

s and Doctrine :: So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ

So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ Jesus?, on: 2008/8/4 9:55

In this we must keep in mind, God changed the names of several in the scriptures. Knowing the circumstances of why He did can help us with this.

So whatta ya think?

Re: So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation - posted by sojourner7 (), on: 2008/8/4 10:52

None is wise enough to presume to understand
God in His infinite wisdom!!

Re:, on: 2008/8/4 10:52

Thats good thinking. Sez much.. . .))

C'mon, you can do better than that, can't you?

I say the latter because God wanted "many sons brought unto Glory". . . Paul wrote that.

Re: So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation - posted by Logic, on: 2008/8/4 10:52

Quote:

-----Ormyly wrote:

So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ Jesus?

Neither.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2008/8/4 15:14

Let us look at Scripture-

Acts 15:18 Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world.

We read in the Revelation that Christ was "the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world"(Rev 13:8).

So, it is very easy to see that God knew that in fact Adam would fall and plunge mankind into sin.

But God had already established that there would be a Savior.

I suppose in one sense, yes Adam was purposed to fall, but not by God's design. Adam used his free will(yes Adam had free will, similar to us as Christians who can choose God's way or our own, but the unregenerate do not have this ability) and chose to think that he indeed knew better than God what was good and evil.

We cannot climb into the Heavenly realm to figure this out, but we must understand that even Satan was created by God, and exists for God's own pleasure and purposes.

For us and for our salvation, Adam was allowed to fall, and thus Christ was needed and we see in the Scriptures the failed attempts of Satan to stop the Seed of the woman that would crush his head.

I think Psalm 115:3 beautifully sums up much of what happens in our world-
"But our God is in the heavens: he hath done whatsoever he hath pleased."

Re:, on: 2008/8/4 16:45

From that I surmise you believe Adam was created to fail just so Jesus could be born 4 thousand years later to redeem us. Did I get that right or did I leave something out?

Re: So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2008/8/4 16:45

Ormlly,

Once you get this figured out, then what?

ginnyrose

Re: - posted by preacher777E (), on: 2008/8/4 18:31

That is very true.The hebrew word for,in the begining (B'resheet)contains the gospel when you break it down.It seems possible that Adam being one with Eve was destroyed with the sin of Eve.What I mean is that she had to be 100% different from him but his love for her may have been the same.In Jer.3:1 it states that if a women is divorced and joins to another it would corrupt the land to take her back, but he (Yeshua) said come back.This is no contradiction.In Num.5 we hear about a cup, to save his bride he had to take on flesh and take the cup meant for us.Could this be the cup he talked about in the garden.Adam was a shadow of Messiah.

Re:, on: 2008/8/4 18:38

))) Patience, Dear One.

Re:, on: 2008/8/4 19:04

Quote:

preacher777E wrote:
That is very true.The hebrew word for,in the begining (B'resheet)contains the gospel when you break it down.It seems possible that Adam being one with Eve was destroyed with the sin of Eve.What I mean is that she had to be 100% different from him but his love for her may have been the same.In Jer.3:1 it states that if a women is divorced and joins to another it would corrupt the land to take her back, but he (Yeshua) said come back.This is no contradiction.In Num.5 we hear about a cup, to save his bride he had to take on flesh and take the cup meant for us.Could this be the cup he talked about in the garden.Adam was a shadow of Messiah.

Well you are still looking at Adam after the fact, after the fact of his failure that now required a redeemer to cancel out. What if Adam had not failed? We must remember God said multiply, replenish the earth. What did God have in mind if not a creation filled and perfected in Him? Perfection requires divinity. Certainly He didn't want it whereby procreation would be forever tempted; hindered/badgered by the enemy of God that sought to destroy what God created; to sever it so completely from God to place it in the same damnable condition he was in. Certainly it could never have been where the sinless and the sinful could exist together, a mixer of sinless ones mixed in with sinful ones. Sorry that does not compute. There had to be a conclusion in God for Adam had he not transgressed. What we can see from scripture is not speculative but supportive that Adam was to be what Jesus became, i.e., a Divine-Human representative in the Godhead. Of course we know in order for that to happen Adam would have to become divine perfection, again, as Jesus, in His flesh, became, a forever Glorified body.

The devil messed that up by his solicitations to Eve.

Re:, on: 2008/8/4 20:17

Quote:
-----The devil messed that up by his solicitations to Eve.

God doesn't have a plan B. If that's the case, plan A was a miserable failure, which means God is far less than perfect. God forbid that any should suggest such!

The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/8/4 21:52

Quote:

Josef_Urban wrote:

Quote:
-----The devil messed that up by his solicitations to Eve.

God doesn't have a plan B. If that's the case, plan A was a miserable failure, which means God is far less than perfect. God forbid that any should suggest such!

The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world.

Why is it so hard to believe that God has given His creation a free will to obey or disobey?

Why do some have to think, that if God gave his creation a free will and then planned redemption because of knowing man's failure, then that is accusing God of making a mistake?

Why can't we just believe that within God's sovereignty He gave man a free will to choose to love Him and obey Him?

Why is it so hard to believe that God Gave Lucifer (an archangel) so much power and freedom that He got proud and because God gave Him freedom He abused it to try and get praised for himself?

Why is it so hard to believe that in God's sovereignty He allowed it to happen and therefore created man a little lower than the angels to defeat Satan?

So creating man lower than the angels, God wanted man to overcome the devil and rid the world of evil. God being all knowing, He knew the risk of giving man free will and prepared a head of time for redemption. He kept man from eating of the tree of Life after he sinned, so that he would not be glorified in a sinful state but could be redeemed by the blood of the Lamb and still overcome the devil.

The overcomers in Christ shall inherit all things and have a glorified body like the angels in the resurrection. Praise God!

Why not believe this instead of accusing God of creating people with no hope of redemption just so He can send them to hell, when that is against His nature of Love.

Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/8/4 23:10

Quote:

rbanks wrote:

Quote:

Josef_Urban wrote:

Quote:
-----The devil messed that up by his solicitations to Eve.

God doesn't have a plan B. If that's the case, plan A was a miserable failure, which means God is far less than perfect. God forbid that any should suggest such!

The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world.

Why is it so hard to believe that God has given His creation a free will to obey or disobey?

Why do some have to think, that if God gave his creation a free will and then planned redemption because of knowing man's failure, then that is accusing God of making a mistake?

Why can't we just believe that within God's sovereignty He gave man a free will to choose to love Him and obey Him?

Why is it so hard to believe that God Gave Lucifer (an archangel) so much power and freedom that He got proud and because God gave Him freedom He abused it to try and get praised for himself?

Why is it so hard to believe that in God's sovereignty He allowed it to happen and therefore created man a little lower than the angels to defeat Satan?

So creating man lower than the angels, God wanted man to overcome the devil and rid the world of evil. God being all knowing, He knew the risk of giving man free will and prepared a head of time for redemption. He kept man from eating of the tree of Life after he sinned, so that he would not be glorified in a sinful state but could be redeemed by the blood of the Lamb and still overcome the devil.

The overcomers in Christ shall inherit all things and have a glorified body like the angels in the resurrection. Praise God!

Why not believe this instead of accusing God of creating people with no hope of redemption just so He can send them to hell, when that is against His nature of Love.

Blessings to all!

Many of these, "why is it so hard for you", questions could be asked of you as well. You, my friend, simply do not agree with the doctrines of grace. :-)

Those that do agree with these doctrines love God and study their Bibles. They are not merely in agreement with a man named Calvin; they are steeped in scripture and seek the Lord as you do.

"Calvinism", as some call it, has been revealed to many people simply through prayer and Bible study and not by studying man made doctrines. Remember, they very well may believe you are as deceived as you believe they are. ;-)

I have noticed you grappling with these doctrines on various threads. I think it is good to discuss and understand them. I wish you well brother. May God lead, guide, and direct you in your studies.

Grace and peace my brother

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/8/4 23:41

Quote:

tjservant wrote:

I have noticed you grappling with these doctrines on various threads. I think it is good to discuss and understand them. I wish you well brother. May God lead, guide, and direct you in your studies.

Grace and peace my brother

You my friend and brother as well as others on here have not answered my questions either.

Yes! You are right, for I have asked many questions in many posts about Calvinistic doctrine.

I have no problem with much of Calvinistic doctrine that agree with scripture.

I believe in grace as much as anyone on here. I am trusting in Jesus with all my heart because there is no salvation without His Grace.

People have not answered my questions because they as well as me do not fully understand grace. His grace is amazing!

I am persuaded by nothing but scripture not man's opinions. My questions are legit and are not answered.

The scripture says it is by grace through faith.

I believe God's grace is all powerful to save anyone who believes. Do you?

Do you believe God's grace is all powerful or not? Do you believe it is only powerful enough to save some or do you believe it is powerful enough to save the whole world.

I believe in a God of all grace and all powerful enough to save every human ever born on the face of the earth, do you? Do yours and mine Calvinist friends?

You and others talk about me not believing in grace how about you and other Calvinists on here.

You can never offend me my brother because I am one of his elect and I am saved by grace.

How much grace do you need my brother for He is the God of all grace.

Jesus is the Savior of the world and efficient to those that believe.

God has given to every man the measure of faith.

I will praise my God for ever for His all sufficient Grace.

Blessings to you my brother even though you can't answer my questions.

Love in Christ!

Re: Defining Terms,etc., on: 2008/8/5 0:00

The subject of this thread appears to be one of the many age-old arguments.

As with many of the others(age-old arguments)this one too is connected and related to various other doctrines.

I believe the reason for such connection is due to the Truth that none would argue, namely this, "But he is in one mind, and who can turn him? and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth." (Job 23:13)

Yet men have and do attempt to bring Him down to their level, Psa 50:21-23 These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself: but I will reprove thee, and set them in order before thine eyes. Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces, and there be none to deliver. Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me: and to him that ordereth his conversation aright will I show the salvation of God.

May we truly meditate upon His Word and think upon The Most High Who fills Heaven and earth.

Consider what He is saying here. Do we know this God? Oh! that we'd acquaint ourselves with Him, and not some image we've formed in our own minds that we make into God and present such to others.

If I'm correct, I think the subject of this thread is the argument between two terms.

From Elwell Evangelical Dictionary

The term "supralapsarianism" comes from the Latin words *supra* and *lapsus*; the decree of predestination was considered to be "above" (*supra*) or logically "before" the decree concerning the fall (*lapsus*), while the *infralapsarians* viewed it as "below" (*infra*) or logically "after" the decree concerning the fall. The contrast of the two views is evident from the following summaries.

The logical order of the decrees in the supralapsarian scheme is:

- (1) God's decree to glorify himself through the election of some and the reprobation of others;
- (2) as a means to that goal, the decree to create those elected and reprobated;
- (3) the decree to permit the fall; and
- (4) the decree to provide salvation for the elect through Jesus Christ.

The logical order of the decrees according to *infralapsarians* is:

- (1) God's decree to glorify himself through the creation of the human race;
- (2) the decree to permit the fall;
- (3) the decree to elect some of the fallen race to salvation and to pass by the others and condemn them for their sin; and
- (4) the decree to provide salvation for the elect through Jesus Christ.

Neither side suggests that the elect were chosen after Adam sinned. God made His choice before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4)—long before Adam sinned. Both *infras* and *supras* (and even many *Arminians*) agree on this.

H. Bavinck has this to say, "Supralapsarianism undoubtedly has in its favor the fact that it refrains from every attempt to justify God, and that both with respect to reprobation and with respect to election it rests in God's sovereign, incomprehensible, yet wise and holy good pleasure."

He further states, "Now Reformed theologians all agree that the entrance of sin and punishment was willed and determined by God. It is perfectly true that words like "permission" and "foreknowledge" do not solve anything. The difficulty remains the same, and the same questions arise; viz., why, if God foreknew everything, did he create man fallible, and why did he not prevent the fall? Why did he allow all men to fall in Adam? Why does he not grant to all men faith and the blessing of hearing the Gospel? In brief, if God foreknows and permits something, he does this either "willingly" or "unwillingly." The latter is impossible. Accordingly, only the former remains: God's permission is an "efficacious permission," an act of his will. Nor should it be supposed that the idea of permission is of any force or value over against the charge that God is the Author of sin; for he who permits or allows someone to sin and to perish in his sin although he was able to prevent him from sinning is just as guilty as he who incites someone to sin. On the other hand, however, all agree that although sin is not "excluded" from the will of God it is, nevertheless, "contrary" to his will; that it is not merely a means to the final goal, but a disturbance in God's creation; and that Adam's fall was not a step ahead but a fall in the real sense of the word. It is also a fact that admits of no doubt that, however much logical reasoning may demur, no one is able to suggest other and better words than "permission, foreknowledge, preterition, dereliction," etc."

Bavinck's concluding remarks, "Neither the *supra-* nor the *infralapsarian* view of predestination is able to do full justice to the truth of Scripture, and to satisfy our theological thinking. The true element in *supralapsarianism* is: that it emphasizes the unity of the divine decree and the fact that God had one final aim in view, that sin's entrance into the universe was not something unexpected and unlooked for by God but that he willed sin in a certain sense, and that the work of creation was immediately adapted to God's redemptive activity so that even before the fall, i.e., in the creation of Adam, Christ's coming was definitely fixed. And the true element in *infralapsarianism* is: that the decrees manifest not only a unity but also a diversity (with a view to their several objects), that these decrees reveal not only a teleological but also a causal order, that creation and fall cannot merely be regarded as means to an end, and that sin should be regarded not as an element of progress but rather as an element of disturbance in the universe so that in and by itself it cannot have been willed by God."

Some of the names of men who fall on one side or the other are:

Infralapsarianism

John Calvin
John Owen
Thomas Watson
Matthew Henry
George Whitefield
Jonathan Edwards
C.H. Spurgeon
Charles Hodge
Thornwell
William G.T. Shedd
L. Boettner
Anthony Hoekema
Robert Lewis Dabney
B.B. Warfield
Martyn Lloyd-Jones
Scott Hill
Jason Robertson
R.C. Sproul
John Piper

Supralapsarianism

Beza
John Gill
Abraham Kuyper
Herman Hoeksema
A. W. Pink
Cornelius Van Til
Gordon Clark
Louis Berkhof
Karl Barth
Robert Reymond

The above names are just a few of the many which could be listed.

There is also the sublapsarianism view and also what is known as Amyraldism.

Under the Amyraldism view would be:

Amyraldism

Richard Baxter
John Bunyan
Timothy Dwight
A. H. Strong
Henry Thiessen
J.C. Ryle
Lewis Sperry Chafer
R.T. Kendall

These studies can be and are mentally exhausting.

Therefore I will stop here.

If any are interested they may do further study on their own.

As for me, I am content knowing Him and His absolute sovereignty, and will serve The LORD God Who is omnipotent an

d reigneth.

Re: What then? - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/8/5 0:11

"Supralapsarianism"

Ah, it's been awhile since we have seen this ... It has been given some treatment in the past here, a search would bare it out.

To the original comment\question at hand;

Tit 3:9 But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.

Tit 3:9 - Avoid foolish questions, and genealogies - In these the Jews particularly delighted; they abounded in the most frivolous questions; and, as they had little piety themselves, they were solicitous to show that they had descended from godly ancestors.

Of their frivolous questions, and the answers given to them by the wisest and most reputable of their rabbins, the following is a specimen: -

Rabbi Hillel was asked: Why have the Babylonians round heads? To which he answered: This is a difficult question, but I will tell the reason: Their heads are round because they have but little wit.

Adam Clarke

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/8/5 0:30

Quote:
-----Blessings to you my brother even though you can't answer my questions.

Just because someone does not answer your question(s) when, where, and how you want does not mean they cannot be answered; you haven't stumbled upon the question(s) that will end this conversation/debate any time soon.

I believe all of your questions are very answerable and have been answered countless times on this forum. Many of the folks you may want to respond are just exercising caution due to past experiences.

I will leave it to the folks, much wiser than I, that have thoroughly replied to these questions and many like them before. Please search for threads on these topics.

The doctrines of grace are well documented. I doubt there are any new questions being asked. The answers are there...you may not want, like, or agree with them.

Grace and peace brother

Re: So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation, on: 2008/8/5 0:44

Adam was purposed to bring pleasure to His Creator, as a son was to any Father. In the creation of Adam, made after the image of God himself, and possessing the attributes of the Father, Adam was given a will, and a conscience. God has a will, in the affairs on the Earth, and His conscience is part of his character, which we call Holy.

My answer is neither. Adam was not purposed to fall; It was simply a fruit of a decision he made, through his very own volition, to act as he saw fit. The angels possessed this very essence also, as some chose to act as they desired. We call these acts sin. It is willfulness outside of the will of God. Without a will, you are not a personality, and technically do not have a conscience. You are not a person, or a personality.

Adam was therefore not purposed to usher in the Redeemer either. It was God's purpose to redeem Adam, not through the creation of Adam, but an attribute of God that we know as Love, or compassion, for the weakness, and eternal trouble that his beloved creation had got himself into.

God sits in the front of the room, and at the back of the room, at the same time. In his economy, we live before him even now, in New Jerusalem. He is the beginning, and the end; the Alpha and Omega; the first and the last. The Bible speaks of the Lamb that was slain, before the foundations of the Earth. Jesus, laid his life down, before there was Adam.

So Adam was not created to manifest the Messiah, through His sin, and God's following mercies. It was the plan before all things, stemming from God's character, to act on behalf of him, and his offspring, after making a terrible mistake, all on his own. God foresaw Adam's bite into eternal death.

For God so loved the World, that He gave. He gave. It's that simple. The wheels of the incarnation were spinning long before in eternities past, before Adam fell. Adam's choice. God loved. Jesus came for this.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/8/5 0:45

Quote:

tjservant wrote:

I will leave it to the folks, much wiser than I, that have thoroughly replied to these questions and many like them before. Please search for threads on these topics.

The doctrines of grace are well documented. I doubt there are any new questions being asked. The answers are there...you may not want, like, or agree with them.

Grace and peace brother

Isa 45:22 Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else.

Isa 49:6 And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.

Isa 55:1 Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.

Eze 18:23 Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord GOD: and not that he should return from his ways, and live?

Eze 33:11 Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord GOD, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?

Lu 14:23 And the lord said unto the servant, Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.

Joh 3:15 That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life.

Joh 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Joh 3:17 For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.

Ro 3:29 Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles? Yes, of the Gentiles also:

Ro 3:30 Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

2Co 5:17 Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

2Co 5:18 And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation;

2Co 5:19 To wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.

1Th 2:15 Who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men:

1Th 2:16 Forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.

Tit 2:11 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men,

2Pe 3:9 The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

Straw man in Paradise., on: 2008/8/5 4:54

"Did George W. Bush invade Iraq because he liked boxing, and enjoyed a healthy fight, or was it because he has seen too many John Wayne movies?"

This is called a straw man, a term that Sermonindex folks are well aware of, as they are inundated with this kind of logic. It means basing your opinions and statements upon a faulty assumption, and then comparing that assumption with your ideas to form a division that may appear to qualify an empirical judgement.

'Purposed to fall'

In your case, your inquisitive assumptions are both faulty, and without merit, so that whatever is derived upon either logic would bolster your perceived enigma unto the negative. It is Questioning one untruth in an either or process to accept another untruth. In one sense, it is not worthy of responding to, for this reason alone. I question whether your inquisition is authentic, and not contrived for reasons of controversy or the "uncaused cause"...ergo; the enigma.

If Adam was purposed to fall, then was the human race purposed to fall. This means that my God designed much of humanity to boil in sulphur throughout Eternities, as His will. You have my God mixed up with another of his creations, that became pure evil. The first leg of your straw man; to me; a little blasphemous. Jesus suffered, after he left his throne in pure love, to bleed and be tortured to rescue Adam. It was not His purpose for Adam to fall, but to live, as an object of His affections. He adored Adam, and redeemed him, at great cost to Himself....the death and Sacrifice of His Son, Yahweh Yeshua!

"Purposed for the incarnation"
This has similar implications.

The incarnation was arrived at before the foundation of the world, when Jesus was slain. Adams purpose was that God desired a son, and children, that He could pour Himself into, and enjoy. God loves, and he loved Adam. He saw that all of Creation was "GOOD"

Jesus was "incarnated" to be Crucified, and overcome Death, not for reasons of Adams existence. "For this reason was the Son of Man manifested, that He might destroy the works of the Devil!" Jesus came to rescue Adam, and his children, from a fate to horrible to think. We were helpless.

Adam was not purposed "for the incarnation". He was simply bound and without hope, in the midst of his life, and driven away in despair from Eden. The "incarnation" was not founded on the fact that Adam existed, or was created, but in order to Redeem Adam, the Lord Yahweh had to become an Adam...of the race of men. "Lo, a body has thou prepared for Me!"

Adam was purposed to live, and be, in the fellowship of His Creator. Jesus manifested Himself to bring mercies, and restoration, in spite of Adam's apparent hopeless state; to overcome Death, and the grave...which are, by the way, Eternal places.

Janus was an early name of Satan within the Babylonian religions. He was depicted as a two faced being, with only one head. This is what your straw man reminds me of. Two lies opposing the other to prove one or the other as a truth.

"Has God Said?".....

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 7:29

Quote:
-----Why not believe this instead of accusing God of creating people with no hope of redemption just so He can send them to hell, when that is against His nature of Love.

Amen! Bro rbanks! A pleasure for me to read all you wrote.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 7:36

Quote:

rbanks wrote:

Quote:

Josef_Urban wrote:

Quote:
-----The devil messed that up by his solicitations to Eve.

God doesn't have a plan B. If that's the case, plan A was a miserable failure, which means God is far less than perfect. God forbid that any should suggest such!

The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world.

Why is it so hard to believe that God has given His creation a free will to obey or disobey?

Why do some have to think, that if God gave his creation a free will and then planned redemption because of knowing man's failure, then that is accusing God of making a mistake?

Why can't we just believe that within God's sovereignty He gave man a free will to choose to love Him and obey Him?

Why is it so hard to believe that God Gave Lucifer (an archangel) so much power and freedom that He got proud and because God gave Him freedom He abused it to try and get praised for himself?

Why is it so hard to believe that in God's sovereignty He allowed it to happen and therefore created man a little lower than the angels to defeat Satan?

So creating man lower than the angels, God wanted man to overcome the devil and rid the world of evil. God being all knowing, He knew the risk of giving man free will and prepared a head of time for redemption. He kept man from eating of the tree of Life after he sinned, so that he would not be glorified in a sinful state but could be redeemed by the blood of the Lamb and still overcome the devil.

The overcomers in Christ shall inherit all things and have a glorified body like the angels in the resurrection. Praise God!

Why not believe this instead of accusing God of creating people with no hope of redemption just so He can send them to hell, when that is against His nature of Love.

Blessings to all!

Where is God's grace violated and why call the above, man's reasoning anymore than what you would yours, except you have a bias. I wrote the Bible is supportive of God intending for Adam to be HIS representative of man, as He intended man to be. Adam failed, he did not achieve God's purpose, i.e., Throne-ship in the Godhead. God planned for such a failure. Jesus, the second Adam, now makes it possible.

How does that go against the Grace of God. It is a statement of fact as it can be seen from scriptures. Please explain.

Re: Straw man in Paradise. - posted by jayyou, on: 2008/8/5 7:49

Hi there Dear Saints,

After reading some of the posts here I have decided to comment on this, Maybe it will help maybe it will not, but here it goes....

I believe that God has written a very special book to tell us about Him and His unfathomable love for us. But I also believe that when we talk about God and His attributes we should take our spiritual shoes off for this is Holy ground.

Let's us all be very careful so that God won't rebuke us with the same words that were directed to Job.

Job 38:1-2 Then the LORD answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said: 2 "Who is this who darkens counsel By words without knowledge?

=====

Having said that let's us all believe that the Grace given to us at calvary through Jesus Christ is sufficient for the salvation of all of us who believes.

Now I believe in a God whose character is love, but also just.

And Ezekiel tells us that God wants us to live.

Ezekiel 18:23 "Do I have any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?" says the Lord GOD, "and not that he should turn from his ways and live?"

Ezekiel 18:31-32 "Cast away from you all the transgressions which you have committed, and get yourselves a new heart and a new spirit. For why should you die, O house of Israel? 32 "For I have no pleasure in the death of one who dies," says the Lord GOD. "Therefore turn and live!"

I don't believe it could be any clearer.

God has no pleasure that anyone should die,

2 Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some count slackness, but is longsuffering toward us, not willing that any should perish but that all should come to repentance.

Now, I have given my life to Christ, I have washed my robes in his blood and I keep His commandments through the guidance of the Holy Spirit because He abides in me, but I am not a calvinist, I do not believe that some are predestined to be saved and some not, I believe that we are all predestined to be saved and by our own rejection of the Gospel we doom ourselves to everlasting death.

This question is for the Calvinists?

Because I do not believe in calvinism, Am I lost? or am I saved because of the blood of the lamb?

1 Timothy 4:10 For to this end we both labor and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe.

I thank God that His Grace is extended to all who believe. Therefore let's all preach the gospel of Christ so that we can give good news to as many as possible.

If we are predestined to either be saved or lost then what is the point in preaching the gospel?

May the Love of Christ abide in us all.

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2008/8/5 8:23

Those with "Calvinist" inquiries may wish to start new threads dealing with their particular questions so as to not detract from the subject of this thread and catch the eyes of those able and willing to answer.

I have only recently begun to study Cal/Ref doctrine. I will add if I can, but will mostly leave it to those much wiser than myself.

Grace and peace to all

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 8:32

This is not arguable:

The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father.

Now what would have happened had Adam been obedient?

With Jesus, the incarnation was there at His birth/conception, to be tried and tested in a man. In the case with Adam, who was created and not begotten, hence created without divinity in him, had he eaten of the tree of Life first would have had the Nature of the Father deposited in him, to become the same as what Jesus possessed, "begottenhood". Quite possibly Adam may even have had to experience a 'thirty years of silence' time period before putting to prison forever the enemy of God and man. We can say without error that both men were given to learn the Character of the Father before expressing Him in power and might.

Keeping in mind, Jesus had His graduation whereby He had completed all the testings of the Father, Oswald Chambers has it that by a series of moral choices Adam would have had his own graduation day; his own Transfiguration.

So what is the difference here is, had Adam not transgressed redemption would not have been necessary. Quite possible

y even his name would have been changed to "Emanuel, God with us" who has all authority both in all of Heaven and Earth.

This is what Jesus came to earth to accomplish. However, before He could get God's program back on track, He had to first redeem man. Those in Him are His "new creation." But either way you look at it, Him being incarnated into Adam or that of a baby birthed by a virgin in a stable, Jesus still had to come, to step into the scene that Satan be defeated and for man to progress to Joint-heir-ship in the Godhead. the man Jesus being the "first of first fruits".

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 8:41

Quote:

tjservant wrote:
Those with "Calvinist" inquiries may wish to start new threads dealing with their particular questions so as to not detract from the subject of this thread and catch the eyes of those able and willing to answer.

I have only recently begun to study Cal/Ref doctrine. I will add if I can, but will mostly leave it to those much wiser than myself.

Grace and peace to all

Thanks tjservant. I had hoped this wouldn't get off on Cal-Ref vs anything else, tangent. I am after objectivity in this that the scriptures might be examined without biasness entering in.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 8:47

This kind of thinking is totally wrong.

Quote:
-----Jesus was "incarnated" to be Crucified, and overcome Death, not for reasons of Adams existence. "For this reason was the Son of Man manifested, that He might destroy the works of the Devil!" Jesus came to rescue Adam, and his "children, from a fate to horrible to think. We were helpless.

"Behold, I make all things new" . . NOT I make new all things. In other words, Jesus doesn't make the old things new. "Adam" is not a man made over but a totally new man. No rescue in this.

Part of what Jesus did by coming to earth was to set the captives free. The captives also included the righteous dead who were in paradise. Paradise, the "abode of the righteous dead", "Abraham's bosom", was NOT a place of torment. If a 'thinker' of the scriptures gets this part wrong, much of all else in his thinking will also be wrong.

Re: Straw man in Paradise....Ormley, on: 2008/8/5 9:46

Since you have quoted me, a little out of context, I am presenting you again with my entire quote.
Quote:

Brothertom wrote:

"Did George W. Bush invade Iraq because he liked boxing, and enjoyed a healthy fight, or was it because he has seen too many John Wayne movies?"

This is called a straw man, a term that Sermonindex folks are well aware of, as they are inundated with this kind of logic. It means basing your opinions and statements upon a faulty assumption, and then comparing that assumption with your ideas to form a division that may appear to qualify an empirical judgement.
"Purposed to fall"

In your case, your inquisitive assumptions are both faulty, and without merit, so that whatever is derived upon either logic would bolster your perception.

ved enigma unto the negative. It is Questioning one untruth in an either or process to accept another untruth. In one sense, it is not worthy of responding to, for this reason alone. I question whether your inquisition is authentic, and not contrived for reasons of controversy or the "uncaused cause"...ergo; the enigma.

If Adam was purposed to fall, then was the human race purposed to fall. This means that my God designed much of humanity to boil in sulphur throughout Eternities, as His will. You have my God mixed up with another of his creations, that became pure evil. The first leg of your straw man; to me; a little blasphemous. Jesus suffered, after he left his throne in pure love, to bleed and be tortured to rescue Adam. It was not His purpose for Adam to fall, but to live, as an object of His affections. He adored Adam, and redeemed him, at great cost to Himself....the death and Sacrifice of His Son, Yahweh Yeshua!

"Purposed for the incarnation"
This has similar implications.

The incarnation was arrived at before the foundation of the world, when Jesus was slain. Adam's purpose was that God desired a son, and children, that He could pour Himself into, and enjoy. God loves, and he loved Adam. He saw that all of Creation was "GOOD"
edit.

"Jesus was "incarnated" to be Crucified, and overcome Death, not for reasons of Adam's existence. "For this reason was the Son of Man manifested, that He might destroy the works of the Devil!" Jesus came to rescue Adam, and his children, from a fate too horrible to think. We were helpless. "....edited to clarify quote, 30 minutes after post...

Adam was not purposed "for the incarnation". He was simply bound and without hope, in the midst of his life, and driven away in despair from Eden. The "incarnation" was not founded on the fact that Adam existed, or was created, but in order to Redeem Adam, the Lord Yahweh had to become a man Adam...of the race of men. "Lo, a body has thou prepared for Me!"

Adam was purposed to live, and be, in the fellowship of His Creator. Jesus manifested Himself to bring mercies, and restoration, in spite of Adam's apparent hopeless state; to overcome Death, and the grave...which are, by the way, Eternal places.

Janus was an early name of Satan within the Babylonian religions. He was depicted as a two faced being, with only one head. This is what your straw man reminds me of. Two lies opposing the other to prove one or the other as a truth.

"Has God Said?".....

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 10:18

Quote:
-----The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father.

Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth was born as the incarnate Son of God, being God in the flesh?

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 10:22

Out of context or in context it is still poor reasoning, given the scriptures.

I can only hope that one may read my posts and conclude there is more to our redemption and life established IN the grace of God than receiving a paid up fire insurance policy.

Creation is more than that. . . much more.

g

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 10:24

Quote:

Josef_Urban wrote:

Quote:

-----The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father.

Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth was born as the incarnate Son of God, being God in the flesh?

Absolutely! Now my question to you: Are you born again?

Re:Jesus achieved Divinity?, on: 2008/8/5 10:59

Ormley wrote:

"The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father."

Josef-Servant wrote;

"Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth was born as the incarnate Son of God, being God in the flesh?"

It is evident in your statement above, that you believe that Jesus of Nazareth,**Achieved** divinity by obedience to the Father.

Could you explain where you derived this insight?

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 11:13

Quote:

Brothertom wrote:
Ormley wrote:

"The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father."

Josef-Servant wrote;

"Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth was born as the incarnate Son of God, being God in the flesh?"

It is evident in your statement above, that you believe that Jesus of Nazareth,**Achieved** divinity by obedience to the Father.

Could you explain where you derived this insight?

The scriptures that state, He learned obedience . . ." Obedience to what if not the Father? What was it He had to learn if not the Character of His Father much like Adam was purposed to do? In our life we know that a child, being born with the nature of its father is given to learn his character; son-ship. "Unto us a child is born, a son given". Why was that necessary if Jesus was already divine in His humanity? It was His Humanity that required the test to become what God purposed, i.e., Humankind transfigured to Glory.

It was this that was purposed for Adam.

May I also ask this question of you: Are you born again?

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/8/5 11:15

Ormly said:

Quote:
-----Adam failed, he did not achieve God's purpose, i.e., Throne-ship in the Godhead.

"May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears..." (Acts 17:19-20)

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 11:36

Quote:

PaulWest wrote:
Ormly said:

Quote:
-----Adam failed, he did not achieve God's purpose, i.e., Throne-ship in the Godhead.

"May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest is? For thou bringest certain strange things to our ears..." (Acts 17:19-20)

Wherein lies the strangeness? Oh, I don't deny it is new, though it shouldn't be. I have violated nothing from scripture unless you have a biased perspective of it taught you by the many years of the teaching of a single dimensioned gospel.

Ask some questions of Paul. How come he places great emphasis on 'son-ship, joint-heir-ship and throne-ship upon his listeners who are not just 'saved' folk? He speaks to the "saints AND to the faithful in Christ.(Eph.1:1,kjv) He makes distinctions most don't ever make when taking God's work to themselves, presumptuously believing they have it all when they repeat the sinners prayer. No my brother, there is more that led Paul to declare, "Eye hasn't seen nor ear heard, nor has entered into the heart of man, what God has for those that love Him". Do you love God? Why of course you do. Every 'Christian' will admit that while never considering what it really means.
Kindly read all I have posted and not cherry pick to find fault. It isn't a strange doctrine I speak. It is however, a more complete one that should offend no one who knows the scriptures to search out for themselves. It should bring joy to the one who longs for more completeness in Christ while still living in this world of testing.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 12:46

Quote:

Ormley wrote:

"The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father."

Josef-Servant wrote;
"Do you believe that Jesus of Nazareth was born as the incarnate Son of God, being God in the flesh?"

It is evident in your statement above, that you believe that Jesus of Nazareth, **Achieved** divinity by obedience to the Father.

Could you explain where you derived this insight?

Ormley replied,
"The scriptures that state, He learned obedience . . ." Obedience to what if not the Father? What was it He had to learn if not the Character of His Father much like Adam was purposed to do? In our life we know that a child, being born with the nature of its father is given to learn his character; son-ship. "Unto us a child is born, a son given". Why was that necessary if Jesus was already divine in His humanity? It was His Humanity that required the test to become what God purposed, i.e., Humankind transfigured to Glory.

It was this that was purposed for Adam.

May I also ask this question of you: Are you born again?

My response to you, Ormly:

Ormly then replied:
"Why was that necessary if Jesus was already Divine, in His humanity. ?.....

In simple strait talk, you do not believe that Jesus was divine, or God in the Flesh. You have stated this clearly. You somewhere believed that Jesus ACHIEVED DIVINITY through obedience to his father. When you are confronted, you will not respond according to the Word, or directly, but divert argument to your "straw men", or accusations of infidelity against your confronters. You have no substance to your claims, and will not reveal the source of these ideas.

Well Ormly, You see, that Jesus was the Son of Man, as well as the Son of God.

"All things were made by him, and without him, was not anything made that was made."

"He was in the World, **and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not!**"

John chapter one.

Who created all things, Ormly?.."who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be EQUAL with God, and made

himself of no reputation, and took upon himself the FORM of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men."

...Philippians, Ch:2

These doctrines of "attainment" by our Lord Jesus are prevalent in Mormonism, Transcendental Hinduism , Buddhism, and Taoism....They all teach that the path to Nirvana, was and is the same that Jesus walked, all with a twist or two.

You have quickly exposed yourself as one who has believed at least a form of these damnable heresies. This is not good, Ormly. Not that we don't invite seekers of God, or are rejecting you because of your unchristian doctrines, but because they might destroy you in the end, if you do not change, or repent.

To know that the Eternal One became a man, and as God, laid his life down, to redeem, is a fundamental and foundational reality for the Believer. You, as per your posts, do not believe this, in spite of your intricate designs to avoid admitting it, or to divert the issues. Your questions , and the name of your posts, are spurious in nature..in that both reflect the substance of your heresy, and, I believe, were purposed to create doubt. God is a good God, Ormly, and desires that NO ONE should perish. This is why Jesus came; not because Adam was created, but to rescue him, and his Hell bound race. In doing so, He soundly defeated Death, and his cohort, Satan!

Jesus left His Throne as God almighty, to become a man. He ascended back to that Throne, as God almighty, having endured the sacrifice, and the suffering of death, as He tasted death for all mankind. It had to be so. This is the root of all mercies, and God's Love, Ormly.

Please stop diverting this issue. Jesus is, was, and will be God Almighty. He is the Great "I AM." He has never attained Divinity. He is Divinity, the alpha and omega. You may not believe this, but this is the Heart of Faith you are disputing , and I believe that it is impossible to know God, and obtain Salvation without this faith I speak of.

I hope you see this, for your sake. My respects, Tom

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 12:51

"I hope you see this, for your sake. My respects, Tom"

I asked if you were born again. If you answered perhaps I just missed in all you stated above. Think you can give a simple yes or no?

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2008/8/5 13:01

Quote:
-----The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father.

This statement alone should cause everyone in this discussion to question any further points you have to make.

Christ did not achieve divinity, He was always divine, always God.

Fully God, and fully man.

I do hope you understand that this belief it seems you are putting forth is close to, if not heretical as you are seemingly denying the deity of Christ in His pre-incarnate state.

You are treading on dangerous grounds brother, please be careful.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 13:01

RE: Tom,

Though I believe most all you say, you nevertheless say enough that would confuse anyone trying to connect the dots.

God can't die, ergo, God wasn't on the cross. Don't call that comment heretical. It's not arguable. Consider you can't make distinctions running with your present theology while dismissing anything that might cause you to think.

So quit, RIGHT NOW, with the accusations. I am a Christian and I have no axe to grind. If you want to discuss using the scriptures, that's fine. You might begin by citing relevant ones instead of those you have posted, that aren't. . . All quoting the writers speaking of Jesus AFTER the fact of the cross and glorification. Again, make better distinctions.

Keep in mind, this is all about God's original intention for Adam.

Why is it Tom, that Jesus needed to obey His Father? Answer that, please.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 13:04

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:
-----The man Jesus, became the first man to achieve divinity. He did so by obedience to His Father.

This statement alone should cause everyone in this discussion to question any further points you have to make.

Christ did not achieve divinity, He was always divine, always God.

Fully God, and fully man.

I do hope you understand that this belief it seems you are putting forth is close to, if not heretical as you are seemingly denying the deity of Christ in His pre-incarnate state.

You are treading on dangerous grounds brother, please be careful.

May I suggest taking a deep breath and re-read my posts.

Don't cherry pick and make it say what is not being said.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2008/8/5 13:09

Brother I need not read the rest of your posts when you say things like, "God was not on the cross".

That is heretical, and is one of the most critical points in our redemption, that God being in the form of man did indeed die in the place of sinners, but was raised again.

In your view, and answer plainly, was and is Christ God?

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 13:28

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:
Brother I need not read the rest of your posts when you say things like, "God was not on the cross".

That is heretical, and is one of the most critical points in our redemption, that God being in the form of man did indeed die in the place of sinners, but was raised again.

In your view, and answer plainly, was and is Christ God?

I have already answered that. Now, I have asked others here and have received no reply. I will ask you: Are you born again? Can you 'plainly' answer that?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2008/8/5 13:31

Close, but, Jesus was "Perfected", "Completed" as a perfect human through obedience to His Father.
He is always divine and never wasn't.

Quote:

"Behold, I make all things new" . . NOT I make new all things. In other words, Jesus doesn't make the old things new. "Adam" is not a man made over but a totally new man. No rescue in this.

The word "NEW here is kahee-nos'
Which means of uncertain affinity; new (especially in freshness; while G3501 (νέος, νεώτερος- neos neōteros) is properly so with respect to age): - new.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 13:44

Quote:

Logic wrote:

Close, but, Jesus was "Perfected", "Completed" as a perfect human through obedience to His Father.
He is always divine and never wasn't.

Quote:

"Behold, I make all things new" . . NOT I make new all things. In other words, Jesus doesn't make the old things new. "Adam" is not a man made over but a totally new man. No rescue in this.

The word "NEW here is kahee-nos'
Which means of uncertain affinity; new (especially in freshness; while G3501 (νέος, νεώτερος- neos neōteros) is properly so with respect to age): - new.

Its not that difficult that understanding the word 'new' should be considered to have a different meaning in this.

I like this from Chambers that has helped me a great deal and has answered much of my curiosity in all this. Not all, but much.

"God did not create Adam holy, He created him innocent, without self-consciousness (as we understand the word) before God; the one thing Adam was conscious of was God and only of himself in relation to the Being Who

se commands he was to fulfill; the main trend of his spirit was towards God. Adam was intended by God to take part in his own development by a series of moral choices whereby he would transform innocence into holiness. Adam failed to do this, Jesus Christ came on the same platform as Adam and did not fail. Supposing Adam had transformed the natural life into the spiritual by obedience, what would have happened? Transfiguration; he would have "spiritualised" the natural life and made it all that God wanted it to be. The natural life is neither good nor bad, moral nor immoral; it is the principle within that makes it good or bad, moral or immoral"

"And the child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom: and the grace of God was upon Him" (Luke 2:40; rv). The innocence of Jesus was not the innocence of a babe born into our order of things, it was the innocence of Adam as God created him, the innocence of an untried possibility of holiness. Innocence is never safe, it is simply full of possibility. The holiness of God is absolute, not progressive; that is, it knows no development by antagonism. Man's holiness must be progressive. The holiness of Jesus developed through antagonism because He revealed what a holy man should be. Our Lord transformed innocence into holiness by a series of moral choices. Satan tempted Him along this line: "Do God's will according to Your own understanding; don't sacrifice the life of nature to the will of God." Jesus made invariably one answer—"For I am come down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me" (John 6:38﻿).

"How are we going to have the innocence that Jesus had? In one way only, by being born again from above. "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John 3:7﻿)

"We can be brought into a state of pristine childlike innocence before God by the regenerating work of His grace. God does something infinitely grander than give a man a new start: He re-makes him from the inside. We have the power, because we have received it, to transform the natural into the spiritual even as Jesus did, because the life generated into us is His own life."

Chambers, O. (1996, c1943). Bringing sons into glory : Studies in the life of our Lord. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott .

Re: So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation - posted by Logic, on: 2008/8/5 1

Quote:
-----Ormlly wrote:
Ormlly wrote:
So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ Jesus

The sole purpose of Adam was to glorify God in worship.
The only reason for the incarnation of Christ was because God knew that Adam would fall and HE made emends for that by His Son.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 13:54

Quote:

Logic wrote:

Quote:
-----Ormlly wrote:
Ormlly wrote:
So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ Jesus

The sole purpose of Adam was to glorify God in worship.
The only reason for the incarnation of Christ was because God knew that Adam would fall and HE made emends for that by His Son.

That must mean God is an egomaniac and nothing more. . . .I don't think so. . . . totally 'logical'.

Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2008/8/5 14:20

Ormlly, in John 12:41, the Holy Spirit reports that Isaiah saw Jesus on His throne in the vision reported in Isaiah 6:3. Since Isaiah's vision was of a fact at that time (as evidenced by the call of Isaiah to go forth) please reconcile your view with Scripture. Also, Emannuel is name given to Christ before his birth. Have they changed the meaning of that word?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2008/8/5 14:24

Quote:

-----Ormlly wrote:

Quote:

-----Logic wrote:

Quote:

-----Ormlly wrote:

So Which is it, Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ Jesus

The sole purpose of Adam was to glorify God in worship.

The only reason for the incarnation of Christ was because God knew that Adam would fall and HE made emends for that by His Son.

That must mean God is an egomaniac and nothing more. . . .I don't think so. . . . totally 'logical'.

Nice pun :-P

God knows that sole worship of Him is the best thing for the benefit of man.

God knows that if man was autonomous it would be the end of him, as we all know from experience.

If God was an true egomaniac He would be selfish and self-centered, but the contrary, His thoughts are toward and His intentions are sacrificially for our benefit.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2008/8/5 14:59

I want to add to something I said earlier.

Jesus was "Perfected", "Completed" **as a perfect human** through obedience to His Father.

To to become divine.

Heb 10:14 by one offering he has perfected forever them that are sanctified

After Christ was deemed a "perfect Man" through His sufferings & obedience to His Father, He then "perfected us" who are set apart by/in/through/according to faith with repentance.

After Christ is deem a perfect man, we are deem perfect men.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 15:29

Quote:

whyme wrote:

Ormlly, in John 12:41, the Holy Spirit reports that Isaiah saw Jesus on His throne in the vision reported in Isaiah 6:3. Since Isaiah's vision was of a fact at that time (as evidenced by the call of Isaiah to go forth) please reconcile your view with Scripture.

We must remember that when Isaiah saw Him, "high and lifted up". Yes. He saw this: "And one cried unto another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the LORD of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." Isaiah 6:3 (KJV)

This speaks of the glorified Son of God-Son of man, after the resurrection.

Quote:

-----Also, Emmanuel is name given to Christ before his birth. Have they changed the meaning of that word?

No. However, Jesus was the Name the Anointing fell upon, Hence His entire Name, Jesus Christ or, the Christ; Emmanuel, God with us.

Here: "Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me" Hebrews 10:5 (KJV)

And of Jesus the man it is spoken:

"Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart. I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O LORD, thou knowest. I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving kindness and thy truth from the great congregation." Psalms 40:7-10 (KJV)

And then it happened in actuality:

"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins." Matthew 1:21 (KJV)

We must remember Jesus, the human, the Son of God did not exist except in the plan or Mind of God before His birth. Up until then the three that bore record in Heaven was the Father, The Word and the Holy Ghost. The Word BECAME flesh and dwelt among us to demonstrate the 'way of the cross' as the way of our new life in Him is to be walked out and then go to the cross to make the same power and love He lived by to be our enablement, to do what He did to accomplish what He accomplished and more if God's will. He, the Word, then returned to Heaven in a glorified human body as the fulfilled Son of God-Son of man..

Hope that helps.

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 15:33

Quote:

Logic wrote:

I want to add to something I said earlier.

Jesus was "Perfect", "Completed" **as a perfect human** through obedience to His Father.
To become divine.

Heb 10:14 by one offering he has perfected forever them that are sanctified

After Christ was deemed a "perfect Man" through His sufferings & obedience to His Father, He then "perfected us" who are set apart by/in/through/according to faith with repentance.

After Christ is deemed a perfect man, we are deemed perfect men.

Deemed, but to be proven, just like Jesus, eh? . . .)) Think about it . . . in our actuality it comes together like that, doesn't it?
I don't believe your life is any different than mine in that regard. BTW, you are born again, aren't you?

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 15:36

Quote:
-----Nice pun :-P

God knows that sole worship of Him is the best thing for the benefit of man.
God knows that if man was autonomous it would be the end of him, as we all know from experience.

If God was an true egomaniac He would be selfish and self-centered, but the contrary, His thoughts are toward and His intentions are sacrificially for our benefit.

That doesn't mesh with your other remark.

Can we return to the OP, now?

Re: He was the Son of Man, and the eternal Son of God!, on: 2008/8/5 17:23

Quote:

Ormyly wrote:

RE: Tom,

Though I believe most all you say, you nevertheless say enough that would confuse anyone trying to connect the dots.

God can't die, ergo, God wasn't on the cross. Don't call that comment heretical. It's not arguable. Consider you can't make distinctions running with your present theology while dismissing anything that might cause you to think.

So quit, RIGHT NOW, with the accusations. I am a Christian and I have no axe to grind. If you want to discuss using the scriptures, that's find. You might begin by citing relevant ones instead of those you have posted, that aren't. . . All quoting the writers speaking of Jesus AFTER the fact of the cross and glorification. Again, make better distinctions.

Keep in mind, this is all about God's original intention for Adam.

Why is it Tom, that Jesus needed to obey His Father? Answer that, please.

Answer: Jesus was the Son of God, and the Son of man. To be the Son of Man, He also had to overcome by Faith. Di
vide and conquer? I think not. Jesus said, "Cast not your pearls before swine, lest they grind them, and vomit them back at your feet."

This is that. I am not saying you are a swine. But the principle is there. In the face of reason, and much compassion and patience, you adamantly defy all careful truth streaming your way, and gnash , and grind, and smugly assert your right to disown the Bible as our only compass, and banner of fellowship. To answer your question, yes, I am born from above, as I was baptized in the Holy Spirit poured out within me, in the name of Jesus, and by Him.

But , Oh...that would make Him God, wouldn't it?

My accusations will be kept for bigger fish, if you don't mind. The brethren and sisters here have exposed enough for me, to assure me that you are an unbeliever, and you may be a God hater; I hope not.

I am taking your advice, and quitting, right now. I hope you still have a conscience left, that can hear truth when He comes to you. Thank you for your post and thread though. This has worked out unto the glory of God, as those approved of God have been manifest to stand, and I have been proud to witness the patience shown you, in spite of yourself. Jesus is Lord, just as he appeared to Abraham! Tom

Re:, on: 2008/8/5 20:14

Quote:
-----If you want to discuss using the scriptures, that's find. You might begin by citing relevant ones instead of those you have posted, that aren't. . . All quoting the writers speaking of Jesus AFTER the fact of the cross and glorification. Again, make better distinctions.

How's this:

Isaiah 9:6 - For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

Dear sermonindex brethren,

this Ormly fellow is deceived and teaching damnable doctrine. Let us pray for him that his eyes be opened. I would admonish everyone to take serious caution when dealing with him and to seriously disregard any additional "insights" and "revelations" he has into the Scriptures on any subject, for a blind man can't see anything. He is propagating strange doctrine and if so wrong about such fundamental issues, no doubt other things must be off too, for if the foundations be destroyed, neither can the house stand.

To deny that the Lord Jesus was ALWAYS divine, and to say that He wasn't God in the flesh when he was hanged upon that old Cross when that blessed Emmanuel became a curse in our stead, is to deny the Gospel. For if He wasn't fully divine, His blood was no better than the blood of any other man, or bull, or goat. No, Adam could not "attain" divinity and be the Savior of the world, and Jesus Christ was the Word as God who took on flesh, fully God yet fully man, who from eternity past was predestined to redeem fallen man in the fullness of time.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2008/8/5 21:24

I don't know Ormly but maybe he didn't explain himself to well.

Now we all know that Jesus the man is God manifest in the flesh.

We know also that Jesus said God is Spirit. We know that Jesus is God and Man, and I can't speak for Ormly but hopefully he believes this also.

We know that Jesus as very God emptied himself and became man to die as a man on the cross. The Word is God and did die as a man but we know that God (as Spirit) can never die. Maybe he was saying the spirit of God didn't die on the cross but only God the man. We know that Jesus gave up His Spirit to the Father and died as a man.

Even us when we die as a man our spirit is released from our body and will keep on existing either in heaven or in hell but we want have a body again until the resurrection.

I don't quite follow Ormly when he talks about divinity because we shouldn't think that we will be in the Godhead. We will have the divine nature and be a glorified man but we will not be deity. It would be heresy to think such.

Still a cause for concern though because I really don't quite follow Ormly.

I pray that he will clear himself in this matter.

Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/8/6 0:08

Ormlly said:

Quote:
-----What we can see from scripture is...supportive that Adam was to be what Jesus became, i.e., a Divine-Human representative in the Godhead

Behold the reason for concocting this thread: the propagation of the abovementioned teaching. The intro question poise d was merely the springboard to set the weapon's sights downfield. As Ron Bailey once said, such people are not lookin g for discussions, but surrenders.

Re:, on: 2008/8/6 4:31

Quote:

Josef_Urban wrote:

Quote:
-----If you want to discuss using the scriptures, that's find. You might begin by citing relevant ones instead of those you have posted, tha t aren't. . . All quoting the writers speaking of Jesus AFTER the fact of the cross and glorification. Again, make better distinctions.

Quote:
-----How's this:

Isaiah 9:6 - For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

I already quoted that one. Pay attention. "Thou shalt call His Name Emanuel . . ." Remember?

Quote:
-----Dear sermonindex brethren,

this Ormlly fellow is deceived and teaching damnable doctrine. Let us pray for him that his eyes be opened. I would admonish everyone to take serious caution when dealing with him and to seriously disregard any additional "insights" and "revelations" he has into the Scriptures on any subject, for a blin d man can't see anything. He is propagating strange doctrine and if so wrong about such fundamental issues, no doubt other things must be off too, fo r if the foundations be destroyed, neither can the house stand.

To deny that the Lord Jesus was ALWAYS divine,

I didn't say that either. I didn't deny He wasn't always divine. I qualified it. I made distinctions. You aren't reading, or don't want to.

Quote:
----- and to say that He wasn't God in the flesh when he was hanged upon that old Cross when that blessed Emmanuel became a curse in our stead, is to deny the Gospel. For if He wasn't fully divine, His blood was no better than the blood of any other man, or bull, or goat. No, Adam co uld not "attain" divinity and be the Savior of the world, and Jesus Christ was the Word as God who took on flesh, fully God yet fully man, who from eter nity past was predestined to redeem fallen man in the fullness of time.

What is strange is because you aren't reading me correctly and yet accuse.

You say the blood of Jesus needed to be divine for man to be forgiven. That isn't so. Only sinless blood was needed. Jesus was sinless. He qualified. The only way He could be sinless was to first start out that way and then protect His sinlessness. Since creation was over, only being born of the Fath er/Holy Ghost could accomplish His beginnings. . . Normal man entering the world from the outside to redeem fallen mankind for the Father. Doesn't th at also speak of the new birth of a believer? Isn't that what the newborn are given to be, to protect and to do?
Get that part correct first then perhaps a few other things may fall into place. Get understanding.

Whose next . . .

Re:, on: 2008/8/6 6:03

Quote:

rbanks wrote:

I don't know Ormly but maybe he didn't explain himself to well.

I have a tendency to wait until the storm quiets down. This is always overwhelming for most and that I might be speaking heresy. I'm not. However, neither do I mean to infer I am fully correct. I haven't arrived.

Quote:

-----Now we all know that Jesus the man is God manifest in the flesh.

Lets make a distinction here: You are to be manifesting God in the flesh. Lets speak now of the differences between Jesus and us. Given the Nature of the Father the resurrection affords us called the , "**work of the cross**", **it is a learning process to be walked out in Christ Jesus called the "way" of the cross, wherein He leads. Upon the new birth, the imputation of the Nature of the Father, a child is born and by the impartation of His Character; produces the Life the Father is looking for from His child, the son is then given back to the Father.. It is called the 'way of the cross' for that reason. We learn by His example and what we suffer and all for the sake of the Father do we do it. Jesus did that. That is why I have been asking if you were born again.**

Quote:

-----We know also that Jesus said God is Spirit. We know that Jesus is God and Man, and I can't speak for Ormly but hopefully he believes this also.

Again, lets qualify: The Word became flesh. In the process, He, the Word, laid aside His divinity that the "body prepared for Him" could suffer and die. Upon successful completion of the task given the body called Jesus, The Word picked it all back up and kept His perfected body to forever abide in, glorifying it in the Godhead.. The Word now has nail prints in His hands. The reason for creation is now complete in Him. All In Heaven is now waiting for the "sheaves" to be gathered up, for the wedding banquet to begin. You partly say as much below:

Quote:

-----We know that Jesus as very God emptied himself and became man to die as a man on the cross. The Word is God and did die as a man but we know that God (as Spirit) can never die. Maybe he was saying the spirit of God didn't die on the cross but only God the man. We know that Jesus gave up His Spirit to the Father and died as a man.

Amen!

Quote:

-----Even us when we die as a man our spirit is released from our body and will keep on existing either in heaven or in hell but won't have a body again until the resurrection.

I like how Chambers puts it but I will use my words here: The body, the flesh of man, manifests what the soul and spirit is. In the case of Jesus, His soul and spirit were of the Father; His body walked perfectly before Him. Keep in mind, the Father, from eternity past knew He would obey, be faithful, and therefore, withheld nothing from Him that would aid Him in His walk while He was manifesting the Father on earth. At the point of temptation/solicitations the Father backed off to

allow His Son to reveal His allegiance from the flesh. While it broke His Heart, this was also just one of the reasons why Father backed away when Jesus hung on the cross. Jesus never failed in His allegiance. Love kept Him, both His and the Father's.

Jesus Christ, the last Adam, states over and over again: "I can of Myself do nothing" (John 5:19, 30; see 7:16; 8:28; 12:49; 14:10).

To Phillip He said: "If you have seen Me you have seen the Father". The Man Jesus was full of Grace and truth; full of the Father. Again, this is what the new born of Him is to be. The process of becoming a son is God's complete will for everyone who claims the Name of Jesus. Again, as Chambers puts it with regards to the process: What we call the beginning, God calls the end. I recommend this reading to everyone . . . unless they just want to argue.

Quote:
-----I don't quite follow Ormly when he talks about divinity because we shouldn't think that we will be in the Godhead. We will have the divine nature and be a glorified man but we will not be deity. It would be heresy to think such.

And that is the reason for this thread. Read what you just wrote! 'Glorified man and yet not deity'?? That doesn't reconcile. What do you believe "joint-heir-ship" means?? Why is it heretical to believe that when Jesus reinforces it when saying: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Revelation 3:21 (KJV)??

And John when he says: "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" 1 John 5:5 (KJV)

Quote:
-----Still a cause for concern though because I really don't quite follow Ormly.

Hang in a while longer. I am still wrestling with some issues in this as well. However, this I know: Our redemption and salvation is much more than just being about a paid up fire insurance policy; presumptuously believing by being 'wrongly' taught, we have it all when we repeated the sinners prayer. Only the prideful and self-absorbed will defend such thinking.

Hope this helps my case, rbanks.

Re:, on: 2008/8/6 6:31

Quote:

PaulWest wrote:
Ormly said:

Quote:
-----What we can see from scripture is...supportive that Adam was to be what Jesus became, i.e., a Divine-Human representative in the Godhead

Behold the reason for concocting this thread: the propagation of the abovementioned teaching. The intro question poised was merely the springboard to set the weapon's sights downfield. As Ron Bailey once said, such people are not looking for discussions, but surrenders.

So what is your argument? Twice before I have asked you to respond. This is my third time. Are you with all those who say God purposed Adam to fail just to redeem fallen man? Perhaps you might explain why God would d

o such a thing; to allow so much misery for 4K years? For His pleasure, no doubt?

Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2008/8/6 8:37

Ormlly said,

You say the blood of Jesus needed to be divine for man to be forgiven. That isn't so. Only sinless blood was needed. Jesus was sinless.

Whose next . . .

I will. Acts 20:28- Be shepards of the church of God which He bought with His own blood. (You know, I was about to end it there but verse 29 is very timely and applicable.... I know that after I leave, savage wolves will come in among you and will not spare the flock. Even from among your own number men will arise and distort the truth in order to draw a way disciples after them.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/8/6 8:54

Quote:
-----Are you with all those who say God purposed Adam to fail just to redeem fallen man? Perhaps you might explain why God would do such a thing; to allow so much misery for 4K years? For His pleasure, no doubt?

Again, this is the bait. The issue is not with you getting an answer to this question; the real issue, rather is the teaching you are propagating here about Adam's original design of being included in the Trinity, of Adam attaining Christ-like divinity through mere obedience, of God's blood not being shed on the cross, and that being born-again doesn't necessarily mean you are saved (as you taught in another thread). And under all this error lurks the all-encompassing haughty attitude of "prove me wrong" by debate. Nothing has changed.

I have no urge to get into a scripture volley with you, as some here are doing, because I know from experience this is exactly what you want and how you survive in the forum. Like Josef Urban, I would only warn others of what I perceive as dangerous teaching coming from your posts.

Those who have ears to hear, hearken.

Re: Strife - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/8/6 8:55

Quote:
-----Get understanding.

Whose next . . .

See that pride still has the better of you Ormlly. Your bent has gotten weary. Your penchant for division and dictating ...

But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes. 2Ti 2:23

But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain. Tit 3:9

Have lost track, but if I am not mistaken you have accused three here with the question of "Are you born again?" You started yet another post that can only be measured as stirring up strife, whether or not that was your intention -it is not unusual.

You were removed from participation here a year ago under similar circumstances and were asked not to re-register. Your behavior here is again quite intolerable. You were given some latitude and abused it.

Now, you have started this fire and others have jumped in with accusing that is not any better than yours, it is an unnecessary contending and strife.

One question. Did you ask to be reinstated?

Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2008/8/6 9:25

Quote:

-----Was Adam purposed to Fall or was he purposed for the incarnation of Christ Jesus?

This would almost be similar to one asking were we (before salvation) purposed to sin or were we (after salvation) purposed for the new life in Christ?

I see this as one of, if not, the entire paradoxical "scheme" of directions/actions of God's mysterious Ways. Paradoxes are forever difficult for human understanding. I have since stopped trying to 'figure out' rather to believe all of all as written/presented in the Bible.

However, I still firmly believe that, on my part as a Christian, that I am 100% responsible and held accountable to all my sins and actions. I also bow to GOD's total sovereignty in all of His determinations in bringing forth of His love and judgment.

Or, it will take many many many examples of such to bring to this discussion..perhaps the entire Holy Scripture.

One came to mind is this (hope my memory serves me right). Did Hezekiah's prayer "really" made God lengthen his life or did God's own will decide to add on to his years? Another one came to mind, did God purpose Pharaoh to harden his heart time after time or did God purpose Israel to be delivered through much sufferings? Even many experiences and events in our own lives ... GOD or US?

One event in my own life also came to mind, I once (not just once of course) sinned in the past (and will), and that same sin was used to turn into a witness in leading a co-worker to Christ, so I often asked, did God purpose me to sin (of course not) or did God purpose this co-worker to come to salvation with this sin (apparently so).

I can answer it this way too, did God purpose me to sin (yes, since I was a believer, sins are forgiven, though consequences remain), did God purpose this coworker to become saved by my sin (no, the consequences of sin are death and corruption).

Confusing? Not really. All is well (but sin), Providence is not to be questioned.

To answer your question, I'd say yes and no to both questions, only GOD can fully answer that perfectly, or, "logically" to our human cognitive liking. Even at the end of this thread, if you or anyone came up with any answers, for sure, they will be debated to no end all over again...?

To answer your next question to come, perhaps, am I born again? YES, praise GOD, I'm born again, 100% by His grace !! Perhaps through Adam's purposeful fall and the purposeful incarnation of the Lord Jesus Christ...the saving Blood, etc. etc.

mamaluk

Re:, on: 2008/8/6 9:30

It ain't pride as you suppose, Bro., just some vented frustrationat with those who accuse without good investigation of what is being presented. Notice, no one has commented on the Oswald Chambers references, choosing rather to keep on accusing me of heresy. Is He also a heretic? I see that more as a pride issue than anything, not wishing to be wrong or perhaps disturbed from their status quote religion... at any cost. "Who's next" is only meant for them. Even you, had you read my reply to rbanks would find no pride from me in that, i.e., unless you wish to find some. But then that is easy regardless of who writes anything. After all, who wants to be told they are wrong.

I have run out ideas in how to present my perspective to those will not be persuaded regardless of one's 'humble' disposition. All you have to do is re-view my posts from the beginning and watch the responses go sour when I hit upon something unfamiliar to them that shakes their world; contradicts their biased commentaries.. It takes time to think and then to write and even more to grasp what is being written. That sorta sez it all about those with the 'oh so fast', replies.

Remember I wrote once, "Read the Bible and write your own commentary". I believe you agreed with me then. Well, that's what I still do.

No one has the right to call anyone a heretic without careful examination of what is written by that person. No guess or 'seems like you saying' in the attempt to get one to say more about what he ISN'T saying. They all try hard to do that. Sorta Satanic in my estimation.

Anyhow, words mean something. I sometimes like the challenge to write it out because it keeps me on my toes to be certain, at least to my mind what I believe to be the more complete gospel.

To be a heretic one must violate the word of God. Where is my violation? . . . and where is the pride that after the accusations I would respond: Whose next?

Quote:

-----Have lost track, but if I am not mistaken you have accused three here with the question of "Are you born again?"

Accused!!! I asked and then expalined why to rbanks. As with the others you have either not read or simply wish to accuse without sustance fro the accusation.

What I have posted is NOT silly genealogy talk but rather serious stuff the enemy doesn't want out for the Christian to understand. Read Chambers' "Bringing son's into glory". He also speaks of it in stronger terms than me.

Is it devisive? You bet it is. I can't apologise for that. That's God's business.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/8/6 9:35

Ormlly,

Answer the question, did you ask to be reinstated or not?

Re:, on: 2008/8/6 9:45

Nope! Apparently you all just missed me.

I did note there wasn't much activity goin on til I arrived. Seems all the arguing over who struck John was finished and there was nothing more for folks to argue over. . Maybe you should thank me for pumping flesh blood and something meanful, into it.

Re:, on: 2008/8/6 9:46

Beter PM Mamaluk. I might not be here long enough to reply to your inquiry. I am sorry should that be the case.

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/8/6 9:49

Or you just took advantage of our longsuffering and patience. Truly sad that this is your only response.

Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. Joh 10:1

Goodbye Ormly, may the Lord grant you repentance.

Thread locked.