



**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Do Catholics believe they are saved by works?**

**Do Catholics believe they are saved by works? - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/2 2:58**

Do Catholics believe they are saved by works?

**Re: Do Catholics believe they are saved by works? - posted by enid, on: 2009/10/2 3:34**

Ephesians 2v8-9, "For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God,

9. not of works, lest anyone should boast."

That's what scripture says.

If Catholics believe different, then they are wrong.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 8:35**

Yes, Roman Catholicism teaches expressly that they are saved by works. Roman Catholics are confident they are going to heaven, not because they have faith in Jesus Christ who died for their sins and came back to life after three days, but rather, because they received the sacraments of baptism and eucharist, and are in good standing with Rome. Officially teaching, they believe "there is no salvation outside of the Church," and they believe that they alone have the authority to minister that salvation. In their theology, one "gets saved" by being baptized, and one maintains their salvation through receiving eucharist at least once a year.

At least, this is the "old line" of thinking in Rome. Ever since Vatican II last century, Rome has been much more pluralistic in its thinking, allowing for the possibility of protestants to receive eternal life, as well as non-Christian people. Pope John Paul was very pluralistic in his thinking. The present pope seems much more "old line" in his thinking.

Most devout Catholics, so far as I have seen, believe "old line" in their theology.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/2 12:20**

Jimmy you wrote.....

"Roman Catholics are confident they are going to heaven,"

I was born and raised a Catholic in a Catholic community and an all Catholic education. No Catholic has any confidence that they are going to heaven at all. At best, most hope to make it into purgatory. The Catholic church teaches that to believe one is going to heaven is the height of presumption, no one knows and to claim to know is an "anathema." Literally putting a curse upon the heads of those who claim, for instance, that if they were to die tonight they know where they are going. Very sad and of course, clear opposition to the truth of the Word of God. Imagine being in a position where you are "shooting for purgatory," and such a place does not even exist. Truly a lost people.....Frank

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 13:37**

Taken from: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13407a.htm>

Individual salvation

The Council of Trent describes the process of salvation from sin in the case of an adult with great minuteness (Sess. VI, v-vi).

It begins with the grace of God which touches a sinner's heart, and calls him to repentance. This grace cannot be merited; it proceeds solely from the love and mercy of God. Man may receive or reject this inspiration of God, he may turn to God or remain in sin. Grace does not constrain man's free will.

Thus assisted the sinner is disposed for salvation from sin; he believes in the revelation and promises of God, he fears God's justice, hopes in his mercy, trusts that God will be merciful to him for Christ's sake, begins to love God as the

source of all justice, hates and detests his sins.

This disposition is followed by justification itself, which consists not in the mere remission of sins, but in the sanctification and renewal of the inner man by the voluntary reception of God's grace and gifts, whence a man becomes just instead of unjust, a friend instead of a foe and so an heir according to hope of eternal life. **This change happens either by reason of a perfect act of charity elicited by a well disposed sinner or by virtue of the Sacrament either of Baptism or of Penance according to the condition of the respective subject laden with sin. The Council further indicates the causes of this change. By the merit of the Most Holy Passion through the Holy Spirit, the charity of God is shed abroad in the hearts of those who are justified.**

Against the heretical tenets of various times and sects we must hold

that the initial grace is truly gratuitous and supernatural;  
that the human will remains free under the influence of this grace;  
that man really cooperates in his personal salvation from sin;  
that by justification man is really made just, and not merely declared or reputed so;  
that justification and sanctification are only two aspects of the same thing, and not ontologically and chronologically distinct realities;  
that justification excludes all mortal sin from the soul, so that the just man is no way liable to the sentence of death at God's judgment-seat.  
Other points involved in the foregoing process of personal salvation from sin are matters of discussion among Catholic theologians; such are, for instance,  
the precise nature of initial grace,  
the manner in which grace and free will work together,  
the precise nature of the fear and the love disposing the sinner for justification,  
the manner in which sacraments cause sanctifying grace.  
But these questions are treated in other articles dealing ex professo with the respective subjects. The same is true of final perseverance without which personal salvation from sin is not permanently secured.

What has been said applies to the salvation of adults; children and those permanently deprived of their use of reason are saved by the Sacrament of Baptism.

--

In summary, this statement from the RCC encyclopedia agrees with my assessment of RCC theology. This is their official policy. Whether any Catholic actually believes it or teaches it is another matter altogether. But this is what they officially believe.

Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/10/2 13:39

Quote:

-----

appolus wrote:

Jimmy you wrote.....

"Roman Catholics are confident they are going to heaven,"

I was born and raised a Catholic in a Catholic community and an all Catholic education. No Catholic has any confidence that they are going to heaven at all. At best, most hope to make it into purgatory. The Catholic church teaches that to believe one is going to heaven is the height of presumption, no one knows and to claim to know is an "anathema." Literally putting a curse upon the heads of those who claim, for instance, that if they were to die tonight they know where they are going. Very sad and of course, clear opposition to the truth of the Word of God. Imagine being in a position where you are "shooting for purgatory," and such a place does not even exist. Truly a lost people.....Frank

-----

What Frank said is true. This insecurity about salvation of Catholics is what drives one of their biggest franchises - indulgences. You do things or you pay for things to get indulgences, which are like merit badges for Boy Scouts in order to attain a higher rank.

Typically when a loved one dies, family and friends would pay certain fees to have their names mentioned during masses in order to accumulate indulgences to get them out of purgatory into heaven. Many wealthy Catholics, who are often as

signed personal "father-confessors", even donate all of their wealth and property to the Catholic church upon their deaths in order to secure a ticket to heaven.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 13:41**

Frank's assessment is well meaning and no doubt what he believed as a Catholic. But what he believed as a Catholic (like many other Catholics), is not consistent with the official teachings of the RCC. There is often a great disparity between the two.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 13:58**

On the RCC view of purgatory, from: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12575a.htm>

Duration

The very reasons assigned for the existence of purgatory make for its passing character. We pray, we offer sacrifice for souls therein detained that "God in mercy may forgive every fault and receive them into the bosom of Abraham" (Apostolic Constitutions); and Augustine (City of God XXI.13, 16) declares that the punishment of purgatory is temporary and will cease, at least with the Last Judgment. "But temporary punishments are suffered by some in this life only, by others after death, by others both now and then; but all of them before that last and strictest judgment."

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/2 17:10**

All,

the reason I ask is because I have been studying Catholicism a new and more in depth.

As always I am seeking to get passed biases and get to the exact truth of the matter.

Therefore, I have asked some Catholics about these things.

Some say they are saved by works and some don't. Then when I discuss with them it usually seems through reasoning and defining of terms that they say they are not saved by works but faith alone. The terms that are often confused is that when they say they are not saved by faith alone they say they mean that if you have faith works will follow and not that they make you right before God. Then they say the only works that do save you are actually not works but acts towards sacraments of grace. As the woman with the flow touched the hem of Jesus for healing so they touch baptism. As it was not a work of merit but an action to receive grace for her so it is with them.

I have found this to be true with many cults that when reasoned with they will say faith alone. We usually agree on our stances. For my stance is that we are made right before God by faith alone in Christ's work. However, faith will always result in works. Therefore if you don't have works you do not have faith and can't be saved. Still though faith and works are so close they are ever so far in distinction as opposites as well.

Sometimes in this explanation people can get confused between the 2 and think because both must be there that it is faith and works that saves you or that faith and works are one and the same.

I have often seen that possibly the Evangelical Protestant Church is equally as guilty of a false Gospel as legalistic cults are just that they have erred on the extreme of lasciviousness. There is legalism, lasciviousness, which is false, and the liberty yet not license to us.

The question would then come then if faith always results in works then do we have to have perfect works to have perfect faith to have perfect salvation. Well, I don't think we have to have perfect faith to be saved, but we cannot "practice" unbelief and sin.

So, I think the question would arise is baptism a work even though it is seen as a sacrament of grace?

Some might say well maybe baptism is not a work, but surely penance is. Surely penance in having to walk on your knees or something outside of the Gospel grace. Yet, they will say well penance is not really for salvation it will only keep you from being in purgatory. At baptism you are saved and become a Christian, but after that all your works don't deal with your salvation but with your time in purgatory. Though there are some serious sins you can do to lose your salvation not

so much by not doing works but not doing faith in taking Eucharist ect.

At the forum I was conversing on they stated that 50% of them were former Protestants.

There were many other things, though I do not want to branch off to them since I want to deal with this topic. Like some would say they are re-crucifying Christ at Eucharist where as they would say they are only making His sacrifice again present. Or maybe the topic of security in salvation I believe they could say that they are presently secure but they do not know if they will lose faith later and this would be no different from a person who believed you could lose your salvation. Or, they will even say that non Catholics can be saved in a Christian Church that is if they are ignorant of the truth of the Church, but if they knew the Church was true and did not enter then they would be damned.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/2 17:59**

Hi,

What is really important here is what people believe. Jimmy is young and a wee bit naive but I still love him :) Now, almost all Catholics will confess to you that they are not good enough to go to Heaven, they will say this because this is what they are taught. It is important also to remember that the official teaching of the Catholic church is that there is no salvation outside of Catholicism. Perhaps you were ignorant of the true Catholic teaching they say, but once you discover this, you must acknowledge and bow to the teaching authority of the Pope. So, no salvation outside of the Catholic church, and none inside, hmmm, only purgatory, which of course does not exist.

An important point to remember while debating Catholics (and I would not debate Catholics, it tends to be fruitless, its more effective to talk about Jesus and how you know Him personally, then go from there, because Catholics have a head knowledge of Jesus but do not "know," Him) is definition of terms. The word "works," for instance, is a key word and unless you can agree to a definition up front you will have a messy discussion, it has to start there. The best question, I have found, and it cuts through the clutter, to ask a Catholic is "What do you think Jesus meant when He said that you must be born again." Typically you will hear things like "Baptism," or "First Holy Communion," and so on.

If a Catholic wants to discover what works truly is, then James gives us two perfect examples. One example is Abraham's obedience to God in taking his son up to sacrifice him and the other is Rahab the prostitute, when she sent the spies on and covered for them. Both these examples are of lives being put on the line and being justified by God. When one gives up their lives in order to follow God then that one is justified. It is the dying to one's self that one finds life. This of course is the teaching of Jesus, and of course Catholics believe in Jesus, but, as brother James says in the very same passage, so do the demons and they tremble. God will have all of our lives or He will have none of it. The man or woman who comes before God and gives up His whole life to God, that man or woman is born again. Nothing, of course, to do with any empty ritual, whether that ritual be baby sprinkling or coming forward and signing on the dotted line in a Protestant church. Its life or death. One is either alive or one is not. Most Catholics are actually quite fascinated by the genuinely born again person.....Frank

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 18:56**

Quote:

Therefore, I have asked some Catholics about these things.

It is generally not best to ask Catholics what the RCC teaches, most simply do not know. If you were going to ask, it would probably be best to ask a priest. If you don't have access to a priest to ask, I'd simply recommend studying church history, especially the major church councils, where a lot of these issues came up. Also study the writings of the "fathers" of the first few centuries, and you'll see how their present system and beliefs came into shape.

If you read the Catholic Encyclopedia I cited, you'll find that they (as well as theologians like Augustine) saw no contradiction between teaching salvation by unmerited grace, but that such grace was only available through the receiving the sacraments. Such is no different than the problem Paul faced with the Galatian church over the issue of circumcision. Those who 'mutilated' themselves appealed to the grace of God for their salvation, but asserted that grace would only continue to be available to those who received circumcision. Paul said such men might as well go ahead and not stop with the f

orskin, but go ahead and to cut entire male organ off. Or if he were talking to Catholics, he'd probably tell them to drown in their baptism or gorge themselves with the Lord's supper to ensure they got all the grace they could for salvation.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 19:03**

And Frank, my elder brother, I love you too :-) Behave though... this younger brother of yours has read a LOT of St. Augustine and other dead catholic brains, and has been at various times in my life well versed in Catholic history and theology :-)

\*edit\* And if put under pressure, I could probably still recite the 7 sacraments without googling them :-)

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 19:11**

Baptism  
Eucharist  
Confirmation  
Penance  
Matrimony  
Holy Orders  
Last Rites

Boom shakalaka :-)

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/2 20:08**

Appolus,

yes I understand about emphasizing the main things like relationship ect.

Now, it can probably be said that the average nominal Catholic is not spiritual, but so are most Evangelicals.

Traditionally, though I think the Catholics have a deep emphasis of spirituality whether good or bad in prayer, monks, and just general mystic devotion. So, I am not sure that applies so much to the more devoted.

It has been interesting to me that I have heard here and there Evangelicals honoring Catholics. Well, for instance there are the fathers, but I don't know much of them maybe they taught differently? Or I think of how many honor Mother Teresa and I am not sure what to think of that and I would bet she is devout in her Catholic theology? Or I think of Richard Wurmbrand or some other saying that the most devout people they had met under persecution were Catholics. Or Madame Guyon. Or Nouwen? :/

I think that sharing the spiritual with these would be to some degree like sharing it with Mormons who also emphasize "spiritual" things.

It is a good point that it matters more what the individual believes. I however am specifically trying to figure out what Rome officially teaches though of course it matters how much it is accepted in the local Churches.

I have been thinking over this verse though. For I had previously been thinking that well they mostly believe that they need grace and might have some contradiction in them, but that's okay because we all need mercy. And, I still think that to some degree. But, I hear Paul say that if we rely on one part of the Law we are demanded to keep the whole Law.

It is an interesting thing that many of men fear to not keep the Law, but it should also more so be fearful if one does not keep faith and that perfectly yet I am persuaded there is room for grace on the issue.

It is true to some extent that only God can know some are saved, though there are some we can know whether they are saved or not.

Again, I am talking to more knowledgeable Catholics some were former Protestant ministers. I am on a main apologetic forum. I have already heard them try to refute the Abraham only by faith thing by saying well you see he also had works. So, again I think maybe the terminology and thoughts were mixed up in them not saying we are made right before God by works but that it is not by faith alone in the sense that works will accompany but faith alone in the sense of our righteous

ness before God if I have heard them right.

As for the term on works that is an important thing you bring up. I think they use it in 2 ways. The first being the works of the law. And, the second being the works of grace or sacraments.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/2 20:20**

Jimmy,

Quote:  
-----you'll find that they (as well as theologians like Augustine) saw no contradiction between teaching salvation by unmerited grace, but that such grace was only available through the receiving the sacraments.  
-----

So, I was right in saying that they do not believe they are saved by the works of the Law or their own righteousness. It would seem though that many Evangelicals are saying that they say they are saved by works and faith.

Now, as to the question of whether taking of sacraments for salvation is a work or not. I have to think over this some. are you sure it is the same as circumcision? I mean people were circumcised to make themselves right by the Law. Whereas people who get baptized do it to be in Christ. Or what of the woman with the flow of blood who touched the hem of Jesus and was healed. Was it a work to touch grace? Was it a work somehow because she had to wrestle through people ect? But even if so it were an action yet was by faith in grace? Someone once told me that sometimes faith needs an action to be accomplished. Like stepping out in faith beyond just believing in the heart to confessing with ones mouth ect. Or think of when Israel looked on the serpent on the rod. Would that be a work because they had to look at an object? Or was it by faith made active by looking?

I will say this that I do not believe faith is a work as Calvinist' will state. I stick with Paul in saying that faith is not a work. It is not so much a grabbing as it is a letting go. It is not so much an effort as it is a surrender. It is not so much a doing as it is receiving that which has been done for you. Nowhere in the Scriptures does it say that faith is a work, but instead that it is opposite.

I do wonder if the Reformation in formulating their doctrine in part as a reaction have gone to the other side of extremes in some cases.

As for the talking to a Priest thing. This I agree with I have not been able to get ample info from the average Catholic, but this website forum I am using as I have just previously said is a main apologetic site and some are former Protestant ministers and one is a teacher of Church history at a private university ect.

You know.. I think that as many Evangelicals think that they say they are saved by works of the Law they also believe Evangelicals think they can be saved and have no works at all. And, for some good reason since that is what some Evangelicals teach and some more self deceptively so.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/2 21:37**

Hi Anonymity (why no name?)

True Christians have always been a danger to the Catholic church. For centuries they hunted down and killed true brothers and sisters in Christ, its an ancient battle between the religious men and the followers of Christ. I am not so sure what Jean Guyon would say, especially from the Bastille where the Catholic church had her thrown into. As for Mother Theresa, have you read her diaries? Seems like that poor woman was a practising atheist. Many religious men do well under persecution, in fact 1 Cor 13 makes the point that one can even give their body to be burned but without the love of God burning in their soul, they have nothing.

James main point was that without a changed life, claims of faith are meaningless. If you want to figure out what Rome teaches, check your history for the last 1600 years. Perhaps Catholic dogma just gets a bad press? Maybe they need another 1600 years to relay the essence of what they believe to the people who follow Catholicism? Or, maybe the people believe exactly what they have been taught to believe, that they have no assurance of salvation, that they need to be sanctified before they can be justified and that to be born again, to have Jesus take up residence in your heart, they have to be Baptized and make their first Holy Communion. No, I think that Rome and its dogma is not misunderstood, it has been



expertly conveyed to its poor hapless followers, may God have mercy on them that they may see the light of Christ.....  
..Frank

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 23:16**

Quote:  
-----  
So, I was right in saying that they do not believe they are saved by the works of the Law or their own righteousness. It would seem though that many Evangelicals are saying that they say they are saved by works and faith  
-----

No. When you really think about what they teach, and read what they say, what it amounts to is works based salvation. Augustine and the like talk about the grace of God, but they teach that "saving grace" is only available to those who receive the sacraments, namely baptism. "Faith" in Catholicism isn't so much a trust in the Lord for salvation as it is simply mentally agreeing to the creeds of the Church.

Such is why the RCC in practice has had no problem converting people through force. They baptized at the point of the sword, because they saw the baptismal waters as salvific. This is also why they believe and teach that infants must be baptized. This is why they teach that the mentally retarded can experience salvation through water baptism. They believe "baptism is what saves you."

Quote:  
-----  
Now, as to the question of whether taking of sacraments for salvation is a work or not. I have to think over this some. are you sure it is the same as circumcision?  
-----

In the days of the apostle Paul, there were false teachers who taught amongst other things that one must be circumcised and observe the law of Moses in order to be saved. That's the exact same thing that Roman Catholicism teaches, they've simply just substituted one set of rituals for another. That's works based salvation no matter how you slice it (no pun intended).

Quote:  
-----  
I will say this that I do not believe faith is a work as Calvinists will state. I stick with Paul in saying that faith is not a work. It is not so much a grabbing as it is a letting go. It is not so much an effort as it is a surrender. It is not so much a doing as it is receiving that which has been done for you. Nowhere in the Scriptures does it say that faith is a work, but instead that it is opposite.  
-----

Amen. I totally agree. The Scriptures clearly teach that faith is a work, not of man, but of God, and that faith "comes" through hearing the preached word. Many attempt to make faith a work of man, but that it is not. Faith comes from God through the hearing of the word. That word enables a person to hear the gospel, and believe in it so as to be saved. Biblical faith brings an end to man and causes him to come to a place where all that he has left is to trust God.

The doctrines of Rome never bring one to this point of emptiness and abandon. Instead, it says, "Ok, you believe these things, now get baptized, get confirmed, receive eucharist, do this, do that, etc." Part of this is due to the fact that Rome doesn't teach righteousness is imputed to one on the basis of faith. In fact, the idea of a "passive righteousness" that comes as a gift of God is entirely foreign to their theology. Rather, to them righteousness is something you earn. And if you don't earn enough in this life through your own good deeds and devotion to the sacraments, you'll earn while in purgatory as you there purged of your unrighteousness and made fit for eternity.

Quote:  
-----

You know.. I think that as many Evangelicals think that they say they are saved by works of the Law they also believe Evangelicals think they can be saved and have no works at all. And, for some good reason since that is what some Evangelicals teach and some more self deceptively so.

-----

The evangelical position is that because you are saved, you will live a transformed life that results in bearing fruit and works for God. No doubt, many have perverted this to be a million other things, which make it sound as if the evangelical position is simply a distant cousin to Catholicism. But if the evangelical position is rightly understood, one will see there is no relationship between the two whatsoever.

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/2 23:17**

Appolus,

maybe for some of the reasons people have nicknames. One thing though is I do not want to be eternalized on the internet if I can help it. I know that I am prone to change and am growing. I am not sure I want to be youtube'd one day and slammed for things I no longer hold to ect.

I am not sure that I can say any real Christian could kill anyone for those purposes therefore I am not sure how much I receive any of it or them.

That is interesting what you said of Teresa can you explain or document?

As for the religious men enduring hardship well I have a hard time receiving that. I think maybe you are a bit extreme on the non salvation of Catholics. I am not sure at this point, but I cannot that easily throw it out. I know what Paul said, but it would be hard to see a man imprisoned for saying that He loves Christ. I mean many of Pauls enemies were those for money and he proved himself by carrying the marks of the Lord Jesus so... Yet, I guess Muslims and JW's have suffered in prison hmm..

I know about James I agree.

Guyon I think she held to the Church I read a bio, but that doesn't really mean all that much.

The 1,600 years thing is a big point.

I can see the expertly conveyed thing.

As for the justification thing I am not sure you read what I said. I believe they are saying that they are justified after baptism, but that they have to continue in faith just like Evangelicals who believe you can lose your salvation. All the rest of the works are not for salvation, but will be dealt with in purgatory. Not, that I am agreeing but it would seem that your view might not be right on and ect.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/2 23:20**

And while we are on the topic, I wrote a little essay some time ago on the issue of justification by faith, and how it is ultimately a life and death issue. If you have time, consider:

[http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/justification\\_by\\_faith.php](http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/justification_by_faith.php)



**Re: , on: 2009/10/3 1:22**

Hi ,

"Guyon I think she held to the Church I read a bio, but that doesn't really mean all that much."

Not true, she gave a defence of Christianity to the King of France himself and found herself in the Bastille. I have read most of her books and they are all about an intimate relationship with Christ. You can find, by googling, much information on Mother Teresa's letter to her confessors over 66 years. Here is an interesting article <http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1655415,00.html>

Teresa can barely believe in a God at all. This is not to be confused with "dark nights of the soul," this was the woman's state and she admits it. She also admits that there was a public persona that bore no resemblance to her inner state, I believe her when she writes this.

On another note, the parish Priest of the parish that I grew up in used to come to our apartment every Friday night for a long time. He was supposedly coming to see my dad, who was a Catholic, but all good alcoholics were to be found in the pub on a Friday night. No, he came to see my mom who had "found," Jesus. This was quite a rare thing in my Scottish community. He was fascinated by this little woman who actually claimed to know the Lord and speak to Him and He would speak to her. One night he confessed to my mother one of the greatest burdens of his soul. He said that, many years before, a woman knocked on the door of the Parsonish at about midnight. The woman was dying and quite near death yet somehow she had managed to get herself ready and get to the door of the church. Her problem? She was terrified of death and where she would go. Now, what was this Parish Priest's burden? He had to send her away, he had no answers for her and it haunted him. The Catholic church has no answer for the crisis of the soul. The answer alone lies in Jesus. Not the Sacrament, the communion, the piece of bread, but the real Jesus who is alive and stands and knocks at the door of our hearts. When one has a real relationship with Jesus, then death holds no fears for we know that to be absent from the Body is to be present with the Lord. That is a glorious thing to those who "know," Him.....Frank

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/3 18:59**

Appolus,

hmm, I am pretty sure she gave a defense of her beliefs which were more "Christian", but I do not think that she defended Protestantism. I think she was imprisoned because her teaching were similar to "Christian" and so under suspicion and for some of her beliefs ect. I think though that she wanted to stay within the Church and just reform to some degree. Though I think she somehow became friends with Fenelon. I am not sure though it has been a long time since I read it and the biographer could have been wrong.

I got a little mixed up on what part she wrote and what part you wrote. I think I get the point though. Do you know where this quote is from? She may have just been criticizing this one Priest and honoring her mother.

So here is what I am thinking. I am thinking that you are basically saying the Catholic Church is all external rituals without inner experience or any manner of serious devotion with no hope ect. I would bet the truth is that this is the case among probably most Catholics especially in the west. However, the people I am speaking to are attributing quite opposite things. This can be similar to Evangelical Church where more than half are probably not saved and among those who are probably only 10% are walking in any good degree of victory. They say that they were Protestant ministers for years or brought up in an Evangelical Church and found no rest. Then when they came to the Catholic Church they grew in the spiritual relation to God. That they have hope as long as they continue, and even if they think they will probably go to purgatory for temporary purifying they are not so worried about that since it will soon be over and they will enter heaven ect. And, as for the case I received from them about whether they are saved by works or not I am not so sure. They seem not to be except that they believe baptism is something that must literally be done to receive the reality and grace of it. The argument being on the table as to whether having to be baptized as a sacrament of grace or not is legalism.

Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/3 19:15

Jimmy,

Well, yes they are saying that to receive grace you must receive it through literal sacraments of grace. For instance for healing they will note that you must come to the elders of the Church and when they pray in faith you will be healed. This would be an example of having to go through the government of the Church and coming to the Church to get to God since we are the body.

So, you are saying the reason they had no problem making war was because they believed they were going to save people by afterwards baptizing them? of forcefully? I think they say one must be sincere and repentant ect for baptism to have any effect.

As for whether circumcision and baptism are used in the same way I am still not sure. I mean again, circumcision was to make you right before God by your righteousness of doing it. It promised no forgiveness of sins ect. Whereas baptism does promise forgiveness of sins and is not to make oneself righteous before God but to receive the righteousness of God. I again note the woman touching the hem of Jesus not being a work but an "act" of faith not a "work" of the law.

I am not sure if you understood what I was saying. I was saying that I do "not" believe the same views as Calvinists on faith. It is true that faith is received from hearing the word and creation and the conscience ect itself. However, the word must still be mixed with faith. One still has to surrender to believe. Faith is a choice yet still not a work. It is not a choice to earn ones way to heaven but a choice to allow Jesus to earn your way. So, I am saying unlike Calvinist I cannot reject Rome in the sense of saying that we do not receive Rome because they believe faith is a choice or limited atonement ect.

Quote:  
-----The doctrines of Rome never bring one to this point of emptiness and abandon. Instead, it says, "Ok, you believe these things, now get baptized, get confirmed, received eucharist, do this, do that, etc." Part of this is due to the fact that Rome doesn't teach righteousness is imputed to one on the basis of faith. In fact, the idea of a "passive righteousness" that comes as a gift of God is entirely foreign to their theology. Rather, to them righteousness is something you earn. And if you don't earn enough in this life through your own good deeds and devotion to the sacraments, you'll earn while in purgatory as you there purged of your unrighteousness and made fit for eternity.  
-----

I am not sure they would agree with this statement though the average lay person mostly probably would, but so would the average Evangelical in other ways. They would say that the sacraments are nothing to you if you are not sincere and broken and have a clinging faith. The righteousness they earn is not one based on works but faith. And all the righteousness are not toward salvation, but toward getting beyond purgatory. Evangelicals would also hold that our works will get us more or less rewards and their view is similar with the exception to a temporal purging place before heaven. We do not hold to a purgatory, but we do believe that our sinful nature cannot enter heaven that our spirits will enter I believe and then our bodies when they are raised and glorified on that day though the view is somewhat differing among Christians as to soul sleep ect.

I understand the Evangelical position on faith alone and the relation of faith and works ect. I will try and check out your article.

Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/3 19:27

All again,

here is what I am saying.

It would seem the Catholic Church officially among the devoted presently do not teach salvation by works, but faith alone. That they are not saved by works of the Law. The terminology and ideas may be messed up when they say they are saved by faith and works. But, really they are saying they are saved by faith alone Godward in righteousness but faith will not be alone in the sense that works will result and follow. The only works that they say make them right before God are actually acts toward grace. For instance they say you have to be baptized to be saved. However, this is not an act of trying to make oneself righteous by their own merit but an act of coming to the grace of God through baptism. As the woman who "acted" and broke through the people to touch the hem of his garment to be healed. Was this action attributed to her as a work of the Law? No, it was faith made active faith acted out faith activated faith done faith used. Also, one might say that their way of salvation is external and ritualistic. However, they would say that one would have to be sincere, h

ave faith, and be repentance in order for baptism to effect them. Or one might say that their acts of penance like walking on their knees are works for salvation. However, though these are works they are works by faith and they are works not for salvation but to get passed purgatory sooner which is not a place so much of punishment as it is a place to be made pure before entering heaven in which nothing unholy can enter. Evangelicals have a similar view as they believe that what they do whether good or bad will be recompensed to them as through fire. Some teach that as through fire means a punishment in burning though I do not think so. I think that the punishment is our false works being burned not us. And whatever we do whether good or bad will effect how much blessing we have after we have already been saved and these acts do not effect our salvation, but our state within salvation to as much blessing we will have in eternity and not whether we will enter but how much blessing after we have entered. Also, the views of the Roman Church and the practices can often be judged by the state of the average lay person. However, if the Evangelical Church were judged in the same way it would be pretty bad as well though in different ways.

So I think the bottom line comes down to on this issue is. Is baptism a work like circumcision or is it different? Are all these things I have heard really official Catholic teachings? and these are only the beginning of the questions, but on this topic of faith and works I think they are the main ones left.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/3 19:35**

Hi we may be getting our wires crossed. The story about the priest was my story not Guyon's :) She did lay her defence of Christianity out and presented it to the Catholic King of France. She was imprisoned at the behest of the Catholic church. She did have friends within the Catholic church.

I believe that a vast swath of "Evangelicals," know nothing of the new birth. Ravenhill thought about 2% of Americans were actually Christians. Not sure if that is the number but probably pretty close.

Being a member in good standing of any denomination cannot and will not save. Just because one may be an unsaved Evangelical, and then moves to the Catholic church simply now makes that one an unsaved Catholic convert. Unless a man is born again he cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven. It does not matter what cult you belong to, whether the Mormons or the JW's or the Catholic church, they all deny the essential truths of the Gospel and that would simply make it harder for one of their own to be saved, but of course not impossible. There are millions of Catholics over the centuries, that have come out from her and found Salvation, praise God. One large church I used to attend had a high proportion of ex-Catholics in their congregation, including ex-nuns who had found the Truth and had been set free, again, praise God. Catholic numbers all over the world are in serious decline and this is a good thing. The expose of child abuse on a grand scale in every corner of the world in the Catholic institutions was also very hurtful to the Catholic Church. I just pray that every Catholic seeks and finds the truth before they leave this planet. God will be found by those who seek Him.....Frank

**Re: , on: 2009/10/3 19:42**

"However, they would say that one would have to be sincere, have faith, and be repentance in order for baptism to effect them."

One could debate Catholic issues until the cows come home but just consider the above statement in light of the fact that Catholics are baptized as babies. How sincere is a baby? How much faith does a baby have? Does a baby have a repentant heart? One of the greatest problems my very Catholic grandma had after I was set free by the Lord Jesus at the age of 26 was when I was baptized a few months later. She was stabbed in the heart by this because by doing this I was publicly saying, and she was correct, that my first Baptism was meaningless and of course it was.....Frank

**Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/10/4 8:25**

Quote:  
-----appolus wrote:  
I believe that a vast swath of "Evangelicals," know nothing of the new birth. Ravenhill thought about 2% of Americans were actually Christians. Not sure if that is the number but probably pretty close.

Being a member in good standing of any denomination cannot and will not save. Just because one may be an unsaved Evangelical, and then moves to the Catholic church simply now makes that one an unsaved Catholic convert. Unless a man is born again he cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven.  
-----

I believe in the baptism of the Spirit and all the gifts. When my dad was still alive, he and his wife took me to an evening

spirit-filled Catholic church service. The only different between a pentecostal church service and theirs was the communion. They anointed and laid hands on people, spoke in tongues, prophesied and praised the Lord.

There are many Christians who take communion every day in their homes, so communion cannot be the issue. And I did not enter this to argue with anyone.

I think outside the box and I'm going to present a scenario to you. If that's all they know and they have lived faithful to it (and no Christian has ever presented the true gospel to them only judged them), then I believe they will be judged **BETTER** than some Protestant Christians who **knew the truth and did NOTHING with the talent they were given**. But I also know that's just me and my scenario, it's not the gospel.

Re: , on: 2009/10/4 8:46

Hi Lysa

Unless a man is born-again he cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven. On that I am sure we could agree. What if I changed your scenario to , say, Mormons or Jehovah's Witness's or even Muslims, and they lived faithful to what they believed, will they be "judged better?" Just interested in how far you are willing to take the logic of your scenario and what "judged better," means to you.....Frank

Re: appolus - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/10/4 10:23

Quote:

-----appolus wrote:

Hi Lysa

Unless a man is born-again he cannot enter the Kingdom of heaven. On that I am sure we could agree. What if I changed your scenario to , say, Mormons or Jehovah's Witness's or even Muslims, and they lived faithful to what they believed, will they be "judged better?" Just interested in how far you are willing to take the logic of your scenario and what "judged better," means to you.....Frank

I'm not willing to take it that far!! So I concede! Uncle uncle! :-D

Re: , on: 2009/10/4 10:57

:-)

Re: , on: 2009/10/7 21:29

You are ignorant of your own Christian history. Baptism replaced Circumcision. Consider this:

A Hebrew baby could not have faith, repent, or even pray. Yet that baby was received into the saving covenant community on the eighth day. That baby's father gave it its faith. When it was old enough it could throw off that faith through an act of free will.

It was the same for the early Christian community. When baptism replaced circumcision and the Spirit of God was poured out upon your sons AND DAUGHTERS baptism was received by whole families...babies included.

In fact I challenge you to find ONE single dispute in early church history about infant baptism other than "should Christians have to wait until the third day to baptize their children?"

I dare you.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/7 21:51**

Quote:

-----  
A Hebrew baby could not have faith, repent, or even pray. Yet that baby was received into the saving covenant community on the eighth day.  
-----

A child was accepted into the covenant community by birth because of the God who made a covenant with Abraham and his seed. Circumcision was merely the sign the covenant made with Abraham. The sign of the New Covenant is not circumcision or water baptism, rather, it is the Holy Spirit who, according to Ephesians, was given to us as a pledge of our inheritance to come.

Quote:

-----  
In fact I challenge you to find ONE single dispute in early church history about infant baptism other than "should Christians have to wait until the third day to baptize their children?"  
-----

What's all this have to do with anything that has been discussed so far?

Quote:

-----  
I dare you.  
-----

You dare? That's not very Christ like. Brother, if you wish to discuss doctrine, that is great. But a "bring it on" attitude is far from Christ like, and lays a foundation that will make all future discussion unprofitable and unedifying.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/7 22:41**

Amen Jimmy, well said. Just a note to add. Not a single Scripture to support infant Baptism, just an argument from silence, which I am sure most would agree is no way to determine doctrine.....Frank

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/7 22:50**

Ah Frank, I knew I could get an amen corner out of you! ;-)

**Re: - posted by anonymity, on: 2009/10/8 18:31**

I was just listening to the radio of some Christian pastors who are well knowledgeable of Catholicism from 20 years in it and debate with Catholic leaders. They said that even among the Priests there is not a unity on their view of it?

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/8 21:56**

The Catholic Church likes to put on the image of a unified front with everything, but, there isn't any unity. That's why the Pope and the Councils are viewed as having the sole right to interpret the dogma. Everybody else is supposed to just repeat after them like a machine, and say they agree.

Re: , on: 2009/10/9 15:35

Spoken like a fundamental baptist.

But where's the proof? I'm calling you to account for your statement so we can agree with you.

Although many Protestant traditions baptize babies, Baptists—and "Bible churches" in the Baptist tradition—insist that baptism is only for those who have come to faith. Nowhere in the New Testament, they point out, do we read of infants being baptized.

On the other hand, nowhere do we read of children raised in believing households reaching the age of reason and then being baptized. The only explicit baptism accounts in the Bible involve converts from Judaism or paganism. For children of believers there is no explicit mention of baptism—either in infancy or later.

This poses a problem for Baptists: On what basis do they require children of believers to be baptized at all? Given the silence of the New Testament, why not assume Christian baptism is only for adult converts (age 21 and up)?

This, of course, would be contrary to historical Christian practice. But so is rejecting infant baptism. As we will see, there is no doubt that the early Church practiced infant baptism; and no Christian objections to this practice were ever voiced until the Reformation.

The New Testament itself, while it does not explicitly say when (or whether) believers should have their children baptized, is not silent on the subject.

Luke 18:15–16 tells us that "they were bringing even infants" to Jesus; and he himself related this to the kingdom of God: "Let the children come to me . . . for to such belongs the kingdom of God."

When Baptists speak of "bringing someone to Jesus," they mean leading him to faith. But Jesus says "even infants" can be "brought" to him. Even Baptists don't claim their practice of "dedicating" babies does this. The fact is, the Bible gives us no way of bringing anyone to Jesus apart from baptism.

Thus Peter declared, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you and to your children" (Acts 2:38–39).

The apostolic Church baptized whole "households" (Acts 16:33; 1 Cor. 1:16), a term encompassing children and infants as well as servants. While these texts do not specifically mention—nor exclude—infants, the very use of the term "households" indicates an understanding of the family as a unit. Even one believing parent in a household makes the children and even the unbelieving spouse "holy" (1 Cor. 7:14).

Does this mean unbelieving spouses should be baptized? Of course not. The kingdom of God is not theirs; they cannot be "brought to Christ" in their unbelief. But infants have no such impediment. The kingdom is theirs, Jesus says, and they should be brought to him; and this means baptism.

Baptism is the Christian equivalent of circumcision, or "the circumcision of Christ": "In him you were also circumcised with . . . the circumcision of Christ, having been buried with him in baptism and raised with him through your faith in the power of God, who raised him from the dead" (Col. 2:11–12). Thus, like circumcision, baptism can be given to children as well as adults. The difference is that circumcision was powerless to save (Gal. 5:6, 6:15), but **"aptism . . . now saves you" (1 Pet. 3:21).**

**The first explicit evidence of children of believing households being baptized comes from the early Church—w here infant baptism was uniformly upheld and regarded as apostolic. In fact, the only reported controversy on t he subject was a third-century debate whether or not to delay baptism until the eighth day after birth, like its Old Testament equivalent, circumcision! (See quotation from Cyprian, below; compare Leviticus 12:2–3.)**

**Consider, too, that Fathers raised in Christian homes (such as Irenaeus) would hardly have upheld infant baptis m as apostolic if their own baptisms had been deferred until the age of reason.**

**For example, infant baptism is assumed in Irenaeus' writings below (since he affirms both that regeneration h**



appens in baptism, and also that Jesus came so even infants could be regenerated). Since he was born in a Christian home in Smyrna around the year 140, this means he was probably baptized around 140. He was also probably baptized by the bishop of Smyrna at that time—Polycarp, a personal disciple of the apostle John, who had died only a few decades before.

#### Irenaeus

"He came to save all through himself; all, I say, who through him are reborn in God: infants, and children, and youths, and old men. Therefore he passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, sanctifying infants; a child for children, sanctifying those who are of that age . . . he might be the perfect teacher in all things, perfect not only in respect to the setting forth of truth, perfect also in respect to relative age" (Against Heresies 2:22:4).

"And dipped himself . . . seven times in the Jordan'. It was not for nothing that Naaman of old, when suffering from leprosy, was purified upon his being baptized, but as an indication to us. For as we are lepers in sin, we are made clean, by means of the sacred water and the invocation of the Lord, from our old transgressions, being spiritually regenerated as newborn babes, even as the Lord has declared: 'Except a man be born again through water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven' " (Fragment 34).

#### Hippolytus

"Baptize first the children, and if they can speak for themselves let them do so. Otherwise, let their parents or other relatives speak for them" (The Apostolic Tradition 21:16).

#### Origen

"Every soul that is born into flesh is soiled by the filth of wickedness and sin. . . . In the Church, baptism is given for the remission of sins, and, according to the usage of the Church, baptism is given even to infants. If there were nothing in infants which required the remission of sins and nothing in them pertinent to forgiveness, the grace of baptism would seem superfluous" (Homilies on Leviticus 8:3).

"The Church received from the apostles the tradition of giving baptism even to infants. The apostles, to whom were committed the secrets of the divine sacraments, knew there are in everyone innate strains of sin, which must be washed away through water and the Spirit" (Commentaries on Romans 5:9).

#### Cyprian of Carthage

"As to what pertains to the case of infants: You said that they ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, that the old law of circumcision must be taken into consideration, and that you did not think that one should be baptized and sanctified within the eighth day after his birth. In our council it seemed to us far otherwise. No one agreed to the course which you thought should be taken. Rather, we all judge that the mercy and grace of God ought to be denied to no man born" (Letters 64:2).

"If, in the case of the worst sinners and those who formerly sinned much against God, when afterwards they believe, the remission of their sins is granted and no one is held back from baptism and grace, how much more, then, should an infant not be held back, who, having but recently been born, has done no sin, except that, born of

the flesh according to Adam, he has contracted the contagion of that old death from his first being born. For this very reason does he approach more easily to receive the remission of sins: because the sins forgiven him are not his own but those of another" (ibid., 64:5).

Gregory of Nazianz

"Do you have an infant child? Allow sin no opportunity; rather, let the infant be sanctified from childhood. From his most tender age let him be consecrated by the Spirit. Do you fear the seal because of the weakness of nature? Oh, what a pusillanimous mother and of how little faith!" (Oration on Holy Baptism 40:7 ).

"'Well enough,' some will say, 'for those who ask for baptism, but what do you have to say about those who are still children, and aware neither of loss nor of grace? Shall we baptize them too?' Certainly, if there is any pressing danger. Better that they be sanctified unaware, than that they depart unsealed and uninitiated" (ibid., 40:28).

John Chrysostom

"You see how many are the benefits of baptism, and some think its heavenly grace consists only in the remission of sins, but we have enumerated ten honors ! For this reason we baptize even infants, though they are not defiled by sins, so that there may be given to them holiness, righteousness, adoption, inheritance, brotherhood with Christ, and that they may be his members" (Baptismal Catecheses in Augustine, Against Julian 1:6:21 ).

Augustine

"What the universal Church holds, not as instituted by councils but as something always held, is most correctly believed to have been handed down by apostolic authority. Since others respond for children, so that the celebration of the sacrament may be complete for them, it is certainly availing to them for their consecration, because they themselves are not able to respond" (On Baptism, Against the Donatists 4:24:31 ).

"The custom of Mother Church in baptizing infants is certainly not to be scorned, nor is it to be regarded in any way as superfluous, nor is it to be believed that its tradition is anything except apostolic" (The Literal Interpretation of Genesis 10:23:39 ).

"Cyprian was not issuing a new decree but was keeping to the most solid belief of the Church in order to correct some who thought that infants ought not be baptized before the eighth day after their birth. . . . He agreed with certain of his fellow bishops that a child is able to be duly baptized as soon as he is born" (Letters 166:8:23 ).

"By this grace baptized infants too are ingrafted into his body, infants who certainly are not yet able to imitate anyone. Christ, in whom all are made alive . . . gives also the most hidden grace of his Spirit to believers, grace which he secretly infuses even into infants. . . . It is an excellent thing that the Punic Christians call baptism salvation and the sacrament of Christ's Body nothing else than life. Whence does this derive, except from an ancient and, as I suppose, apostolic tradition, by which the churches of Christ hold inherently that without baptism and participation at the table of the Lord it is impossible for any man to attain either to the kingdom of God or to salvation and life eternal? This is the witness of Scripture, too. . . . If anyone wonders why children born of the baptized should themselves be baptized, let him attend briefly to this. . . . The sacrament of baptism is most assuredly the sacrament of regeneration" (Forgiveness and the Just Deserts of Sin, and the Baptism of Infants 1:9:10; 1:24:34; 2:27:43 ).

## Council of Carthage V

"Item: It seemed good that whenever there were not found reliable witnesses who could testify that without any doubt they were baptized and when the children themselves were not, on account of their tender age, able to answer concerning the giving of the sacraments to them, all such children should be baptized without scruple, lest a hesitation should deprive them of the cleansing of the sacraments. This was urged by the legates, our brethren, since they redeem many such from the barbarians" (Canon 7 ).

## Council of Mileum II

"Whoever says that infants fresh from their mothers' wombs ought not to be baptized, or say that they are indeed baptized unto the remission of sins, but that they draw nothing of the original sin of Adam, which is expiated in the bath of regeneration . . . let him be anathema . Since what the apostle says, 'Through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so passed to all men, in whom all have sinned' , must not be understood otherwise than the Catholic Church spread everywhere has always understood it. For on account of this rule of faith even infants, who in themselves thus far have not been able to commit any sin, are therefore truly baptized unto the remission of sins, so that that which they have contracted from generation may be cleansed in them by regeneration" (Canon 3 ).

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/10 10:42

Quote:

Spoken like a fundamental baptist.

I'm not a fundamental or southern baptist. I simply am a Christian. I attend a Pentecostal church, but, really don't care about the label over the door or the denomination the door is a part of. Jesus isn't denominational, and denominations are the fruit of the flesh. They are expressions of carnality, and a party spirit that promotes one over the other wreaks of carnality, according to the apostle Paul in his writings to the Corinthians.

All I care for are the teachings of Christ, and the apostolic example modeled for us by individuals like the apostle Paul. The teachings of the ante-nicene fathers while important, as these are the recorded lives of Christians who loved the Lord, carry little weight with me. I have a library full of their writings and have read most of what they wrote about. They are sometimes an impressive bunch of individuals, but like other brothers and sisters in the faith that live today, sometimes they are just wrong about the things of God.

The writings of the apostles contain more than enough information for us to pattern our beliefs and lives after. The ante-nicene fathers sometimes contradicted these writings, and sometimes contradicted each other. Where they are in agreement with the apostles, so am I, but where they obviously made stuff up or taught things that added or take away from those writings, they are to be ignored.

You can unroll the writings all you want. It isn't necessary, I've read almost all of them, and am seldom impressed. I even have cliff note versions that I used in seminary to hit on the major citations.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/10 12:33**

"The writings of the apostles contain more than enough information for us to pattern our beliefs and lives after"

Another amen to my apparently Baptist brother :)......Frank

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/10 19:38**

Quote:

-----  
Another amen to my apparently Baptist brother :)......Frank  
-----

LOL Frank. :-) For years I struggled with the messy issue of apostolic succession, tradition, and the large tsunami of an argument that Catholics, Anglicans, and the eastern Orthodox attempt to use to overwhelm people with and coerce them into submitting to the tyrannical spirit which rules over those who submit themselves to these carnal institutions.

But thank God for the revelation contained within the word of God, and the personal leading of the Holy Spirit that has all owed me to see straight through all that nonsense. And I praise God every day I meet other precious brothers and sisters of the faith whom the Lord has shown similar things to.

The thing the Lord has shown me is that apostolic succession is not passed on in some hierarchical institutional manner, as many in these respective churches would have us to believe. Rather, Paul told us to follow the example of those who walk after the pattern established by him, based off what he wrote in his letters and personally demonstrated. He told us very plainly to ignore those who have departed from his example.

Apostolic succession is not established by unrolling some long list of names and saying, "See, we are the historic church , that's why you have to do what we do and say." Such is simply coercion and manipulation at its finest. Especially when it is clear that those who unroll such a list have no demonstration of the power of the gospel in their life and ministry, and are unable to walk in the footsteps of the Lord and the original apostles.

The Lord and His holy apostles and prophets taught once and for all the faith that was to be handed down to the saints. It is clear and available for all to see in the writings of the sacred Scriptures. It might take much intense study to uncover those things. But they are there.

We are only apostolic to the degree we imitate the Lord and his apostles, and follow in their footsteps. Whatever does not follow that pattern must be abandoned as soon as it is discovered.

As Leonard Ravenhill was as so bold to say on one occasion, "Show me your apostolic succession with your apostolic results."

**Re: , on: 2009/10/14 3:06**

Quote:

-----They are sometimes an impressive bunch of individuals, but like other brothers and sisters in the faith that live today, sometimes they are just wrong about the things of God.  
-----

I get it. They, even though they knew the apostles personally and you didn't, are WRONG. And you are right.

Understood.

Re: , on: 2009/10/14 3:13

Quote:  
-----The thing the Lord has shown me is that apostolic succession is not passed on in some hierarchical institutional manner, as many in these respective churches would have us to believe.  
-----

“And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.” - 1 Tim. 2:2

This was written by an apostle to a bishop who was appointed to "Preach the word...reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine."

Sounds like hierarchy and succession to me.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/14 7:03

Quote:  
-----  
This was written by an apostle to a bishop who was appointed to "Preach the word...reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine."  
-----

Contrary to popular myth and lie, Timothy was not "a bishop" or "sr pastor," rather, he was a fellow apostle with Paul, who served as a mentor to him. Notice:

1 Thes 2:6 nor did **we** seek glory from men, either from you or from others, even though as **apostles** of Christ we might have asserted our authority.

Notice the plural personal pronouns of "we" and "our" used in conjunction with the plural "apostles." Which group of apostles is he talking about? He's talking about the group of apostles that he visited with in the establishing of the church of Thessalonica, the one's he wrote this epistle with. And who were the one's that co-authored this epistle with him? Well, the introduction to the letter tells us:

1 Timothy 1:1 Paul and Silvanus and **Timothy**, To the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace be to you and peace.

Paul, Silvanus (Silas), and TIMOTHY, the "apostles" of 1 Thes 2:6 co-wrote this letter to the church. It is error to read the so-called "pastoral epistles" of 1 & 2 Timothy, and Titus as letters to monarchical bishops. Rather, they must be read as letters to Paul's fellow junior apostles.

You should not read later contexts into the contexts of Scripture. That's called eisegesis, not exegesis. I did considerable research on this topic in undergrad and graduate school. I would encourage you to read the scholarly essay I turned in on the topic that goes into considerable detail on the issue of church polity in the first few centuries. Even Roman Catholic scholar, Anthony Sullivan, whom I use as a frequent source, agrees that the structure of the Roman Catholic Church was something that developed over the centuries, and did not exist in its hierarchical form in the first century. He sees the subsequent development as inspired by God, but, he does an excellent job at not reading things back into the Scriptures that aren't there.

<http://www.iamadisciple.com/articles/papers/TheRiseOfBishops.pdf>

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/14 7:10**

Quote:

-----  
I get it. They, even though they knew the apostles personally and you didn't, are WRONG. And you are right.  
-----

Even the apostle Peter said individuals like Paul were easily misunderstood, and the perverted distorted their letters. In fact, the elders of Ephesus, whom Paul personally raised up, and whom knew him very well, many would later turn away from the faith, and introduced destructive heresies that would, as Paul said in his farewell to them, cause men to seek after them. Do you not think these very men appealed to Paul and his teachings when they finally did begin to dispute with one another? They did in Corinth.

So, these men might have known the apostles. But that doesn't keep them from having perverted their teachings. Thankfully, we have their teachings reserved for us in the inspired and Holy Scriptures, to help us know where these men got it right, and where they got it wrong, as we read what the apostles themselves wrote, and instructed us in what to believe and practice in the faith once and for all handed down to the saints. It's all there for us to see, and we need not appeal to "tradition" to learn how to read a book.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/14 8:02**

Hebrews 8:11

No longer will a man teach his neighbor, or a man his brother, saying, 'Know the Lord,' because they will all know me, from the least of them to the greatest.

The simplicity of Christ destroys the complexity of man. Many of the 'learned' have, and will, lord over their theologies as proper and absolute in their endless quest to silence all but their own voices. This is done in a spirit of pomp that takes away from the any real aspect of relationship and quells the calling of many. They have not much desire other than more information. They stumble many times throughout knowing and understanding that they we're wrong in their view... yet instead of humbling themselves they take this new knowledge and lord over once again. NOW, they have it figured out. The problem is that in the wake of this so called education.... enlightenment and the importance of transformation and regeneration are relegated to the bench..... stagnant to battle pride and self absorbed piety. Scholarship is of the highest regard, and those who they believe own this are the one's they quote the most. The church will not be outdone in scholarly attainment, truly they are just as intelligent as any in the world of secular lostness. Yet somehow, in the strangest of ways, they look just like them. Just as the presiding judge puts on his black robe and takes his place at the high seat, so too the learned scholar clothes themselves in endless theology and an insatiable quest to get this theology right before they are right with Christ. They want a seat at the prestigious table before they are willing to wash anyone's feet. The cart is before the horse.

Oh I remember those nuns, they had the knowledge and were ready to smack you with it .....more as a tool for behavior modification than for preaching the true Gospel. Yet their own troubling behaviors eluded them, they had no idea as to how they looked even to the common man. It wasn't their 'burden' as they suggested.... it was misery, it was confusion, it was frustration, self martyrdom. Oh I remember the priest, the same man who was at a family party drunk and playing poker, and decided to call my mother a 'b\*\*ch' because she made my father... the business manager of the church... take a couple of days off to recover from illness which put the priest in some kind of a bind. Oh he could argue theology like none other I'm sure. Once he told me that God is an emotionless deity then declared over me 'theology 101!'. When, being quite naive at the time, I asked him how that could be if God described Himself as 'jealous' and sometimes 'angry' and that we were made in His image yet we are not without emotion, he responded: "now we're getting into a philosophical debate". It wasn't philosophical but scriptural. But his hierarchy trumped my scripture and was taken full advantage of, his calling being so sure that it was his duty to silence ignorance. He did. I was silenced, and more confused than ever about God and the work of the cross.

I thank God that Christ came to my rescue, eyes were opened, and through no work of my own.. I knew. It was Him. It was Him. I never thought that day would come but alone in my room, (not in a pew, not in front of a statue, not in 'theology 101', not in a crazed raucus of hand waving and dancing) He came. Everything I had learned evaporated, He consumed the knowledge and gave me Himself. Now, as important as proper doctrine is, we are saved not because of it, but despite it. If we were saved because of it, as everyone claims correct doctrine, the world would be born again and the a



dvancement of the 'church' would be a byproduct of the Holy Spirit that says 'know the Lord'. I'm proof that the doctrine of the church had nothing to do with my salvation lest it boast of it's own eloquence. No, it was because of a Person, the only One who could boast but doesn't. If you know the Lord you know it, He won't leave you as an orphan nor will His testimony be a fleeting whisper. It can be a still small voice, but our rejoicing ears make it as loud as thunder. No denying it, God isn't so nefarious to promise something only to dangle it around so you never know for sure. You know. This isn't proven through knowledge or education... anyone can learn... but not everyone can hear. The hearing is interactive as relationship takes two and it is in this relationship.... that The One on the other end makes Himself known. What a blessing considering that many, including myself, still go our own way and decide in our own intellect. It is His faithfulness that stands taller than any hierarchy, a hierarchy that, for many, strives to tower above all in the cesspool of self... a self that is also non-denominational, as many ambitions are, and is to the detriment of God with you.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/15 14:58**

Quote:

-----Even the apostle Peter said individuals like Paul were easily misunderstood, and the perverted distorted their letters.  
-----

Right. It is "unlearned" and "unstable" men who would do the distorting. You can choose to believe that Peter would appoint Ignatius knowing that he would be "unlearned" and "unstable". I choose to believe that the apostle took his own advice and appointed a saint.

Quote:

-----In fact, the elders of Ephesus, whom Paul personally raised up, and whom knew him very well, many would later turn away from the faith, and introduced destructive heresies that would, as Paul said in his farewell to them, cause men to seek after them.  
-----

The evidence of heresy is always that men depart from the Church. (1 John 2:19 - written concurrently in Ignatius' time) The church is indefectible. (Matt. 16:18,19) It is the pillar and ground of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15).

We must conclude that these destructive heresies would always separate themselves from the Church. You could point out the Arian heresy that took root in such places as Constantinople for a time. But they were eventually and relatively quickly ejected from the Church. The consistent voice of the Church in all times and all places is one clear voice of orthodoxy. And, I might add, given what we can learn of human nature from history...quite miraculous.

Quote:

-----So, these men might have known the apostles. But that doesn't keep them from having perverted their teachings.  
-----

Here's the problem with the point you are trying to make. You say that Ignatius, Polycarp, Irenaeus, Clement of Rome, etc. perverted the teachings of the apostles. (i.e. the church was a miserable failure immediately after having been passed off from the apostles to the next generation) This poses a real problem:

1. It isn't that their teachings cannot be substantiated by Scripture. It is just that their interpretation is different than yours.
2. Since their interpretation is different than yours, you reject theirs in favor of yours.
3. For example, take the eucharist. They said that it was the real body and blood of Christ offered in a sacrificial manner. They interpreted the passage "do this in memory of me" in the sacrificial tones evident in the original languages "offer this as a memorial". You see the passage with 21st century protestant western eyes and say "do this" meaning to the best of your ability you are going to copy in practice what you read on the surface. You read "this is my body" and drop your literal interpretation of Scripture like a hot potato and say "this is (a symbol) of my body." You add meaning to the text that isn't there in your case. So you could argue that on the surface both parties are making judgment calls regarding interpretation.

4. So we are left with the option of trusting your 21st century removed opinion. Or we can trust the opinion of those who actually shared the participation in the body and blood of Christ with the apostles.

I choose the fathers.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/15 15:10**

Quote:  
-----Contrary to popular myth and lie, Timothy was not "a bishop" or "sr pastor," rather, he was a fellow apostle with Paul, who served as a mentor to him.  
-----

Even so. Let's assume for a moment that you are correct in your assumption that Timothy was not a mere bishop but an apostle.

In this case the argument is much stronger in my favor, since we are seeing apostolic succession not just of an apostle to a bishop. But of apostle to apostle. We are seeing that indeed there was an anointed succession of leadership in the early church that was intended to continue on in every generation until the return of Christ.

And this is exactly what we do see throughout history whether it is the Orthodox, Catholic, Ethiopic, Coptic, Syriac, Thomas Christians of India, Arminian, etc. How can they preach unless they be sent. We see this perpetual sending through the line of apostles and bishops through the ages. We see that even though some of the apostolic churches I mentioned are in schism, they ALL profess 99.9% the same doctrine. They all confess:

- the real presence of Jesus in the Eucharist
- the same seven holy mysteries/sacraments
- the same doctrine of the Trinity
- the same doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ
- the same doctrine about Mary the theotokos

I could go on and on.

But the point is that for you to claim anointing from heaven, you need to:

1. Discredit the historic Church

and

2. Show some pretty substantial evidence for the ministry of the likes of Martin Luther and John Calvin. I mean, we had better be seeing the dead raised or something spectacular to attest to the break in succession and apparent apostasy that would have to be present for such a wild claim to be true.

If you can't do this. Then you must admit that either you are wrong. Or you must admit that the church still remains lost to some degree...that it was snuffed out and has been trying to come back for a couple millennia.

**Re: History bent is no history at all. Babylon lives!..for a short season., on: 2009/10/18 12:23**

What your espousing as history, is CATHOLIC HISTORY, not the true and authentic history of the remnant church...  
.....  
Orthodox said;

"In this case the argument is much stronger in my favor, since we are seeing apostolic succession not just of an apostle to a bishop. But of apostle to apostle. We are seeing that indeed there was an anointed succession of leadership in the early church that was intended to continue on in every generation until the return of Christ.

And this is exactly what we do see throughout history whether it is the Orthodox, Catholic, Ethiopic, Coptic, Syriac, Thomas Christians of India, Arminian, etc. How can they preach unless they be sent. We see this perpetual sending through the line of apostles and bishops through the ages. We see that even though some of the apostolic churches I mentioned

are in schism, they ALL profess 99.9% the same doctrine. They all confess:

- the real presence of Jesus in the Eucharist
- the same seven holy mysteries/sacraments
- the same doctrine of the Trinity
- the same doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ
- the same doctrine about Mary the theotokos

I could go on and on."

.....

I thank God that the standard of our faith is not rooted in "Apostolic succession", but in the Word of God, the Holy scriptures, which indeed DENY your doctrine of submission to your evil dogma.

No, Jesus is not "PRESENT IN THE EUCHARIST"; as you say, and it is but a superstitious magic show that imputes authority to the priests of Baal as they twist the elements into their own power, and theirs alone. It is an abomination.

I don't know or care what the 7 "Holy" sacraments are, but suspect that they are the same Babylonian bondage as the rest of the Papist sorcery is. My bible says that there is but ONE sacrifice for sins, and one MEDIATOR between God and man, the Lord Jesus. Any deviation from this pure truth is an ABOMINATION.

This leads us to the doctrine of the divinity and ascension of Mary, which, by the way, is not in the Bible. Why would something as important as the Mediatrix herself be denied by scripture?

Because the Catholic Mary is none other than a Satanic being, the queen of demons, Jezebel herself... Faith in this demonic Mary is wicked, and surely an abomination in the sight of the Lord.

As far as "discrediting the historical church," "to claim the true church's anointing as valid", that I indeed do, but it is the version of history that is espoused by the great whore herself, the Roman Catholic Church, that I discredit, and its many, many distortions and lies, both concerning "HISTORY", and its present day authority.

It is MIXTURE! Unclean!, and is of course mixed with overtures that admit, but slight the Lordship of our glorious King, Jesus of Nazareth.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 2:49**

Quote:

-----What your espousing as history, is CATHOLIC HISTORY, not the true and authentic history of the remnant church...

-----

Well if ignorance is bliss, you must be the happiest man alive.

You can't even begin to show WHERE your heretic doctrines even WERE for the majority of Church history. How can you expect me to take you seriously?

Quote:

-----I thank God that the standard of our faith is not rooted in "Apostolic succession", but in the Word of God, the Holy scriptures, which indeed DENY your doctrine of submission to your evil dogma.

-----

Don't confuse the Sacred Scriptures with YOUR INTERPRETATION of them. If your interpretation of the Bible is wrong. ..your interpretation can hardly be called the Word of God.

Quote:  
-----No, Jesus is not "PRESENT IN THE EUCHARIST"; as you say, and it is but a superstitious magic show that imputes authority to the priests of Baal as they twist the elements into their own power, and theirs alone. It is an abomination.  
-----

"This is my body." No magic there. But something highly sacred which you seem comfortable to blaspheme with the greatest of ease.

Please show me just ONE early church father who believed your twisting of Scripture...

Quote:  
-----I don't know or care what the 7 "Holy" sacraments are  
-----

That's like saying: "I don't know or care what a doctor is...I want to talk to someone who can help get me well!"

Quote:  
-----My bible says that there is but ONE sacrifice for sins, and one MEDIATOR between God and man, the Lord Jesus. Any deviation from this pure truth is an ABOMINATION.  
-----

You're preaching to the converted.

Quote:  
-----This leads us to the doctrine of the divinity and ascension of Mary  
-----

Do your research before you embarrass yourself. No apostolic church believes in the "divinity" of Mary. That is heresy.

We also do not believe in the "ascension" of Mary.

You're making yourself look uneducated. You probably are...but don't worry...that can be fixed.

Quote:  
-----Because the Catholic Mary is none other than a Satanic being, the queen of demons, Jezebel herself... Faith in this demonic Mary is wicked, and surely an abomination in the sight of the Lord.  
-----

The Catholic Mary was the first Christian and first believer in Jesus Christ. To find out who she was you need to start at Gen. 3:15

Presumptuous they are...self-willed...not afraid to speak evil of dignities...

God have mercy on your soul.

Quote:  
-----As far as "discrediting the historical church," "to claim the true church's anointing as valid", that I indeed do, but it is the version of his story that is espoused by the great whore herself, the Roman Catholic Church, that I discredit, and its many, many distortions and lies, both concerning "HISTORY", and its present day authority.  
-----

It is the independently verifiable history born by Catholics, Orthodox, and secular sources alike. Sorry your conspiracy websites you frequent didn't fill you in. (not speaking of this website there)

Nice dodge.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 8:05**

"Do your research before you embarrass yourself. No apostolic church believes in the "divinity" of Mary. That is heresy.

We also do not believe in the "ascension" of Mary." orthodox

As a former catholic I can attest that we were taught the 'assumption' of Mary. <http://www.wf-f.org/Assumption.html>

And what is your definition of 'divine'? I spent half my childhood praying to her as taught by them... Why do this if there is not divinity? Do we pray to someone who is not divine, someone who cannot supernaturally intervene for our cause AFTER their physical death? Can we just pray to anyone who is dead, or just the one's the church tells us to? Where in scripture does it state that prayer to Mary is a mandate of God, or even an elective possibility?

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 9:16**

EDIT: quote made my point confusing (others were mixed in there...)

orthodox,

The spirit in which you write screams anything but that of Christ. Please, consider your intentions.

This evening, I was speaking with my student who is a doctor and she mentioned how our goodness is exhibited in the good things we do for others and that in turn helps our relationship with God. Mind you she is a second language student, but she seemed to answer the question of this thread without even trying, because it is what she believes due to her being catholic.

My other male doctor student is most often seen carrying his rosary and most frequently when I visit him he has his head buried in the little book of mary (prayer booklet). I bought him a bible, but he prefers the other stuff. Not to mention that he became a catholic by writing a test (actually, he was too busy because at the time he was studying to be a doctor, so the priest let him slip through...).

The catholic church does not follow Jesus and/or the Word.

BTW, my whole family is catholic so I do not say this whimsically...they all believe themselves to be good enough for Heaven or at least doing good things to earn themselves a spot.

**Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/10/19 11:31**

orthodox,

You said:

Quote:  
-----Quote: What your espousing as history, is CATHOLIC HISTORY, not the true and authentic history of the remnant church...

Well if ignorance is bliss, you must be the happiest man alive. You can't even begin to show WHERE your heretic doctrines even WERE for the majority

y of Church history. How can you expect me to take you seriously?

Quote: I thank God that the standard of our faith is not rooted in "Apostolic succession", but in the Word of God, the Holy scriptures, which indeed DENY your doctrine of submission to your evil dogma.

Don't confuse the Sacred Scriptures with YOUR INTERPRETATION of them. If your interpretation of the Bible is wrong...your interpretation can hardly be called the Word of God.

Quote: No, Jesus is not "PRESENT IN THE EUCHARIST"; as you say, and it is but a superstitious magic show that imputes authority to the priests of Baal as they twist the elements into their own power, and theirs alone. It is an abomination.

"This is my body." No magic there. But something highly sacred which you seem comfortable to blaspheme with the greatest of ease. Please show me just ONE early church father who believed your twisting of Scripture...

Quote: I don't know or care what the 7 "Holy" sacraments are

That's like saying: "I don't know or care what a doctor is...I want to talk to someone who can help get me well!"

Quote: My bible says that there is but ONE sacrifice for sins, and one MEDIATOR between God and man, the Lord Jesus. Any deviation from this pure truth is an ABOMINATION.

You're preaching to the converted.

Quote: This leads us to the doctrine of the divinity and ascension of Mary

Do your research before you embarrass yourself. No apostolic church believes in the "divinity" of Mary. That is heresy. We also do not believe in the "ascension" of Mary. You're making yourself look uneducated. You probably are...but don't worry...that can be fixed.

Quote: Because the Catholic Mary is none other than a Satanic being, the queen of demons, Jezebel herself... Faith in this demonic Mary is wicked, and surely an abomination in the sight of the Lord.

The Catholic Mary was the first Christian and first believer in Jesus Christ. To find out who she was you need to start at Gen. 3:15 Presumptuous they are...self willed...not afraid to speak evil of dignities... God have mercy on your soul.

Quote: As far as "discrediting the historical church," "to claim the true church's anointing as valid", that I indeed do, but it is the version of history that is espoused by the great whore herself, the Roman Catholic Church, that I discredit, and its many, many distortions and lies, both concerning "HISTORY", and its present day authority.

It is the independently verifiable history born by Catholics, Orthodox, and secular sources alike. Sorry your conspiracy websites you frequent didn't fill you in. (not speaking of this website there) Nice dodge.

-----

You speak as one who thinks he has authority, when in truth you have none. Your attitude and the tone of your posts clearly identify your nature, which is sinful. Your lofty presumptions impress no one except possibly the ignorant and the lost. You have the habit of hurling insults at others that eventually fall on your own head, for it is obvious that among those who have posted in this thread, you are the one without the Spirit of God in him. Your pride blinds you and keeps you from seeing what you really are.(edited)

Gal 5:19-23 The **acts of the sinful nature** are obvious: sexual immorality, impurity and debauchery; idolatry and witchcraft; **hatred, discord, jealousy, fits of rage, selfish ambition, dissensions, factions and envy**; drunkenness, orgies, and the like. I warn you, as I did before, that those who live like this will not inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control.

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 11:51

"Orthodox"

One thing that is consistent throughout the many, many posts of Orthodox, is that **he never, ever responds to the Scripture that is presented to him, nor does he respond to world history, that refutes the Catholic "history" that he posts. Both the Bible Scripture, as well as world history refute EVERYTHING he continues to post.**

Please check out the following link— "A picture of the Catholic Jesus":



(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/monstran.htm>) A Picture of the Catholic Jesus

Also, check out this link- The Catholic Mary is A Devil

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mary.htm>) The Catholic Mary is a Devil

Check here to see Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa:

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mothther.htm>) Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

orthodox wrote:

Quote:

-----Contrary to popular myth and lie, Timothy was not "a bishop" or "sr pastor," rather, he was a fellow apostle with Paul, who served as a mentor to him.

Even so. Let's assume for a moment that you are correct in your assumption that Timothy was not a mere bishop but an apostle.  
DELETED

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 11:59**

-edit- post removed.

"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness and self-control." wa  
ltern

I suggest then walter that you demonstrate.... you're not exempt.

**Re: THEY WHICH ARE APPROVED., on: 2009/10/19 12:07**

amen Leo Grace

## ROMANS 16

17. Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them.

18. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

Leo Grace said;

orthodox,

"You speak as one who thinks he has authority, when in truth you have none. Your attitude and the tone of your posts clearly identify your nature, which is sinful. Your lofty presumptions impress no one except possibly the ignorant and the lost."

"You have the habit of hurling insults at others that eventually fall on your own head, for it is obvious that among those who have posted in this thread, you are the one without the Spirit of God in him. Your pride blinds you and keeps you from seeing what you really are."

.....

Well said, my brother. sometimes it is necessary to mark, when it is apparent that the wolf just wants to howl. As usual, there is no consideration to scriptural reason, or honor to sound doctrine, but hateful dogma to smear and attack.

This just further proves what we already know. The Roman Catholic church is the Largest and most deceitful CULT on the Earth, and is the home and tool of the DEVIL himself.

I must thank orthodox for his hearty confirmation of that....and brothers like you Leo Grace. Right on.

1 COR 11; 18-19

18. For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and I partly believe it.

19. For there MUST be also heresies among you, that THEY which are approved may be made manifest among you.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/19 12:25**

Quote:

.....

In this case the argument is much stronger in my favor, since we are seeing apostolic succession not just of an apostle to a bishop. But of apostle to a postle. We are seeing that indeed there was an anointed succession of leadership in the early church that was intended to continue on in every generation until the return of Christ.

.....

This is not what the text supports. Timothy was a co-apostle with the apostle Paul, just in the same way Barnabas and the others were. The only "anointed succession" that existed, was not in some hierarchical chain of command, rather, the "succession" that existed was in the degree to which one followed the pattern of life and doctrine, in the relationship similar to that of a father and son, or mentor and disciple.

Paul lamented regularly that others who had joined him in ministry often failed to live up to the pattern he established for others to follow. In fact, some had ceased altogether to follow the pattern of life he taught. But Paul regularly rejoiced over Timothy, who walked according to the pattern Paul had established.

"Apostolic succession," far from being the perversion that Rome has made it, is successfully carried out everytime anybody walks according to the model Christ, Paul and the other apostles taught, whether or not they've had an unbroken "succession" in some chain of command. Indeed, there were those in Paul's own life time whom he had joined his apostolic team who later departed from being men and women who were apostolic in the quality of the Christian life they exhibited

.

Quote:

.....

And this is exactly what we do see throughout history whether it is the Orthodox, Catholic, Ethiopic, Coptic, Syriac, Thomas Christians of India, Arminian, etc. How can they preach unless they be sent. We see this perpetual sending through the line of apostles and bishops through the ages

.....

It is ultimately Christ who sends. He is our Chief apostle, and it is He who gives gifts and ministries to men, distributing as He wills through the Holy Spirit.

Quote:

1. Discredit the historic Church

The historic Church that exists is those who constitute the redeemed, and have been purchased by the blood of the Lamb. Wherever they are, there is the Church. There are many out there claiming to have letters and credentials, but as Paul reminds us in 2 Corinthians 2-3, it is the Spirit filled life you live, and the difference that it makes in others that constitute the only credentials necessary. Many in his day ran around with commissioning letters, which he equated to the dead law of Moses written in hard stone.

Quote:

2. Show some pretty substantial evidence for the ministry of the likes of Martin Luther and John Calvin. I mean, we had better be seeing the dead raised or something spectacular to attest to the break in succession and apparent apostasy that would have to be present for such a wild claim to be true.

While I'm indebted to the great contributions these men have made, I'm not a fan of them. Though I don't know for a fact, and it is just a mere guess, but I think both of these men may have very well gone to hell.

The reception of the Holy Spirit is the only seal one needs to validate one's salvation, and likewise, the working of the Holy Spirit in one's ministry is all that one needs to validate their ministry before the Lord. One need not produce dynamic miracles, as all have different gifts of the Holy Spirit according to the measure of grace given to them. But, I've seen people healed of various sicknesses (though few). Countless times have I seen God speak through the lips of other men.

Quote:

If you can't do this. Then you must admit that either you are wrong. Or you must admit that the church still remains lost to some degree...that it was snuffed out and has been trying to come back for a couple millennia.

According to Ephesians 4:11-15, the Church is always in the business of growing and reforming, and will do so until it obtains maturity and the perfection that Christ ultimately intends for it to arrive at.

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 12:33

To ccriders, brotherhood, & orthodox:

What ONE THING is consistent with ccriders, brotherhood, & orthodox? ALL of you are attacking the MESSENGER providing the post, and not addressing THE MESSAGE THAT WAS POSTED. Just like the liberal press, who attack the messenger, and marginalize them in order to try to obfuscate (to make obscure, to confuse) the message that is being delivered.

**NOT ONE OF YOU GUYS/GIRLS HAVE RESPONDED TO MY POST, SO I WILL POST IT AGAIN. Maybe, just maybe, you will address the post itself, without calling names to the poster. When I say address, I mean to prove what I have posted is incorrect BY FACTS, AND NOT BY CALLING NAMES. ONLY CHILDREN AND LIBERALS DO SU**

**CH THINGS:**

**One thing that is consistent throughout the many, many posts of Orthodox, is that he never, ever responds to the Scripture that is presented to him, nor does he respond to world history, that refutes the Catholic "history" that he posts. Both the Bible Scripture, as well as world history refute EVERYTHING he continues to post.**

**Please check out the following link—"A picture of the Catholic Jesus" AND RESPOND TO IT:**

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/monstran.htm>) A Picture of the Catholic Jesus

**Also, check out this link- The Catholic Mary is A Devil, AND RESPOND TO IT:**

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mary.htm>) The Catholic Mary is a Devil

**Check here to see Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa, AND RESPOND TO IT:**

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mothther.htm>) Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa

Sincerely,

Walter

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 12:43**

"To ccriders, brothertom, & orthodox:

What ONE THING is consistent with ccriders, brothertom, & orthodox? ALL of you are attacking the MESSENGER providing the post, and not addressing THE MESSAGE THAT WAS POSTED. Just like the liberal press, who attack the messenger, and marginalize them in order to try to obfuscate (to make obscure, to confuse) the message that is being delivered." waltern

Sometimes waltern, the messenger is the problem and he/she is always the last to realize it. But you shouldn't take my word for it as I'm not the only one who has said so. You accused certain people of the 'destruction of the Gospel' and when I asked you on PM to point out my heresy you never responded. That means you attacked the person(s) and not the theology... so you can very well bite your lip or keep on with your hypocrisy.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:03**

to ccriders:

I always address the message. However, if I did not respond to your PM, then I apologize to you. It is not my practice to do so. I have over 178 messages that I have responded to so far, so yours must be the one I missed.

(As I think back, I believe that my post that you were responding to addressed the facts in detail that Roman Catholicism has destroyed the Gospel. If you look at what I just posted below, look at the 3 links that provide proof of the heretical beliefs of Roman Catholicism and the Pope)

Now, back to the business at hand. Instead of making an excuse, and AGAIN ATTACKING THE MESSENGER, instead of addressing what was posted, PLEASE RESPOND TO MY MESSAGE, POINT BY POINT.

We are having a debate here, and in a debate both sides have to prove their position. Only one position will prevail. Why is that? Because the winner of this debate will have the truth of the Gospel and the truth of world history on his/her side.

Do you think that you might be able to do that?

Thanks,

Walter

Quote:

ccrider wrote:

"To ccrider, brothertom, & orthodox:

What ONE THING is consistent with ccrider, brothertom, & orthodox? ALL of you are attacking the MESSENGER providing the post, and not addressing THE MESSAGE THAT WAS POSTED. Just like the liberal press, who attack the messenger, and marginalize them in order to try to obfuscate (to make obscure, to confuse) the message that is being delivered." waltern

Sometimes waltern, the messenger is the problem and he/she is always the last to realize it. But you shouldn't take my word for it as I'm not the only one who has said so. You accused certain people of the 'destruction of the Gospel' and when I asked you on PM to point out my heresy you never responded. That means you attacked the person(s) and not the theology... so you can very well bite your lip or keep on with your hypocrisy.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:17**

"Please check out my voluminous posts in the past that prove my point." waltern

Yes the point is proven.. you just proved it.

What makes you think I have an issue with the theology of what you posted??? With the exception of you saying awhile back that 'temptation is sin' I don't really dispute too much your theology. But, you can have truth and not have Christlikeness. You had one thread shut down not too long ago because of your attitude and your accusations of others here. You think that because you have right theology that you can steamroll it into the collective forum cerebrum. Then, of all things, when people don't take you seriously and challenge your demeanor, you liken them to the 'liberal press'. Obviously you have no idea how that ridiculousness looks.

You're your own worst enemy and until you realize that you will have trouble with people respecting your theology... even if it is correct... because you fail to see your part in all this in how you deal with people here, and you really don't seem to care. If that's the case then why should anyone care about your posts??

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:22**

To ccrider:

Again, you attack the messenger. Now, be an adult, and attack the message that he/I presented to you. You disagree with what I believe. I totally disagree with everything you believe. I have provided proof, with just 3 links, yet here you are, calling me names again.

Address what is presented in my post below. I will post it again, just for you. All you have to do is respond to the 3 links that prove the heresy of the Catholic Church:

- 1.A picture of the Catholic Jesus (a wafer), and compare that to what the Bible says about Jesus
- 2.A picture of the Catholic Mary, the "co-redemptrix with Christ" in relation to what the Bible says about Mary
3. Mother Theresa, was she saved, or is she in hell? Compare what she says about herself, in relation to what the Bible says about the confidence of the true believer.

One thing that is consistent with ccider, brothertom, & orthodox is waht? That ALL of you are attacking the person providing the post, and not addressing what was posted. Just like the liberal press, who attack the messenger, and try to obfuscate (to make obscure, to confuse) the message that is being delivered.

**NOT ONE OF YOU GUYS/GIRLS HAVE RESPONDED TO MY POST, SO I WILL POST IT AGAIN. Maybe, just maybe, you will address the post itself, without calling names to the poster. When I say address, I mean to prove what I have posted is incorrect BY FACTS, AND NOT BY CALLING NAMES. ONLY CHILDREN AND LIBERALS DO SUCH THINGS:**

**One thing that is consistent throughout the many, many posts of Orthodox, is that he never, ever responds to the Scripture that is presented to him, nor does he respond to world history, that refutes the Catholic "history" that he posts. Both the Bible Scripture, as well as world history refute EVERYTHING he continues to post.**

Please check out the following link—"A picture of the Catholic Jesus":

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/monstran.htm>) A Picture of the Catholic Jesus

Also, check out this link- The Catholic Mary is A Devil

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mary.htm>) The Catholic Mary is a Devil

Check here to see Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa:

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mothther.htm>) Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa

Sincerely,

Walter

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/19 13:22**

Brothers,

I have been far from a perfect example of this in my life, but it is something I am growing in: I think it is great that we are passionate about whatever our conviction and opinion on matters happens to be. But, let that passion be channeled into high quality and well made points, instead of insults and rude remarks. The truth does not need you to draw a sword on her behalf, she is capable of defending herself quite well.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:27**

"(As I think back, I believe that my post that you were responding to addressed the facts in detail that Roman Catholicism has destroyed the Gospel. If you look at what I just posted below, look at the 3 links that provide proof of the heretical beliefs of Roman Catholicism and the Pope" walter

And I never once took issue with you on this now did I??? Yet you accused me and several others, including the always gracious brother Neil, of being responsible for the 'destruction of the Gospel'. You accused your brethren here not the RCC. You can't even keep up with your accusations and why you made them. This isn't the first time you've jumped the gun and accused me of saying something that I never said or that implied something I didn't imply. Show me, Walter, my utter disagreement with you on your accusation of the RCC in general.



Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:29

To ccriders:

To ccriders:

Again, and again, you attack the messenger. Now, be an adult, and attack the message that he/I presented to you. You disagree with what I believe. I totally disagree with everything you believe. I have provided proof, with just 3 links, yet here you are, calling me names again.

Address what is presented in my post below. I will post it again, just for you. All you have to do is respond to the 3 links that prove the heresy of the Catholic Church:

- 1.A picture of the Catholic Jesus (a wafer), and compare that to what the Bible says about Jesus
- 2.A picture of the Catholic Mary, the "co-redemptrix with Christ" in relation to what the Bible says about Mary
3. Mother Theresa, was she saved, or is she in hell? Compare what she says about herself, in relation to what the Bible says about the confidence of the true believer.

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:31

"Again, you attack the messenger. Now, be an adult, and attack the message that he/I presented to you. You disagree with what I believe. I totally disagree with everything you believe. I have provided proof, with just 3 links, yet here you are, calling me names again." walter

What do you disagree with that I have posted. I can't help you like a mature adult walter until you provide me with a clue of the theology I have posted that you disagree with.

"You disagree with what I believe. I totally disagree with everything you believe." walter

Wow.

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:37

to ccriders:

Wow, I guess you really cannot understand my post. I will try it again, and be more clear:

- 1.A picture of the Catholic Jesus (a wafer), and compare that to what the Bible says about Jesus  
**THIS IS THE HERESY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, THAT IS IN TOTAL OPPOSITION TO SCRIPTURE (The Gospel)**
- 2.A picture of the Catholic Mary, the "co-redemptrix with Christ" in relation to what the Bible says about Mary  
**THIS IS THE HERESY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, THAT IS IN TOTAL OPPOSITION TO SCRIPTURE (The Gospel)**
3. Mother Theresa, was she saved, or is she in hell? Compare what she says about herself, in relation to what the Bible says about the confidence of the true believer.

**THIS IS WHAT THE HERESY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH DOES TO THEIR BELIEVERS, THAT IS IN TOTAL OPPOSITION TO SCRIPTURE (The Gospel), THERE IS NO ASSURANCE OF SALVATION FOUND IN CATHOLICISM. THE CHRISTIAN BELIEVER HAS THE BLESSED ASSURANCE THAT HE IS SAVED AND ON HIS/HER WAY TO HEAVEN. DO YOU HAVE THAT ASSURANCE, ccridger?**

Please check out the following link—"A picture of the Catholic Jesus":

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/monstran.htm>) A Picture of the Catholic Jesus

Also, check out this link- The Catholic Mary is A Devil

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mary.htm>) The Catholic Mary is a Devil

Check here to see Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa:

(<http://www.jesus-is-lord.com/mothther.htm>) Blasphemy at the lips of Mother Theresa

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

ccridger wrote:

"Again, you attack the messenger. Now, be an adult, and attack the message that he/I presented to you. You disagree with what I believe. I totally disagree with everything you believe. I have provided proof, with just 3 links, yet here you are, calling me names again." walter

What do you disagree with that I have posted. I can't help you like a mature adult walter until you provide me with a clue of the theology I have posted that you disagree with.

"You disagree with what I believe. I totally disagree with everything you believe." walter

Wow.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:42**

No, you just can't back up your accusations.

Perhaps many here but you know that I came from the catholic church and got out after being born again. I've posted many times my experiences with its heresies as a child as well as my disputes with my own priest. I've posted that I try to minister to my family about the heresies of the church. I've posted many times about the deception of the church. Where have you been??

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/19 13:43**

Brothers, in God's name can we please keep things toned down? The hateful attitudes being displayed lend no credibility to what you say as being true, even if it is. Proverbs talks about how a gentle answer turns away wrath, and how the prudent man ponders how to answer.

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:48

To ccrider:

My response to you is the same as it has always been. Roman Catholicism has destroyed the true Gospel. That is what you are disagreeing about.

So, you have left Roman Catholicism. Can you not see now that what the Christian believes, that is found in the Bible, is in total opposition to the beliefs and practices of Roman Catholicism?

Since you have accepted Jesus Christ as your Lord and Savior, do you have the assurance in Christ Jesus that you are saved and on your way to heaven?

If you have that assurance, then you are NOT like EVERY Catholic that I have ever witnessed to or talked with. Not one of them knew they were saved. They are never sure, just like the Latter Day Saints and the Jehovah's Witnesses, which are also cults.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----

ccrider wrote:

No, you just can't back up your accusations.

Perhaps many here but you know that I came from the catholic church and got out after being born again. I've posted many times my experiences with it's heresies as a child as well as my disputes with my own priest. I've posted that I try to minister to my family about the heresies of the church. I've posted many times about the deception of the church. Where have you been??

-----

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 13:56

"My response to you is the same as it has always been. Roman Catholicism has destroyed the true Gospel. That is what you are disagreeing about."waltern

Wrong. You have no clue as to what I was disagreeing about. No clue. You can't even show me the statements thereof. Ever since I was born again I have had issue with the deception of the catholic church. Again walter... where have you been?

"So, you have left Roman Catholicism. Can you not see now that what the Christian believes, that is found in the Bible, is in total opposition to the beliefs and practices of Catholicism?" waltern

Umm yes and anyone who knows me here can testify that I have never propagated anything that concerns the Roman Catholic Church. NEVER!!!! NEVER once verbally and never once on this forum. I didn't even propagate catholicism when I was a catholic... I was totally indifferent. See here you are again accusing of something you can't prove... because it's all in your head. I have never said otherwise concerning the Catholic Church.

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 14:03

Very good, my posts were all actually directed at Orthodox. If they were addressed to others, then I do apologize.

Sorry for any confusion. I would hope and pray that Orthodox can address them all, the main one being that Roman Catholicism has destroyed the Gospel found in God's Word, to conform to their own image of what they think it should be.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
ccrider wrote:

"My response to you is the same as it has always been. Roman Catholicism has destroyed the true Gospel. That is what you are disagreeing about."  
waltern

Wrong. You have no clue as to what I was disagreeing about. No clue. You can't even show me the statements thereof. Ever since I was born again I have had issue with the deception of the catholic church. Again walter... where have you been?

"So, you have left Roman Catholicism. Can you not see now that what the Christian believes, that is found in the Bible, is in total opposition to the beliefs and practices of Catholicism?" waltern

Umm yes and anyone who knows me here can testify that I have never propagated anything that concerns the Roman Catholic Church. NEVER!!!! NEVER once verbally and never once on this forum. I didn't even propagate catholicism when I was a catholic... I was totally indifferent. See here you are again accusing of something you can't prove... because it's all in your head. I have never said otherwise concerning the Catholic Church.

-----  
**Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/10/19 14:08**

Dear Walter,

Please take a minute to calm down and listen to what I have to share about your argument with ccrider. Walter, he never disagreed with your view of the Roman catholic Church that is why he has not posted any scripture to refute you - because he agrees with your post. He has been trying to tell you this, but you have not been listening - and this I believe is the root of his problem with you.

It is not what you post, but the way that you post that he has been commenting on, and which in all honesty, I also see it in this thread. Walter, it is not enough that we post correct doctrine, it is just as important that we do so in a Spirit of love and mutual respect. When others see clearly that you post without thoroughly reading their responses to your previous posts, they are disappointed and whatever value there was in your posts are diminished by it.

You have been fighting over nothing. I pray that you will take this comment to heart and receive it in the Spirit of love with which it was given. I, for one, have seen much to like and respect in the contents of your posts. But most of the time, the manner with which you post has made things more difficult to accept.

In Christ,  
Leo

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 14:15**

Leo.... a huge sigh from me here brother. I was hoping someone would come to my defense and see that I was being wrongly accused. Thank you sir.

King Jimmy. I thank you for your post too, you were right... but I had to run this all the way through so no one would get the wrong idea about my witness of Christ. I could have handled it better but I was clearly put on the defensive.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 14:24**

"Sorry for any confusion." waltern

If you won't listen to me... please try and take Leo's wisdom to heart. I have no animosity towards you.... I just can't do that, you're my brother.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 17:29**

Quote:

-----As a former catholic I can attest that we were taught the 'assumption' of Mary. <http://www.wf-f.org/Assumption.html>

Assumption is not the same as ascension. The assumption says that Mary was "assumed" body and soul into heaven. This would have happened after she fell asleep/died.

Ascension is the word used for the risen Christ. He went alive into heaven. It simply refers to his departure from earth.

Quote:

-----And what is your definition of 'divine'? I spent half my childhood praying to her as taught by them... Why do this if there is not divinity? Do we pray to someone who is not divine, someone who cannot supernaturally intervene for our cause AFTER their physical death? Can we just pray to anyone who is dead, or just the one's the church tells us to? Where in scripture does it state that prayer to Mary is a mandate of God, or even an elective possibility?

"Pray" means ask or to make request. (i.e. "I pray thee" in Old English) There are no overtones of worship as the added element when one is talking to God. In a sense I am "praying" to you right now when I ask you questions.

Do you believe in the Communion of the Saints? Do you believe that we are separated from our brothers and sisters in Christ after they die?

You live in time. Mary lives in eternity. How can you presume to know who or how many people she can commune with when time is not something binding her?

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 17:35**

Quote:

-----One thing that is consistent throughout the many, many posts of Orthodox, is that he never, ever responds to the Scripture that is presented to him, nor does he respond to world history, that refutes the Catholic "history" that he posts. Both the Bible Scripture, as well as world history refute EVERYTHING he continues to post.

Is this your way of not dealing with the utter reasonableness of what I post?

This is patently false that I do not respond to the Scriptures.

Did you ever consider that I might have a business to run and that I only have minimal time to post?

You guys are ruthless!

But I'll look forward to taking on your illogical interpretations of Scripture. No problem.

You guys call me ungodly and such.

I must admit I don't have much toleration for pantywaist men who are so affected by feminism that they start crying when they run into a real man.

Grow up. And to you men...man up!

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 17:44

Quote:  
-----According to Ephesians 4:11-15, the Church is always in the business of growing and reforming, and will do so until it obtains maturity and the perfection that Christ ultimately intends for it to arrive at.  
-----

I'm glad you mentioned this verse. I am interested in seeing you apply a uniform hermeneutic to this passage and to 1 Tim. 3:16:

"All scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

This passage doesn't teach formal sufficiency, which excludes a binding, authoritative role for Tradition and Church. Protestants extrapolate onto the text what isn't there. If we look at the overall context of this passage, we can see that Paul makes reference to oral Tradition three times (cf. 2 Tim. 1:13-14; 2:2; 3:14). And to use an analogy, let's examine a similar passage:

"And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; so that we may no longer be children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the cunning of men, by their craftiness in deceitful wiles. Rather, speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into him who is the head, into Christ" (Eph. 4:11-15).

If 2 Timothy 3 proves the sole sufficiency of Scripture, then, by analogy, Ephesians 4 would likewise prove the sufficiency of pastors and teachers for the attainment of Christian perfection. In Ephesians 4, the Christian believer is equipped, built up, brought into unity and mature manhood, and even preserved from doctrinal confusion by means of the teaching function of the Church. This is a far stronger statement of the perfecting of the saints than 2 Timothy 3, yet it does not even mention Scripture.

So if all non-scriptural elements are excluded in 2 Timothy, then, by analogy, Scripture would logically have to be excluded in Ephesians. It is far more reasonable to recognize that the absence of one or more elements in one passage does not mean that they are nonexistent. The Church and Scripture are both equally necessary and important for teaching.

Do you apply this same hermeneutic to your beliefs about Scripture?

Re: , on: 2009/10/19 17:49

Waltern,

With the little time available to me...a death blow to Waltern's conspiracy website article: "A Picture of the Catholic Jesus"

Quote:  
-----Catholics call it Jesus or the "holy" Eucharist. They eat their Jesus.  
-----

I'm going to see if these crazy claims about me not addressing Scripture will cease here:

I. Old Testament

(a). Foreshadowing of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

Gen. 14:18 - this is the first time that the word "priest" is used in Old Testament. Melchizedek is both a priest and a king and he offers a bread and wine sacrifice to God.

Psalm 76:2 - Melchizedek is the king of Salem. Salem is the future Jeru-salem where Jesus, the eternal priest and king, established his new Kingdom and the Eucharistic sacrifice which He offered under the appearance of bread and wine.

Psalm 110:4 - this is the prophecy that Jesus will be the eternal priest and king in the same manner as this mysterious priest Melchizedek. This prophecy requires us to look for an eternal bread and wine sacrifice in the future. This prophecy is fulfilled only by the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Catholic Church.

Malachi 1:11 - this is a prophecy of a pure offering that will be offered in every place from the rising of the sun to its setting. Thus, there will be only one sacrifice, but it will be offered in many places around the world. This prophecy is fulfilled only by the Catholic Church in the Masses around the world, where the sacrifice of Christ which transcends time and space is offered for our salvation. If this prophecy is not fulfilled by the Catholic Church, then Malachi is a false prophet.

Exodus 12:14,17,24; cf. 24:8 - we see that the feast of the paschal lamb is a perpetual ordinance. It lasts forever. But it had not yet been fulfilled.

Exodus 29:38-39 - God commands the Israelites to "offer" (poieseis) the lambs upon the altar. The word "offer" is the same verb Jesus would use to institute the Eucharistic offering of Himself.

Lev. 19:22 - the priests of the old covenant would make atonement for sins with the guilt offering of an animal which had to be consumed. Jesus, the High Priest of the New Covenant, has atoned for our sins by His one sacrifice, and He also must be consumed.

Jer. 33:18 - God promises that His earthly kingdom will consist of a sacrificial priesthood forever. This promise has been fulfilled by the priests of the Catholic Church, who sacramentally offer the sacrifice of Christ from the rising of the sun to its setting in every Mass around the world.

Zech. 9:15-16 - this is a prophecy that the sons of Zion, which is the site of the establishment of the Eucharistic sacrifice, shall drink blood like wine and be saved. This prophecy is fulfilled only by the priests of the Catholic Church.

2 Chron. 26:18 - only validly consecrated priests will be able to offer the sacrifice to God. The Catholic priests of the New Covenant trace their sacrificial priesthood to Christ.

Top

(b). Foreshadowing of the Requirement to Consume the Sacrifice

Gen. 22:9-13 - God saved Abraham's first-born son on Mount Moriah with a substitute sacrifice which had to be consumed. This foreshadowed the real sacrifice of Israel's true first-born son (Jesus) who must be consumed.

Exodus 12:5 - the paschal lamb that was sacrificed and eaten had to be without blemish. Luke 23:4,14; John 18:38 - Jesus is the true paschal Lamb without blemish.

Exodus 12:7,22-23 - the blood of the lamb had to be sprinkled on the two door posts. This paschal sacrifice foreshadows the true Lamb of sacrifice and the two posts of His cross on which His blood was sprinkled.

Exodus 12:8,11 - the paschal lamb had to be eaten by the faithful in order for God to "pass over" the house and spare their first-born sons. Jesus, the true paschal Lamb, must also be eaten by the faithful in order for God to forgive their sins.

Exodus 12:43-45; Ezek. 44:9 - no one outside the "family of God" shall eat the lamb. Non-Catholics should not partake of the Eucharist until they are in full communion with the Church.

Exodus 12:49 - no uncircumcised person shall eat of the lamb. Baptism is the new circumcision for Catholics, and thus one must be baptized in order to partake of the Lamb.

Exodus 12:47; Num. 9:12 - the paschal lamb's bones could not be broken. John 19:33 - none of Jesus' bones were broken.



Exodus 16:4-36; Neh 9:15 - God gave His people bread from heaven to sustain them on their journey to the promised land. This foreshadows the true bread from heaven which God gives to us at Mass to sustain us on our journey to heaven.

Exodus 24:9-11 - the Mosaic covenant was consummated with a meal in the presence of God. The New and eternal Covenant is consummated with the Eucharistic meal - the body and blood of Jesus Christ under the appearance of bread and wine.

Exodus 29:33 - God commands that they shall eat those things with which atonement was made. Jesus is the true Lamb of atonement and must now be eaten.

Lev. 7:15 - the Aaronic sacrifices absolutely had to be eaten in order to restore communion with God. These sacrifices all foreshadow the one eternal sacrifice which must also be eaten to restore communion with God. This is the Eucharist (from the Greek word "eukaristia" which means "thanksgiving").

Lev. 17:11,14 - in the Old Testament, we see that the life of the flesh is the blood which could never be drunk. In the New Testament, Jesus Christ's blood is the source of new life, and now must be drunk.

Gen. 9:4-5; Deut. 12:16,23-24 - in these verses we see other prohibitions on drinking blood, yet Jesus commands us to drink His blood because it is the true source of life.

2 Kings 4:43 - this passage foreshadows the multiplication of the loaves and the true bread from heaven which is Jesus Christ.

2 Chron. 30:15-17; 35:1,6,11,13; Ezra 6:20-21; Ezek. 40:49-50 - the lamb was killed, roasted and eaten to atone for sin and restore communion with God. This foreshadows the true Lamb of God who was sacrificed for our sin and who must now be consumed for our salvation.

Neh. 9:15 - God gave the Israelites bread from heaven for their hunger, which foreshadows the true heavenly bread who is Jesus.

Psalm 78:24-25; 105:40 - the raining of manna and the bread from angels foreshadows the true bread from heaven, Jesus Christ.

Isaiah 53:7 - this verse foreshadows the true Lamb of God who was slain for our sins and who must be consumed.

Wis. 16:20 - this foreshadows the true bread from heaven which will be suited to every taste. All will be welcome to partake of this heavenly bread, which is Jesus Christ.

Sir. 24:21 - God says those who eat Him will hunger for more, and those who drink Him will thirst for more.

Ezek. 2:8-10; 3:1-3 - God orders Ezekiel to open his mouth and eat the scroll which is the Word of God. This foreshadows the true Word of God, Jesus Christ, who must be consumed.

Zech. 12:10 - this foreshadows the true first-born Son who was pierced for the sins of the inhabitants of the new Jerusalem.

Zech. 13:1 - on the day of piercing, a fountain (of blood and water) will cleanse the sins of those in the new House of David.

Top

## II. New Testament

### (a). Jesus Promises His Real Presence in the Eucharist

John 6:4,11-14 - on the eve of the Passover, Jesus performs the miracle of multiplying the loaves. This was prophesied in

in the Old Testament (e.g., 2 Kings 4:43), and foreshadows the infinite heavenly bread which is Him.

Matt. 14:19, 15:36; Mark 6:41, 8:6; Luke 9:16 - these passages are additional accounts of the multiplication miracles. This points to the Eucharist.

Matt. 16:12 - in this verse, Jesus explains His metaphorical use of the term "bread." In John 6, He eliminates any metaphorical possibilities.

John 6:4 - Jesus is in Capernaum on the eve of Passover, and the lambs are gathered to be slaughtered and eaten. Look what He says.

John 6:35, 41, 48, 51 - Jesus says four times "I AM the bread from heaven." It is He, Himself, the eternal bread from heaven.

John 6:27, 31, 49 - there is a parallel between the manna in the desert which was physically consumed, and this "new" bread which must be consumed.

John 6:51-52 - then Jesus says that the bread He is referring to is His flesh. The Jews take Him literally and immediately question such a teaching. How can this man give us His flesh to eat?

John 6:53 - 58 - Jesus does not correct their literal interpretation. Instead, Jesus eliminates any metaphorical interpretations by swearing an oath and being even more literal about eating His flesh. In fact, Jesus says four times we must eat His flesh and drink His blood. Catholics thus believe that Jesus makes present His body and blood in the sacrifice of the Mass. Protestants, if they are not going to become Catholic, can only argue that Jesus was somehow speaking symbolically.

John 6:23-53 - however, a symbolic interpretation is not plausible. Throughout these verses, the Greek text uses the word "phago" nine times. "Phago" literally means "to eat" or "physically consume." Like the Protestants of our day, the disciples take issue with Jesus' literal usage of "eat." So Jesus does what?

John 6:54, 56, 57, 58 - He uses an even more literal verb, translated as "trogo," which means to gnaw or chew or crunch. He increases the literalness and drives his message home. Jesus will literally give us His flesh and blood to eat. The word "trogo" is only used two other times in the New Testament (in Matt. 24:38 and John 13:18) and it always means to literally gnaw or chew meat. While "phago" might also have a spiritual application, "trogo" is never used metaphorically in Greek. So Protestants cannot find one verse in Scripture where "trogo" is used symbolically, and yet this must be their argument if they are going to deny the Catholic understanding of Jesus' words. Moreover, the Jews already knew Jesus was speaking literally even before Jesus used the word "trogo" when they said "How can this man give us His flesh to eat?" (John 6:52).

John 6:55 - to clarify further, Jesus says "For My Flesh is food indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed." This phrase can only be understood as being responsive to those who do not believe that Jesus' flesh is food indeed, and His blood is drink indeed. Further, Jesus uses the word which is translated as "sarx." "Sarx" means flesh (not "soma" which means body). See, for example, John 1:13, 14; 3:6; 8:15; 17:2; Matt. 16:17; 19:5; 24:22; 26:41; Mark 10:8; 13:20; 14:38; and Luke 3:6; 24:39 which provides other examples in Scripture where "sarx" means flesh. It is always literal.

John 6:55 - further, the phrases "real" food and "real" drink use the word "alethes." "Alethes" means "really" or "truly," and would only be used if there were doubts concerning the reality of Jesus' flesh and blood as being food and drink. Thus, Jesus is emphasizing the miracle of His body and blood being actual food and drink.

John 6:60 - as are many anti-Catholics today, Jesus' disciples are scandalized by these words. They even ask, "Who can listen to it (much less understand it)?" To the unilluminated mind, it seems grotesque.

John 6:61-63 - Jesus acknowledges their disgust. Jesus' use of the phrase "the spirit gives life" means the disciples need supernatural faith, not logic, to understand His words.

John 3:6 - Jesus often used the comparison of "spirit versus flesh" to teach about the necessity of possessing supernatural faith versus a natural understanding. In Mark 14:38 Jesus also uses the "spirit/flesh" comparison. The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak. We must go beyond the natural to understand the supernatural. In 1 Cor. 2:14, 3:3; Rom 8:5; and

Gal. 5:17, Paul also uses the "spirit/flesh" comparison to teach that unspiritual people are not receiving the gift of faith. They are still "in the flesh."

John 6:63 - Protestants often argue that Jesus' use of the phrase "the spirit gives life" shows that Jesus was only speaking symbolically. However, Protestants must explain why there is not one place in Scripture where "spirit" means "symbolic." As we have seen, the use of "spirit" relates to supernatural faith. What words are spirit and life? The words that we must eat Jesus' flesh and drink His blood, or we have no life in us.

John 6:66-67 - many disciples leave Jesus, rejecting this literal interpretation that we must eat His flesh and drink His blood. At this point, these disciples really thought Jesus had lost His mind. If they were wrong about the literal interpretation, why wouldn't Jesus, the Great Teacher, have corrected them? Why didn't Jesus say, "Hey, come back here, I was only speaking symbolically!"? Because they understood correctly.

Mark 4:34 - Jesus always explained to His disciples the real meanings of His teachings. He never would have let them go away with a false impression, most especially in regard to a question about eternal salvation.

John 6:37 - Jesus says He would not drive those away from Him. They understood Him correctly but would not believe.

John 3:5,11; Matt. 16:11-12 - here are some examples of Jesus correcting wrong impressions of His teaching. In the Eucharistic discourse, Jesus does not correct the scandalized disciples.

John 6:64,70 - Jesus ties the disbelief in the Real Presence of His Body and Blood in the Eucharist to Judas' betrayal. Those who don't believe in this miracle betray Him.

Psalms 27:2; Isa. 9:20; 49:26; Mic. 3:3; 2 Sam. 23:17; Rev. 16:6; 17:6, 16 - to further dispense with the Protestant claim that Jesus was only speaking symbolically, these verses demonstrate that symbolically eating body and blood is always used in a negative context of a physical assault. It always means "destroying an enemy," not becoming intimately close with him. Thus, if Jesus were speaking symbolically in John 6:51-58, He would be saying to us, "He who reviles or assaults me has eternal life." This, of course, is absurd.

John 10:7 - Protestants point out that Jesus did speak metaphorically about Himself in other places in Scripture. For example, here Jesus says, "I am the door." But in this case, no one asked Jesus if He was literally made of wood. They understood him metaphorically.

John 15:1,5 - here is another example, where Jesus says, "I am the vine." Again, no one asked Jesus if He was literally a vine. In John 6, Jesus' disciples did ask about His literal speech (that this bread was His flesh which must be eaten). He confirmed that His flesh and blood were food and drink indeed. Many disciples understood Him and left Him.

Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25; Luke 22:18 - Jesus says He will not drink of the "fruit of the vine" until He drinks it new in the kingdom. Some Protestants try to use this verse (because Jesus said "fruit of the vine") to prove the wine cannot be His blood. But the Greek word for fruit is "genneema" which literally means "that which is generated from the vine." In John 15:1,5 Jesus says "I am the vine." So "fruit of the vine" can also mean Jesus' blood. In 1 Cor. 11:26-27, Paul also used "bread" and "the body of the Lord" interchangeably in the same sentence. Also, see Matt. 3:7; 12:34; 23:33 for examples where "genneema" means "birth" or "generation."

Rom. 14:14-18; 1 Cor. 8:1-13; 1 Tim. 4:3 - Protestants often argue that drinking blood and eating certain sacrificed meats were prohibited in the New Testament, so Jesus would have never commanded us to consume His body and blood. But these verses prove them wrong, showing that Paul taught all foods, even meat offered to idols, strangled, or with blood, could be consumed by the Christian if it didn't bother the brother's conscience and were consumed with thanksgiving to God.

Matt. 18:2-5 - Jesus says we must become like children, or we will not enter the kingdom of God. We must believe Jesus' words with child-like faith. Because Jesus says this bread is His flesh, we believe by faith, even though it surpasses our understanding.

Luke 1:37 - with God, nothing is impossible. If we can believe in the incredible reality of the Incarnation, we can certainly believe in the Real Presence of Jesus in the Eucharist. God coming to us in elements He created is an extension of the awesome mystery of the Incarnation.

Top

(b). Jesus Institutes the Eucharist / More Proofs of the Real Presence

Matt. 26:26-28; Mark. 14:22,24; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor. 11:24-25 - Jesus says, this IS my body and blood. Jesus does not say, this is a symbol of my body and blood.

Matt. 26:26; Mark. 14:22; Luke 22:19-20 - the Greek phrase is "Tauto estin to soma mou." This phraseology means "this is actually" or "this is really" my body and blood.

1 Cor. 11:24 - the same translation is used by Paul - "tauto mou estin to soma." The statement is "this is really" my body and blood. Nowhere in Scripture does God ever declare something without making it so.

Matt. 26:26; Mark. 14:22; Luke 22:19 - to deny the 2,000 year-old Catholic understanding of the Eucharist, Protestants must argue that Jesus was really saying "this represents (not is) my body and blood." However, Aramaic, the language that Jesus spoke, had over 30 words for "represent," but Jesus did not use any of them. He used the Aramaic word for "est" which means "is."

Matt. 26:28; Mark. 14:24; Luke 22:20 - Jesus' use of "poured out" in reference to His blood also emphasizes the reality of its presence.

Exodus 24:8 - Jesus emphasizes the reality of His actual blood being present by using Moses' statement "blood of the covenant."

1 Cor. 10:16 - Paul asks the question, "the cup of blessing and the bread of which we partake, is it not an actual participation in Christ's body and blood?" Is Paul really asking because He, the divinely inspired writer, does not understand? No, of course not. Paul's questions are obviously rhetorical. This IS the actual body and blood. Further, the Greek word "koinonia" describes an actual, not symbolic participation in the body and blood.

1 Cor. 10:18 - in this verse, Paul is saying we are what we eat. We are not partners with a symbol. We are partners of the one actual body.

1 Cor. 11:23 - Paul does not explain what he has actually received directly from Christ, except in the case when he teaches about the Eucharist. Here, Paul emphasizes the importance of the Eucharist by telling us he received directly from Jesus instructions on the Eucharist which is the source and summit of the Christian faith.

1 Cor. 11:27-29 - in these verses, Paul says that eating or drinking in an unworthy manner is the equivalent of profaning (literally, murdering) the body and blood of the Lord. If this is just a symbol, we cannot be guilty of actually profaning (murdering) it. We cannot murder a symbol. Either Paul, the divinely inspired apostle of God, is imposing an unjust penalty, or the Eucharist is the actual body and blood of Christ.

1 Cor. 11:30 - this verse alludes to the consequences of receiving the Eucharist unworthily. Receiving the actual body and blood of Jesus in mortal sin results in actual physical consequences to our bodies.

1 Cor. 11:27-30 - thus, if we partake of the Eucharist unworthily, we are guilty of literally murdering the body of Christ, and risking physical consequences to our bodies. This is overwhelming evidence for the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. These are unjust penalties if the Eucharist is just a symbol.

Acts 2:42 - from the Church's inception, apostolic tradition included celebrating the Eucharist (the "breaking of the bread") to fulfill Jesus' command "do this in remembrance of me."

Acts 20:28 - Paul charges the Church elders to "feed" the Church of the Lord, that is, with the flesh and blood of Christ.

Matt. 6:11; Luke 11:3 - in the Our Father, we ask God to give us this day our daily bread, that is the bread of life, Jesus Christ.

Matt. 12:39 - Jesus says no "sign" will be given except the "sign of the prophet Jonah." While Protestants focus

only on the "sign" of the Eucharist, this verse demonstrates that a sign can be followed by the reality (here, Jesus' resurrection, which is intimately connected to the Eucharist).

Matt. 19:6 - Jesus says a husband and wife become one flesh which is consummated in the life giving union of the marital act. This union of marital love which reflects Christ's union with the Church is physical, not just spiritual. Thus, when Paul says we are a part of Christ's body (Eph. 1:22-23; 5:23,30-31; Col. 1:18,24), he means that our union with Christ is physical, not just spiritual. But our union with Christ can only be physical if He is actually giving us something physical, that is Himself, which is His body and blood to consume (otherwise it is a mere spiritual union).

Luke 14:15 - blessed is he who eats this bread in the kingdom of God, on earth and in heaven.

Luke 22:19, 1 Cor. 11:24-25 - Jesus commands the apostles to "do this," that is, offer the Eucharistic sacrifice, in remembrance of Him.

Luke 24:26-35 - in the Emmaus road story, Jesus gives a homily on the Scriptures and then follows it with the celebration of the Eucharist. This is the Holy Mass, and the Church has followed this order of the Liturgy of the Word and the Liturgy of the Eucharist for 2,000 years.

Luke 24:30-31,35 - Jesus is known only in the breaking of bread. Luke is emphasizing that we only receive the fullness of Jesus by celebrating the Eucharistic feast of His body and blood, which is only offered in its fullness by the Catholic Church.

John 1:14 - literally, this verse teaches that the Word was made flesh and "pitched His tabernacle" among us. The Eucharist, which is the Incarnate Word of God under the appearance of bread, is stored in the tabernacles of Catholic churches around the world.

John 21:15,17 - Jesus charges Peter to "feed" His sheep, that is, with the Word of God through preaching and the Eucharist.

Acts 9:4-5; 22:8; 26:14-15 - Jesus asks Saul, "Why are you persecuting me?" when Saul was persecuting the Church. Jesus and the Church are one body (Bridegroom and Bride), and we are one with Jesus through His flesh and blood (the Eucharist).

1 Cor. 12:13 - we "drink" of one Spirit in the Eucharist by consuming the blood of Christ eternally offered to the Father.

Heb. 10:25,29 - these verses allude to the reality that failing to meet together to celebrate the Eucharist is mortal sin. It is profaning the body and blood of the Lord.

Heb. 12:22-23 - the Eucharistic liturgy brings about full union with angels in festal gathering, the just spirits, and God Himself, which takes place in the assembly or "ecclesia" (the Church).

Heb. 12:24 - we couldn't come to Jesus' sprinkled blood if it were no longer offered by Jesus to the Father and made present for us.

2 Pet. 1:4 - we partake of His divine nature, most notably through the Eucharist - a sacred family bond where we become one.

Rev. 2:7; 22:14 - we are invited to eat of the tree of life, which is the resurrected flesh of Jesus which, before, hung on the tree.

Top

(c). Jesus' Passion is Connected to the Passover Sacrifice where the Lamb Must Be Eaten

Matt. 26:2; Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7 - Jesus' passion is clearly identified with the Passover sacrifice (where lambs were slain and eaten).

John 1:29,36; Acts 8:32; 1 Peter 1:19 - Jesus is described as the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Th

the Lamb must be sacrificed and eaten.

Luke 23:4,14; John 18:38; 19:4,6 - under the Old Covenant, the lambs were examined on Nisan 14 to ensure that they had no blemish. The Gospel writers also emphasize that Jesus the Lamb was examined on Nisan 14 and no fault was found in him. He is the true Passover Lamb which must be eaten.

Heb. 9:14 - Jesus offering Himself "without blemish" refers to the unblemished lamb in Exodus 12:5 which had to be consumed.

Matt. 26:29; Mark 14:25 - Jesus is celebrating the Passover seder meal with the apostles which requires them to drink four cups of wine. But Jesus only presents the first three cups. He stops at the Third Cup (called "Cup of Blessing" - that is why Paul in 1 Cor. 10:16 uses the phrase "Cup of Blessing" to refer to the Eucharist - he ties the seder meal to the Eucharistic sacrifice). But Jesus conspicuously tells his apostles that He is omitting the Fourth Cup called the "Cup of Consummation." The Gospel writers point this critical omission of the seder meal out to us to demonstrate that the Eucharistic sacrifice and the sacrifice on the cross are one and the same sacrifice, and the sacrifice would not be completed until Jesus drank the Fourth Cup on the cross.

Matt. 26:30; Mark 14:26 - they sang the great Hallel, which traditionally followed the Third Cup of the seder meal, but did not drink the Fourth Cup of Consummation. The Passover sacrifice had begun, but was not yet finished. It continued in the Garden of Gethsemane and was consummated on the cross.

Matt. 26:39; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42; John 18:11 - our Lord acknowledges He has one more cup to drink. This is the Cup of Consummation which he will drink on the cross.

Psalm 116:13 - this passage references this cup of salvation. Jesus will offer this Cup as both Priest and Victim. This is the final cup of the New Testament Passover.

Luke 22:44 - after the Eucharist, Jesus sweats blood in the garden of Gethsemane. This shows that His sacrifice began in the Upper Room and connects the Passion to the seder meal where the lamb must not only be sacrificed, but consumed.

Matt. 27:34; Mark 15:23 - Jesus, in his Passion, refuses to even drink an opiate. The writers point this out to emphasize that the final cup will be drunk on the cross, after the Paschal Lamb's sacrifice is completed.

John 19:23 - this verse describes the "chiton" garment Jesus wore when He offered Himself on the cross. These were worn by the Old Testament priests to offer sacrifices. See Exodus 28:4; Lev. 16:4.

John 19:29; cf. Matt. 27:48; Mark 15:36; - Jesus is provided wine (the Fourth Cup) on a hyssop branch which was used to sprinkle the lambs' blood in Exodus 12:22. This ties Jesus' sacrifice to the Passover lambs which had to be consumed in the seder meal which was ceremonially completed by drinking the Cup of Consummation. Then in John 19:30, Jesus says, "It is consummated." The sacrifice began in the upper room and was completed on the cross. God's love for humanity is made manifest.

Matt. 27:45; Mark 15:33; John 19:14 - the Gospel writers confirm Jesus' death at the sixth hour, just when the Passover lambs were sacrificed. Again, this ties Jesus' death to the death of the Passover lambs. Like the Old Covenant, in the New Covenant, the Passover Lamb must be eaten.

1 Cor. 5:7 - Paul tells us that the Lamb has been sacrificed. But what do we need to do? Some Protestants say we just need to accept Jesus as personal Lord and Savior.

1 Cor. 5:8 - But Paul says that we need to celebrate the Eucharistic feast. This means that we need to eat the Lamb. We need to restore communion with God.

Heb. 13:15 - "sacrifice of praise" or "toda" refers to the thanksgiving offerings of Lev. 7:12-15; 22:29-30 which had to be eaten.

1 Cor. 10:16 - Paul's use of the phrase "the cup of blessing" refers to the Third Cup of the seder meal. This demonstrates that the seder meal is tied to Christ's Eucharistic sacrifice.

John 19:34-35 - John conspicuously draws attention here. The blood (Eucharist) and water (baptism) make the fountain that cleanses sin as prophesied in Zech 13:1. Just like the birth of the first bride came from the rib of the first Adam, the birth of the second bride (the Church) came from the rib of the second Adam (Jesus). Gen. 2:22.

John 7:38 - out of His Heart shall flow rivers of living water, the Spirit. Consequently, Catholics devote themselves to Jesus' Sacred Heart.

Matt. 2:1, Luke 2:4-7 - Jesus the bread of life was born in a feeding trough in the city of Bethlehem, which means "house of bread."

Luke 2: 7,12 - Jesus was born in a "manger" (which means "to eat"). This symbolism reveals that Jesus took on flesh and was born to be food for the salvation of the world.

Top

(d). The Eucharist Makes Present Jesus' One Eternal Sacrifice; it's Not Just a Symbolic Memorial

Gen. 14:18 - remember that Melchizedek's bread and wine offering foreshadowed the sacramental re-presentation of Jesus' offering.

Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24-25 - the translation of Jesus' words of consecration is "touto poieite tan eman anamnasin." Jesus literally said "offer this as my memorial sacrifice." The word "poiein" (do) refers to offering a sacrifice (see, e.g., Exodus 29:38-39, where God uses the same word "poieseis" regarding the sacrifice of the lambs on the altar). The word "anamnesis" (remembrance) also refers to a sacrifice which is really or actually made present in time by the power of God, as it reminds God of the actual event (see, e.g., Heb. 10:3; Num. 10:10). It is not just a memorial of a past event, but a past event made present in time.

In other words, the "sacrifice" is the "memorial" or "reminder." If the Eucharist weren't a sacrifice, Luke would have used the word "mnemosunon" (which is the word used to describe a nonsacrificial memorial. See, for example, Matt. 26:13; Mark 14:9; and especially Acts 10:4). So there are two memorials, one sacrificial (which Jesus instituted), and one non-sacrificial.

Lev. 24:7 - the word "memorial" in Hebrew in the sacrificial sense is "azkarah" which means to actually make present (see Lev. 2:2,9,16;5:12;6:5; Num.5:26 where "azkarah" refers to sacrifices that are currently offered and thus present in time). Jesus' instruction to offer the bread and wine (which He changed into His body and blood) as a "memorial offering" demonstrates that the offering of His body and blood is made present in time over and over again.

Num. 10:10 - in this verse, "remembrance" refers to a sacrifice, not just a symbolic memorial. So Jesus' command to offer the memorial "in remembrance" of Him demonstrates that the memorial offering is indeed a sacrifice currently offered. It is a re-presentation of the actual sacrifice made present in time. It is as if the curtain of history is drawn and Calvary is made present to us.

Mal. 1:10-11 - Jesus' command to his apostles to offer His memorial sacrifice of bread and wine which becomes His body and blood fulfills the prophecy that God would reject the Jewish sacrifices and receive a pure sacrifice offered in every place. This pure sacrifice of Christ is sacramentally re-presented from the rising of the sun to its setting in every place, as Malachi prophesied.

Heb. 9:23 - in this verse, the author writes that the Old Testament sacrifices were only copies of the heavenly things, but now heaven has better "sacrifices" than these. Why is the heavenly sacrifice called "sacrifices," in the plural? Jesus died once. This is because, while Christ's sacrifice is transcendent in heaven, it touches down on earth and is sacramentally re-presented over and over again from the rising of the sun to its setting around the world by the priests of Christ's Church. This is because all moments to God are present in their immediacy, and when we offer the memorial sacrifice to God, we ask God to make the sacrifice that is eternally present to Him also present to us. Jesus' sacrifice also transcends time and space because it was the sacrifice of God Himself.

Heb. 9:23 - the Eucharistic sacrifice also fulfills Jer. 33:18 that His kingdom will consist of a sacrificial priesthood forever, and fulfills Zech. 9:15 that the sons of Zion shall drink blood like wine and be saved.



Heb. 13:15 - this "sacrifice of praise" refers to the actual sacrifice or "toda" offering of Christ who, like the Old Testament toda offerings, now must be consumed. See, for example, Lev. 7:12-15; 22:29-30 which also refer to the "sacrifice of praise" in connection with animals who had to be eaten after they were sacrificed.

1 Peter 2:5-6 - Peter says that we as priests offer "sacrifices" to God through Jesus, and he connects these sacrifices to Zion where the Eucharist was established. These sacrifices refer to the one eternal Eucharistic sacrifice of Christ offered in every place around the world.

Rom. 12:1 - some Protestants argue that the Eucharist is not really the sacrifice of Christ, but a symbolic offering, because the Lord's blood is not shed (Heb. 9:22). However, Paul instructs us to present ourselves as a "living sacrifice" to God. This verse demonstrates that not all sacrifices are bloody and result in death (for example, see the wave offerings of Aaron in Num. 8:11,13,15,21 which were unbloody sacrifices). The Eucharistic sacrifice is unbloody and lifegiving, the supreme and sacramental wave offering of Christ, mysteriously presented in a sacramental way, but nevertheless the one actual and eternal sacrifice of Christ. Moreover, our bodies cannot be a holy sacrifice unless they are united with Christ's sacrifice made present on the altar of the Holy Mass.

1 Cor. 10:16 - "the cup of blessing" or Third cup makes present the actual paschal sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb who was slain.

1 Cor. 10:18 - Paul indicates that what is eaten from the altar has been sacrificed, and we become partners with victim. What Catholic priests offer from the altar has indeed been sacrificed, our Lord Jesus, the paschal Lamb.

1 Cor. 10:20 - Paul further compares the sacrifices of pagans to the Eucharistic sacrifice - both are sacrifices, but one is offered to God. This proves that the memorial offering of Christ is a sacrifice.

1 Cor. 11:26 - Paul teaches that as often as you eat the bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death. This means that celebrating the Eucharist is proclaiming the Gospel.

1 Cor. 10:21 - Paul's usage of the phrase "table of the Lord" in celebrating the Eucharist is further evidence that the Eucharist is indeed a sacrifice. The Jews always understood the phrase "table of the Lord" to refer to an altar of sacrifice. See, for example, Lev. 24:6, Ezek. 41:22; 44:16 and Malachi 1:7,12, where the phrase "table of the Lord" in these verses always refers to an altar of sacrifice.

Heb. 13:10,15 - this earthly altar is used in the Mass to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice of praise to God through our eternal Priest, Jesus Christ.

Top

(e). Jesus in Glory Perpetually Offers the Father His Sacrifice on Our Behalf

Rev. 1 to 22 - Jesus is described as the "Lamb" 28 times in the book of Revelation. This is because Jesus emphasizes His sacrifice in heaven and in His Holy Catholic Church.

Rev. 1:13 - Jesus is clothed in heaven with a long robe and golden girdle like the Old Testament priests who offered animal sacrifices. See Exodus 28:4.

Rev. 2:17 - the spiritual manna, our Lord's glorious body and blood, is emphasized in the heavenly feast.

Rev. 3:20 - as Priest and Paschal Lamb, our Lord shares the Eucharistic meal with us to seal His New Covenant. Through the covenant of his body and blood, we are restored to the Father and become partakers of the divine nature.

Rev. 5:6 - this verse tells us that Jesus in His glory still looks like a lamb who was slain. Also, Jesus is "standing" as though a Lamb who was slain. Lambs that are slain lie down. This odd depiction shows Jesus stands at the Altar as our eternal priest in forever offering Himself to the Father for our salvation.

Rev. 7:14 - the blood of the Lamb is eternally offered in heaven with the washing of the robes to make them white.

Rev. 14:1, Heb. 12:22 - Zion is the city where Jesus established the Eucharist and which was miraculously preserved after the destruction of Jerusalem. See also Psalms 2:6 and 132:13. It represents the union of heaven and earth, of divinity and humanity. This is why those who enter into the Eucharistic celebration on earth enter into the presence of innumerable angels, the souls of the just made perfect, Jesus the Mediator of the Covenant and His sprinkled blood, and God the Judge of all.

Rev. 19:13 - in all His glory, Jesus' sacrifice is eternally present as He presents Himself to the Father clothed in a robe dipped in blood. Jesus' sacrifice is the focus in heaven and in the Mass. When the Father beholds His Son, He beholds His sacrifice for humanity.

Rev. 19:9 - we are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb where we become one with Him by consuming His body and blood. This is the nuptial union of divinity and humanity.

Heb. 2:17; 3:1; 4:14; 8:1; 9:11,25; 10:19,22 - Jesus is repeatedly described as "High Priest." But in order to be a priest, "it is necessary for [him] to have something to offer." Heb. 8:3. This is the offering of the eternal sacrifice of His body and blood to the Father.

Heb. 2:18 - although His suffering is past tense, His expiation of our sins is present tense because His offering is continual. Therefore, He is able (present tense) to help those who are tempted.

Heb. 5:6,10; 6:20; 7:15,17 - these verses show that Jesus restores the father-son priesthood after Melchizedek. Jesus is the new priest and King of Jerusalem and feeds the new children of Abraham with His body and blood. This means that His eternal sacrifice is offered in the same manner as the bread and wine offered by Melchizedek in Gen. 14:18. But the bread and wine that Jesus offers is different, just as the Passover Lamb of the New Covenant is different. The bread and wine become His body and blood by the overshadowing of the Holy Spirit.

Heb. 4:3 - God's works were finished from the foundation of the world. This means that God's works, including Christ's sacrifice (the single act that secured the redemption of our souls and bodies), are forever present in eternity. Jesus' suffering is over and done with (because suffering was earthly and temporal), but His sacrifice is eternal, because His priesthood is eternal (His victimized state was only temporal).

Heb. 4:14 - Jesus the Sacrifice passes through the heavens by the glory cloud of God, just like the sacrifices of Solomon were taken up into heaven by the glory cloud of God in 2 Chron. 7:1. See also Mark 16:19; Luke 24:51; and Acts 1:10.

Heb. 7:24 - Jesus holds His priesthood forever because He continues forever, so His sacrificial offering is forever. He continues to offer His body and blood to us because He is forever our High Priest.

Heb. 8:2 - Jesus is a minister in the sanctuary offering up (present tense) His eternal sacrifice to the Father which is perfected in heaven. This is the same sanctuary that we enter with confidence by the blood of Jesus as written in Heb. 10:19. See also Heb. 12:22-24.

Heb. 8:3 - as High Priest, it is necessary for Jesus to have something to offer. What is Jesus offering in heaven? As eternal Priest, He offers the eternal sacrifice of His body and blood.

Heb. 8:6; 9:15; cf. Heb. 12:22-24; 13:20-21 - the covenant Jesus mediates (present tense) is better than the Old covenant. The covenant He mediates is the covenant of His body and blood which He offers in the Eucharist. See Matt. 26:26-28; Mark. 14:22,24; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor. 11:24-25 - which is the only time Jesus uses the word "covenant" (which is the offering of His body and blood).

Heb. 9:12 - Jesus enters into heaven, the Holy Place, taking His own blood. How can this be? He wasn't bleeding after the resurrection. This is because He enters into the heavenly sanctuary to mediate the covenant of His body and blood by eternally offering it to the Father. This offering is made present to us in the same manner as Melchizedek's offering, under the appearance of bread and wine.

Heb. 9:14 - the blood of Christ offered in heaven purifies (present tense) our consciences from dead works to serve the living God. Christ's offering is ongoing.

Heb. 9:22 – blood is indeed required for the remission of sin. Jesus' blood was shed once, but it is continually offered to the Father. This is why Jesus takes His blood, which was shed once and for all, into heaven. Heb. 9:12.

Heb. 9:23 – Jesus' sacrifice, which is presented eternally to the Father in heaven, is described as "sacrifices" (in the plural) in the context of its re-presentation on earth (the author first writes about the earthly sacrifices of animals, and then the earthly offerings of Jesus Christ's eternal sacrifice).

Heb. 9:26 – Jesus' once and for all appearance into heaven to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself shows that Jesus' presence in heaven and His sacrifice are inseparable. This also shows that "once for all," which refers to Jesus' appearance in heaven, means perpetual (it does not, and cannot mean, "over and done with" because Jesus is in heaven for eternity). "Once for all" also refers to Jesus' suffering and death (Heb. 7:27; 9:12,26;10:10-14). But "once for all" never refers to Jesus' sacrifice, which is eternally presented to the Father. This sacrifice is the Mal. 1:11 pure offering made present in every place from the rising of the sun to its setting in the Eucharist offered in the same manner as the Melchizedek offering.

Heb. 10:19 - we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus on earth in the Eucharistic liturgy, which is the heavenly sanctuary where Jesus' offering is presented to God in Heb. 8:2.

Heb. 10:22 - our hearts and bodies are (not were) washed clean by the action of Jesus' perpetual priesthood in heaven.

Heb. 13:10 – the author writes that we have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat. This altar is the heavenly altar at which Jesus presides as Priest before the Father, eternally offering His body and blood on our behalf. See. Mal. 1:7,12; Lev. 24:7; Ez. 41:22; 44:16; Rev. 5:6; 6:9; 9:13; 11:1; 16:7.

Heb. 13:20-21 - Jesus died once, but His blood of the eternal covenant is eternally offered to equip us (present tense) with everything good that we may do God's will.

Heb. 13:8 - this is because Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever. While His suffering was temporal (because bodily pain is temporal), Jesus and His sacrifice are eternal (because redemption, salvation, and the mediation of the New covenant are eternal).

Heb. 13:15 – the letter concludes with an instruction to continually offer up, through Christ, a sacrifice of praise to God. The phrase "sacrifice of praise" refers to the "today" animal sacrifices that had to be consumed. See, for example, Lev. 7:12-15; 22:29-30.

1 Pet. 2:9; Rev. 20:6 - we are a royal priesthood in Jesus, and offer His sacrifice to the Father on earth as He does in heaven.

1 John 1:7 - the blood of Jesus cleanses us (present tense) from all sin. His blood cannot currently cleanse us unless it is currently offered for us.

Top

(f). The Book of Revelation and the Holy Mass

The Book of Revelation shows us glimpses of the heavenly liturgy – Jesus Christ's once and for all sacrifice eternally present in heaven. This is why the Church has always incorporated the elements that John saw in the heavenly liturgy into her earthly liturgy, for they are one and the same liturgical action of Jesus Christ our High Priest.

Rev. 1:6, 20:6 - heaven's identification of the priesthood of the faithful is the same as the Church's identification on earth.

Rev. 1:10 - John witnesses the heavenly liturgy on Sunday, the Lord's day, which is a Catholic holy day of obligation for attending Mass on earth.

Rev. 1:12, 2:5 - there are lampstands or Menorahs in heaven. These have always been used in the Holy Mass of the Church on earth.

Rev. 1:13 - Jesus is clothed as High Priest. Our priests also clothe themselves as "alter Christuses" (other Christs) in off

ering His sacrifice in the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 1:13, 4:4, 6:11, 7:9, 15:6, 19:13-14 - priests wear special vestments in heaven. Our priests also wear special vestments in celebrating the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 2:5,16,21; 3:3; 16:11 - there is a penitential rite in heaven which is also part of the liturgy of the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 2:17 - there is manna in heaven given to the faithful. This is the same as the Eucharistic manna given to the faithful at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 4:4, 5:14; 11:16, 14:3, 19:4 - there are priests ("presbyteroi") in heaven. Priests offer sacrifice. Our earthly priests participate with the heavenly priests in offering Jesus' eternal sacrifice in the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 4:8 - heaven's liturgical chant "Holy, Holy, Holy" is the same that is used in the liturgy of the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 4:8-11, 5:9-14, 7:10-12, 18:1-8 - the various antiphonal chants in the heavenly liturgy are similar to those used at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 5:1 - there is a book or scroll of God's word in heaven. This is reflected in the Liturgy of the Word at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 5:6 and throughout - heaven's description of Jesus as the "Lamb" is the same as the description of Jesus as the Lamb of God in the Eucharistic liturgy of the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 5:8, 6:9-11, 8:3-4 - heaven's emphasis on the intercession of the saints is the same as the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 5:8, 8:3-4 - there is incense in heaven which has always been part of the liturgy of the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 5:14; 7:12; 19:4 - heaven's concluding liturgical prayer "Amen" is the same as is used at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 6:9 - the martyrs who are seen under the heavenly altar is similar to the Church's tradition of keeping relics of saints under the earthly altars.

Rev. 7:3, 14:1, 22:4 - there is the sign of the cross ("tau") in heaven. This sign is used during the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 7:9; 14:6 - the catholicity or universality of heaven as God's family is the essence of the Catholic faith on earth.

Rev. 8:1 - the silent contemplation in heaven is similar to our silent contemplation at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 8:3, 11:1, 14:18, 16:7 - there is an altar in heaven. But no altar is needed unless a sacrifice is being offered in heaven. This is the same sacrifice that is offered on the altars used in the Holy Masses on earth.

Rev. 11:12 - the phrase "come up here" is similar to the priest's charge to "lift up your hearts" at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 12:1-6, 13-17 - heaven's emphasis on the Blessed Virgin Mary is the same as the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 12:7 - heaven's emphasis on the Archangel Michael's intercession is the same as the concluding prayers at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 14:4 - there are consecrated celibates in heaven, as there are with our Catholic priests and religious on earth.

Rev. 15:7, 16:1-4,8,10,12,17; 21:9 - there are chalices (or bowls) in the heavenly liturgy. This is like the chalices used to offer Christ's sacrifice in the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 15:3-4 - there is the recitation of the "Gloria" in heaven. This is also recited at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 15:5 - there is a tent or tabernacle in heaven. Tabernacles are used to store the Eucharist at the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 17, 19:9 - the consummation of the Lamb at heaven's marriage supper is the same as the Lamb's supper in the Holy Mass on earth.

Rev. 19:1,3,4,6 - there is the recitation of the "Alleluia" in heaven. This is also recited at the Holy Mass on earth.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 18:10**

The Catholic Mary:

Scripture

I. The Uniqueness of Mary as the Mother of God

Gen. 3:15 - we see from the very beginning that God gives Mary a unique role in salvation history. God says "I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and her seed." This refers to Jesus (the "eminity") and Mary (the "woman"). The phrase "her seed" (spermatozoon) is not seen elsewhere in Scripture.

Gen 3:15 / Rev. 12:1 - the Scriptures begin and end with the woman battling Satan. This points to the power of the woman with the seed and teaches us that Jesus and Mary are the new Adam and the new Eve.

John 2:4, 19:26 - Jesus calls Mary "woman" as she is called in Gen. 3:15. Just as Eve was the mother of the old creation, Mary is the mother of the new creation. This woman's seed will crush the serpent's skull.

Isaiah 7:14; Matt. 1:23 - a virgin (the Greek word used is "parthenos") will bear a Son named Emmanuel, which means "God is with us." John 1:14 - God in flesh dwelt among us. Mary is the Virgin Mother of God.

Matt. 2:11 - Luke emphasizes Jesus is with Mary His Mother, and the magi fall down before both of them, worshipping Jesus.

Luke 1:35 - the child will be called holy, the Son of God. Mary is the Mother of the Son of God, or the Mother of God (the "Theotokos").

Luke 1:28 - "Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with you." These are the words spoken by God and delivered to us by the angel Gabriel (who is a messenger of God). Thus, when Catholics recite this verse while praying the Rosary, they are uttering the words of God.

Luke 1:28 - also, the phrase "full of grace" is translated from the Greek word "kecharitomene." This is a unique title given to Mary, and suggests a perfection of grace from a past event. Mary is not just "highly favored." She has been perfected in grace by God. "Full of grace" is only used to describe one other person - Jesus Christ in John 1:14.

Luke 1:38 - Mary's fiat is "let it be done to me according to thy word." Mary is the perfect model of faith in God, and is worthy of our veneration.

Luke 1:42 - "Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the fruit of your womb, Jesus." The phrase "blessed are you among women" really means "you are most blessed of all women." A circumlocution is used because there is no superlative in the Greek language. Note also that Elizabeth praises Mary first, and then Jesus. This is hyperdulia (but not latria which is worship owed to God alone). We too can go through Mary to praise Jesus. Finally, Catholics repeat these divinely inspired words of Elizabeth in the Rosary.

Luke 1:43 - Elizabeth's use of "Mother of my Lord" (in Hebrew, Elizabeth used "Adonai" which means Lord God) is the equivalent of "Holy Mary, Mother of God" which Catholics pray in the Rosary. The formula is simple: Jesus is a divine person, and this person is God. Mary is Jesus' Mother, so Mary is the mother of God (Mary is not just the Mother of Jesus' human nature - mothers are mothers of persons, not natures).

Luke 1:44 - Mary's voice causes John the Baptist to leap for joy in Elizabeth's womb. Luke is teaching us that Mary is our powerful intercessor.

Luke 1:46 - Mary claims that her soul magnifies the Lord. This is a bold statement from a young Jewish girl from

Nazareth. Her statement is a strong testimony to her uniqueness. Mary, as our Mother and intercessor, also magnifies our prayers.

Luke 1:48 - Mary prophesies that all generations shall call her blessed, as Catholics do in the "Hail Mary" prayer. What Protestant churches have existed in all generations (none), and how many of them call Mary blessed with special prayers and devotions?

Gal. 4:4 - God sent His Son, born of a woman, to redeem us. Mary is the woman with the redeemer. By calling Mary co-redemptrix, we are simply calling Mary "the woman with the redeemer." This is because "co" is from the Latin word "cum" which means "with." Therefore, "co-redemptrix" means "woman with the redeemer." Mary had a unique but subordinate role to Jesus in salvation.

Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; Col. 1:2 - the word "saints" (in Hebrew "qaddiysh") means "holy" ones. So Mary is called Holy, the greatest Saint of all.

Luke 2:35 - Simeon prophesies that a sword would also pierce Mary's soul. Mary thus plays a very important role in our redemption. While Jesus' suffering was all that we needed for redemption, God desired Mary to participate on a subordinate level in her Son's suffering, just as he allows us to participate through our own sufferings.

Luke 2:19,51 - Mary kept in mind all these things as she pondered them in her heart. Catholics remember this by devoting themselves to Mary's Immaculate Heart and all the treasures and wisdom and knowledge contained therein.

Top

## II. Mary - the Immaculate Ark of the New Covenant

Exodus 25:11-21 - the ark of the Old Covenant was made of the purest gold for God's Word. Mary is the ark of the New Covenant and is the purest vessel for the Word of God made flesh.

2 Sam. 6:7 - the Ark is so holy and pure that when Uzzah touched it, the Lord slew him. This shows us that the Ark is undefiled. Mary the Ark of the New Covenant is even more immaculate and undefiled, spared by God from original sin so that she could bear His eternal Word in her womb.

1 Chron. 13:9-10 - this is another account of Uzzah and the Ark. For God to dwell within Mary the Ark, Mary had to be conceived without sin. For Protestants to argue otherwise would be to say that God would let the finger of Satan touch His Son made flesh. This is incomprehensible.

1 Chron. 15 and 16 - these verses show the awesome reverence the Jews had for the Ark - veneration, vestments, songs, harps, lyres, cymbals, trumpets.

Luke 1:39 / 2 Sam. 6:2 - Luke's conspicuous comparison's between Mary and the Ark described by Samuel underscores the reality of Mary as the undefiled and immaculate Ark of the New Covenant. In these verses, Mary (the Ark) arose and went / David arose and went to the Ark. There is a clear parallel between the Ark of the Old and the Ark of the New Covenant.

Luke 1:41 / 2 Sam. 6:16 - John the Baptist / King David leap for joy before Mary / Ark. So should we leap for joy before Mary the immaculate Ark of the Word made flesh.

Luke 1:43 / 2 Sam. 6:9 - How can the Mother / Ark of the Lord come to me? It is a holy privilege. Our Mother wants to come to us and lead us to Jesus.

Luke 1:56 / 2 Sam. 6:11 and 1 Chron. 13:14 - Mary / the Ark remained in the house for about three months.

Rev 11:19 - at this point in history, the Ark of the Old Covenant was not seen for six centuries (see 2 Macc. 2:7), and

now it is finally seen in heaven. The Jewish people would have been absolutely amazed at this. However, John immediately passes over this fact and describes the "woman" clothed with the sun in Rev. 12:1. John is emphasizing that Mary is the Ark of the New Covenant and who, like the Old ark, is now worthy of veneration and praise. Also remember that Rev. 11:19 and Rev. 12:1 are tied together because there was no chapter and verse at the time these texts were written.

Rev 12:1 - the "woman" that John is describing is Mary, the Ark of the New Covenant, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars. Just as the moon reflects the light of the sun, so Mary, with the moon under her feet, reflects the glory of the Sun of Justice, Jesus Christ.

Rev. 12:17 - this verse tells us that Mary's offspring are those who keep God's commandments and bear testimony to Jesus. This demonstrates, as Catholics have always believed, that Mary is the Mother of all Christians.

Rev. 12:2 - Some Protestants argue that, because the woman had birth pangs, she was a woman with sin. However, Revelation is apocalyptic literature unique to the 1st century. It contains varied symbolism and multiple meanings of the woman (Mary, the Church and Israel). The birth pangs describe both the birth of the Church and Mary's offspring being formed in Christ. Mary had no birth pangs in delivering her only Son Jesus.

Isaiah 66:7 - for example, we see Isaiah prophesying that before she (Mary) was in labor she gave birth; before her pain came upon her she was delivered of a son (Jesus). This is a Marian prophecy of the virgin birth of Jesus Christ.

Gal 4:19 - Paul also describes his pain as birth pangs in forming the disciples in Christ. Birth pangs describe formation in Christ.

Rom. 8:22 - also, Paul says the whole creation has been groaning in travail before the coming of Christ. We are all undergoing birth pangs because we are being reborn into Jesus Christ.

Jer. 13:21 - Jeremiah describes the birth pangs of Israel, like a woman in travail. Birth pangs are usually used metaphorically in the Scriptures.

Hos. 13:12-13 - Ephraim is also described as travailing in childbirth for his sins. Again, birth pangs are used metaphorically.

Micah 4:9-10 - Micah also describes Jerusalem as being seized by birth pangs like a woman in travail.

Rev. 12:13-16 - in these verses, we see that the devil still seeks to destroy the woman even after the Savior is born. This proves Mary is a danger to satan, even after the birth of Christ. This is because God has given her the power to intercede for us, and we should invoke her assistance in our spiritual lives.

[Top](#)

### III. Mary is our Mother and Queen of the New Davidic Kingdom

John 19:26 - Jesus makes Mary the Mother of us all as He dies on the Cross by saying "behold your mother." Jesus did not say "John, behold your mother" because he gave Mary to all of us, his beloved disciples. All the words that Jesus spoke on Cross had a divine purpose. Jesus was not just telling John to take care of his mother.

Rev. 12:17 - this verse proves the meaning of John 19:26. The "woman's" (Mary's) offspring are those who follow Jesus. She is our Mother and we are her offspring in Jesus Christ. The master plan of God's covenant love for us is family. But we cannot be a complete family with the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Christ without the Motherhood of Mary.

John 2:3 - this is a very significant verse in Scripture. As our mother, Mary tells all of us to do whatever Jesus tells us. Further, Mary's intercession at the marriage feast in Cana triggers Jesus' ministry and a foreshadowing of the



Eucharistic celebration of the Lamb. This celebration unites all believers into one family through the marriage of divinity and humanity.

John 2:7 - Jesus allows His mother to intercede for the people on His behalf, and responds to His mother's request by ordering the servants to fill the jars with water.

Psalms 45:9 - the psalmist teaches that the Queen stands at the right hand of God. The role of the Queen is important in God's kingdom. Mary the Queen of heaven is at the right hand of the Son of God.

1 Kings 2:17, 20 - in the Old Testament Davidic kingdom, the King does not refuse his mother. Jesus is the new Davidic King, and He does not refuse the requests of his mother Mary, the Queen.

1 Kings 2:18 - in the Old Testament Davidic kingdom, the Queen intercedes on behalf of the King's followers. She is the Queen Mother (or "Gebirah"). Mary is our eternal Gebirah.

1 Kings 2:19 - in the Old Testament Davidic kingdom the King bows down to his mother and she sits at his right hand. We, as children of the New Covenant, should imitate our King and pay the same homage to Mary our Mother. By honoring Mary, we honor our King, Jesus Christ.

1 Kings 15:13 - the Queen Mother is a powerful position in Israel's royal monarchy. Here the Queen is removed from office. But now, the Davidic kingdom is perfected by Jesus, and our Mother Mary is forever at His right hand.

2 Chron. 22:10 - here Queen Mother Athaliah destroys the royal family of Judah after she sees her son, King Ahaziah, dead. The Queen mother plays a significant role in the kingdom.

Neh. 2:6 - the Queen Mother sits beside the King. She is the primary intercessor before the King.

#### IV. Mary is Ever Virgin

Exodus 13:2,12 - Jesus is sometimes referred to as the "first-born" son of Mary. But "first-born" is a common Jewish expression meaning the first child to open the womb. It has nothing to do with the mother having future children.

Exodus 34:20 - under the Mosaic law, the "first-born" son had to be sanctified. "First-born" status does not require a "second" born.

Ezek. 44:2 - Ezekiel prophesies that no man shall pass through the gate by which the Lord entered the world. This is a prophecy of Mary's perpetual virginity. Mary remained a virgin before, during and after the birth of Jesus.

Mark 6:3 - Jesus was always referred to as "the" son of Mary, not "a" son of Mary. Also "brothers" could have theoretically been Joseph's children from a former marriage that was dissolved by death. However, it is most likely, perhaps most certainly, that Joseph was a virgin, just as were Jesus and Mary. As such, they embodied the true Holy Family, fully consecrated to God.

Luke 1:31,34 - the angel tells Mary that you "will" conceive (using the future tense). Mary responds by saying, "How shall this be?" Mary's response demonstrates that she had taken a vow of lifelong virginity by having no intention to have relations with a man. If Mary did not take such a vow of lifelong virginity, her question would make no sense at all (for we can assume she knew how a child is conceived). She was a consecrated Temple virgin as was an acceptable custom of the times.

Luke 2:41-51 - in searching for Jesus and finding Him in the temple, there is never any mention of other siblings.

John 7:3-4; Mark 3:21 - we see that younger "brothers" were advising Jesus. But this would have been extremely disrespectful for devout Jews if these were Jesus' biological brothers.

John 19:26-27 - it would have been unthinkable for Jesus to commit the care of his mother to a friend if he had brothers.

John 19:25 - the following verses prove that James and Joseph are Jesus' cousins and not his brothers: Mary the wife of

Clopas is the sister of the Virgin Mary.

Matt. 27:61, 28:1 - Matthew even refers to Mary the wife of Clopas as "the other Mary."

Matt. 27:56; Mark 15:47 - Mary the wife of Clopas is the mother of James and Joseph.

Mark 6:3 - James and Joseph are called the "brothers" of Jesus. So James and Joseph are Jesus' cousins.

Matt. 10:3 - James is also called the son of "Alpheus." This does not disprove that James is the son of Clopas. The name Alpheus may be Aramaic for Clopas, or James took a Greek name like Saul (Paul), or Mary remarried a man named Alpheus.

V. Jesus' "Brothers" (adelphoi) = Cousins or Kinsmen

Luke 1:36 - Elizabeth is Mary's kinswoman. Some Bibles translate kinswoman as "cousin," but this is an improper translation because in Hebrew and Aramaic, there is no word for "cousin."

Luke 22:32 - Jesus tells Peter to strengthen his "brethren." In this case, we clearly see Jesus using "brethren" to refer to the other apostles, not his biological brothers.

Acts 1:12-15 - the gathering of Jesus' "brothers" amounts to about 120. That is a lot of "brothers." Brother means kinsmen in Hebrew.

Acts 7:26; 11:1; 13:15,38; 15:3,23,32; 28:17,21 - these are some of many other examples where "brethren" does not mean blood relations.

Rom. 9:3 - Paul uses "brethren" and "kinsmen" interchangeably. "Brothers" of Jesus does not prove Mary had other children.

Gen. 11:26-28 - Lot is Abraham's nephew ("anepsios") / Gen. 13:8; 14:14,16 - Lot is still called Abraham's brother (adelphos) . This proves that, although a Greek word for cousin is "anepsios," Scripture also uses "adelphos" to describe a cousin.

Gen. 29:15 - Laban calls Jacob is "brother" even though Jacob is his nephew. Again, this proves that brother means kinsmen or cousin.

Deut. 23:7; 1 Chron. 15:5-18; Jer. 34:9; Neh. 5:7 - "brethren" means kinsmen. Hebrew and Aramaic have no word for "cousin."

2 Sam. 1:26; 1 Kings 9:13, 20:32 - here we see that "brethren" can even be one who is unrelated (no bloodline), such as a friend.

2 Kings 10:13-14 - King Ahaziah's 42 "brethren" were really his kinsmen.

1 Chron. 23:21-22 - Eleazar's daughters married their "brethren" who were really their cousins.

Neh. 4:14; 5:1,5,8,10,14 - these are more examples of "brothers" meaning "cousins" or "kinsmen."

Tobit 5:11 - Tobit asks Azarias to identify himself and his people, but still calls him "brother."

Amos 1: 9 - brotherhood can also mean an ally (where there is no bloodline).

[Top](#)

## VI. Mary's Assumption into Heaven

Gen. 5:24, Heb. 11:5 - Enoch was bodily assumed into heaven without dying. Would God do any less for Mary the Ark of the New Covenant?

2 Kings 2:11-12; 1 Mac 2:58 - Elijah was assumed into heaven in fiery chariot. Jesus would not do any less for His Blessed Mother.

Psalms 132:8 - Arise, O Lord, and go to thy resting place, thou and the Ark (Mary) of thy might. Both Jesus and Mary were taken up to their eternal resting place in heaven.

2 Cor. 12:2 - Paul speaks of a man in Christ who was caught up to the third heaven. Mary was also brought up into heaven by God.

Matt. 27:52-53 - when Jesus died and rose, the bodies of the saints were raised. Nothing in Scripture precludes Mary's assumption into heaven.

1 Thess. 4:17 - we shall be caught up in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air and so we shall always be with the Lord.

Rev. 12:1 - we see Mary, the "woman," clothed with the sun. While in Rev. 6:9 we only see the souls of the martyrs in heaven, in Rev. 12:1 we see Mary, both body and soul.

2 Thess. 2:15 - Paul instructs us to hold fast to oral (not just written) tradition. Apostolic tradition says Mary was assumed into heaven. While claiming the bones of the saints was a common practice during these times (and would have been especially important to obtain Mary's bones as she was the Mother of God), Mary's bones were never claimed. This is because they were not available. Mary was taken up body and soul into heaven.

## VII. Mary's Coronation in Heaven

2 Tim 4:8 - Paul says that there is laid up for him the crown of righteousness. The saints are crowned in heaven, and Mary is the greatest saint of all.

James 1:12 - those who endure will receive the crown of life which God has promised. Mary has received the crown of life by bringing eternal life to the world.

1 Peter 5:4 - when the chief Shepherd is manifested we will receive the unfading crown of glory.

Rev. 2:10 - Jesus will give the faithful unto death the crown of life. Jesus gave Mary His Mother the crown of life.

Rev. 12:1 - Mary, the "woman," is crowned with twelve stars. She is Queen of heaven and earth and the Mother of the Church.

Wis. 5:16 - we will receive a glorious crown and a beautiful diadem from the hand of the Lord. Mary is with Jesus forever crowned in His glory.

[Top](#)

VIII. Misunderstanding about Matthew 1:25 (Joseph knew her "not until")

Matt. 1:25 - this verse says Joseph knew her "not until" ("heos", in Greek) she bore a son. Some Protestants argue that this proves Joseph had relations with Mary after she bore a son. This is an erroneous reading of the text because "not until" does not mean "did not...until after." "Heos" references the past, never the future. Instead, "not until" she bore a son means "not up to the point that" she bore a son. This confirms that Mary was a virgin when she bore Jesus. Here are other texts that prove "not until" means "not up to the point that":

Matt. 28:29 - I am with you "until the end of the world." This does not mean Jesus is not with us after the end of the world.

Luke 1:80 - John was in the desert "up to the point of his manifestation to Israel." Not John "was in the desert until after" his manifestation.

Luke 2:37 - Anna was a widow "up to the point that" she was eighty-four years old. She was not a widow after eighty-four years old.

Luke 20:43 - Jesus says, "take your seat at my hand until I have made your enemies your footstool." Jesus is not going to require the apostles to sit at His left hand after their enemies are their footstool.

1 Tim. 4:13 - "up to the point that I come," attend to teaching and preaching. It does not mean do nothing "until after" I come.

Gen. 8:7 - the raven flew back and forth "up to the point that" the waters dried from the earth. The raven did not start flying after the waters dried.

Gen. 28:15 - the Lord won't leave Jacob "up to the point that" he does His promise. This does not mean the Lord will leave Jacob afterward.

Deut. 34:6 - but "up to the point of today" no one knows Moses' burial place. This does not mean that "they did not know place until today."

2 Sam. 6:23 - Saul's daughter Micah was childless "up to the point" her death. She was not with child after her death.

1 Macc. 5:54 - not one was slain "up to the point that" they returned in peace. They were not slain after they returned in peace.

IX. Misunderstanding about Romans 3:23 ("All have sinned")

Rom. 3:23 - Some Protestants use this verse "all have sinned" in an attempt to prove that Mary was also with sin. But "all have sinned" only means that all are subject to original sin. Mary was spared from original sin by God, not herself. The popular analogy is God let us fall in the mud puddle, and cleaned us up afterward through baptism. In Mary's case, God did not let her enter the mud puddle.

Rom. 3:23 - "all have sinned" also refers only to those able to commit sin. This is not everyone. For example, infants, the retarded, and the senile cannot sin.

Rom. 3:23 - finally, "all have sinned," but Jesus must be an exception to this rule. This means that Mary can be an exception as well. Note that the Greek word for all is "pantes."

1 Cor. 15:22 - in Adam all ("pantes") have died, and in Christ all ("pantes") shall live. This proves that "all" does not mean "every single one." This is because not all have died (such as Enoch and Elijah who were taken up to heaven), and not all will go to heaven (because Jesus said so).

Rom. 5:12 - Paul says that death spread to all ("pantes") men. Again, this proves that "all" does not mean "every single one" because death did not spread to all men (as we have seen with Enoch and Elijah).

Rom. 5:19 - here Paul says "many (not all) were made sinners." Paul uses "polloi," not "pantes." Is Paul contradicting what he said in Rom. 3:23? Of course not. Paul means that all are subject to original sin, but not all reject God.

Rom. 3:10-11 - Protestants also use this verse to prove that all human beings are sinful and thus Mary must be sinful. But see Psalm 14 which is the basis of the verse.

Psalm 14 - this psalm does not teach that all humans are sinful. It only teaches that, among the wicked, all are sinful. The righteous continue to seek God.

Psalm 53:1-3 - "there is none that does good" expressly refers to those who have fallen away. Those who remain faithful do good, and Jesus calls such faithful people "good."

Luke 18:19 - Jesus says, "No one is good but God alone." But then in Matt. 12:35, Jesus also says "The good man out of his good treasure..." So Jesus says no one is good but God, and then calls another person good.

Rom. 9:11 - God distinguished between Jacob and Esau in the womb, before they sinned. Mary was also distinguished from the rest of humanity in the womb by being spared by God from original sin.

Luke 1:47 - Mary calls God her Savior. Some Protestants use this to denigrate Mary. Why? Of course God is Mary's Savior! She was freed from original sin in the womb (unlike us who are freed from sin outside of the womb), but needed a Savior as much as the rest of humanity.

Luke 1:48 - Mary calls herself lowly. But any creature is lowly compared to God. For example, in Matt. 11:29, even Jesus says He is lowly in heart. Lowliness is a sign of humility, which is the greatest virtue of holiness, because it allows us to empty ourselves and receive the grace of God to change our sinful lives.

#### X. Misunderstandings about Jesus "rebuking" Mary

Matt. 12:48; Mark 3:33; Luke 8:21 - when Jesus asks, "Who are my mother, and sisters and brothers?," some Protestants argue that Jesus is rebuking Mary in order to denigrate her. To the contrary, when Jesus' comments are read in light of Luke 8:5-15 and the parable of the sower which Jesus taught right before His question, Jesus is actually implying that Mary has already received the word as the sower of good ground and is bearing fruit. Jesus is teaching that others must, like Mary, also receive the word and obey it.

Matt. 12:48; Mark 3:33; Luke 8:21 - Jesus' question about "who are my mother, and sisters and brothers" was also made in reference to Psalm 69:8-9. Jesus the Prophet was answering the psalmist's prophecy that those closest to Him would betray Him at His passion. Jesus is emphasizing the spiritual family's importance over the biological family, and the importance of being faithful to Him. While many were unfaithful to Jesus, Mary remained faithful to Him, even to the point of standing at the foot of the Cross.

Matt. 12:48; Mark 3:33; Luke 8:21 - finally, to argue that Jesus rebuked Mary is to argue that Jesus violated the Torah, here, the 4th commandment. This argument is blasphemous because it essentially says that God committed sin by dishonoring His Mother.

Luke 11:28 - when Jesus says, "Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and keep it," some Protestants also call this a rebuke of Mary. Again, to the contrary, Jesus is exalting Mary by emphasizing her obedience to God's word as being more critical than her biological role of mother. This affirms Luke 1:48.

Luke 11:28 - also, the Greek word for "rather" is "menounge." Menounge really means "Yes, but in addition," or "Further." Thus, Jesus is saying, yes my mother is blessed indeed, but further blessed are those who hear the word of God and keep it. Jesus is encouraging others to follow Mary's example in order to build up His kingdom.

Luke 11:27-28 - finally, Jesus is the one being complimented, not Mary. Therefore, Jesus is refocusing the attention from Him to others who obey the word of God. If He is refocusing the attention away from Him to others, His comment cannot be a rebuke of Mary His mother.

John 2:4 - this is another example that Protestants use to diminish Mary's significance. Jesus' question to Mary, "what have you to do with me?" does no such thing. To the contrary, Jesus' question illustrates the importance of Mary's role in the kingdom. Jesus' question is in reality an invitation to His mother to intercede on behalf of all believers and begin His ministry, and His Mother understands this. Mary thus immediately intercedes, Jesus obeys her, and performs the miracle which commenced His ministry of redemption.

Luke 8:28 - the demons tell Jesus the same thing, "what have you to do with us." The demons are not rebuking Jesus, for God would not allow it. Instead, the demons are acknowledging the power of Jesus by their question to Him.

John 2:4; 19:26 - when Jesus uses the title "woman" (gynai), it is a title of dignity and respect. It is the equivalent of Lady or Madam. Jesus honored His Mother as God requires us to do.

**Re: - posted by wind\_blows, on: 2009/10/19 18:21**

Orthodox wrote: I must admit I don't have much toleration for pantywaist men who are so affected by feminism that they start crying when they run into a real man.

Grow up. And to you men...man up!

---

This is offensive and completely uncalled for. This is not the attitude or the heart that Jesus would have us use with one another. I will be praying for you, by what you write and say its clear you are very deceived.

In Him  
Elizabeth

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/19 18:24**

Quote:  
-----  
If 2 Timothy 3 proves the sole sufficiency of Scripture, then, by analogy, Ephesians 4 would likewise prove the sufficiency of pastors and teachers for the attainment of Christian perfection. In Ephesians 4, the Christian believer is equipped, built up, brought into unity and mature manhood, and even preserved from doctrinal confusion by means of the teaching function of the Church. This is a far stronger statement of the perfecting of the saints than 2 Timothy 3, yet it does not even mention Scripture.  
-----

Great question. I believe the so-called "five-fold ministry gifts" of Ephesians 4 are individuals who God has gifted to complement what we read of in 2 Tim 3:16-17 concerning the sufficiency of the Scriptures. The Scriptures contain within their pages the content of "the faith once and for all handed down to the saints." But the ministries of Ephesians 4 exist to aid in the equipping of the saints with the knowledge of that faith, so as to make it plain to them, and to help them find its practical application in their own individual lives. They do this so that all the saints, at a corporate level, might be fully equipped as a Christian to live out their pilgrimage in this world, and to bear the witness God needs us to bear, as a fully developed and mature Christian people.

I have been so equipped. And as a result, wherever I find myself, I always seek to propagate the faith to those who don't know Christ, and to strengthen the hands of those who are weak in their faith, so as to bring them into the fullness of Christ. I make a difference for Christ and the kingdom wherever I am. I have been so equipped that should you drop me in a place where there are no Christians whatsoever, with the Lord's help, I would shortly begin to establish a Church. For I have a thorough knowledge of the faith, and have much practical experience in ministering the word of the Lord, be it from a pulpit, on a street corner, or one-on-one even in a homeless shelter.

Quote:

-----  
The Church and Scripture are both equally necessary and important for teaching.  
-----

I absolutely and totally agree.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/19 18:39**

Quote:

-----  
Grow up. And to you men...man up!  
-----

I like Paul's definition of a man better:

2 Timothy 2:24-25 The Lord's bond-servant must not be quarrelsome, but be kind to all, able to teach, patient when wronged, 25 with gentleness correcting those who are in opposition, if perhaps God may grant them repentance leading to the knowledge of the truth, 26 and they may come to their senses and escape from the snare of the devil, having been held captive by him to do his will.

Any Barbarian can act like an ass (and I don't pick this word to be vulgar, so please don't moderate this). That's not manhood, that's simply being an ass, or a child at best. It takes a man of God to control his temper and actually speak in a loving and kind way to those who are in error. This is something I've been working on growing in myself, especially since I have often been one to come out with all guns blazing in the past.

James 1:26 If anyone thinks himself to be religious, and yet does not bridle his tongue but deceives his own heart, this man's religion is worthless.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 19:00**

Is cutting and pasting allowed ? :). ....Frank

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/19 19:05**

Frank, can you please translate your scottish "pastung" phrase for me :-)

**Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/10/19 19:15**

Dear orthodox,

It is not just a matter of addressing Scripture, but of addressing it correctly in truth as revealed by the Holy Spirit. The Catholic belief that the verses you quoted should be taken to mean that Jesus' flesh is that piece of bread used in the consecration of the Catholic mass through transubstantiation is far removed from the truth.

1. From the start of the Book of John, we are made to understand clearly that Jesus IS the Word of God, who became flesh for the salvation of man.

Verses:

*Jn 1:1-4 **In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was the light of men.***

*Jn 1:10-15 **He was in the world, and though the world was made through him, the world did not recognize him. He came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him. Yet to all who received him, to those who believed in his name, he gave the right to become children of God***— children born not of natural descent, nor of human decision or a husband's will, but born of God.

***The Word became flesh and made his dwelling among us. We have seen his glory, the glory of the One and Only***



**y, who came from the Father, full of grace and truth. John testifies concerning him. He cries out, saying, "This was he of whom I said, 'He who comes after me has surpassed me because he was before me.'"**

2. Jesus, the Word made flesh, called himself the "living bread" which gives eternal life - exactly the same life attributed to "The Word" which became flesh. When Jesus says to eat his flesh, he means to feed on God's Word for spiritual life, as one would eat real bread for physical life.

Verse:

*Jn 6:51 "I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever. This bread is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."*

3. The rest of the new testament, which makes no mention of transubstantiation of wafers, consistently recognizes Jesus (The Word made flesh) as the source of eternal life.

Verses:

**1Pe 1:18-23 For you know that it was not with perishable things such as silver or gold that you were redeemed from the empty way of life handed down to you from your forefathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, a lamb without blemish or defect. He was chosen before the creation of the world, but was revealed in these last times for your sake. Through him you believe in God, who raised him from the dead and glorified him, and so your faith and hope are in God.**

*Now that you have purified yourselves by obeying the truth so that you have sincere love for your brothers, love one another deeply, from the heart. **For you have been born again, not of perishable seed, but of imperishable, through the living and enduring word of God.***

4. The Roman Catholic Church, by its violent and turbulent history, has shown itself far removed from the teachings of Jesus Christ. It's nature is more like the Roman Empire from which it truly sprung than like Christ. It is a political organization, cloaked in religion, but devoid of the Spirit.

5. Your attempt to justify Catholic adoration and worship of Mary is too much of a stretch - not worth discussing since it openly flies against the teachings of God.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/19 19:57**

Jimmy, its gaelic for pasting, kinda like achtung, you have to be able to spit to speak Scottish ;-) .....Frank

**Re: , on: 2009/10/20 0:03**

Quote:

-----

Grow up. And to you men...man up!

-----

I repeat.

orthodox,

The spirit in which you write screams anything but that of Christ. Please, consider your intentions.

This evening, I was speaking with my student who is a doctor and she mentioned how our goodness is exhibited in the good things we do for others and that in turn helps our relationship with God. Mind you she is a second language student, but she seemed to answer the question of this thread without even trying, because it is what she believes due to her being catholic.

My other male doctor student is most often seen carrying his rosary and most frequently when I visit him he has his head buried in the little book of mary (prayer booklet). I bought him a bible, but he prefers the other stuff. Not to mention that he became a catholic by writing a test (actually, he was too busy because at the time he was studying to be a doctor, so the priest let him slip through...).

The catholic church does not follow Jesus and/or the Word.

BTW, my whole family is catholic so I do not say this whimsically...they all believe themselves to be good enough for He

aven or at least doing good things to earn themselves a spot.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/20 0:12**

To Orthodox:

When studying Scripture, it is most important to let the Scripture speak for itself. If any of us have any pre-conceived ideas, and then find Scripture to justify those ideas, we are in trouble.

In the third chapter of Genesis we find one of the most important verses in Scripture. The "Seed of the woman"- the First Prophecy in the Bible of the coming redeemer Jesus Christ, The Messiah, who would take away the sin of the world is found in Genesis 3:15, at the beginning of time, in the Garden of Eden:

And I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your seed and her Seed; He shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise His heel (Genesis 3:15).

According to this verse, there will be enmity between the individual woman (Eve) and the serpent who deceived her. The word enmity indicates a blood feud. There will also be enmity between his seed and her seed. God promised that eventually the serpent would bruise the heel of the seed of the woman. However, the seed of the woman would also bruise (or crush) the head of the serpent. This will be a fatal blow. Who is the seed of the woman and who is the seed of the serpent? What do these predictions mean?

#### Seed Of The Woman

In Genesis 3, there is no explanation of the phrase the seed of the woman. We know that women do not have seed--men are the ones that have the seed. The seed is to be understood as either one individual or a group of people whose appearance would be some time in the future. It was a promise of someone or some people to come.

#### 1.Redeemed Humanity

Many commentators understand it to refer initially to redeemed humanity and then ultimately to Jesus Christ. Therefore the seed of the woman began with Abel, the second son of Adam and Eve. Cain, the first son, would not qualify because he was a murderer. The comment of Eve, upon the birth of the third son mentioned, Seth, seems to show that she understood Abel as part of the fulfillment of the promised seed.

"And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son and named him Seth, For God has appointed another seed for me instead of Abel, whom Cain killed" (Genesis 4:25).

The ultimate seed of the woman would be Jesus Himself. Therefore, we have in Genesis 3:15, the first promise of a Redeemer. It is the beginning of a long line of prophecies concerning the coming Messiah. The Promised One would be from the woman's seed an indication of the eventual virgin birth of Christ.

#### 2.Humanity In General

Some Bible students see that seed of the woman as referring to humanity in general. They believe that Cain was the beginning of the fulfillment of this prophecy that was eventually culminated in Christ.

#### 3.Not Virgin Mary

The Latin Vulgate version of the Old Testament has an unfortunate translation in Genesis 3:15. It changes the pronoun from the masculine his to the feminine. This unfortunate translation gave wrongful support for the claims concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary. The idea that Mary was the seed of the woman has no basis in fact in the Scripture.

#### Bruised Heel

The seed of the serpent would bruise the heel of the seed of the woman. On the cross Satan bruised the heel of Christ, causing His death. only during the death of crucifixion is the heel tremendously bruised (because the person dying on

the cross is pushing his foot, that is nailed closest to the cross, against the cross itself, desperately trying to breath, and get oxygen into his lungs) This Bruising suggests something that was not ultimate or final. Christ died on our behalf being made sin for us (2 Corinthians 5:21). He bore our judgment upon Calvary's cross and, in doing so, bruised His heel. Though wounded, the damage done to Jesus was not final, for He came back from the dead three days later.

#### Seed Of The Serpent

The phrase seed of the serpent also has various explanations. It does not mean the physical descendants of the Devil but rather those who are his spiritual descendants. There is no indication that Satan ever had any physical offspring.

#### Unredeemed Humanity

Some feel seed of the serpent speaks of unredeemed humanity beginning with Adam and Eve's first son Cain and continuing on to all those who oppose God. Jesus called the religious leaders of his day the children of the Devil (John 8:44).

#### Fallen Creatures

There is also the view that the seed of the serpent refers to the creatures who have fallen like Satan. These include demons and fallen angels.

#### Crushed Head

The seed of the woman will crush the serpent's head indicating Satan's ultimate defeat. This has different aspects.

##### 1.At The Cross

The first stage of the Devil's defeat was at the cross. It was there where Satan was initially defeated. Jesus said: Now is the time for judgment on this world; now the prince of this world will be driven out (John 12:31).

##### 2.Second Coming

When Christ eventually returns to the earth, He will bind Satan and place him in the pit (Revelation 20:1-4).

##### 3.Lake Of Fire

Eventually Satan will be cast into the lake of fire along with those who followed him (Revelation 20:7-10). Scripture looks forward to the day when the serpent's head will be crushed.

And the God of peace will crush Satan under your feet shortly (Romans 16:20).

#### Summary

From an examination of Genesis 3:15 we can make the following conclusions.

- 1.The seed of the woman refers to Jesus Christ.
- 2.The bruised heel of the seed of the woman refers to the crucifixion of Christ.
- 3.The bruised head of the serpent speaks to the final judgment of Satan.

xxxxxxxxxxxx

This is further teaching on "The Seed of the Woman":

God began with the promise in Genesis 3:15 that the elect lived upon, until the time of Abraham. To him (Abraham), God made further revelations of his eternal council concerning man's redemption.

Afterwards, at sundry times, and in divers manners, God spoke to the fathers by the prophets, till at length the Lord Jesus himself was manifested in the flesh, and came and tabernacled amongst us

(Hebrews 1:1-2) "1. God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, 2. Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;"

Look and see what Job had to say about His redeemer (that is our redeemer as well). Job is considered to be one of the oldest Books in the Bible.:

Job 19:25-27

" 25. For I know that my redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth:26. And though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God:

27. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."

All those, before the Cross, who believed in the "seed of the woman", in the Messiah to come, before He came to the earth are saved--all those who offered a blood sacrifice, a firstborn lamb, without blemish or spot, on the altar, as a covering for their sin, are saved.

All of those, after the Cross, who believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God who took on human flesh, and became a man, and shed His precious blood, and died on the cross at calvary as a substitutional sacrifice for all of the sins of humanity, and rose again from the grave on the third day are saved."For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him" 2 Cor 5:21

Who are some of these men who died before the cross, that are now in Heaven? We know Abel was one of them. In Hebrews, Chapter 11, we have a list of some of those before the cross that are in Heaven, waiting for their new Resurrected bodies:

Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us:

Abel; Enoch; Noah; Abraham; Isaac and Jacob; Sarah; Joseph; Moses; Rahab; Gedeon; Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets;

How do we know that the saved before the Cross are in heaven?

In Luke 16:22-31 we know that those that believed in the Messiah went to a place called Abraham's bosom, and those that did not believe went to hell.

"22. And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried; 23. And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. 24. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. 25. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented. 26. And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence. 27. Then he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house: 28. For I have five brethren; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. 29. Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. 30. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. 31. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

All of these saints, who believed in the Messiah to come, upon their death, were in a holding tank, in a place called Abraham's bosom, in a place called Paradise, waiting for Messiah to take them to heaven when He came:

Psalm 68:18-20 gives us the Prophecy of this upcoming event:

18. Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them.

19. Blessed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with benefits, even the God of our salvation. Selah. 20. He that is our God is the God of salvation; and unto God the Lord belong the issues from death.

In the New Testament, we find that Jesus Christ has fulfilled the Prophecy of Psalm 68:18-20 when we read in Ephesians 4:7-10

7. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ.

8. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. 9. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? 10. He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.):

Early in the morning, on the first day of the week, in the Garden, before Christ had ascended into heaven, before he took those in captivity (Abrahams bosom, or Paradise)"captive" He would not allow Mary to touch Him because He had not yet ascended:

John 20:17

17. Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.

However, later that same day, in the evening, He visited the disciples in the upper room and he showed them his hands and his feet:

John 20:19-20

19. Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you.

20. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.

Then, 8 days later, Christ returned again to confront Thomas:

26. And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.

27. Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.

28. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God.

So, we know for sure that He had not yet ascended on High, to take captivity captive in the early morning, but the same evening he appeared to his Disciples with no mention of not being touched. Then, 8 days later, he encouraged a doubting Thomas to place his finger into His wounds in His hands and in His side.

So today we can understand a little bit of how Christ was teaching to the the two disciples from the Old Testament about Himself, The Messiah, the Seed of the Woman, the Redeemer for all of humanity, from the beginning of time, in Luke 24:27:

13. And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Emmaus, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs.

14. And they talked together of all these things which had happened.

15. And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. 16. But their eyes were holden that they should not know him.

17. And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad? 18. And the one of them, whose name was Cleopas, answering said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days? 19. And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: 20. And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him.

21. But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done. 22. Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre; 23. And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive. 24. And certain of them which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not.

25. Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: 26. Ought not

Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?

27. And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.

28. And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went: and he made as though he would have gone further. 29. But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them. 30. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. 31. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight.

32. And they said one to another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures? 33. And they rose up the same hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, 34. Saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon.

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

orthodox wrote:  
The Catholic Mary:

Scripture

I. The Uniqueness of Mary as the Mother of God

Gen. 3:15 - we see from the very beginning that God gives Mary a unique role in salvation history. God says "I will put enmity between you and the woman, between your seed and her seed." This refers to Jesus (the "seed") and Mary (the "woman"). The phrase "her seed" (spermatozoon) is not seen elsewhere in Scripture.

Gen 3:15 / Rev. 12:1 - the Scriptures begin and end with the woman battling Satan. This points to the power of the woman with the seed and teaches us that Jesus and Mary are the new Adam and the new Eve.

John 2:4, 19:26 - Jesus calls Mary "woman" as she is called in Gen. 3:15. Just as Eve was the mother of the old creation, Mary is the mother of the new creation. This woman's seed will crush the serpent's skull.

Isaiah 7:14; Matt. 1:23 - a virgin (the Greek word used is "parthenos") will bear a Son named Emmanuel, which means "God is with us." John 1:14 - God in flesh dwelt among us. Mary is the Virgin Mother of God.

Matt. 2:11 - Luke emphasizes Jesus is with Mary His Mother, and the magi fall down before both of them, worshiping Jesus.

DELETED

-----

**Re: Do Catholics believe they are saved by works? - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/10/20 6:25**

Quote:

orthodox wrote:

Quote:

-----As a former catholic I can attest that we were taught the 'assumption' of Mary. <http://www.wf-f.org/Assumption.html>

Assumption is not the same as ascension. The assumption says that Mary was "assumed" body and soul into heaven. This would have happened after she fell asleep/died.

Ascension is the word used for the risen Christ. He went alive into heaven. It simply refers to his departure from earth.

Quote:

-----And what is your definition of 'divine'? I spent half my childhood praying to her as taught by them... Why do this if there is not divinity?

Do we pray to someone who is not divine, someone who cannot supernaturally intervene for our cause AFTER their physical death? Can we just pray to anyone who is dead, or just the one's the church tells us to? Where in scripture does it state that prayer to Mary is a mandate of God, or even an elective possibility?

-----

"Pray" means ask or to make request. (i.e. "I pray thee" in Old English) There are no overtones of worship as the added element when one is talking to God. In a sense I am "praying" to you right now when I ask you questions.

Do you believe in the Communion of the Saints? Do you believe that we are separated from our brothers and sisters in Christ after they die?

You live in time. Mary lives in eternity. How can you presume to know who or how many people she can commune with when time is not something binding her?

-----

Some people will NEVER agree with you, you just need to realize this!! LOL

My ex- father-in-law and my dad's wife were Catholic. I asked them years ago about worshiping Mary and they said it was like asking **you** to pray for **me**. So I thinking according to that; what about the many Christians DAILY telling others "pray I make it till tomorrow." Or even "please pray for me that I make till next week, I don't think I'm going to make it. Co unless protestant Christians do this! What is the difference?

Just so you know, just because most are silent on this doesn't mean we are against you. I do not condemn Catholic's because (no matter how many bible verses I would use to back my stand), I cannot dare to know a person's heart.

I don't condemn Christians either when I see them doing something I would not do. If it's really bad, I approach them and when I approach them, I approach them in love, not in a condescending way. I definitely DO NOT CONDEMN THOSE I DON'T KNOW here in a discussion forum.

Personally, I believe there are faithless Catholics **JUST LIKE** there are faithless Christians and visa versa. I think the Day of Judgment is going to be a HUGE eye-opener for all of us know-it-all's!! (huge grin)

I have not in the past (I'm not perfect at it), but at the present I try to live by the following verses:

*I tell you that on the day of judgment people **will have to account for every careless word they speak**. For by your words you will be acquitted, and by your words you will be condemned.*  
Matthew 12.36-37

All the words I have spoken supposedly IN HIS NAME will be judged whether they were really in His name or not. All the verses I used to back my stand will be judged if I used them for His glory or my own.

God bless you everyone,

**Re: cutting and pasting - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/10/20 6:30**

Quote:

-----

appolus wrote:

Is cutting and pasting allowed? :). ....Frank

-----

I believe "cutting and pasting" is indeed allowed! Many do it all the time; with very, very... very long posts I might add. Orthodox does not seem the first one to cut and paste long posts!

Sorry, orthodox, I didn't read all your verses and I don't read anyone else's either! If it's longer than my window that is open, it's way too long!! (Although, I think I'm guilty of one or two myself!! wink, wink)

God bless us everyone!!

Re: , on: 2009/10/20 7:27

Right and what is so special about assumption that the church celebrates it so? It's yet another of many 'celebrations' of Mary that constitutes worship.

Have you ever heard of 'May Crowning' orthodox???

Check it out here: <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&source=hp&q=May+Crowning&aq=f&oq=&aqi=g10>

I encourage everyone here to look at this link... study ALL of the attributes of catholic MAY CROWNING, and decide for yourself if it is considered 'worship' and even remotely biblical. Anything that promotes taking our eye off of The One who paid the price for our sin in the form of these kinds of so-called 'celebrations' constitutes sitting at the table of deception. Adorning statues and carrying them around while spectators chant, pray, take pictures of it?? When I became born again, none of this stuff mattered. It made no sense, it was an empty celebration based on empty church doctrine. It's deceptive... it's sad... it's not of God.

"You live in time. Mary lives in eternity. How can you presume to know who or how many people she can commune with when time is not something binding her?" orthodox

Because it's not in the bible. Communion of saints does not imply a dead one communing with a live one. Who else can you commune with that is not bound by time?? What other dead people can we commune with Orthodox?? Can we commune with them all or just the one's the church says you can? Where can you find communing with dead people in the bible other than Saul... who was rebuked for disturbing Samuel...and what does the bible say about divination or mediums??

"Pray" means ask or to make request. (i.e. "I pray thee" in Old English) There are no overtones of worship as the added element when one is talking to God. In a sense I am "praying" to you right now when I ask you questions" orthodox

Matthew 6:5 (New International Version)

Prayer

5"And when you pray, do not be like the hypocrites, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the street corners TO BE SEEN BY MEN. I tell you the truth, they have received their reward in full." Jesus 'THE' Son of God

Overt prayers have their reward Orthodox. And the tone seemed much less than sincere.

Who are you praying to for me?? Mary, Paul, Peter, John, St. Teresa of Avila, St. Francis of Assisi, St. Bonaventure, St. Maria Goretti, St. John of the Cross, St. Leo the Great, St. Charles?? If I were traveling would St. Christopher be the appropriate patron?? Why is that?? Do you believe that praying to a dead saint can help the one prayed for? If so, why?

Orthodox, how does 'the Church' determine these saints as being divinely able and capable to help as a PATRON. What's the process and the Scripture validation??

Jesus taught us how to pray and Mary was nowhere in there or anyone else for that matter. That's why the church felt so compelled to include Mary in the Rosary. She is not to be outdone with ten 'hail mary's' to one 'Our Father' (which is the prayer taught in the bible). It is pointless nonetheless.. the chanting of words to one who cannot answer them is a serious deception that hinders God's work. But I don't blame her, I think the person of Mary.. who gave birth to Christ would be highly disturbed at all the celebrations and by all the prayers directed at her. May God have mercy on this deception. Where is the prayer 'hail mary' taught in the scripture?? Don't piece a bunch of little quips then call it a biblical prayer... it is indeed a church concoction. Where's May Crowning in Scripture? How did it originate and for what reason?

Luke 11:24

27As Jesus was saying these things, a woman in the crowd called out, "Blessed is the mother who gave you birth and nursed you."

28He replied, "BLESSED RATHER are those who hear the word of God and obey it." (who is blessed and by what means?? We are but NOT because 'the church' but the Word of God)



**Re: Conflict and centering., on: 2009/10/20 12:14**

I believe that there is merit in this thread, in spite of some passionate jarring from the zealous...

A man is not defined, except by conflict, and his response when confronted. Remember Peter, and his conception of his most bold faith at Gethsemane.. "Lord, I am ready to go with you, both to prison and to death!" ..., and then the conflict .... "I never heard of this man.." .

Then, when confronted by Jesus again, with a prophecy fulfilled by the chicken, and but a glance....he wept bitterly. His repentance and place as the great apostle was then defined, by a greater conflict, and his response. "Feed my Lamb s, sheep and little ones."; Jesus said.... Peter did so the rest of his life.

Sometime faith arises within us, that we do not know of, and it is NOT all about doctrine. Doctrine alone can follow the twists and turns of logic, until it is so convoluted and twisted, it is but a jungle; not a well worn path. It is the spirit within us, that becomes grieved, or joyful, and the Word says that the Spirit within us rejoices with TRUTH.

The bible also says that the spirit and the Word agree, and that the scriptures CANNOT BE BROKEN! It is here that we gain our center in the reality of what and Who we believe.

The Roman Catholic church holds at least ONE BILLION souls in her covetous arms. They are not, and probably will not, be born again, to be saved, unless they are delivered, and repent. They will all be cast into a Lake of fire, by the Lord himself, unless they are. God is Holy. Herein is our battle. It is not the petty undertaking of self righteous doctrine or egos that we attack, but a spirit.

It is a spirit of anti-Christ, whose desire is to MASTER you, and cloud your faith with the administration of wicked works, and unclean ceremonies, as God's WAY, administered by unclean Priests. They have instituted their own authority, and seek to impose it on every living soul under the sun, as does Islam.

I do not strive to convince one so filled with lies and distortion, spewing them over and over again, but seek to expose the core of it, which I believe is happening, as those saved ones see...the light and darkness side by side. It is a good thing, and is surely working to the good of the believer.

Also; when all else fails; spam the boards.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/21 15:59**

Quote:  
-----Great question. I believe the so-called "five-fold ministry gifts" of Ephesians 4 are individuals who God has gifted to complement what we read of in 2 Tim 3:16-17 concerning the sufficiency of the Scriptures. The Scriptures contain within their pages the content of "the faith once and for all handed down to the saints." But the ministries of Ephesians 4 exist to aid in the equipping of the saints with the knowledge of that faith, so as to make it plain to them, and to help them find its practical application in their own individual lives.  
-----

Great. So I'm going to assume a couple things about you based on your response.

1. You reject Sola Scriptura as un-Scriptural
2. You only view the Scriptures as a Divinely established "help" and not as the "only source for faith and practice"

Right?

**Re: , on: 2009/10/21 16:03**

Quote:  
-----Any Barbarian can act like an ass (and I don't pick this word to be vulgar, so please don't moderate this). That's not manhood, that's simply being an ass, or a child at best. It takes a man of God to control his temper and actually speak in a loving and kind way to those who are in error.  
-----

Who says I have a temper? Maybe I need to be more like the apostle John:

There are also those who heard from that John, the disciple of the Lord, going to bathe at Ephesus, and perceiving Cerinthus within, rushed out of the bath-house without bathing, exclaiming, "Let us fly, lest even the bath-house fall down, because Cerinthus, the enemy of the truth, is within." And Polycarp himself replied to Marcion, who met him on one occasion, and said, "Dost thou know me?" "I do know thee, the first-born of Satan." Such was the horror which the apostles and their disciples had against holding even verbal communication with any corrupters of the truth; as Paul also says, "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." (Against Heresies, Book III, chapter 3)

**Re: , on: 2009/10/21 16:22**

Quote:  
-----by Leo\_Grace on 2009/10/19 16:15:50 Dear orthodox, It is not just a matter of addressing Scripture, but of addressing it correctly in truth as revealed by the Holy Spirit.  
-----

Now we're talking. Spot on. So you agree that the Scriptures NEED TO BE INTERPRETED. They don't interpret themselves. Men do the interpreting. Now I am guessing that you believe that when you "hear from the Holy Spirit" you do so perfectly 100% of the time. But I am going to be honest with you. I am capable of error. And I'd bet when pressed the rest of the folks here would too. But I guess I need to shake your hand as the first man I've ever met (besides Jesus) who is infallible.

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation." - 2 Pet 1:20

Quote:  
-----Verse: Jn 6:51 "I am the living bread that came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread, he will live forever. This bread is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." 3. The rest of the new testament, which makes no mention of transubstantiation of wafers, consistently recognizes Jesus (The Word made flesh) as the source of eternal life.  
-----

Ah...but you WANT John 6:51 to stop there. But let's continue shall we?

"The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?"

(They took Jesus meaning in the context in which He said it and repeated the meaning they heard back to Him)

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last

day. **For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."**

Hmm... Meat indeed? Real food? Hmm...

"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. **This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."**

Interesting. So His flesh and blood they saw standing before them was the "bread which came down from heaven"?

Come on...where are you literalists? Don't you believe in the literal interpretation of Scripture?

Now this passage actually mentions many of you:

"Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard saying; who can hear it? When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

I'm a spirit. Am I a metaphor? You are a spirit. Are you merely a symbol?

No. A thousand times no.

Jesus was going to let them walk if they didn't receive this.

You are doing just as your founders did. Walk.

Re: , on: 2009/10/21 16:29

Quote:

-----It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.  
-----

But you couldn't know this based on Scripture alone. O...yeah...you need Holy Tradition to know that.

Re: , on: 2009/10/21 16:31

Quote:

-----The Roman Catholic church holds at least ONE BILLION souls in her covetous arms. They are not, and probably will not, be born again, to be saved, unless they are delivered, and repent. They will all be cast into a Lake of fire, by the Lord himself, unless they are. God is Holy. Here in is our battle. It is not the petty undertaking of self righteous doctrine or egos that we attack, but a spirit.  
-----

Spoken like a fiery heretic. How long will you kick against the pricks?

It is Jesus whom you are persecuting.

The Lord is that Spirit.

Re: , on: 2009/10/21 16:41

ccrider,

You let your pre-judgments cloud your judgment. I understand. We don't like to be wrong. Many times being wrong involves changing our whole lives.

Quote:  
-----Have you ever heard of 'May Crowning' orthodox??? Check it out here: <http://www.google.com/search?hl=en&source=hp&q=May+Crowning&aq=f&oq=&aqi=g10> I encourage everyone here to look at this link... study ALL of the attributes of catholic MAY CROWNING, and decide for yourself if it is considered 'worship' and even remotely biblical.  
-----

The litmus test "show me in the Bible" is not remotely Biblical. Nowhere does Scripture say that the Bible alone is the sole source for faith and practice. It is a Protestant church tradition of men.

And we can defend iconography using Scripture. We can defend the Jewish Gebirah using Scripture. But we are not tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine since we have a divinely established teacher and you merely have the text book. We have both.

Quote:  
-----"You live in time. Mary lives in eternity. How can you presume to know who or how many people she can commune with when time is not something binding her?" orthodox Because it's not in the bible.  
-----

Do you believe in the Trinity? The Athanasian creed is NOT in the Bible. Yet the doctrine is true.

Quote:  
-----Communion of saints does not imply a dead one communing with a live one.  
-----

Why not? Are the departed saints cut off from Christ? Are we? You err, sir.

"And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints." - Rev. 5:8

Re: , on: 2009/10/21 16:51

Brothertom wrote:

"I do not strive to convince one so filled with lies and distortion, spewing them over and over again, but seek to expose the core of it, which I believe is happening, as those saved ones see...the light and darkness side by side. It is a good thing, and is surely working to the good of the believer."

"Also; when all else fails; spam the boards." "

prophetic, Eh?

Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/10/21 17:31

Quote:

Brothertom wrote:

"I do not strive to convince one so filled with lies and distortion, spewing them over and over again, but seek to expose the core of it, which I believe is happening, as those saved ones see...the light and darkness side by side. It is a good thing, and is surely working to the good of the believer."

Amen, Brothertom. God is at work even here in this thread.

orthodox wrote:

Quote:  
-----I am guessing that you believe that when you "hear from the Holy Spirit" you do so perfectly 100% of the time. But I am going to be honest with you. I am capable of error. And I'd bet when pressed the rest of the folks here would too. But I guess I need to shake your hand as the first man I've ever met (besides Jesus) who is infallible.  
-----

As far as your guess about me is concerned you would be wrong, I'm afraid. I am exactly like the others who agree with me in this thread, who humbly seek enlightenment from the Holy Spirit when reading the Word, knowing how easily we could err as humans. I do agree with you, however, that you are capable of error - in fact, you are almost totally in error in your beliefs. How do I know know? As Jesus said, "You will know them by their fruit."

Your posts reek of arrogance, anger, idolatry, malice, hatred, fits of rage, selfishness, and impurity. I know you cannot interpret the Bible correctly because it is spiritually discerned, and by your fruit I know that the Holy Spirit is not in you. I know this sounds harsh, but it is true.

*1Co 2:14-16 The man without the Spirit does not accept the things that come from the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him, and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually discerned. The spiritual man makes judgments about all things, but he himself is not subject to any man's judgment: "For who has known the mind of the Lord that he may instruct him?" But we have the mind of Christ.*

orthodox...a bit late to the party., on: 2009/10/21 18:38

forgive me I don't know your name, but I just want to ask a couple questions.....are you a adherent to the roman institution, what is called the roman catholic church?...and are you preaching "mary idolatry"? if the answer is "no", forgive me for my inquisitiveness, if the answer is "yes" on both questions, I'll use Rev Ian Paisley to do my "talking". May God love you is my prayer. neil

(<http://playmp3.sa-media.com/media/6863/6863.mp3>) Fundamentalism versus apostasy- Ian Paisley

Re: orthodox...a bit late to the party. - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/10/21 18:46

I have never wished that a thread would be locked as much as I do this one. The lies that are being promoted and pushed forth as gospel should not be allowed to continue. The Roman Catholic church has caused many to die and go to hell with their pagan teachings. I pray for all who are lost and deceived in this pagan religious institution.

with a sad heart  
mj

**Re: orthodox...a bit late to the party., on: 2009/10/21 20:34**

Quote:  
-----forgive me I dont know your name, but I just want to ask a couple questions.....are you a adherent to the roman institution, what is called the roman catholic church?...and are you preaching "mary idolatry"? if the answer is "no", forgive me for my inquisitiveness, if the answer is "yes" on both questions, I'll use Rev Ian Paisley to do my "talking". May God love you is my prayer. neil  
-----

First of all, I would not want to be Ian Paisley on judgment day.

Second, no I do not consider myself "Roman Catholic." But they are part of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. In fact the Bishop of Rome is the successor to St. Peter and holder of the keys to the kingdom and the corresponding office. He is the servant of the servants of God and head of all other bishops on earth. He is not over Jesus Christ who is his superior in every respect.

Third, I do not preach idolatry to Mary or any other saint or person. Worship (latria) is due to God alone. Worshiping Mary is heretical and blasphemous.

I can only hope the Ian Paisley is sincere in his misguided and heretical views.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/21 20:38**

Quote:  
-----I have never wished that a thread would be locked as much as I do this one. The lies that are being promoted and pushed forth as gospel should not be allowed to continue.  
-----

Many left our Lord when he first taught about the Eucharist. This is the first indication we received that those that are not of us would have remained with us, but due to the deception of the devil they can't stand to remain with us.

I believe you are sincere. I do not believe you are malicious. I love your soul.

I pray God reveals His truth to you as He did me.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/21 22:22**

Quote:  
-----  
1. You reject Sola Scriptura as un-Scriptural  
-----

I believe Sola Scriptura so far as it contains the faith once and for all handed down to the saints. And within those Scriptures is the teaching that God has given gifts/ministries to men to aid us in understanding that faith, as taught within the Scriptures, and to help us work out the practical ramifications of it in our lives.

I know some make Sola Scriptura to equate to cessationist view points. Where so held, I reject that as being consistent with the Scriptures.

Quote:  
-----  
2. You only view the Scriptures as a Divinely established "help" and not as the "only source for faith and practice"  
-----

This would not be correct. I believe the Scriptures to contain the authoritative faith that are to be believed universally by everyone. It contains the faith once and for all handed down to the saints. The ministers of the faith exist to minister this faith to others, and are enabled to do so by the help of the Holy Spirit.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/21 22:24**

Quote:

Who says I have a temper? Maybe I need to be more like the apostle John:

Strongly rebuking somebody is one thing. Provoking them with a "bring it on" attitude is quite another.

**alright...lets begin again, on: 2009/10/21 23:07**

since I feel that my questions are being dodged, and equivocation is going on...you have more than answered my questions.

Either, in the darkest recesses of your soul you realize your error in following the dark satanic machinations of that scarlet harlot in Rome, and seek succor, or you're just a trouble-maker, here to confuse and vex. The Lord rebuke you, let God deal with you.

**Re: Wayne!, on: 2009/10/22 0:01**

Who is "orthodox"? Is he for real, or was he the creation of "Wayne" aka "Wayneman" to play with the minds of God's chosen vessels?

What we have is a charismatic, supported by other charismatics, who hate sound doctrine. We don't have anyone that is an "Orthodox", or a "Catholic", that is fueling this thread, and is challenging and attacking those who hold to the importance of Scripture, and the Sound Doctrine that is found within it, we have a charismatic WHO HATES SOUND DOCTRINE.

In Paul's letter to Titus it is stated in chapter 2 verse 1, "You must teach what is in accord with sound doctrine." Beginning with verse two Titus is told what qualifies as being consistent with sound doctrine. In the remainder of chapter two he deals with the things five different groups of individuals are to be taught. The details of these teachings is the Biblical foundation for sound doctrine.

Among many today the definition of sound doctrine has been changed. Today's definition is often much broader than the definition we find in Scripture.

**The definition of sound doctrine today has been expanded to include an acceptance and application of man's interpretation of Scripture and the religious traditions he holds dear. Unfortunately this is not the definition originally given by inspiration. To hold to this broader description is to go far beyond what was revealed or written by God. If we are to please God our definitions must follow the intent God provided through inspiration in the original text. If we allow an "Orthodox" or a "Loingirder" or Wayne to rewrite the original definition so that it suits their intent, it certainly will not be the Biblical definition given by inspiration.**

**This is a PM sent to me by Wayne (Wayneman), when at that time "Wayne" was also "LoinGirder" (and how many "others"?):**

Quote:

To answer your first question, I am 42. LoinGirder's immaturity was part of the joke. LoinGirder is me when I was fifteen and my Heroes of the Faith were Jack Chick, Mike Warnke and Keith Green. Now I look back and cringe at the nonsense I believed and the way I treated people for disbelieving the nonsense that I believed. My excuse is that I was fifteen. I can't tell you how many times I've read posts on this forum and assumed that the writer was 15, only to find he was in his fifties or sixties, or even in his seventies, like that poor "Intensity" nut who got booted off the forum. (Remember when he called you a "pompous fop" for disagreeing with his doctrine? I don't know how a guy who wears horn-rimmed glasses and polyester leisure suits and carries a Jack Van Impe Soulwinner's Bible gets labelled a "fop" but anyway...) I was literally shocked to learn that Intensity was 73 years old! He had the psychology of a teenager - a fragile ego trying to vaunt itself into manhood - and an immature teenager at that. But there you are: dogmatism is always marked by an unusual level of emotional immaturity.

You seem to think that my humorous twisting of the Scripture to support fundamentalism is irreverent and I might be in trouble with the Almighty. I don't. Sanctified satire is justifiable because there is no better way to disaffect people to error than getting them to laugh at it. And fundamentalism is error. In fact, it is a heresy in the strictest New Testament sense of the term. When you sift through the rhetoric, fundamentalism defines "faith" as "sound doctrine." This is a vast departure from "the faith once delivered unto all the saints." Sound doctrine is essential, because saving faith can only arise from a foundation of Gospel truth - no one needs to explain that to you! But faith and doctrine are not the same thing, yet fundamentalism confounds them, making no distinction. Faith in Jesus is synonymous with faith in evangelical theology. Keep this in mind when you persue your favorite heresy watchdog websites and you will see that this is the case.

Why do FUNDAMENTALISTS infallibly fall into bibliolatry - making an idol out of a casket of words? You said yourself,  
Quote:

"The ultimate purpose of the Scriptures is to lead us to Christ"

By this do you mean a living, personal, experiential relationship with Christ? If so, why do fundamentalists stop short, worshipping the road map instead of following the road? Why do they obsess over the errors of others? Why do they perceive "compromise" as the primal sin? Why do they reduce the Bible to an object that they can control, instead of a subject that acts upon and controls them? All these follies arise from the fundamental error of confounding faith with dogma. But this error did not occur by chance; it arose from the peculiar adolescent psychology of the sectarian.

Wayne  
-----

In the Bible we find what God has to say about His Word- He has magnified His Word, the Bible, above His very name!

2. I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name. Psalms 138:2

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:  
-----  
orthodox wrote:

Quote:  
-----I have never wished that a thread would be locked as much as I do this one. The lies that are being promoted and pushed forth as gospel should not be allowed to continue.  
-----

Many left our Lord when he first taught about the Eucharist. This is the first indication we received that those that are not of us would have remained with us, but due to the deception of the devil they can't stand to remain with us.

I believe you are sincere. I do not believe you are malicious. I love your soul.

I pray God reveals His truth to you as He did me.  
-----



Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/10/22 0:33

orthodox

Please believe me when I say this in all sincerity I will be praying for you, you are lost and deceived and there is nothing to do but turn you over to the hands of the Lord. You are promoting the lies of a false and pagan religion that has led many down the path of destruction. I pray that your eyes are opened before it is too late, but I won't come back and post to this thread any further because I can read in your writing that your only desire is to push forth the Roman Catholic lies as truth and I will have no part in it. Truly my heart grieves for those who are lost in the RCC, I pray that they might repent and come to know the Lord.

maryjane

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2009/10/22 0:43

orthodox wrote:

Quote:

Second, no I do not consider myself "Roman Catholic." But they are part of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. **In fact the Bishop of Rome is the successor to St. Peter and holder of the keys to the kingdom**

Orthodox,

You just stated that your faith in entering the Kingdom runs through a mortal man... mortal flesh... the created.

Do you see no error with this?

Re: , on: 2009/10/22 1:49

Quote:

orthodox wrote:

In fact the Bishop of Rome is the successor to St. Peter and holder of the keys to the kingdom and the corresponding office. He is the servant of the servants of God and head of all other bishops on earth. He is not over Jesus Christ who is his superior in every respect.

Are you really that blind to believe what you claim? Silly me, I thought Jesus had the keys to the kingdom?

Before you spam the rest of the board, please take a listen to this (try listening to all of it, before you jump the gun):

<http://video.google.com/videosearch?hl=en&safe=active&q=john%20macarthur%20catholic%20&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=vv#>

...or your conscience.

Also, just so you realize, your 'defense of catholic tradition' is doing nothing more than reassuring many here on SI that the Roman Catholic Church is the Antichrist, although, I would have to admit one of many, but very high in terms of scriptural warning: she is the Harlot riding the beast.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/22 2:35**

Quote:  
-----Who is "orthodox"? Is he for real, or was he created by Wayne to play with the minds of God's chosen vessels? What we have is a charismatic, supported by other charismatics, who hate sound doctrine. We don't have anyone that is "Orthodox", or a "Catholic", that is fueling this thread, and is challenging and attacking those who hold to the importance of Scripture, and the Sound Doctrine that is found within it, we have a charismatic WHO HATES SOUND DOCTRINE.  
-----

Um...THAT is what I would call a character assassination. And by someone who doesn't know or even care to know me. I doubt he has read all of my posts. (He can correct me if I'm wrong)

I could properly be called "Catholic", "Orthodox", "Charismatic", even "Pentecostal". But labels are of no consequence as such. Are you a part of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church?

But I'll let the Lord be my defense. The Lord knows all of them that are His. I am satisfied with that.

Quote:  
-----In Paul's letter to Titus it is stated in chapter 2 verse 1, "You must teach what is in accord with sound doctrine." Beginning with verse two Titus is told what qualifies as being consistent with sound doctrine. In the remainder of chapter two he deals with the things five different groups of individuals are to be taught. The details of these teachings is the Biblical foundation for sound doctrine.  
-----

So Waltern is the definer of what sound doctrine is? This seems to be unilateral here. So we can gather that if what Waltern says is true...if Waltern agrees, it is sound. If Waltern disagrees, it is unsound. But he cloaks his pronouncement under the vail of being "Biblical".

Sir, do you know how many people of different and contradictory persuasions I have heard tell me that theirs is the Biblical view?

But really the truth is that you might as well spit in the face of every church father since the first century and therefore the apostles and Jesus Christ, God in the flesh Himself. You exalt your own beliefs against the knowledge of God and His Church.

Quote:  
-----The definition of sound doctrine today has been expanded to include an acceptance and application of man's interpretation of Scripture and the religious traditions he holds dear.  
-----

According to this definition you have given you leave yourself susceptible to logically based accusations of your own guilt. Do you not believe doctrines concocted by your own "interpretation"? Of course you do. But they are not and can not be properly called "the Word of God" unless they carry the intended meaning of Scripture with the words of Scripture. That meaning has been universally (catholicly) understood by the Church in all places and all times.

Quote:  
-----This is a PM sent to me by Wayne, when at that time "Wayne" was also "LoinGirder" (and how many "others"?):  
-----

Just when I think I don't have any more respect for you to lose, you go and pull this. How dare you post someone's private message to you? Disgusting.

Re: , on: 2009/10/22 3:18

Quote:  
-----Are you really that blind to believe what you claim? Silly me, I thought Jesus had the keys to the kingdom? Before you spam the rest of the board, please take a listen to this (try listening to all of it, before you jump the gun): <http://video.google.com/videosearch?hl=en&safe=active&q=john%20macarthur%20catholic%20&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=vv#>  
-----

Thank you very much for posting this link. I was not aware that John MacArthur was so anti-Catholic. But what was distressing from what I listened to was how he presumes as many (including myself before) do to ascend the pulpit without getting his facts straight. He, like many so-called "Bible Baptists", is so enamoured with his view of what is believed by Catholics that he fails to truly UNDERSTAND what it is that they do believe....what I believe.

His assertion that the whole "system" would collapse without purgatory proves this. He ignores that the Eastern Catholic s and Orthodox do not have a formally defined doctrine about purgatory and they believe exactly what the Western Catholics believe.

He is ignorant of the fact that purgatory is NOT a "second chance" to get into heaven. No one enters into a state of purgatory after death who has died outside of the state of grace. No one in a state of purgatory goes to hell. No one who has not been FORGIVEN goes to a state of purgatory or, in the East, final theosis.

He claims that indulgences is "selling forgiveness for money". What an ignorant claim. He constantly sets up straw men so he can knock them down. Before you attack a position, you must first understand what the person holding it claims to believe by it.

He speaks of "the perversion of forced celibacy." Does this guy read anything that isn't on Chick's website?

No of course he does. He is obviously well read in the writings of the Rebels of the so-called "reformation" or revolt. He exhibits their same force and spirit of presumption and error. Only he has inherited his heresy and they willfully chose it from a presumed state of grace.

This heretic says that "Mary has nothing to do with the salvation of anybody." This is the difference between Protestant heretics and apostolic Christians whether they be Catholic, Orthodox, Syriac, Ethiopic, Coptic, etc. The difference is that the Protestant gospel seems to start at Christ's passion. The true gospel begins with the incarnation. Those that understand salvation history see this from Genesis to Apocalypse. It was Mary's "Amen" that cooperated with the Divine plan. She is the second Eve, the mother of all the living. Mary is the mother of every man or woman who will be saved. If Mary isn't your mother, you're lost.

He misquotes Pope JP II about hell among other things and calls him a universalist...even though he admitted that he couldn't find a statement of universalism in any of his writings...only statements utilizing the term "universal salvation." I have to think MacArthur has to shut something off internally when he shuts off his objectivity.

MacArthur claims that Peter was never in Rome. Ask me and I'll give you evidence such that you will probably blush.

This guy near the end says "the more liturgy the more apostasy." From who? We are the Church. Protestantism apostasized from us. Liturgy is apostolic. No time to go into that one.

Now it is your turn. Please listen to this message (3 parts):

[http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq\\_1047.mp3](http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq_1047.mp3)

[http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq\\_1048.mp3](http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq_1048.mp3)

[http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq\\_1049.mp3](http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq_1049.mp3)

God bless you as you listen.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/22 3:20**

"Orthodox,

You just stated that your faith in entering the Kingdom runs through a mortal man... mortal flesh... the created.

Do you see no error with this?"

Here's my answer:

[http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq\\_1047.mp3](http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq_1047.mp3)

[http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq\\_1048.mp3](http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq_1048.mp3)

[http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq\\_1049.mp3](http://www.ewtn.com/vondemand/audio/resolve.asp?audiofile=iq_1049.mp3)

**Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2009/10/22 7:54**

Anonymous said,

I pray God reveals His truth to you as He did me.  
-----

That would be your interpretation.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/22 9:31**

Where did he go?...pray for him.

This is the difference. Last week I was kicked off of a site because I brought up Christ and was threatened on another one for the same reason. I am not leaving them, they are leaving me...sadly.

Orthodox, left SL...(well, that profile did), we are not leaving him.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/22 12:08**

"The litmus test "show me in the Bible" is not remotely Biblical." anon

That just isn't true!!

...Timothy 3:16

16All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness, 17so that the man of God may be thoroughly equipped for every good work.....

I guess I don't get it, you cut and paste Scripture and throw it around like some kind of dissertation to justify your doctrine and reprove someone else, then turn around and cry foul when you can't scripturally justify a deception. At this point you say Scripture is not sufficient, and therefore it is only sufficient when you deem necessary. You seem to want it both ways and that's a problem from the beginning... that's deceptive.. that's hypocrisy... that's subjective justification. After being born again I understood this... the Holy Spirit did not testify to anything other than the Father and the Son. It was made very clear.

"Do you believe in the Trinity? The Athanasian creed is NOT in the Bible. Yet the doctrine is true." ortho-anon

The Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit are in the bible. Whatever label man puts upon it is subjective to them. This is a perfect example of doctrine justifying scripture instead of the other way around. The cart is in front of the horse... We shouldn't need a creed to tell me that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one. The Holy Spirit is sufficient in this. God doesn't need the word 'Trinity' nor a creed to justify His truth.. it is what it is. What one calls it, and what 'creed' is derived from

it, and the fact that the word or the creed that describes it isn't in the bible, doesn't preclude the knowledge of it. Nor does the creed enlighten me to it. I've never heard of this creed as a catholic which only proves I never needed the creed to understand the truth in it.

Again where's May Crowning? Where's the Patron Saints who help us? And what is the church process of how one becomes a patron saint... Even if you can't justify it scripturally it seems so convoluted that it's hard to grasp.

"Why not? Are the departed saints cut off from Christ? Are we? You err, sir" anon

Exactly brother anon. We are not cut off from Christ and they are not as well. So no err there. No, they (the dead) are just cut off from us. The error is in their ability to mediate for us divinely, as if we need an advocate to Christ. See how the deception works? If we believe that someone can act as our advocate to Christ, even though the bible says that He alone is our mediator of the New Covenant-

(1 Timothy 2:5

5For there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus).

..then the enemy has succeeded in undermining our Savior. Satan distracts us from Our Savior. It's true.

What part of one God AND ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD AND MEN, THE MAN JESUS CHRIST is lacking in truth ?? This is a simple truth and powerful.

He's our high priest, our first love, our righteousness. The bible says 'HE', and only He, is our advocate. Christ never said pray to dead people to represent us on His behalf. In the Bible, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit testify to no one but each other. And the Holy Spirit will not testify to anything other than this. Satan dresses up like an angel of light. Again divination is a biblical abomination.

At the end of time the prayers of the saints will be thrown down. Yes. But you're focusing on what you've been told... that the saints are dead and these saints pray. But the body of Christ are the saints dead or living. The saints are those who are in Christ Jesus... they are not 'Canonized'. Canonization wasn't even a reality when the bible described the saints. The prayers are the prayers of us while we are here. There is nothing in the bible that says those who have passed on are saints who pray. Your definition of 'saints' is the catholic one. Please sir... I'm telling you the truth... let go of your own reasoning and ask God to give you truth. I don't want this for you because I've been where you've been. There has to be something deep down that troubles you about some of this. The catholic church demands loyalty to their church, their doctrine, they have people convinced that if you are outside of them then hell awaits. IT'S NOT TRUE!!!! IT'S NOT. That's why people have to call the experts in doctrine to get answers to theological questions. They create a co-dependency. They amend doctrine and rules as they go along, and it's hard for the average catholic to keep up with. I'll sum up all my catholic family and friends with this phrase: very loyal... and very confused. Not just confused about Christ and justification by faith but the whole convoluted catholic way. Please, wipe the slate clean of all you know and have been taught and open up Paul's Epistles and just look at what it says. Pray for the leading of the Spirit. Tell God 'I give up trying to know all of this, I want YOU, please give me truth and reveal yourself to me, reveal your truth to me.' Letting go and letting God can be a scary thing... but if He knows your heart and your heart wants Him, He will not forsake you, He will come and you will know. Don't even get caught up in what we are saying here... just let go and get alone with God and His Word. I pray for this. I know where I was then and where I am now, and I can tell you that you will never be the same and you will have peace, love, and truth beyond anything you imagine. This isn't about Protestantism vs Catholicism... this is about relationship with our creator... this is about Our Savior's indwelling via His holy spirit.

**Re: Orthodox - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/10/22 12:47**

Quote:

-----BrianMira wrote:

Where did he go?...pray for him.

This is the difference. Last week I was kicked off of a site because I brought up Christ and was threatened on another one for the same reason. I am not leaving them, they are leaving me...sadly.

Orthodox, left SL...(well, that profile did), we are not leaving him.

-----  
Amen! If you read back over his final replies to Walter, the spirit in which they were written were not at all like Waltern's which says something about who has more of the Fruit of the Spirit.

**ORTHODOX please come back to SI! Ask Greg to reinstate your name!!** With those who gave you a hard time, CONSIDER THE SOURCE!!

I know I'm not the only one who enjoys intelligent conversation on SI!

**Re: , on: 2009/10/22 13:10**

Firstly, I apologize to ortho and anon if I may have offended. These are passionate debates and in my last post towards the end my plea was with a sincere heart. I could care less about winning arguments but you wouldn't know it sometimes. I'm as guilty as anyone in getting caught up in the semantics of debate. Being a former catholic and now knowing the Lord intimately, I want everyone to have this. Therefore the passion can easily become misguided and flesh driven.

"I know I'm not the only one who enjoys intelligent conversation on SI!" lysa

I think 'the intellect' on the forum in part of the problem... but I know what you meant. Amen.

**Re: - posted by MaryJane, on: 2009/10/22 13:14**

Greetings Lysa

There were many here who love the Lord dearly, we were not giving Orthodox a hard time, we were sharing truth with him. He was pushing forth a doctrine of lies that is blasphemy to the Lord. Should that have been allowed to continue? The Catholic church does not save, mary does not save, dead saints do not save, only Jesus saves.

Orthodox was promoting a teaching that is other than Biblical truth, would you want a Jehovah witness to come and spread their lies, or a mormon to come and spread their lies here on Sermon index to deceive young immature Christians into following their deceiving doctrines as well? I pray for the person behind the name Orthodox to repent and cry out to Jesus. I pray for his salvation because this person is lost in a dead religion and will suffer eternity apart from God if they do not repent. I hold no anger or hate for this person, but at the same time I do not want them to push their lies and cause others to parish along with them. If Orthodox had shown even the smallest desire to seek truth then sharing with him would be beneficial but that was not the case, his desire was made clear with what he posted time and time again. The Bible is very clear on this point, "No one comes to the Father except by Jesus. He is the way the truth and the light! This is not about a debate on who is right or wrong(at least not for me) this is about people who are lost in a pagan religion dying and going to hell because we don't want to make anyone uncomfortable by telling them the truth. Agreed it has to be done in a Christ like loving manner but at the same time should a wolf be allowed to devour the sheep unchecked? After all this is eternity were talking about!

God Bless  
maryjane

**Re: - posted by Leo\_Grace, on: 2009/10/22 13:28**

Quote:

-----  
MaryJane wrote:  
Greetings Lysa

There were many here who love the Lord dearly, we were not giving Orthodox a hard time, we were sharing truth with him. He was pushing forth a doctrine of lies that is blasphemy to the Lord. Should that have been allowed to continue? The Catholic church does not save, mary does not save, dead saints do not save, only Jesus saves.

Orthodox was promoting a teaching that is other than Biblical truth, would you want a Jehovah witness to come and spread their lies, or a mormon to come and spread their lies here on Sermon index to deceive young immature Christians into following their deceiving doctrines as well? I pray for the person behind the name Orthodox to repent and cry out to Jesus. I pray for his salvation because this person is lost in a dead religion and will suffer eternity apart from God if they do not repent. I hold no anger or hate for this person, but at the same time I do not want them to push their lies and cause others to parish along with them. If Orthodox had shown even the smallest desire to seek truth then sharing with him would be beneficial but that was not the case, his desire was made clear with what he posted time and time again. The Bible is very clear on this point, "No one comes to the Father except by Jesus. He is the way the truth and the light! This is not about a debate on who is right or wrong(at least not for me) this is about people who are lost in a pagan religion dying and going to hell because we don't want to make anyone uncomfortable by telling them the truth. Agreed it has to be done in a Christ like loving manner but at the same time should a wolf be allowed to devour the sheep unchecked? After all this is eternity were talking about!

God Bless  
maryjane  
-----

Amen. Well said, MJ.

Re: , on: 2009/10/22 21:37

Wow, what a revelation. Previously, I discovered that Wayne has been creating "posters" to represent his views. Who are these posters? "Loingirder" was one, another is "Orthodox", and another (just created yesterday) is "artsy". And what are the views of Wayne (Wayneman) that he uses these fictitious posters to present? HE HATES SOUND DOCTRINE THAT IS FOUND IN GOD'S WORD, THE BIBLE, AND HE USES SATIRE AND WHATEVER OTHER DEVIOUS THINGS HE CAN DO TO DENIGRATE THE PRECIOUS WORD OF GOD, AND IT'S VALUE TO THE SAVED, BORN AGAIN BELIEVER.

Now, since I have exposed his nasty secret, he is no longer posting here. His lie has been exposed. Yet, who on this thread is inviting him back?

"Lysa"

Who is in agreement with what he has posted?

"Annonymous"

Very interesting, to say the least!

Who is "orthodox"? Is he for real, or was he the creation of "Wayne" aka "Wayneman" to play with the minds of God's chosen vessels?

What we have is a charismatic, supported by other charismatics, who hate sound doctrine. We don't have anyone that is "Orthodox", or a "Catholic", that is fueling this thread, and is challenging and attacking those who hold to the importance of Scripture, and the Sound Doctrine that is found within it, we have a charismatic WHO HATES SOUND DOCTRINE.

In Paul's letter to Titus it is stated in chapter 2 verse 1, "You must teach what is in accord with sound doctrine." Beginning with verse two Titus is told what qualifies as being consistent with sound doctrine. In the remainder of chapter two he deals with the things five different groups of individuals are to be taught. The details of these teachings is the Biblical foundation for sound doctrine.

Among many today the definition of sound doctrine has been changed. Today's definition is often much broader than the definition we find in Scripture.

**The definition of sound doctrine today has been expanded to include an acceptance and application of man's**

interpretation of Scripture and the religious traditions he holds dear. Unfortunately this is not the definition originally given by inspiration. To hold to this broader description is to go far beyond what was revealed or written by God. If we are to please God our definitions must follow the intent God provided through inspiration in the original text. If we allow "Orthodox" or "Loingirder" or Wayne to rewrite the original definition so that it suits their intent, it certainly will not be the Biblical definition given by inspiration.

This is a PM sent to me by Wayne (Wayneman), when at that time "Wayne" was also "LoinGirder" (and how many "others"?):

Quote:

-----  
To answer your first question, I am 42. LoinGirder's immaturity was part of the joke. LoinGirder is me when I was fifteen and my Heroes of the Faith were Jack Chick, Mike Warnke and Keith Green. Now I look back and cringe at the nonsense I believed and the way I treated people for disbelieving the nonsense that I believed. My excuse is that I was fifteen. I can't tell you how many times I've read posts on this forum and assumed that the writer was 15, only to find he was in his fifties or sixties, or even in his seventies, like that poor "Intensity" nut who got booted off the forum. (Remember when he called you a "pompous fop" for disagreeing with his doctrine? I don't know how a guy who wears horn-rimmed glasses and polyester leisure suits and carries a Jack Van Impe Soulwinner's Bible gets labelled a "fop" but anyway...) I was literally shocked to learn that Intensity was 73 years old! He had the psychology of a teenager - a fragile ego trying to vaunt itself into manhood - and an immature teenager at that. But there you are: dogmatism is always marked by an unusual level of emotional immaturity.

You seem to think that my humorous twisting of the Scripture to support fundamentalism is irreverent and I might be in trouble with the Almighty. I don't. Sanctified satire is justifiable because there is no better way to disaffect people to error than getting them to laugh at it. And fundamentalism is error. In fact, it is a heresy in the strictest New Testament sense of the term. When you sift through the rhetoric, fundamentalism defines "faith" as "sound doctrine." This is a vast departure from "the faith once delivered unto all the saints." Sound doctrine is essential, because saving faith can only arise from a foundation of Gospel truth - no one needs to explain that to you! But faith and doctrine are not the same thing, yet fundamentalism confounds them, making no distinction. Faith in Jesus is synonymous with faith in evangelical theology. Keep this in mind when you persuade your favorite heresy watchdog websites and you will see that this is the case.

Why do FUNDAMENTALISTS infallibly fall into bibliolatry - making an idol out of a casket of words? You said yourself,  
Quote:

-----  
"The ultimate purpose of the Scriptures is to lead us to Christ"

By this do you mean a living, personal, experiential relationship with Christ? If so, why do fundamentalists stop short, worshipping the road map instead of following the road? Why do they obsess over the errors of others? Why do they perceive "compromise" as the primal sin? Why do they reduce the Bible to an object that they can control, instead of a subject that acts upon and controls them? All these follies arise from the fundamental error of confounding faith with dogma. But this error did not occur by chance; it arose from the peculiar adolescent psychology of the sectarian.

Wayne  
-----

In the Bible we find what God has to say about His Word- He has magnified His Word, the Bible, above His very name!

2. I will worship toward thy holy temple, and praise thy name for thy lovingkindness and for thy truth: for thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name. Psalms 138:2

Sincerely,

Walter

Quote:

-----  
orthodox wrote:

Quote:

-----I have never wished that a thread would be locked as much as I do this one. The lies that are being promoted and pushed forth as gospel should not be allowed to continue.  
-----

Many left our Lord when he first taught about the Eucharist. This is the first indication we received that those that are not of us would have remained with us, but due to the deception of the devil they can't stand to remain with us.



I believe you are sincere. I do not believe you are malicious. I love your soul.

I pray God reveals His truth to you as He did me.

Quote:

Leo\_Grace wrote:

Quote:

MaryJane wrote:

Greetings Lysa

There were many here who love the Lord dearly, we were not giving Orthodox a hard time, we were sharing truth with him. He was pushing forth a doctrine of lies that is blasphemy to the Lord. Should that have been allowed to continue? The Catholic church does not save, Mary does not save, dead saints do not save, only Jesus saves.

Orthodox was promoting a teaching that is other than Biblical truth, would you want a Jehovah witness to come and spread their lies, or a Mormon to come and spread their lies here on Sermon index to deceive young immature Christians into following their deceiving doctrines as well? I pray for the person behind the name Orthodox to repent and cry out to Jesus. I pray for his salvation because this person is lost in a dead religion and will suffer eternity apart from God if they do not repent. I hold no anger or hate for this person, but at the same time I do not want them to push their lies and cause others to parish along with them. If Orthodox had shown even the smallest desire to seek truth then sharing with him would be beneficial but that was not the case, his desire was made clear with what he posted time and time again. The Bible is very clear on this point, "No one comes to the Father except by Jesus. He is the way the truth and the light! This is not about a debate on who is right or wrong (at least not for me) this is about people who are lost in a pagan religion dying and going to hell because we don't want to make anyone uncomfortable by telling them the truth. Agreed it has to be done in a Christ-like loving manner but at the same time should a wolf be allowed to devour the sheep unchecked? After all this is eternity we're talking about!

God Bless  
maryjane

Amen. Well said, MJ.

Re: - posted by Lysa (), on: 2009/10/22 22:38

Quote:

-----waltern wrote:

What we have is a charismatic, supported by other charismatics, who hate sound doctrine. We don't have anyone that is "Orthodox", or a "Catholic", that is fueling this thread, and is challenging and attacking those who hold to the importance of Scripture, and the Sound Doctrine that is found within it, we have a charismatic WHO HATES SOUND DOCTRINE.

I do not know that every single Catholic is bound for hell; therefore **I choose not and I will NOT condemn them.** I did not agree with everything that Orthodox believed. The same way that I don't agree on everything with DeepThinker, even though you accused me of being married to him but did I slap your obnoxious PM up here for everyone to see? No, I did not.

You are a nasty, malicious and hateful man who continually stirs up strife in these threads all the while maligning others thinking you are doing God a favor. I know that I am not correct on every issue and I know that God knows my heart, that I do not hate sound doctrine nor do I hate you but if I have to hate anything Waltern, it would be the doctrine you propagate.

The only person I have seen that Wayneman has admitted to being is LoinGirder. Do you even KNOW for sure that Orthodox was Wayneman (or this Artsy)? If you cannot produce evidence where he says that he is Orthodox or Artsy, you need to cease and desist from spreading these lies.

May God have mercy on you Waltern.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/22 22:45**

The logic used to support Catholicism creates one giant problematic circle. Catholicism says we have no right to individually interpret the Scriptures. Rather, we must use the Fathers to establish the interpretation of Scriptures. And then the Pope interprets the Fathers and the Scriptures. My question is then, who interprets the Pope? And if we have the interpretative skills to rightly understand the Pope, who is generally a highly versed doctor of philosophy or theology, then why can't we just interpret the Scriptures to begin with?

**walter, on: 2009/10/23 1:25**

I was glad when "orthodox" was bounced before he was preaching the doctrine of devil's that of that scarlet whore of Rome, with their papa the pope leading a parade of murderous priests, child molesting, homosexual idol worshipping clergies to their place, which will be splitting hell wide open. The Roman institution has always been a ruse of Satan, and continues in its way to this very day.

But you Walter, have amply demonstrated the heart of a neo-pharisee, an ugly hard-hearted spirit, ugly words, capped off, not by "love, Walter", but by "sincerely, Walter". Oh, I'm sure you're "sincere", as the Word has shown us that the pharisees were "sincere", knowing the letter of the law, but not the Spirit.

Have some integrity, you have stumbled many, edified none, leave.

**Re: - posted by hearthetruth, on: 2009/10/23 3:15**

Quote:  
-----by BrianMira on 2009/10/22 6:31:36 Where did he go?...pray for him. This is the difference. Last week I was kicked off of a site because I brought up Christ and was threatened on another one for the same reason. I am not leaving them, they are leaving me...sadly. Orthodox, left SI...(well, that profile did), we are not leaving him.  
-----

What are you talking about? I, Orthodox, was kicked off. I didn't leave. Here's the email I received:

hello,

I have deleted your sermonindex.net forum account and ask that you do not re-register. We are an evangelical ministry and do not accept Catholic teachings as biblical. So the forums are there not to debate this issue. Thank you for your understanding.

--  
Greg Gordon

If Greg is honest, he'll admit that to you all instead of letting you all believe this.

**Re: - posted by hearthetruth, on: 2009/10/23 3:18**

Quote:  
-----ORTHODOX please come back to SI! Ask Greg to reinstate your name!! With those who gave you a hard time, CONSIDER THE SOURCE!! I know I'm not the only one who enjoys intelligent conversation on SI!  
-----

Lysa,

I'd love to. But you see, Greg is the one who kicked me off.

**Re: - posted by hearthetruth, on: 2009/10/23 3:24**

Quote:  
-----Orthodox was promoting a teaching that is other then Biblical truth, would you want a Jehovah witness to come and spread their lies, or a mormon to come and spread their lies here on Sermon index to deceive young immature Christians into following their deceiving doctrines as well?  
-----

MaryJane,

I thought it just might have been you who encouraged Greg to close my account. Well, if it was you, please know that I forgive you from the bottom of my heart.

I truly believe that you love the Lord and believe what you are doing is right. I pray He shows you the truth someday. Remember, whoever seeks finds. Hallelujah!

I'm waiting for you to come home...

**Re: - posted by hearthetruth, on: 2009/10/23 3:27**

Quote:  
-----by walter on 2009/10/22 18:37:29 Wow, what a revelation. Previously, I discovered that Wayne has been creating "posters" to represent his views. Who are these posters? "Loingirder" was one, another is "Orthodox"  
-----

No. Your presumption has turned into lies.

I, Orthodox, am not Wayne or Loingirder. Just setting the record straight.

God help you, sir.

**Re: - posted by hearthetruth, on: 2009/10/23 3:28**

Quote:  
-----The only person I have seen that Wayneman has admitted to being is LoinGirder. Do you even KNOW for sure that Orthodox was Wayneman (or this Artsy)? If you cannot produce evidence where he says that he is Orthodox or Artsy, you need to cease and desist from spreading these lies.  
-----

Thank you for coming to my defense. God love you.

Satan was a liar from the beginning.

**Re: - posted by hearthetruth, on: 2009/10/23 3:31**

Quote:  
-----The logic used to support Catholicism creates one giant problematic circle. Catholicism says we have no right to individually interpret the Scriptures. Rather, we must use the Fathers to establish the interpretation of Scriptures. And then the Pope interprets the Fathers and the Scriptures. My question is then, who interprets the Pope?  
-----

This is not Catholicism. This is another straw man.

I am not accusing you of doing it on purpose though.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Do Catholics believe they are saved by works?**

The pope is bound to change NOTHING from the sacred deposit. The pope could not stand up tomorrow and deny the Trinity or the Virgin Birth. The pope is the guardian of a sacred deposit...as are all the bishops.

It is the councils that speak with the same authority as Scripture.

**Re: , on: 2009/10/23 6:08**

Quote:

-----  
hearthetruth wrote:

Quote:

-----by BrianMira on 2009/10/22 6:31:36 Where did he go?...pray for him. This is the difference. Last week I was kicked off of a site because I brought up Christ and was threatened on another one for the same reason. I am not leaving them, they are leaving me...sadly. Orthodox, left Sl...(well, that profile did), we are not leaving him.  
-----

What are you talking about? I, Orthodox, was kicked off. I didn't leave. Here's the email I received:

hello,

I have deleted your sermonindex.net forum account and ask that you do not re-register. We are a evangelical ministry and do not accept catholic teachings as biblical. So the forums are there not to debate this issue. thank you for your understanding.

--  
Greg Gordon

If Greg is honest, he'll admit that to you all instead of letting you all believe this.  
-----

What am I talking about...? Well, I am talking about what seemed to be your deletion of your account, which under the circumstances would have seemed to be your doing.

Whether or not Greg deleted your account, that is his decision, because it is his site. Much like I respected the people who kicked me off of their site. However, my claim about you still holds true, especially, since you re-registered under another name when asked NOT to do so...which produces doubt as to how many other times you have done so...and have tried to justify yourself, not to mention that you are still the same person without the Spirit of Christ.

Although, my request still stands in that I hope and pray that all who have been wasting their time on this thread, will join in prayer for you to break away from the lies in which the roman catholic church has implanted into many and have subsequently further damned countless to hell.

May God grant you, dear Sir, the Grace to understand that He alone deserves the reward for His suffering and by NO WORKS will anyone enter the Kingdom of God and where Peter, nor Mary, have no more power to hear or answer prayers and thus have no power to make any more decisions since they were buried six feet under less than two thousand years ago, whereas Christ alone is the reward of salvation and is wonderfully received by all of those who repent and trust in Him, as they work out their own salvation with fear and trembling, while walking in the Spirit, which is given when born again; Popes not included!

**Re: , on: 2009/10/23 7:36**

"Much like I respected the people who kicked me off of their site. However, my claim about you still holds true, especially, since you re-registered under another name when asked NOT to do so...which produces doubt as to how many other times you have done so...and have tried to justify yourself, not to mention that you are still the same person without the Spirit of Christ." brianmira

Amen. He was asked to leave and not set up a new account but did anyway to set 'the record straight.' And after he does this he chimes in with a quick heresy, all while playing nice with those who have a heart for the lost, and playing the victim to everyone else.

Since he chose to set up another account he had the option with PM to show his love and forgiveness but he did not. Instead, he tried to throw Greg under the bus on the forum. Greg and the moderators are very patient men, when they decide to pull the trigger it is absolutely justified.

Jesus told His disciples when He sent them out that if those who will not receive you and the truth you bring, then we are to dust off our feet and pronounce peace unto them. There's a time to let go because there are plenty of others who want to know the truth of the Gospel. That doesn't mean that we don't love them and it doesn't make us any less Godly. If someone keeps biting the hand trying to help them, then it's time to spare that hand and lend it to another. It is in the enemy's best interest to tie us up with rabble-rousers. Yet we are to pray for them still.

Lysa, your heart is in the right place but I can tell you for the most part as a former catholic, that it is the ignorant pew-sitting catholics that seek the truth, not the arrogant PHD's in catholicism. These are the ones who lord over their knowledge to keep other catholics in bondage. They are the problem, not the solution. They condescend and make people feel like truth is only in the hands of the church and only the 'educated' have it. The person 'Catholic' who was on the forum before verified this by saying that one must be educated in the 'sciences' of the mysteries of God (I'm paraphrasing) who are capable of knowing truth and share it. Church scholarship of the highest honor and only debate on this level, which is why they choose sites like this to sharpen their theological sword and stir the pot.

As far as walter, I agree. The man has jumped the gun so many times that he has little to no credibility, even if he may be correct in some of his 'sleuthing'.

"If Greg is honest, he'll admit that to you all instead of letting you all believe this." ORTHODOX

Not a phrase of a genuine heartfelt poster. This says more about Orthodox than Greg. They castigate others while trying to make a 'smooth' exit for themselves. They have their reward.

These kinds don't need a theology change, they need a heart change. Theology is just a shroud to hide behind.

And by the way.... THEY'LL BE BACK!!!

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/23 8:18**

\*sigh\*

**Re: walter, on: 2009/10/23 8:58**

I take that back walter, and apologize, you are not a "neo-pharisee".....nor do you have "ugly" spirit. However, your posts are very hard hearted, what you remind of is of Job's three friends, Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar, who's learned theology had no helpful, encouraging or comforting word for a truly Godly sufferer.

It's true, search your heart walter. Grace given is a mystery. I praise God He has me in my devotional readings in the Book of Job at this time.

leave, stay, keep your keyboard silent, crank it up, do what you must.

**the poster formerly known as "orthodox", now known as "hearthetruth" , on: 2009/10/23 9:04**

you poor man. I might be the "refuse of the earth", but I try not to play with the Deep Things of God, or fool with His Ministries.

re-consider your ways, as I will quote Paul in describing the game you are playing:

8"But Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith.

9 Then Saul, (who also is called Paul,) filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him.

10 And said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?"

Acts 13:8-10

**to this post - posted by mysst, on: 2009/10/23 9:14**

Mark 12

28And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all?

29And Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord:

30And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment.

31And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.

I have to say...I am new to this board and I have not seen very much love going around in this topic. I have seen a lot of judgement and a lot of throwing around condemnation.

Jesus said...this is the most important command. Love Him and love others. Period. If I were lost and happened to come on here and see some of the 'fist slinging' between Christians well, honestly, I would have no desire to know God at all. Most (not all) of you would turn me off...

John 13

34"A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. 35By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another."

**Re: the poster formerly known as "orthodox", now known as "hearthetrut, on: 2009/10/23 10:30**

Hi Guys,

I have watched this thread with great sadness. I PM'd KingJimmy right at the beginning of this thread and warned him that this conversation was a trap, Orthodox was not a truth seeker. As an ex Catholic, gloriously saved and liberated by the Lord Jesus Christ who also spent two years debating Catholic theologians, I could see that this conversation would be fruitless. I wrote this near the beginning of this thread....

"An important point to remember while debating Catholics (and I would not debate Catholics, it tends to be fruitless, it's more effective to talk about Jesus and how you know Him personally, then go from there, because Catholics have a head knowledge of Jesus but do not "know," Him) is definition of terms. The word "works," for instance, is a key word and unless you can agree to a definition up front you will have a messy discussion, it has to start there. The best question, I have found, and it cuts through the clutter, to ask a Catholic is "What do you think Jesus meant when He said that you must be born again." Typically you will hear things like "Baptism," or "First Holy Communion," and so on."

As someone who has a little experience in this situation, I would urge my fellow brothers and sisters not to get drawn into a debate with Catholic apologetics. Also, as someone who has a deep love for Catholics, I would reiterate that you should share about how you know Jesus personally. I once spent 20 minutes with a "stalwart," Catholic telling her about my Jesus and how much I loved Him and how I loved to walk in His presence and how He had gloriously changed my life. At the end of that conversation, she was very quiet and she said this "I do not know the Jesus that you are talking about." And that is the essence of it.

By the way, I applaud Greg's decision to remove that particular account. Discernment has to be exercised in any organization.

ation, and in this particular case, there was no truth seeking . Also orhtodox had started another thread which I believed was designed to instill fear rather than edify.....Frank

**Re: CONFRONTATION, on: 2009/10/23 11:40**

Confrontation is a very integral and necessary part of the Gospel, and often it does not SEEM like love, but it is. The light must shine into the darkness, and it must overcome the darkness. The bible speaks of condemnation as being such; "Men loved darkness more than they loved LIGHT. Jesus is the Light of the world. IN THIS SENSE, THERE WOULD BE NO salvation WHATSOEVER, if THE light DID NOT CONFRONT THE DARKNESS! Jesus did it over, and over, and over again, hoping to save more.

I think of John 8: But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham.

41. Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God.

42. Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me.

43. Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word.

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

45. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not.

**""WHY DO YOU NOT UNDERSTAND MY SPEECH? YOU ARE OF YOUR FATHER THE DEVIL!"**

All the teaching and coaxing in all the World from the Creator himself would not have mattered one iota. There was a hardness, a rebellion within them that hated unto death, that Jesus associated with Satan; ...that shut their ears. They just wanted to murder him.

SO IT IS WITH THE spirit OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM AND ISLAM.

Jesus loves the PEOPLE bound by the devil in Roman Catholicism, Yet he hates the deeds and the teachings of it. There is a difference.

Our defence is not to be explained, or defended, but proclaimed. There is no middle ground for compromise. If you do so, be prepared for a roller coaster journey into an endless maze, and see every Pearl of life you offer be torn and broken, and cast back at you in tones of accusation and slander. It will be, as in this instance, an exercise in futility.

The devil is smarter than you, and capable of outwitting you, but not overcoming your faith. Our response should always be, as Jesus did with satan, "It is written!" ...and REBUKE!

"YOU SHALL NOT TEMPT THE LORD YOU GOD!", and this to the Tempter, Satan!

By the way, our convoluted friend was quite brilliant, but, sadly quite lost too. He reminded me of that group of Phari

sees in John 8. Jesus loved them, but had to speak the truth. He confronted them with His loving light.

The gospel is about confrontation, as two forces collide, LIFE AND DEATH, and our victory, and proclamation is centered around the CROSS of Jesus, and our Faith in it.

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2009/10/23 11:44**

Quote:

-----I have deleted your sermonindex.net forum account and ask that you do not re-register.  
-----

And yet you have brazenly disregarded our host's request by creating a new one. This action does not come from the heart of God, nor does the myriad of contentious posts as evidenced in this thread.

This horrible thread is being shut down. I am sad that someone who purports to be a member of the "one holy and apostolic church" would exude such a spirit contrary to the meekness and fragrance of Christ, but by their fruit such are made known - regardless of their dogma and/or ecclesiastical rubrics.

*Topic terminated.*