which was to be repeatedly 'established' in successive generations).

So we have identified already 4 covenants, The Seed Covenant (Gen 15:8), The Circumcision Covenant (Gen 17:9,10), The Sinai (old) Covenant, and the promised 'New' covenant of Jeremiah 31 (and Hebrews etc). The question is how many of these covenants was Abraham a participant in? Well neither the Sinai (old) Covenant nor the New Covenant had arrived, so its not difficult to narrow the options a little.

Justifying faith is separable from these covenants, in concept at least.

Paul asks the question 'what shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found?' He then takes the rest of the chapter to answer as he expounds the breadth and width of Abraham's experience encompassed in consequence of his 'justifying' faith. He traces justifying faith through into the experience of David thereby showing that Abraham and David experienced the same justifying faith.

In chapter 5 he makes some additions. **Therefore, having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, (Rom 5:1 NASB)** So he now includes 'us' in the kind of experience expounded in chapter 4 and which I am calling justifying faith. But that is only the first verse of chapter 5. He starts from the experience of Abraham and David but goes far beyond it. **through whom also we have obtained our introduction by faith into this grace in which we stand; and we exult in hope of the glory of God. (Rom 5:2 NASB)**

In chapter 4 he expounded the grace into which Abraham had entered. In chapter 5 he expounds the grace into which 'we' have entered'. I have underlined two words above which show how the thought is developing. In Chapter 4 we read of 'that grace', the grace the Abraham and David found. In Chapter 5 we read of the distinctive grace of the Christian era. We discover that it is marked by the phrase 'much more' (pollo mallon). What Abraham and David had experienced was wonderful, but 'this grace' is 'much more'

1. **Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him. (Rom 5:9 KJV)**
2. **For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. (Rom 5:10 KJV)**
3. **But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. (Rom 5:15 KJV)**
4. **For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) (Rom 5:17 KJV)**

If you ask what is the distinctive of this 'much more' I would answer; **the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.**

Peter points in the same direction when he says **Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into. (1Pe 1:8-12 KJV)**

Peter speaks of grace which was different to that which the prophets received. Not that the source is different; God is the source of all grace. But all grace is not the same grace. The prophets were taught that the 'grace' of which they prophesied was not for their time, but for a time which was to come. The coming grace is further identified as that which was 'preached'... with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven'. The distinctive of this Christian era, is the Holy Spirit's

ent down from heaven... shed abroad in our hearts. This distinctive Christian experience is never recorded in the lives of Abraham or David, although they were richly blessed.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/20 17:52

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----Peter speaks of grace which was different to that which the prophets received. Not that the source is different; God is the source of all grace. But all grace is not the same grace. The prophets were taught that the 'grace' of which they prophesied was not for their time, but for a time which was to come. The coming grace is further identified as that which was 'preached'... with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven'. The distinctive of this Christian era, is the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven... shed abroad in our hearts. This distinctive Christian experience is never recorded in the lives of Abraham or David, although they were richly blessed.

I see your point in terms of the nature or content of the grace that defines the covenants you have pointed too. The faith that justifies is essentially the same, but the workings of God through the grace that He dispenses differs.

Please, I hope I did not state this wrong, if so I am sorry.

In another thread I posted today, concerns the nature of the grace that Joel prophesied that would come. And Peter declared that the day of Pentecost was the day that Joel spoke of.

On that day, Joel and Peter said that those who received the out pouring of this grace would have visions, dreams, and prophesy. My 11 year old son taught bible study for our family this weekend on the life of Joseph. Joseph had dreams, visions, and prophesy. And I have been reading through the book of Acts this weekend, and there are witnessess of visions, dreams, and prophesy.

Do you believe that the out pouring spoken of by Joel and Peter were for that generation only?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/21 4:02

Quote:
-----Do you believe that the out pouring spoken of by Joel and Peter were for that generation only?

Jeff
My answer to this is contained in your question. Joel predicted and Peter identified an 'outpouring'. The consequence of this was not that individual prophets as Joseph and Joel would arise; that had always been true. The distinctive of the era that Peter heralded was **And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams: And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will pour out in those days of my Spirit; and they shall prophesy: (Act 2:17-18 KJV)**

What had been occasional and sporadic in earlier days was to become the 'norm' in this 'outpouring' of God's Spirit... men, women, sons, daughters, servants, hand-maidens...

No I don't believe that Peter spoke only his generation. The Christian era stretches, as done Peter's first declaration, from the Day of Pentecost to the Day of the Lord.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/21 14:17

Br. Ron wrote:

Quote:
-----No I don't believe that Peter spoke only his generation. The Christian era stretches, as done Peter's first declaration, from the Day of Pentecost to the Day of the Lord.

In my study of Scripture, I have begun to search for the evidence of God's work in the believer. The examples given to us of individual's mentioned in Scripture testify to where each man or woman has made the subject of their faith evident. Like in 1 John, this book, to me describes a self analysis that each believer is called to perform on one self.

Now, you have asserted first that the nature of God's grace differs according to dispensations. Secondly, you have asserted that the promise of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit was not only to the generation of the Apostles but in each generation that has followed for these last 2000 years.

And that this outpouring correctly signifies the beginning of the New Covenant dispensation.

So my question then is: Where is the testimony of the New Covenant grace, primarily, the promise of visions, dreams, and prophesy, in today's generation?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/21 16:29

Quote:
-----So my question then is: Where is the testimony of the New Covenant grace, primarily, the promise of visions, dreams, and prophesy, in today's generation?

Now there's the question. The cessationists have their answer but mine would be different. It is so easy for Christianity to settle into sterile patterns. It has always been the way. I am blessed to be part of a congregation where prophecy is a regular part of our church life. Dreams and visions are less common but not entirely absent.

This is part of John Wesley's sermon, "The More Excellent Way," "It does not appear that these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were common in the Church for more than two or three centuries. We seldom hear of them after that fatal period when the Emperor Constantine called himself a Christian; and, from a vain imagination of promoting the Christian cause thereby, heaped riches and power and honour upon the Christians in general, but in particular upon the Christian Clergy. From this time they almost totally ceased; very few instances of the kind were found. The cause of this was not, as has been vulgarly supposed, "Because there was no more occasion for them," because all the world was become Christians. This is a miserable mistake; not a twentieth part of it was then nominally Christian. The real cause was, "the love of many," almost of Christians, so called, was "waxed cold." The Christians had no more of the Spirit of Christ than the other Heathens; The Son of Man when He came to examine His Church, could hardly "find faith upon the earth." This was the real cause why the extra-ordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were to no longer be found in the Christian Church; because the Christians were turned heathens again, and had only a dead form left."

The abiding injunction is

But earnestly desire the greater gifts. And I show you a still more excellent way. 1Co 12:31 NASB)

But now faith, hope, love, abide these three; but the greatest of these is love. Pursue love, yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts, but especially that you may prophesy. (1Co 13:13-14:1 NASB)

those chapter divisions often do us a real disservice. This is one of the few times I quote the RSV **So faith, hope, love abide, these three; but the greatest of these is love. Make love your aim, and earnestly desire the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy. (1Co 13:13-14:1 RSVA)**

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/21 16:47

Quote:
-----he real cause was, "the love of many," almost of Christians, so called, was" waxed cold." The Christians had no more of the Spirit of Christ than the other Heathens; The Son of Man when He came to examine His Church, could hardly "find faith upon the earth." This was the real cause why the extra-ordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were to no longer be found in the Christian Church; because the Christians were turned heathens again, and had only a dead form left."

Now this is a sobering statement! We hear so much of the 'prophetic' and the like, yet Wesley seems to be indicating here that it could be a matter of course for Christians to live at a 'prophetic' level. I don't mean that in the flakey sense, but in the sense that God was revealing Himself to the people in a way that made Himself 'very real' to them. Do you have anything you would share with us to help us understand the Biblical model of what our Christian life should be like in terms of prophesy and the like?

Quote:
----- The cessationists have their answer but mine would be different.

I am all ears. :-)

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/12/22 14:45

Br. Ron wrote two posts ago:

Quote:
-----What had been occasional and sporadic in earlier days was to become the 'norm' in this 'outpouring' of God's Spirit... men, women, sons, daughters, servants, hand-maidens...

Then Br. Ron quoted Wesley:

Quote:
-----This is part of John Wesley's sermon, "The More Excellent Way, "It does not appear that these extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost were common in the Church for more than two or three centuries. We seldom hear of them after that fatal period when the Emperor Constantine called himself a Christian; and, from a vain imagination of promoting the Christian cause thereby, heaped riches and power and honour upon the Christians in general, but in particular upon the Christian Clergy.

It is not my intention to argue but to question the essence of what we teach.

The quote from Wesley seems to contradict your earlier statement concerning the nature of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

In Christ
Jeff