

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Sinlessness of Christ

Sinlessness of Christ - posted by Romans510, on: 2010/6/3 12:12

Dear Saints,

I am looking for some articles on this topic. I hope my post isn't considered spam, or as trying to instigate a debate. Rather, I am having a friendly discussion on this matter elsewhere, and hope for direction toward reputable resources. Naturally, SermonIndex is the first place to which I have come. I found the one by M.R. DeHaan, M.D., and wonder what else there is in printed format.

Thank you in advance for your suggestions.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ - posted by Romans510, on: 2010/6/6 11:20

I should've elaborated somewhat on my request, as I don't believe this was an odd one, but rather, perhaps, a very perplexing and misunderstood topic. Conversing with friends, one of them brought up an interesting question regarding Jesus' nature: being God, does that mean He was unable to sin, or, being also man, does that mean he merely suppressed a sin-nature. I am persuaded by scripture that He was unable to sin, but I felt inadequate in making the case, since, I suppose, other verses could be used to say otherwise.

In my search, I was directed by a most gracious instructor to a chapter from Andrew Murray's book "Like Christ", specifically, Chapter 15. Therefore, my search is over.

Re: , on: 2010/6/6 11:35

Quote:

----- I am persuaded by scripture that He was unable to sin, but I felt inadequate in making the case,

Heb 2:17 Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

heb 2:18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

If Christ was unable to sin then how could he be tempted? If he wasn't able to be tempted then how can he help me when I am tempted?

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/11 17:24

Hi Romans510,

Please read from the beginning of this download. <http://mp3.biblebase.com/details.php?file=43> - The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Romans.

You'll need Adobe Reader if you don't have it already.

The booklet may come at your topic from an angle you hadn't considered - holiness - but the writer had considered the

many facets of your question and more. I hope you are blessed.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/11 17:55

I would add from James 1:

12 Blessed the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive the crown of life, which the Lord hath promised to them that love him. 13 Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: 14 But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. 15 Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death. 16 Do not err, my beloved brethren. 17 Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.

and, preceding those quoted by sscott

Heb 2:16 For verily he took not on angels; but he took on the seed of Abraham.

Romans 8:3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

It is important to separate 'sin' (the cause of sins) and 'sinful flesh'. People do not sin only because of sinful flesh. Sinful flesh is fallen flesh. Originally, Adam's flesh was not fallen, and he had a spirit which was free from sin which could fellowship with God - according to Luke, his Father - Luke 3:38.

So, what did unfallen flesh look like, if the spirit inside was free from all sin? That's an unanswerable question, but, some preachers would suggest that there was a glory gilding the first man and woman which was forced to depart because of sin. Christ came without the 'glory', also. Maybe read Romans 5 as well.

I'm suggesting that while Christ had no sin within Him, and, He did not DESIRE to sin (because He was the Son of God), He did have to contend with the urges and temptations to His flesh, because that's what Paul seems to be implying in Romans 8:3. But the word 'likeness' is extremely important.

Psalms 22 is also worth reading, as there is a breakthrough point which is repeated in Heb 2:12. The first section, from v 1 - v 21, ably describe what Christ was experiencing on the cross. There is a lot of meaning hidden in those verses: how he was reminding himself of truth which he had known, and, how the various spiritual pressures were manifesting themselves to him, which he had to overcome without sinning, to destroy the devil (on the cross - Heb 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; 15 And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.)

If Christ had ever sinned, for whatever reason, He would not have been able to give His life in substitutionary sacrifice for mankind. He chose to not sin.

Through new birth, we also are brought into a spiritual condition which enables us to choose to 'not sin': 1 John 3:9 'and he can not sin'.

This could be taken as a reverse proof that Christ did not sin, because, we are made like Him: 1 John 3:1 Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God: therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not. 2 Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. 3 And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/12 9:28

Romans 5:10: I would like to add to what sscott was saying as he was hitting on the crux of the matter in answer to the question.

Look at Php 2:6-8

(6) Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

(7) But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:

(8) And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

Look at the phrase "became obedient". Obedience is an act of or choice of the will. The very fact that I am obedient means that I could have been otherwise. If it is impossible to do otherwise, then obedience loses its meaning and the statement itself is meaningless.

Look at Heb 4:15

(15) For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

Again we see that He was, "yet without sin." If it were impossible for Jesus to give in to temptation then it is not even worth mentioning that He was, "yet without sin." The very statement would lose all of its meaning. But He was tempted, meaning that He could have given in to the temptation and that the temptation was real in His flesh.

Some people envision Christ as "God in an earth suit", retaining all of His divine nature and yet walking this earth in a physical body. Not so according to Philippians 2:6-8. He did not think it taking something that did not belong to Him to be equal with God (He WAS.). But He emptied Himself (look at the Greek here) of everything divine and became man just as I am. Many times we see Jesus claiming to do nothing of Himself, but to be operating only as a man filled with the power of the Holy Spirit. See John 8:28 and John 14:10 and others. This does not detract from His divinity nor does it make Him any less God. Jesus IS God. But it is the act of laying aside the divine nature and operating as we do that made the substitutionary work of the atonement effective. Without this laying aside of divine privilege the atonement itself becomes meaningless. 1 Cor. 15:21.

The cool part of this is that Jesus desires to fill us with the same Holy Spirit that He was filled with. He said the comforter was with us, but would be IN us. John 14:17. You see, not realizing that Jesus operated as a man filled with the Holy Spirit on this earth is why some people find verses such as John 14:12 so hard to comprehend. We can do the same works and greater than Jesus did. Why? Because we can be filled with the same Holy Spirit that Jesus was. The power source, the comforter, the Holy Spirit, is the SAME in us as it was in Him. He did no works out of His own divinity, His own standing as God. He did it as a man filled with the abiding and indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit and then He offered that same abiding power to us. Praise God!!!

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/12 9:31

AlivetoGod: Just read the entirety of your last post. Amen!! I was blessed.

Re: - posted by jerryaustin1 (), on: 2010/6/12 10:28

It all boils down to whether deity can sin. He can not. While Jesus became flesh (John 1:14), He was also God (Colossians 2:9). Scripture testifies that it is impossible for God to lie (please forgive the lack of reference but you can look it up). If it is impossible for God to lie, is it possible Him to commit any sin? I realize that He was really man and that no less than I am. Being a man involves freewill. But we must take note of something else. He was also God. Being God involves the inability of sinning. So you have freewill and the inability to sin. He had the choice to sin but it was something that was impossible that He would do it.

Re: - posted by jerryaustin1 (), on: 2010/6/12 10:32

It is absurd but give it a thought. Can I tempt you to fly to mars flapping your arms?

Re: , on: 2010/6/12 11:39

Quote:

-----It all boils down to whether deity can sin. He can not. While Jesus became flesh (John 1:14), He was also God (Colossians 2:9). Scripture testifies that it is impossible for God to lie (please forgive the lack of reference but you can look it up). If it is impossible for God to lie, is it possible Him to commit any sin? I realize that He was really man and that no less than I am. Being a man involves freewill. But we must take note of something else. He was also God. Being God involves the inability of sinning. So you have freewill and the inability to sin. He had the choice to sin but it was something that was impossible that He would do it.

So are you saying this verse is a lie and shouldn't be in the bible? It doesn't say he had a choice to sin...it says he was "TEMPTED".

Heb 2:17 Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

heb 2:18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

Can you give me your understanding of this verse?

Re: - posted by jerryaustin1 (), on: 2010/6/12 15:06

ponder on my previous post

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/12 16:17

Travis, thank you. I'm blessed you were blessed. :-)

I'm rarely online with leisure to read these days, so I apologise to all, for seeming not to reply directly to posts.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/12 16:44

Hi jerryaustin1,

Titus 1:2

Quote:

-----It all boils down to whether deity can sin. He can not. While Jesus became flesh (John 1:14), He was also God (Colossians 2:9). Scripture testifies that it is impossible for God to lie (please forgive the lack of reference but you can look it up). If it is impossible for God to lie, is it possible Him to commit any sin? I realize that He was really man and that no less than I am. Being a man involves freewill. But we must take note of something else. He was also God. Being God involves the inability of sinning. So you have freewill and the inability to sin. He had the choice to sin but it was something that was impossible that He would do it.

"Being a man involves freewill."

Why is that? It's because man was made in God's image.

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

(Paul Washer says that 'the only begotten' means that Jesus was in a class by Himself. It's helpful to have the Greek m

ore clearly explained.)

John's statement harks back to Gen 1, where God's word became light, or anything else He wanted it to be. Thus, it's impossible to separate Jesus who is Man from Jesus who is God. He simply 'is' human and divine both totally and simultaneously.

What He demonstrated is that total integration between flesh and spirit on God's terms, wherein 'the flesh' can 'not sin' because it is totally controlled by God the Spirit. Not like a remote control controls a car, or the tv, but like the Spirit fills every part of the flesh and its functions.

I'm not sure what God being unable to lie has to do with this.

Sin is unbelief. Unbelief is a demonstration of believing a lie rather than the truth as it is in Jesus.

Jesus did not have an inner sin life trying to get out through His flesh, but, His flesh was subject to temptation from outside, to passions which tried to pull His flesh off course to separate it from His Spirit, thus creating disunity in Himself.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2010/6/12 17:11

Scott,

In one way brother you are right in that He could not sin because He had no desire to sin because He had the nature of God.

But we must also realize that He emptied himself from the form of God and was made into the likeness of men and humbled himself as a man filled with the Holy Spirit under obedience to God His Father having a divine nature without any trace of a sin nature in Him. As a man He subjected himself to be totally dependent upon His Father to do His Father's will only with the divine enablement of the Holy Spirit to live out His sinless life and minister the gospel message.

So He could have sinned if He had ever given into the temptation of the devil to disobey His Father in any area. But praise God He always did those things that pleased His Father. This is why He got up a great while before day and prayed and also praying all night before even choosing His disciples. This is why He stayed full of the Holy Spirit and was always led by the Spirit and therefore He never sinned not even one time.

We are different in that we were born with a nature of sin and also prone to sin. We must be born again and be filled with the Spirit and to walk in the Spirit to be cleansed of sin by His precious blood and to also overcome our sinful nature by putting it off and being dead to sin. We must walk in the Spirit and we will not fulfill the lusts of the flesh.

Hebrews 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;

Hebrews 2:15 And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham.

Hebrews 2:17 Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

Hebrews 2:18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

Hebrews 4:14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession.

Hebrews 4:15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.

Hebrews 4:16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

He came into this world as the second man from heaven as Adam being the first and we know that the first man was disobedient and sinned. Jesus had to come and partake of our human nature in order to destroy the works of the devil for us. He took part of our nature but not part of our sin. He had the same nature of Adam before he sinned. We receive this nature as a new man in Christ. The seed of Christ living in us will cause us to overcome all temptations of the devil if we grow in Christ and be filled, controlled, and led by the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ is our High Priest in heaven always interceding

eding for us who are in Christ. We are regenerated by the Holy Spirit and filled with the Holy Spirit so that Christ's "will" is being carried out on this earth through our obedient faith.

The point is that Christ Jesus was tempted in every way that any of us could ever be tempted in and he didn't sin so He is able to help us not to continue in sin. We are human but Christ also became human and everything that was available to Christ as a human is available to us as a human in Christ. We must not think that he couldn't of sinned because there are sins of omission as well as commission and He could have disobeyed the Father in even a very small detail, but praise God he didn't disobey even unto the death of the cross. Even though he had the power not to suffer he suffered any way according to the will of God. He suffered for our sins so we could be made the righteousness of God in Him who never sinned.

The argument of flapping our arms and flying to Mars is far-fetched because we were never created as a human with any capability to do so but Christ was made in the likeness of man and subjected himself to be obedient to the Father and therefore being capable of being disobedient but thank God he never disobeyed. We are so blessed!!!

Blessings to You!

Re: - posted by andres (), on: 2010/6/12 17:20

I read this somewhere,
"When the devil tempts us, It's as if he shoots a flaming arrow into gasoline, It ignites all kinds of thoughts about disobeying God..

on the other Hand, when The devil shot his flaming arrows at Christ, it was like shooting them into water, they were put out.." Jesus never got inflamed on the inside to lust after a woman, or steal... His heart was always directed to His Father...

So was Jesus Tempted .. Yes.. Did he ever think once about sinning .. NEVER!

Much Love
andy

mu

Re: , on: 2010/6/12 18:06

I believe the bible teaches that we can live above sin. Though I believe it, I don't believe it's possible, even though all things are possible with God. When you're young and filled with spiritual ambition a lot of those ideas seemed to be a fantasy that one could arrive at. When you get older, you begin to realize that nothing is a fantasy, the reality is Jesus Christ and Him crucified and the believers continual journey carrying a cross. I think happiness in Jesus is found in sorrow and grief at least so far that has been my experience.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2010/6/12 18:33

If Jesus was unable to sin then He wasn't fully man, and the incarnation didn't really happen. His being fully God does not put a limitation on His humanity as a man. Such is shown in the fact He died. Not only that, but in His death He became sin on the cross. If Christ could not sin when He was tempted, then neither could He have become sin and die on the cross. Yet He did all these things being fully God in His incarnation.

Hope this helps you.

Jimmy

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/12 18:59

I have tremendous difficulty with the idea that when the English translates the Greek to 'emptied', it means His DIVINITY drained out of Him in the way some of you seem to think (or, the way you write, seems to read).

The way I read it is more that BEING DIVINE, He did not let His Divinity rule over His humanity, as is so often believed by some who wish to give themselves an excuse to sin, saying that HE didn't sin, because as God, He found it easy to not sin; whereas He had come to show us how a man could live in fellowship with God, rejecting sin and triumphing over it, as a necessary part of preparing to endure the cross. But always, He had the prize of victory over death in sight, and despised the discomforts which attempted to rob Him on the way to that victory, that we could become partakers of the divine nature.

2 Peter 1:3 According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: 4 Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2010/6/12 20:34

Alive-to-God,

I very much enjoyed all your posts.

Thanks for sharing.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/13 7:05

rbanks, thank you. I am humbled.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/13 9:19

Alive-to-God

Quote:
-----I have tremendous difficulty with the idea that when the English translates the Greek to 'emptied', it means His DIVINITY drained out of Him in the way some of you seem to think (or, the way you write, seems to read).

I don't think it means that He emptied Himself of His obvious position as God (positional divinity I guess one could say?). He never became "not God". But He emptied Himself of divine privilege and ability. He operated on this earth as 100% man empowered by the Holy Spirit. Yet, He was still God, He was still divinity. His identity did not change, but His "form" did.

I am reminded of the woman with the issue of blood. When she touched the hem of His garment in faith, He perceived that something had transpired in the Spirit, but He did not know who it was who touched Him. His question to that effect was not rhetorical, it was genuine. Had He retained divine privilege, had He been operating as God in the earth, He would have known who touched Him. But outside of a word of knowledge by the Holy Spirit (gifts of the Spirit) He could not know. So, He asked the question.

Re: , on: 2010/6/13 11:57

Quote:
-----I am reminded of the woman with the issue of blood. When she touched the hem of His garment in faith, He perceived that something had transpired in the Spirit, but He did not know who it was who touched Him. His question to that effect was not rhetorical, it was genuine. Had He retained divine privilege, had He been operating as God in the earth, He would have known who touched Him. But outside of a word of knowledge by the Holy Spirit (gifts of the Spirit) He could not know. So, He asked the question.

Very good point. There are several examples in the scriptures like this. For example, Christ did not know the time of His return...only the father knew. There were also time where the "power to heal" was present with him. Obviously that implies that there were other times when the power was not present. He was definitely a man operating under the power of God's Spirit.

For some reason though, today it's almost blasphemous to talk about the humanity of Christ and the fact that there were things Christ did not know unless the Spirit gave him the knowledge. People somehow think this is robbing God of His glory or denying who He is. Yet it's the truth of scripture.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/15 13:35

Hi Travis,

I think I know the point you are making, but I'm uncomfortable with the way it is explained, because if

Quote:
-----He never became "not God".

then He never became not divine, either.

He was not limited by being a whole man - Word made Flesh - made in the image of God, as well as being God, but He disowned His divinity in the same way as we are to disown our personal lives and follow Him, being crucified with Him. He showed us what a crucified life looks like.

At the time though, He was the Resurrection and the Life, even although He had not yet died or been resurrected. I am far more comfortable with all the mystery of His revelation of Himself, than with the choice of wording you (and others) have offered me.

If, as you imply, His only 'divinity' was the fullness of the Holy Spirit, then our power to become the sons of God - to 'receive the gift, and Giver, too' (C Wesley), ought to make us as wholly divine as He was. But that most certainly is not the case.

Do you see what I'm getting at.... ? The minimisation of God incarnate, to suit our theologies; because nowhere in the New Testament is there a statement which even vaguely hints that Christ's divinity ceased, even temporarily - however He chose to reveal that to us. John 8:58, Matt 1:21, 22, 23.

I think also, it's important to retain the context of what Paul was conveying in Phil 2, and not try to create a whole doctrine out of one verse lifted way off the page.

Sorry, I'm still short of time online. Won't be back till later this week.

Love to you all. :-)

Re: Sinlessness of Christ - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/15 17:11

Alive-to-God:

Hmmm! Trying to figure out if we have a semantics issue or if there is really a difference in how we see this.

I agree, He never became "not divine". But He emptied Himself of divine right and privilege. He knew who He was, but He did not operate in that capacity with respect to the omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotence that He had before His incarnation. In fact, in John 17:5 Jesus speaks to the Father about His regaining that glory that He had before He became a man. A practical way to look at this is to look at examples from His earthly ministry. His divine nature was omniscient, yet He did not know who touched Him in the crowd. His divine nature was omnipotent, yet the lack of faith of those in Nazareth prevented Him from performing miracles other than that He healed a few sick folk. He was bound by every limitation that you or I am as a human being. Yet He operated in the power of the Holy Spirit.

I don't think the fact that we too can operate in the power of the Holy Spirit makes us divine. It makes us full of, baptized in, saturated with, the divine nature of God. 2 Peter 1:3-4. He is God, we are humans who can be full of the Spirit of God. Yet for 33 years He became fully as we are and partook of our humanity, our nature if you will (not to be confused with the religious term "sin nature").

It seems to me that Philippians 2:6-8 and Hebrews 2:16-18 speak of this casting off of divine privilege and taking on of humanity pretty clearly. In fact, Hebrews sets the upper limit of His operation on earth as the nature of angels and says that He did not stoop only to that level, but became fully human. I agree that nowhere does scripture say He gave up His place as God, i.e., gave up His position as divinity. But He did give up divine privilege (I am not sure I have a better word than privilege to describe this). His power to work miracles did not come from a divine right or privilege, but rather from the operation of the Holy Spirit in Him. This is how we can partake of the divine nature ourselves as stated in 2 Peter 1:3-4. Not because we "become divine", but because now the comforter has been sent to indwell us in the same way that He indwelt Christ.

Not sure if that made things better or worse, but I think it vitally important if we are to understand the fullness of the power of the Holy Spirit that God desires us to walk in. We are to do the same works that Jesus did and greater works according to John 14. There is only one way this can happen. It must be that we are filled with a power that is not our own. It must be that we are filled with the same Holy Spirit that Christ was filled with. We can do what He did because we can be filled with the same power that He was filled with.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/15 18:24

Hello Travis :-) Thanks for your patience...

First, let me quote the end of John 17 (YLT) 22 `And I, the glory that thou hast given to me, have given to them, that they may be one as we are one; 23 I in them, and Thou in me, that they may be perfected into one, and that the world may know that Thou didst send me, and didst love them as Thou didst love me. 24 `Father, those whom Thou hast given to me, I will that where I am they also may be with me, that they may behold my glory that Thou didst give to me, because Thou didst love me before the foundation of the world.

Quote:
-----Not sure if that made things better or worse, but I think it vitally important if we are to understand the fullness of the power of the Holy Spirit that God desires us to walk in. We are to do the same works that Jesus did and greater works according to John 14. There is only one way this can happen. It must be that we are filled with a power that is not our own. It must be that we are filled with the same Holy Spirit that Christ was filled with. We can do what He did because we can be filled with the same power that He was filled with.

I agree WHOLEheartedly that we are to do the works He did, and greater, and that it must be by the power of the Holy Spirit, but that makes us 'in Christ' and 'He' and 'the Father' in us. Christ clearly said 'I and my Father are one'. I'm just resisting steadfastly, the notion WE can define the terms of the Word made Flesh, better than scripture.

John 17:5 does not specifically refer to His manhood, and is completely compatible with 'before Abraham was, I Am', which got Him into so much trouble with unbelieving Jews.

Regarding He didn't know who had touched him in the crowd, He had no need to ask His Father, because He was surrounded with people who had seen the event. But do we know how He knew the name of the widow to whom Elijah had been sent? Or, which disciples to call? (and so on).

I believe Jesus came and suffered as a man, not because God had not suffered already, but to be seen by so many men that their testimony would have some weight. We could not, as humans, suffer, if God in whose image we are made, cannot suffer - or had not suffered (with respect to eternity).

The other major difference between Christ and us, is that His flesh did not have to die. It did die, but it was that Flesh which did not see corruption. Whereas ours will have to be raised from corruption into incorruption, one day; mortality will put on immortality (and so on).

I will think some more about what you're saying. Of course I accept there were physical limitations on Christ's physical presence amongst men, but.... why cannot He be the fully divine God while exercising those limitations?

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/15 18:40

Quote:
-----Regarding He didn't know who had touched him in the crowd, He had no need to ask His Father, because He was surrounded with people who had seen the event. But do we know how He knew the name of the widow to whom Elijah had been sent? Or, which disciples to call? (and so on).

I think maybe John 14:10 and John 5:19, John 5:30, John 8:28 have some bearing on this. It is also interesting to note that Jesus did no miracles until after He was filled with the Holy Spirit. It is also interesting to look at the 9 gifts of the Spirit in 1 Cor. 12 and then look for instances of each of these in Jesus' life. For example, Jesus knowing that the woman at the well had 5 husbands previously and was living with the man she was not married to was the operation of the gift of the word of knowledge. I have known things about people through the Holy Spirit in ministry situations through this manifestation of the Holy Spirit. I would say that all of the miracles that He performed were accomplished through the indwelling power of the Holy Spirit. To me that is absolutely exciting because it means that I have that same power resident in me if I am baptized in the Holy Spirit. Jesus said the comforter was WITH the disciples, but would be IN them. With in that Jesus was filled with the Holy Spirit and was with them, and later He would send the comforter. In fact, He said it was needful that He leave bodily so that the comforter could be sent.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2010/6/15 23:03

It seems to be really hard to explain the nature of Christ. "Fully man, yet fully God". Fully man, yet without sin. Here we see sin does not reside in our bodies as some teach. His nature is pure, ours is fallen. He came to redeem us from our fallen nature and to purify us (Acts 15:8-9).

Fully God, therefore without sin. Because He is God, He could not sin. Because He is man, He is surrounded with the potential of sin. But because He is God,... It is something that is almost impossible to understand and explain. 1 Tim. 3:16 helps.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/16 9:37

Hi Travis,

I understand completely that the Holy Spirit enables us to do things Christ did - because He came to restore the likeness of God, in man.

But that doesn't explain why He caused such a stir even before His baptism - His baptism which, you will recall, John the Baptist also understood He did not need.

Jesus did not become able to 'not sin' (and therefore, to do His Father's will), only because of the power of the Holy Spirit (as we do). He was able to 'not sin' - all through His life before as well as after His baptism.

I would suggest there must have been other ways in which He was different, which are not noted in scripture for us; Psalms 22:9. Or, perhaps they are prophetically noted? We forget there was no New Testament when the disciples were evangelizing, but Jesus fulfilled far more than they could understand.

These verses point towards that: Luke 2:19, Luke 2:40, 46, 47, 48 And when they saw him, they were amazed; Luke 2:52

Thanks again for the dialogue.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/16 19:49

Quote:
-----But that doesn't explain why He caused such a stir even before His baptism - His baptism which, you will recall, John the Baptist also understood He did not need.

Actually, Jesus stated explicitly that it was necessary. I am not so sure John felt it not necessary as much as he felt himself unworthy. Jesus straightened that out really quickly.

I don't think anyone would claim that the grace of God was not on Jesus in a very special way. As you noted Luke 2:40. It is not an all or nothing proposition. Jesus was anointed with the oil of gladness above all of his fellows right? In that respect I would agree that he was different in many ways. Absolutely agree with you there. It is just that He did not operate out of His position as the son of God, but rather operated as the son of man filled with the power of God through the Holy Spirit. (It just occurs to me that I keep repeating myself. That is bound to drive you crazy. Sorry.)

Well, must study. God bless you.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/6/17 0:23

If Jesus Christ had not divested Himself of equality with God, no man could have looked upon Him without death. But, "if you have seen Me you have seen the Father?" He simply became a Man, all Man, with the express image of God the Father manifested by His presence as the express image of God, that we might look upon Him and see what God intended from before the beginning of the earth, what is that?

Albert Barnes' Notes on the Bible

Ephesians 1:4

Verse 4. According as. The importance of this verse will render proper a somewhat minute examination of the words and phrases of which it is composed. The general sense of the passage is, that these blessings pertaining to heaven were bestowed upon Christians in accordance with an eternal purpose. They were not conferred by chance or hap-hazard. They were the result of intention and design on the part of God. Their value was greatly enhanced from the fact that God had designed from all eternity to bestow them, and that they come to us as the result of his everlasting plan. It was not a recent plan; it was not an after-thought; it was not by mere chance; it was not by caprice; it was the fruit of an eternal counsel. Those blessings had all the value, and all the assurance of permanency, which must result from that fact. The phrase "according as" kaqwV--implies that these blessings were in conformity with that eternal plan, and have flowed to us as the expression of that plan. They are limited by that purpose, for it marks and measures all. It was as God had chosen that it should be, and had appointed in his eternal purpose.

He hath chosen us. The word "us" here shows that the apostle had reference to individuals, and not to communities. It includes Paul himself as one of the "chosen," and those whom he addressed--the mingled Gentile and Jewish converts in Ephesus. That it must refer to individuals is clear. Of no community, as such, can it be said, that it was "chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy." It is not true of the Gentile world as such, nor of any one of the nations making up the Gentile world. The word rendered here "hath chosen" - exelaxato--is from a word meaning to lay out together, (Passow,) to choose out, to select. It has the idea of making a choice or selection among different objects or things. It is applied to things, as in Lu 10:42. "Mary hath chosen that good part;"--she has made a choice, or selection of it, or has shown a preference for it. 1Co 1:27: "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world;" he has preferred to make use of them among all the conceivable things which might have been employed "to confound the wise." Comp. Ac 1:2; 6:5; 15:22,25. It denotes to choose out with the accessory idea of kindness or favour. Mr 13:20. "For the elect's sake whom he hath chosen, he hath shortened the days." Joh 13:18, "I know whom I have chosen." Ac 13:17. "The God of this people of Israel chose our fathers;" that is, selected them from the nations to accomplish important purposes. This is evidently the sense of the word in the passage before us. It means to make a selection or choice, with the idea of favour or love, and

with a view to impart important benefits on those whom he chose. The idea of making some distinction between them and others, is essential to a correct understanding of the passage-- since there can be no choice where no such distinction is made. He who chooses one out of many things makes a difference, or evinces a preference--no matter what the ground or reason of his doing it may be. Whether this refers to communities and nations, or to individuals, still it is true that a distinction is made, or a preference given of one over another. It may be added, that so far as justice is concerned, it makes no difference whether it refers to nations or to individuals. If there is injustice in choosing an individual to favour, there cannot be less in choosing a nation--for a nation is nothing but a collection of individuals. Every objection which has ever been made to the doctrine of election as it relates to individuals, will apply with equal force to the choice of a nation to peculiar privileges. If a distinction is made, it may be made with as much propriety in respect to individuals as to nations.

In him. In Christ. The choice was not without reference to any means of saving them; it was not a mere purpose to bring a certain number to heaven; it was with reference to the mediation of the Redeemer, and his work. It was a purpose that they should be saved by him, and share the benefits of the atonement. The whole choice and purpose of salvation had reference to him, and out of him no one was chosen to life, and no one out of him will be saved. End

Only the Only Begotten Son of the Seed of the Father by the Holy Spirit, being fully man and fully God could accomplish this Plan God had already planned before Adam or even the earth was created as we know it now.

This is it, In Christ and The Same Seed of the Father, Jesus Christ, "Christ in you the Hope of Glory": Phillip

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/17 9:40

Hi Travis, :-) I've just seen how long this post is! Take a breath...

Quote:

-----It is just that He did not operate out of His position as the son of God, but rather operated as the son of man filled with the power of God through the Holy Spirit. (It just occurs to me that I keep repeating myself. That is bound to drive you crazy. Sorry.)

I'm not going crazy; it's just that I don't agree with the statement you're repeating.

I suppose I genuinely fear to align the parallels too simplistically. It will always be that only Jesus Christ could have died for us, because, as the Son of God, He could, and did, choose to not sin, (thus becoming an acceptable substitute for our deaths, for us who were eternally condemned by our sin(s)).

That word 'emptied' (Himself), can be translated 'made void'. In that we imagine we know what He would have been like if He had not 'made void' His right to behave as a majesty on earth (or, Majesty).

(eg Dan 10:5 Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins girded with fine gold of Uphaz: 6 His body also like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude. 7 And I Daniel alone saw the vision: for the men that were with me saw not the vision; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves. Rev 1: 13 And in the midst of the seven candlesticks like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. 14 His head and hairs white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes as a flame of fire; 15 And his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. 16 And he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a sharp twoedged sword: and his countenance as the sun shineth in his strength. 17 And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: 18 I he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.)

I fully accept that He made void also, His right as Creator and Owner, and, all the other qualities you listed in an earlier post which can be possible only if not limited by a body that was able to die.

Quote:

-----Jesus was anointed with the oil of gladness above all of his fellows right?

Again, I think this has to be given context, such as Psa 45 from which it comes. It seems to be referring to a time after the cross, don't you think?

Heb 12: who for the JOY that was set before him ENDURED the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. 3 For consider him that ENDURED such contradiction of sinners against himself.

You see, I agree that we see Jesus going through steps towards public ministry, which are utterly essential for fallen-but-saved humans to pass through also, but, I believe Jesus was filled with the Holy Spirit at His birth. I cannot think of a reason that would not have been possible. Can you?

His baptism was necessary as part of His making void His equality with God, but He was, nevertheless, actually equal with God - which He said again and again in different ways, and, frequently, was the cause of trouble with Pharisees and unbelieving Jews.

Do you see my problem yet? It was precisely because He was the Son of God that He was on earth, going through the things He went through. The obedience which He learned by suffering, was not the obedience to His natural mother, but the obedience to His natural Father, which kept Him on earth with multitudes of self-seeking unbelievers, who simply did not see what He could 'see' - could see because He was the only begotten Son of God, the Word of God being lived out as the Man. His flesh, though able to be tempted, was entirely as it should have been, bearing the image of God without flaw or failure. AND He was baptised in the Holy Spirit. A double portion?

I guess you'd agree with me, that we also, by the power of the Holy Spirit in us, overcoming sin and the flesh, are to become 'the word of God' to the world.

Remember, I do already agree that through receiving His death and resurrection, we can become like Christ, receiving all the gifts of the Spirit and living them out in such a way as to bring the kingdom of heaven near to our generation, as He did (and does) to His. Yes, that is really exciting!

But, there are many claiming the name of Christ, who do not want to live a crucified life; who think the power of these gifts is for them to enjoy for themselves, and is a kind of endorsement of their life as it is; that God is pleased with them as they are, rather than understanding that it's only as they are obedient to death (the cross daily, as much as Heb 10:14), as He was, (therefore, they are 'in Christ') and, as He, and the Father, by the Holy Spirit, are 'in' them, that they have everlasting life both now and for ever.

I don't think I can say more. Again, I thank you for patiently bearing in this discussion. God bless you very much.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/17 21:37

I would have to say that I agree with a great deal of what you have just said. Having a rather difficult family situation this evening, I have not had time or energy to thoroughly digest it. I will replay later.

Re: Sinlessness of Christ, on: 2010/6/18 7:15

Travis, no hurry, no worry. God bless you all.

Re: - posted by Romans510, on: 2010/6/18 11:32

Forgive me, I've not checked in since my last comment of June 6th...I assumed no one was interested since it was silent for a while. Only now, June 18th, am I seeing that there has since been a blessed shower of responses. Thank you very much to all of you. I will read the booklet provided at the beginning of this thread, together with all the other responses...this will take some time before I can comment further.

I will say that Alan Redpath had a very insightful sermon on this which I have on CD, but am unable to find online. I'm still trying to grasp this...

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/6/21 19:32

Quote:
-----You see, I agree that we see Jesus going through steps towards public ministry, which are utterly essential for fallen-but-saved humans to pass through also, but, I believe Jesus was filled with the Holy Spirit at His birth. I cannot think of a reason that would not have been possible. Can you?

Hmmm! I guess it is not so much that it would not have been possible, but what does scripture say about it? It was possible for Jesus to turn the stones into bread at His temptation, or at least Satan assumed it possible, yet He did not.

Quote:
-----His baptism was necessary as part of His making void His equality with God, but He was, nevertheless, actually equal with God - which He said again and again in different ways, and, frequently, was the cause of trouble with Pharisees and unbelieving Jews.

We may be involved in a symantical dance. I am not sure that His baptism was simply a "ceremony" He had to go through to prove He was like us, but rather the point at which He was filled with the Holy Spirit. But I am totally with you in the rest of this statement. AMEN!

Quote:
-----But, there are many claiming the name of Christ, who do not want to live a crucified life; who think the power of these gifts is for them to enjoy for themselves, and is a kind of endorsement of their life as it is; that God is pleased with them as they are, rather than understanding that it's only as they are obedient to death (the cross daily, as much as Heb 10:14), as He was, (therefore, they are 'in Christ') and, as He, and the Father, by the Holy Spirit, are 'in' them, that they have everlasting life both now and for ever.

True. In fact, I spoke on this very fact at church yesterday. I have been teaching on the Holy Spirit, and brought out the point that the purpose of being filled with the Holy Spirit is not the gifts. The purpose is to be filled with the Power of God, to have His Spirit indwelling us, to be in constant communion with His Holy Spirit, to have the very mind of Christ according to 1 Cor. 2. The gifts are simply manifestations of that power to be used to minister to others. I taught yesterday about walking in the Spirit and about how doing that will require a death, namely our own.

Blessings Alive-to-God

Re: - posted by Romans510, on: 2010/6/23 12:20

Dear Alive-to-God & Travis,

Thank you for taking the time to expound on all this. I read the intro to the Romans exposition (just don't give me a pop quiz, please), and I read all the comments. I'd say you expressed your understanding much better than I was able to, as we are on the "same page". For about 6 months now, I've been listening, and re-listening to the sermons of Maj. Thomas and the like (Alan Redpath, John Hunter). As Maj. Thomas teaches, Jesus lived as a man wholly surrendered to the Father. He was man as man was intended to be: dependant on the Father. My understanding also is that he emptied Himself of all His Power and lived (as an example to us as to how we are to live) dependant on the Father at all times. Any power that He had was a direct result of His being perfectly "in tune" with the Father. No man could ever imitate this since we are born in the flesh. Only Jesus, being incarnate, could live this life, and then, by His Spirit given to us who believe in Him, are then able to do likewise: as He was dependant on the Father moment-by-moment, so are we to be dependant on Jesus, moment-by-moment. That is my very simplified understanding.

I realise I may have a few rough edges, and if you see anything that needs correcting, I'd be grateful to receive such.

My thanks to you who have contributed.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2010/6/25 22:46

Romans510 Said, "being God, does that mean He was unable to sin, or, being also man, does that mean he merely suppressed a sin-nature.

* Being God added nothing the Jesus' humanity. Being human subtracted nothing from His divinity.

Romans510 Said, "I am persuaded by scripture that He was unable to sin"

* Jesus was God while here on Earth, however, He did not use any of His Godness (if you will) to overcome the world. God defeated Sin, Death and Satan in Satan's own turf (this world), stripping Himself of His divine authority and taking on the form of a servant, a mere mortal man. God exposed Himself to all the elements, poverty, hunger and sufferings of this world.

Jesus beat Satan with both hands tied behind His back.

Jesus did not have any advantage over sin any more than we have right now.

Jesus did not use any of His "God powers" to overcome sin and the world; He only made use of His volition as all mankind has to not sin; He did not remain sinless by any slightest difference than any other man, He was the EXACT same as we are to day.

These verses are telling us that Jesus was made human just as we are; as flesh.

John 1:14 And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.

Romans 8:3 For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

Sinful flesh means flesh which is able to sin, not that flesh is sinful in & of its self, which is a Gnostic belief.

The flesh was created week from the beginning, in the Garden.

It was never meant to be used as strength for resisting sin. It is one of the very reasons that Adam fell, lust of the flesh...

The weakness of Jesus being made flesh, not using His "God Powers" proved that man IS able to never sin in his whole life, just as the following Scriptures.

Philippians 2:6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not a thing to be grasped to be same as God:

:7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:

:8 And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

God becoming as one of us in the same kind of flesh with no difference between any other man.

Galatians 4:4 But when the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, came out of a woman, made under the law,

Eve was made of dust just as we all are; Jesus became dust also.

"The virgin birth" is to show us that His Father is God and that He was not "created" as we are.

There is nothing more to get out of "the virgin birth".

Hebrews 2:14 Since then the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil;

Jesus was the same as "the children" with no difference.

Hebrews 2:16 For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the nature of Abraham.

:17 Therefore in all things he had to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.

:18 For in that he himself has suffered being tempted, he is able to help them that are tempted.

What is the nature of Abraham?

Human, made of weak, dying flesh.

In all things he had to be made like us as we are now.

If Jesus had any advantage over sin and the world any more than we have now, Jesus would not have been a perfect priest.

Hebrews 4:15 For we have not a high priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our weaknesses; but was in all points tempted like we are, yet without sin

The "yet without sin" does not mean that He was "born without sin", but that He always chose not to sin as we should.

Jesus remained sinless not because He is God, but by loving His Father; which is exactly how we may not sin.

Jesus is our Standard.

Standards must be reachable/attainable in order for the standard to be fair & just.

IF remained sinless precisely because he was/is God, then that would be an unjust standard for us to be held to, because we are not God to not sin.

Jesus is our perfect example. Examples are to be imitated.

IF Jesus remained sinless precisely because he was/is God, then we can not imitate Him; for we aren't God (or gods). Since we are not God (or gods) so that we may not sin, how are we supposed to imitate Him?

Re: - posted by Romans510, on: 2010/6/27 12:03

Sounds perfectly logical to me, Logic! I'm a swirl of confused inconsistencies at the moment...I see that I need to study this more. You've given me plenty to chew on - thank you very much.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/28 14:37

Is there any virtue in not yielding to temptation when it was impossible to yield to temptation? If I tell a child to resist the cookies and then tie his hands to his side would it be virtue for the child not to have taken the cookies?

Eve had no old nature but was tempted and fell. Christ had no 'old nature' was tempted and resisted. (clearly by dependence upon God). His temptation was 'if you are the son of God... do this'. In his incarnation he was bound to live as a human being and his answers shows it 'man shall not live by bread alone'. He was tempted to behave as God but he determined to live as man dependent upon God.

To say that he was divine and therefore could not sin undermines the fullness of his incarnation. If we follow that line we would have to say he was divine and could not die.

Re: , on: 2010/6/29 1:44

Dear brethren

Oswald Chambers has the answer for this one I think. He believed that Christ could not sin, the temptations were not over that issue. They were over the same issue that those face who have been sanctified through their consent to the crucifixion of the old nature and are now living holy lives, in union with Christ with the power of sin broken but who now must learn to sacrifice the physical for the spiritual. These ones know that sin is no longer an issue as all desire for it has gone.

This involves forsaking the natural desires of man which are not sinful, like to eat, to sleep, to preserve life, to have human love, for the higher will of God which is to be entirely moved by the Holy Spirit, not just in defeating sin but also to have these human instincts given by God overruled and controlled by the Spirit in order that God's perfect will be done in His working amongst other men.

This was the essence of what Jesus went through in the wilderness and where He succeeded rather than Adam who failed through allowing his desire for knowledge to overcome God's will.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/29 5:12

Quote:
-----Oswald Chambers has the answer for this one I think. He believed that Christ could not sin, the temptations were not over that issue. They were over the same issue that those face who have been sanctified through their consent to the crucifixion of the old nature and are now living holy lives, in union with Christ with the power of sin broken but who now must learn to sacrifice the physical for the spiritual. These ones know that sin is no longer an issue as all desire for it has gone.

I would be grateful for the Oswald Chambers reference here. I align myself very much with the teaching of OC and would like to follow this up.

Are you saying that to yield to a temptation to the natural desires, outside the will of God, would not be 'sin'?

Re: , on: 2010/6/29 5:26

Hmmm you have set me a task there - but I will seek the reference for you. I am pleased to hear that you align yourself with his teachings as he taught entire sanctification in the traditional way not the Keswick way.

"Are you saying that to yield to a temptation to the natural desires, outside the will of God, would not be 'sin'?"

I understand it as following the permitted will of God and not the perfect will which will place us in the position of being at risk of falling into sin.

Re: , on: 2010/6/29 5:49

OK here it is :

Our Brilliant Heritage pub 1991 by Nova Publishing Ltd.

Chapter 18 p 135 1st para.

"If any man come after Me let him deny himself" Mt 16:24

"Our Lord is referring to the natural self which must be denied in order that it may be made spiritual (note from me - the old man is crucified and is not self)

Our Lord does not teach 'Deeper death to self' Sin and self are not the same thing. Sin does not belong in the human nature as God created it. Adam was innocent when God created him and God intended him to take part in his own moral development and to transform his natural life into a spiritual life by obedience but Adam refused to do this. Our Lord continually denied the natural and turned into the spiritual by obedience. With our Lord everything was spiritual - His eating His drinking were continual acts of subordination to His father's will (Mt 4:2-4)"

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/29 10:31

Quote:
-----"Our Lord is referring to the natural self which must be denied in order that it may be made spiritual (note from me - the old man is crucified and is not self)

OC is not referring to the act of a sin here but to the nature of Sin, hence his upper case 'S' in my version.

This is interesting as I was preaching on this just this Sunday morning in our church here in Reading UK. We must distinguish between His cross which dealt with the nature of Sin and put an end to the old man to all who are genuinely in Christ AND our cross which we must take up daily. In OC's usual language, our cross is 'denying my right to myself' Notice that is 'myself' and not 'my self'. The modern psychological term of 'the self' has no place in the biblical revelation, there is just 'me'.

The fact that we have natural desires which can be the beachhead of temptation may, if we yield, become a sin. Christ had natural desires, he would not have been thoroughly incarnated without them, but to submit to them in a context in which the will of God had demanded otherwise would be a sin.

He denied his right to himself in the satisfaction of his natural desires in order to remain in what he knew to be the will of God. This is not the same as saying 'Christ could not sin'. His nature was not the source of his temptation his nature was 'worked on' by an enemy. The nature was not at fault and he resisted where Adam and Eve had yielded. If he had yielded it would have been 'a sin' just as it was for Adam and Eve. It was Adam's sin in this yielding which opened the door to a different nature entering, hence 'it was by one man that Sin entered'. Technically, the first sin was Eve's but Adam's sin, as the federal head of the race, had a far more devastating consequence; through his 'sin' Sin entered.

Genuine regeneration deals with our Sin inheritance from Adam, but we must still make the choices which transform the natural into the spiritual (as OC would say).

Do let's pursue this theme, there are vital truths here which I believe OC identified more clearly than almost any other writer I know.

ps I once shared a meal with OC's daughter Katherine!

Re: , on: 2010/6/29 12:32

Quote:

-----We must distinguish between His cross which dealt with the nature of Sin and put an end to the old man to all who are genuinely in Christ AND our cross which we must take up daily. In OC's usual language, our cross is 'denying my right to myself' Notice that is 'myself' and not 'my self'. The modern psychological term of 'the self' has no place in the biblical revelation, there is just 'me'.

Yes exactly and this is where false ideas come in which say that our self has to die. This is the Buddhist idea where 'salvation' is found in getting rid of our desires whereas the Christian way is to sacrifice them. The natural part of man is neutral, the important thing is what is behind it. If it is Sin then self will be a slave to sin but if we deny self then Christ is our all and in every thought and action as the ruling disposition, another OC term! But this is further on than crucifixion of the old nature.

I believe that OC was teaching these matters to those who had already known the 'second blessing' and this is where most teachers stop but he went further and so was teaching another theology to Keswick teaching which corresponds to the older teaching of three stages - purgation, illumination and union whereas Keswick teaches only two steps. For OC union was when we have sacrificed all of the natural and our nature is at one with Christ.

"God has set in the Scriptures many other patterns to show us this truth. And we see the number three coming up time and again. We see it in the tabernacle, with the outer court, the Holy Place, and then the Holiest of all. There is yet the fullness of the Spirit before me... and so I must continue on... like Ezekiel, when the man in fine linen measured out the waters of the River... till there were "waters to swim in, an River that could not be passed over," flowing out of the House of God. I must continue on.

I must not settle for the "outer court," with the altar of burnt offering, and the laver. I must not neglect that, but I must not settle for it either. I must move further into the Holy Place, where there is the illumination of the Lampstand, and the table of shewbread, and the golden altar of incense (which, we are told, actually pertains to the Holiest of all, Heb. 9.4, 1 Kings 6.22). ALL of this was

given as a provision for the priests (the worshippers) to prepare them and equip them to come into the realm beyond the veil... God's own dwelling Place between the cherubim... and DWELL there with Him. We are told that in the old tabernacle only the high priest could enter that place, but in the New Covenant we are all called "to enter the Holiest of all..." (Heb. 10.19). His provision to us of salvation, and gifts and ministries... this is all to equip us for what He ultimately has in mind for us, which is union

with Himself, the same union shared by Father and Son (Jn. 17.20-23)"(ADisciple)

The three stages are also depicted for us in the journey of the children of Israel, where they are under bondage of the law of the Pharaoh (not the state of an unbeliever as Pharaoh is typifying the old nature in us) are delivered into a place where they are tested but have been enlightened and have seen great works of God, but alas, few entered into the land of promise.

omise (union) full obedience and fruitfulness of the Spirit because of unbelief. They reached the borders to the place where God would save them from their enemies, but they "believed not God and trusted not in His salvation."

I believe that OC was teaching three stages too and how wonderful to meet his daughter.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/29 13:23

The difference between OC and Keswick teaching was even more fundamental. Keswick taught progressive sanctification but with the possibility of a conscious beginning. They opted for the counter-action theory of sanctification. OC was more in line with the traditional Wesleyan position sometime called 'eradication'.

Keswick taught that our new nature was added to the old nature and hence the struggle continued, OC is much more along the lines of the Wesleyan.

I am not sure that OC was ever into 'stages'. The beginning of Our Brilliant Heritage shows he is addressing folks who had had a conscious meeting with Christ in the power of the Spirit. OC distinguished between conversion and regeneration and said that what he meant by regeneration others might call sanctification.

It is extraordinary that so many people who praise 'My Utmost for his Highest' would strongly disagree with his theology if they read more of his works.

Re: , on: 2010/6/29 14:00

"It is extraordinary that so many people who praise 'My Utmost for his Highest' would strongly disagree with his theology if they read more of his works."

Yes I have noted this too. I feel that OC was so very clever and his works could benefit everyone but only those with his own spiritual discernment could see the meatier teaching amongst the milk.

"Keswick taught that our new nature was added to the old nature and hence the struggle continued,"

Yes I agree they taught the two natures but from my reading, they taught that the old man was put out of action and subdued rather than eradicated and it was possible to sin if we ask for forgiveness and stay in our position rather than lose it. The struggle from what I understand does not continue after the second work although I agree that later teachings did bring in gradual sanctification. I find Wesley to be inconsistent in his theology on various points. Great to discuss it with you.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/29 16:52

Yes, I find Wesley to be inconsistent too but then I find a lot of holiness teaching to be inconsistent. Had you noticed that OC differentiated between conversion and regeneration?

I want to return too to my original comment. I doubt very much that OC taught that Christ could not sin. It would go against so much of his other teachings.

Re: , on: 2010/6/30 7:31

"Had you noticed that OC differentiated between conversion and regeneration?"

Yes. From what I understood, he rated regeneration as the new birth from some of his comments like :

"In the NT new birth is always spoken of in terms of sanctification not salvation ; to be saved means that a man receives the gift of eternal life, which is the gift of God ; sanctification means that his spirit becomes the birthplace of the Spirit of God `My little children of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you` Gal 4:19" Conformed to his image p24

And this as an instant :

"The mystery of sanctification is that the perfections of Jesus Christ are imparted to us not gradually but instantly when by faith we enter into the realisation that Christ is made unto us sanctification." Our Brilliant Heritage p18.

Then he says ;

" The process of sanctification begins at the moment of birth from above and is consummated on the unconditional surrender of my right to myself to Jesus Christ - the time that elapses between new birth and entire sanctification depends entirely on the individual" Conformed to His Image p101

So he is distinguishing between three events - conversion, regeneration or sanctification and entire sanctification which he calls transfiguration elsewhere but I can't find the ref.

I understood that he meant that Christ could not sin as it was not over sin that Satan tempted Him in the wilderness, it was over the issue we have discussed, that of sacrificing His natural desires like to eat and drink to obey God's will. Do you have anything on this to indicate otherwise?

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/30 7:46

I am not sure he would have divided 'salvation' into your three categories. He certainly understood regeneration = new birth = the commencement of sanctification but I am not sure that he looked for a third experience of entire sanctification. I think he saw that simply as the outworking of sanctification. I think if we understand that part of the impact of sanctification is that it is the setting apart of someone entirely for God's purposes (as in the sanctification of Israel according to the flesh) we can see that the idea of partial sanctification or sanctification on the instalment plan doesn't really make any sense. If in a marriage we promised 'sanctification' to our spouse on the instalment plan how would that sound? I think, by definition, sanctification is entire or is not sanctification.

The process of being conformed to his image I think is better understood as 'glorification' or as OC puts it 'transfiguration'.

Quote:

----- understood that he meant that Christ could not sin as it was not over sin that Satan tempted Him in the wilderness,

If I requote that with an upper case S for sin see how it would read...

Quote:

----- understood that he meant that Christ could not sin as it was not over Sin that Satan tempted Him in the wilderness,

I think OC is stating that Christ was not tempted as an unregenerate man is tempted, where the temptation rises from the old nature. Christ had no 'old nature' and, in my view, neither do the regenerate. So, as with Christ, the saint's temptation comes from outside but it is still temptation and still produces a sin if we yield to it.

Re: , on: 2010/6/30 9:25

"I am not sure that he looked for a third experience of entire sanctification. If in a marriage we promised 'sanctification' to our spouse on the instalment plan how would that sound? I think, by definition, sanctification is entire or is not sanctification."

Oswald Chambers wrote

"When a man 'born from above' begins his new life, he meets God at every turn, hears Him in every sound.....he is a new creation.....till on some transfiguration morning, he finds himself entirely sanctified by God and from that unspeakable bliss God loosens him from heaven a pilgrim of eternity to work a work for Him among men" Christian Disciplines p11

I don't see anything other than an event here. We have already ascertained that OC called the new birth sanctification and here now he adds entire sanctification as a further work of God and not in the afterlife but in this life.. And moreover, it seems that man is not fit to do the work of God until he has been ES'ed which OC is presenting as a third experience which means that men who have had merely two works of God on them or mercy above, only one, are working without being sent.

This view is one I have studied from other holiness writers but not from the later years of the holiness revival where it was two stages and still is amongst holiness people.

The expression 'loosed from heaven' is the experience of those who have trodden this path and is illustrated very well by George Fox, another entirely sanctified man who tells of going up through the flaming sword into Eden.

"Christ had no 'old nature' and, in my view, neither do the regenerate. So, as with Christ, the saint's temptation comes from outside but it is still temptation and still produces a sin if we yield to it."

I agree that the regenerate have no old nature it is crucified so long as they are abiding in that but the question is whether we will sacrifice the natural for the spiritual and if we do yield to it we have acted from our natural man or for example if Christ ate which is not a sin but acting from the natural man puts one in a position that can lead to sin. Is that what you say?

Brenda

Re: , on: 2010/6/30 10:39

Another place where OC makes his view clear is :

"By the term Consecration is meant that human action whereby we present ourselves to God. The period of consecration may be three minutes, or thirty years, according to the individual or the soul may degenerate during its consecration. The period of consecration may be thoroughly misused.

Sanctification begins at regeneration and goes on to a second great crisis when God upon an uttermost abandonment in consecration bestows His gracious work of entire sanctification" Christian Disciplines p169

God is doing a new thing, on: 2010/6/30 12:59

II Tim. 1:7,ESV

It's quaint how these 'scholars' have a definition for everything saying this is this and that is that; and then are so bold so as to put the number of times these things occur. Perhaps these are the limitations they chose to assign to God's work? Let them, and those who believe in them, be as they are.

This whole 'dark night of the soul' concept?

i have gone through it 7 times now, and it's when His voice seems not heard from inside, or even lessened, that i in a way dread what just might be around the corner. Yet, hope rests in His refreshing so i press and push and strive in seeking God out. He answers, not with just words, but in presence. It is at this point that this becomes most fearful to me. Seeing Him more clearly, my flesh trembles until weakness takes over. It is at these times that it's recognized most clearly that all of man's ideas, mine included, about how God does and doesn't do things, especially concepts i have been believing to be true, fall to the floor, shattered in so many bits and pieces... not to mention the purging from things i did not even recognize to be sin. (Out with the old and in with the new.)

He revives me again, and then i think, well, now i'm entirely sanctified. Yet, every time this has occurred he has proved that it is just not so at all.

The infilling (baptism in the Holy Spirit) has not been a one time thing either. There several noted points of 'charging' with power, yet this is not what is meant. This is about (at least from this perspective) infilling, like the first time i was baptized in the Spirit, yet each successive time, it is much more powerful than the former time. In each instance, afterwards, manifestation of His Spirit's presence and power with gifts accompanying, is more evident than was formerly known. This walk into greater and greater vibrancy, closeness, and manifest presence towards ministry has now happened 4 times on my behalf.

Oh, and the issue of '(my)self' discussed, i really do not think it is a matter of how one defines it so much as it being a matter of whether one is given over to God's purpose in recognition that i am not my own. i am bought with a price that nothing in this world can even come close in comparative value, especially myself. To think that we are apart from God, free to choose according to our predilections means that we have not surrendered to His right to rule as our Lord.

There are many things others can do that i cannot, as for me it would be sin.

In growth, the way grows narrower, yet with it, the freedom experienced grows broader. What is limitation for others often for me personally, and those with whom i am told to relate with, is paltry.

The scriptures relate that the Spirit of God is the Spirit of power, love and self-control. The Holy Spirit works in all three ways. The Spirit of God doesn't work only in power or only in love or only in self-control, but in all three ways, as recorded in I Corinthians 12,13, and 14. We can't discard any of these chapters. Through these things we grow into experiencing the sinlessness of Jesus the Messiah, yet without this carpenter dying on a wooden gibbet, none of this work through His spirit would ever be possible.

It is not that Jesus could not have sinned, because taking on the form of a man, this is an option. Take this comment in relation to what has just been testified.

Jesus as a man, had the Holy Spirit without measure.

He did not suppress the sin nature. He turned His back on it so that He could remain in unhindered relationship He already knew with our Father.

Failure to sin, by always choosing to do the will of our Father, opens greater manifestation of God's purpose and presence, by His Spirit working out through us love and power in self-control.

It's thought that many ask the wrong questions, and strong delusions are often the dead end result.

The issue is not whether something is this or the other. A person who abides in Jesus finds too many answers before any need for personal conclusions. There are so many things i once thought were true about The Faith, all said by well meaning folk, usually 'in the know' STS, that just don't measure up in being a comprehensive answer, unless we choose to believe in these things more than our relationship with God.

Whatever type of psychocosm we contrive regarding God and His word does not merely miss, but always falls short of the mark. Any mental map of God and what He says can never come close to how above and beyond our human reasonings He is. It's nice to think we have all our ducks in a row, yet the nature and purpose of He who always exceeds the complexity of the way we think He might be.

It is grievous to hear others talk about God so much, yet when testimony time comes, they have nothing to say. It hurts to hear others say this means this and that means that yet they have not verified it as an 'unashamed workman' in the daily grind. It tears me up inside to know anybody claims they believe, yet in dealing with other people they are heartless, cruel and sometimes even vicious. Do these really know the God I know?

These serve a God in their heads, or something based on the past records, and not He who is I AM, present to meet EVERY need here and now.

God is as he has always been and will be the same tomorrow. The question is whether we will come up with all kinds of various conjectures, or if in relationship with Him, walk in what he has proven Himself faithful and True to do.

As for interpretation of scripture, it need not be a task of hourly studies. Go and do what God says to you through it. Just don't let your head get in the way of His heart.

i love all of you,
and pray all experience
the simplicity
that is
in Christ Jesus,

gregg
Acts 20:32

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/30 13:56

Quote:
-----"Sanctification begins at regeneration and goes on to a second great crisis when God upon an uttermost abandonment in consecration bestows His gracious work of entire sanctification" Christian Disciplines p169

Would this not then be two events rather than your three?

John Wesley's view was that there was a process of sanctification which culminated in a crisis of sanctification which was then followed by a process of sanctification. I find that hard to get my head around.

Re: God is doing a new thing - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/30 13:59

Quote:
-----It's quaint how these 'scholars' have a definition for everything saying this is this and that is that; and then are so bold so as to put the number of times these things occur. Perhaps these are the limitations they chose to assign to God's work? Let them, and those who believe in them, be as they are.

I think most of those 'scholars' are just saints trying to understand the scripture. To deride their efforts is not charitable.

Quote:
-----The issue is not whether something is this that or the other. A person who abides in Jesus finds too many answers before any need for personal conclusions. There are so many things I once thought were true about The Faith, all said by well meaning folk, usually 'in the know' STS, that just don't measure up in being a comprehensive answer, unless we choose to believe in these things more than our relationship with God.

What is the supreme criterion for understanding the works of God; my experience or the scripture?

Re: God is doing a new thing - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/6/30 14:22

A simple question please; Did Adam have a sin nature before he partook of the fruit of tree of the knowledge of good and evil?

If the answer is yes, as I can see, then God made the first Adam with a sin capacity or free will, but no nature, which The first Adam chose for himself and all mankind.

If the answer is no, then Adam chose his own nature and the sin nature of the whole world.

The Last Adam was begotten, not made. But His Father is God, and there is no sin nature in God, so Jesus had no sin nature. If Jesus had sinned, He would be just like the first Adam, in Choosing A Sin nature.

Do you see the difference? In Jesus choosing not to sin, He was always One with the Father, yet being tempted in all ways as the children of the first Adam, who chose sin nature and separation from the Creator.

Being born again our nature is changed, no longer with the spirit of sin our old father satan, but with the Spirit of our re-birthing Father, God, and The Seed being the incorruptable Seed of Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

1 Peter 1:23 Being born again , not of corruptible seed , but of incorruptible , by the word of God , which liveth and abideth for ever .

The Logos, The living Word Himself, Jesus Christ is the incorruptable Seed we are rebirthed in. Without this Seed we are none of His.

Romans 8:9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

Jesus had no sin nature, but could have chosen to sin and change His nature to a sin nature, separation from God. He did not, always being One with the Father. He did not, and that is why the Father was well pleased with the only begotten Son of God, and could choose Him as the spotless Lamb slain before the world began for the sin of the world.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: , on: 2010/6/30 15:51

"Would this not then be two events rather than your three?"

From my understanding of OC, he is placing regeneration or being born again at a point after conversion where others would say that they had already been born again ie when they first came to Christ for forgiveness. He is classing the baptism of the Spirit as the second grace as being born again. This is quite common in his brand of holiness teaching.

As John of the Cross has been mentioned he also was of this opinion having two dark nights, not one, one of the soul and one of the spirit which occur after conversion.

"John Wesley's view was that there was a process of sanctification which culminated in a crisis of sanctification which was then followed by a process of sanctification. I find that hard to get my head around."

From my study of JW, there is the process which has a crisis at one point in between the continuing process. So he answered people that sanctification is both a crisis and a process using this logic to answer men who claim a gradual sanctification, that he agrees there is a process but there must also be the crisis. The only way this does not fit in with OC is that OC gives another crisis along the way of the process but I read somewhere that JW did indeed himself have the other crisis later on.

All of the arguments about the number of crisis are caused because men are arguing from their own experience and their insight into the scriptures which increases as we go on, and think they have reached the pinnacle even if they haven't.

Mapping out this spiritual journey is extremely useful for those who are on it, and not all are, and the information is only applicable and helpful to them. One of the great trials of the journey is to think that one has lost one's way and gone off the path, so when a spiritual master like Chambers or John of the Cross can discuss the way and the points of crisis, it gives one guidance and reassurance. For any to whom it means nothing then it is best if they just leave the matter until the time if indeed it comes when it makes sense to them.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/6/30 16:52

Quote:
-----From my understanding of OC, he is placing regeneration or being born again at a point after conversion where others would say that they had already been born again ie when they first came to Christ for forgiveness

I am sure you are right in interpreting OC like this, but...

Quote:
-----He is classing the baptism of the Spirit as the second grace as being born again. This is quite common in his brand of holiness teaching.

...I doubt that this is so. Most 'holiness' teachers, after Wesley, identified Baptism in the Spirit with Sanctification which they saw as following New Birth.

This gets a bit complicated if we regard conversion as the first work of grace and new birth as the second. Not many holiness teachers did this other than OC, but some did. Most see conversion as a synonym for new birth, so usually when folks talk about 'second blessing' they are talking about something which is second to regeneration.

The Pentecostal Movement's beginnings were among people who already believed in a 'second experience' which many called Baptism in Spirit, so the Pentecostal experience became the third experience. Many old US Pentecostal denominations had this foundation; they are known as three stage pentecostals although they are becoming rarer, in my experience. Those who had been, in their own view, regenerated and sanctified (in two distinct experiences) saw the Pentecostal experience as the crowning blessing and then called that Baptism in Spirit. Life became somewhat confusing as several holiness movements had described themselves as Pentecostal eg. OC's Pentecostal Leaguer of Prayer. When the 'Pentecostals' got going OC's group dropped the word 'Pentecostal' from their title to avoid confusion. Sadly many holiness teachers were almost violently opposed to the Pentecostal movement. Reader Harris infamously referred to the Pentecostals as 'Hell's Last Vomit!' but he was a very volatile character!

We've probably lost almost all the other Slers at this point! OC was rare although not unique in distinguishing between conversion and new birth but I am pretty sure that he would have seen Baptism in Spirit as the 'holiness' event. I will try to check it out.

(by the way, do you just live in Germany or are you German?)

Re: , on: 2010/6/30 19:08

by philologos on 2010/6/30 9:59:49

by philologos on 2010/6/30 9:59:49

Quote:
-----It's quaint how these 'scholars' have a definition for everything saying this is this and that is that; and then are so bold so as to put the number of times these things occur. Perhaps these are the limitations they chose to assign to God's work? Let them, and those who believe in them, be as they are.

I think most of those 'scholars' are just saints trying to understand the scripture. To deride their efforts is not charitable.

The question is, are such things as entire sanctification 'extra-' or even possibly pseudo-biblical? ...and if this be the case, why praise men's expounding of such, much more: why even entertain such?

If it is charitable to propagate such, have at it.

Quote:
-----The issue is not whether something is this that or the other. A person who abides in Jesus finds too many answers before any need for personal conclusions. There are so many things I once thought were true about The Faith, all said by well meaning folk, usually 'in the know' STS, that just don't measure up in being a comprehensive answer, unless we choose to believe in these things more than our relationship with God.

What is the supreme criterion for understanding the works of God; my experience or the scripture?

The supreme criteria towards understanding the work of God is Christ in you the hope of glory.

Scripture without experience is mental ascent. Experience without scriptural evidence is falacious. Study alone is only knowledge, and if it is not in reference to Jesus Christ relative to whatever topic, it is heading the wrong direction. Understanding does not come through study alone, but experiencing the work of God in our lives in relation to God's testimony. Scripture is the source, and experience is the proving ground, turning what was once merely head knowledge on it's head or into understanding. Scripture is the basis and experience of it is His glory revealed.

Sincerity is no measure of clarity, saint or not. What is charitable? to speak the truth in love, or to expect others to base their faith on some doctrinal issue that does not point them to Jesus Christ (crucified, dead and buried, then resurrected). Reading the synoptics, taking up our cross is stated 6 times and all the other issues related to Jesus ministry pointed to this very thing. In many different ways, all that Paul and the other apostles proclaimed finds basis in this alone. If we are truly about our Master's business, everything we do is centered on this: beginning, middle, and end.

There is no mention of entire sanctification occurring in the scriptures, yet there are prayers towards this, as in John 17:17 and I Thess. 5:23 as concise examples.

When Daniel prophesied "...knowledge shall increase..." it was not primarily meant towards unbelievers, but was intended towards True Israel: the seed of Abraham of David in and of Jesus Christ.

Why go away from what Jesus and the Apostles taught? Is majoring on minor things parcel through walking in His salvation more important?

Here's a question for you brother: Where in the apostles teachings is found the concept of entire sanctification? Do we measure up to Paul, James, or John? Paul stated "not that I have attained..." and as well, in quoting the prophets, repeated that we all continue to sin. James said we all fail in many ways. John stated it is our nature to commit sin.

Sanctification is included in Soteria. By walking further in our salvation, it becomes not only something God recognizes us to already be in Jesus Christ, but we EXPERIENCE it revealed in our lives through God's grace in our salvation, namely Jesus Christ. Grace comes through faith in Him and faith without works is dead.

Relating to God in Jesus Christ brings such issues as sanctification to manifest repeatedly, growing into Him. It is not a one, two, or three time thing. It is a constant process.

There is no derision of the 'scholars' efforts, but to those who study their work as means and end of their experience. What happened to comparing everything to what the full counsel of scripture relates, from Genesis 3:15 to Revelation 22:21?

Walking with God in the cool of the day sure beats pouring over books for hours on end.

EXPERIENCING His Spirit manifest provision in power, love, and self-control, EXACTLY like the Bible says, sure beats trying to figure it all out. God's will and ways are far beyond any specific work man tries to consign Him to.

Herein lies full knowledge from the Lord:

Kohelet 12:

11 The words of the wise are as goads, and as nails fastened by the master of assemblies, which are given from one shepherd.

12 And further, by these, my son, be admonished: of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh.

13 Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.

14 For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil. (A.V.)

Is. 66:2, 4, 5

Ps. 25:14

Living and breathing for the body in Him,
gregg

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/6/30 21:58

Is Christ the total and complete sanctified One?

Is Christ regeneration total and complete, one time?

Is Christ righteousness personified?

Is Christ full and complete redemption?

Is Christ the Word wisdom?

And on and on. Is Christ in you? Then before God we are the birth of His Son in believers, making us also sons'.

Then where is the war? 2 Corinthians 10:3-5 For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;) Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;

Romans 7:25 I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

Romans 15:6 That ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

1 Corinthians 1:10 Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.

gment.

Ephesians 2:3 Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

The War is in our minds. How do we overcome? Romans 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

Regeneration is complete, sanctification is complete, and all else that the Grace of God has for us in Christ is complete, we just don't know it yet.

Perfect in Christ; 2 Corinthians 12:9 And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Ephesians 4:13 Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ:

Colossians 1:28 Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

Colossians 4:12 Epaphras, who is one of you, a servant of Christ, saluteth you, always labouring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.

Hebrews 13:21 Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is wellpleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

1 Corinthians 1:29-31 That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

Man cannot glory in any regeneration, sanctification, or any of God's Grace toward him. Man can only glory in Christ, He is the whole bucket of Grace, not poured out in drips and drops, but we get the whole full bucket.

Ephesians 2:4-10 But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

This must be our mind set, our renewing of our minds to the mind of Christ Jesus. We have it all, we just don't know it.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: , on: 2010/7/1 1:16

"...I doubt that this is so. Most 'holiness' teachers, after Wesley, identified Baptism in the Spirit with Sanctification which they saw as following New Birth."

Yes this is what I have found but this `double way` in contrast with the `via triplex` which OC espouses, which is more common in more recent times including Wesley. I find the double way to be too inconsistent with scripture, having a sin nature which is subdued when the scripture clearly says destroyed.

The via triplex was found much more commonly but not exclusively in the past from the earliest times, amongst Christian mystics and especially the one I am most familiar with, amongst early Quakers - this was George Fox's theology - I have recently written a paper about it in response to a Quaker theologian who has traced the doctrine of holiness through Quaker history and mistakenly in my view attributes their holiness to be the same one as the double or what I call the Keswick way.

The difference between them, as a recap is that the double way is one where the sin nature is subdued and the via triple x is where it is eradicated and one does not sin at all, returned not just to the state of Adam but even higher. The first understanding is that sin is the wilful disobedience of God but the second is that sin is the fruit of a having sin nature so just having the sin nature alone even if sin is scrupulously avoided is in direct disobedience to God who has provided the way out. Man can do nothing.

Adam was innocent and did not have a sin nature till he fell but once he fell he could not stay in Eden even if he decided to be obedient again - there was no option for that - he was cast out.

Incidentally, I have just read OC saying that the reason Adam fell was because he chose to do things according to his own knowledge and not God's way, despite having good intentions and that Christ was tempted on this line - would He work out His ministry according to how He understood it or would He submit it to His fathers direction entirely. This has been personally enlightening for me, as are the rest of OC's wonderful insights. I think that this gives insight to the question of how could Adam sin without a sin nature - it obviously could develop once he had taken the decision to serve God according to his knowledge - an in between point as it were.

The Pentecostal baptism was not the same baptism as the non Pentecostals as it did not make one holy - it gave power for service and the gifts, but most did not go along with the idea of living absolutely without sin, as it developed amongst those who had reached the point of sanctification but not complete freedom from sin as they considered unintentional sin as acceptable, in that one remained in that position of one confessed. So they were second blessing men. I think some were led astray because of the great, understandable, frustration involved in abiding for the Spirit to fall in places where the power for revival is not present.

Traditional holiness people saw this third or later second 'baptism' as a counterfeit and especially the practise of tongues as evidence that it came from the pit, the claimants displaying the same characteristics and behaviour as kundelini Hindus.

Yes I am sure that OC saw the new birth as a holiness event. I believe that Jesus was talking about this when he spoke to Nicodemus. Nicodemus was interpreting Him on the physical line but Jesus put it on the spirit line, 'that which is born of the spirit is spirit'. Of water and of Spirit were the two births, water referring to the OT symbol of baptism into the death of Christ not as has been supposed, to the embryonic fluid sack in physical birth. So my understanding is that the first birth is conversion, a spiritual event, but man must be born spiritually once again to enter the kingdom. I am sure that OC interpreted it this way too.

I am a Brit :)

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/1 4:32

Quote:
-----Here's a question for you brother: Where in the apostles teachings is found the concept of entire sanctification?
Do we measure up to Paul, James, or John? Paul stated "not that i have attained..." and as well, in quoting the prophets, repeated that we all continue to sin. James said we all fail in many ways. John stated it is our nature to commit sin.

The theologians have split up salvation for teaching convenience. This has its place but can also be counterproductive. If you are asking where did the apostles use the phrase 'entire sanctification' the answer is nowhere.

The Paul who said he had not attained went on to address those who are 'perfect'. He also says that if any man is in Christ he is a new creation, old things are passed away and all things are become new.

James says that bitter and sweet water ought not to come from the same stream.

John says 'as he was so are we in the world'

Peter says there are great and precious promises whereby we become partakers of the divine nature.

Where does John say it is in our nature to commit sin. He actually says that he that is born of God does not practise sin.

Do you think God would add a new nature to an old one? Did Christ not say that he had not come to add a new patch to an old garment?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/1 4:33

Quote:
----- So my understanding is that the first birth is conversion, a spiritual event, but man must be born spiritually once again to enter the kingdom. I am sure that OC interpreted it this way too.

Does that mean two new births?

The Quakers, of course, did not believe in original sin. I can't understand any notion of sanctification that does not take account of original sin.

Re: , on: 2010/7/1 4:43

"Does that mean two new births?"

The first a spiritual birth, then another or a rebirth - born again - of the spirit and not of the flesh. So one is the new birth, the other is just the birth - spiritual that is.

"I can't understand any notion of sanctification that does not take account of original sin."

Quakers believed that man is born with a propensity to sin but not with a sin nature. This does not mean that he does not form one - he does when he first sins himself and then is fallen and needs a Saviour.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/7/1 11:48

Where is our sanctification complete?

Where is our sanctification being completed?

Where will our sanctification be completed?

Re: , on: 2010/7/1 12:06

by philologos on 2010/7/1 0:32:13

The theologians have split up salvation for teaching convenience. This has its place but can also be counterproductive. If you are asking where did the apostles use the phrase 'entire sanctification' the answer is nowhere.

phane:
Convenience sake is understandable, as in growth into Jesus Christ, I have had shifting perspective into various areas regarding the comprehensiveness of our salvation.

Regarding the phrase, is there anything that you know of that is synonymous with it? I can't find anything except in regards to Jesus, and note this is where we are to remain focused: Heb.12:2-4.

philo:
The Paul who said he had not attained went on to address those who are 'perfect'. He also says that if any man is in Christ he is a new creation, old things are passed away and all things are become new.

James says that bitter and sweet water ought not to come from the same stream.

John says 'as he was so are we in the world'

Peter says there are great and precious promises whereby we become partakers of the divine nature.

Where does John say it is in our nature to commit sin. He actually says that he that is born of God does not practise sin.

phane:

Re: Paul

The only place i know of where Paul mentions those who are perfect, is in reference to those who understand the power of God (in Jesus) as the wisdom of God...and that word 'perfect' is in reference to being fully mature. It wasn't about attaining to a state of complete perfection. He is speaking in reference to human reasoning being flawed and immature. (I Cor. 1:24-2:7, and all this is in reference to Jesus Christ being our everything in His salvation; note I Cor. 1:29-31.)

Yes, it is only IN CHRIST and not through anything we contrive beyond what is written. Rom. 8:1 seems it should be considered here regarding conditions of this statement.

See, alot of people think that "whosoever believeth in Him 'SHALL' have eternal life, yet this is not what it says at all. There is a huge difference between 'should' and 'shall'. Looking to the end of the chapter clarity of conditions are laid forth: Jn. 3:36,ESV.

Re:James

"...These things should not be so." It is a "should not", not an "are not."

Re: Peter

"might be partakers" not "are".

Re: John

"as He was in the world, so are we", look at the whole book and consider context starting with the first few verses in the first chapter:

The word "sin in I Jn. 1:8 is a noun, meaning "our nature (is) to sin." In I Jn. 1:9 this word sin is not a noun, but an act. These two verses taken together clearly tell us it is our nature to sin.

philo:

Do you think God would add a new nature to an old one? Did Christ not say that he had not come to add a new patch to an old garment?

You are convoluting the issue.

The concept of a new patch on an old garment is a 'post hoc' inappropriate analogy. Go back and reread what that is all about.

We have two complete natures in us after we turn to Jesus for redemption: the old man and the new man. When we are saved the old man in it's nature to sin is "unplugged" STS.

This hardly means that we our selves, or if you prefer ourselves, do not plug it back in again. (Ref: Rom. 6-7).

Salom and Grace
to you and yours
in Jesus Christ,

gregg

Acts 20:32

edited: grammatic errors

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/1 14:03

Gregg

Do you think He is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him?

Do you think he is able to make all grace abound towards us?

As you want to keep the focus on Christ, how about the seed that fell into the ground and died? Is this to produce something which approximates to Christ or is it to produce Christ in me?

I reject that the notion that man becomes spiritually bi-polar. Genuine regeneration effects the end of the power of the old man and co-raises with Christ.

The question here is not whether or not it is possible to me but whether it is possible to God.

Re: Christ without Sin - posted by andres (), on: 2010/7/1 15:48

If Christ were to have sinned then there would have been no acceptable sacrifice to God, and we would have no hope to be with God In Glory.

Why Christ could not have sinned?

1. It was preordained by God - (Revelation 13:8) And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

- God had ordained from the beginning of time that a sacrifice which needed to be pure, would have die to save his people. So when Christ came to earth there was absolutely no chance of Him fallen into Sin Remember whatever God's ordains will come to pass.

(Isa 46:10)

2. It was promised by God- God promised through out the bible (to Adam, Abraham , David and Jesus) that he would have a people for Himself. This promise could only happen by the sinless work of Christ, redeeming the world back to God. Again, God can't lie (Titus 1:1,2), if Christ were to have sinned God would be a liar, and that cant be. See (Psalm 2, Gen.3:15, Gen17.1-9, Isa 53.11- He SHALL see of the travail of His soul and SHALL be satisfied.)

3. Christ has no sin nature- Christ was not born with sin , or the tendency to sin. Look what Christ says about this in (John 14:30) "Hereafter I will not talk much with you: for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me."

--All created things have the power to sin. Though they are good by nature, they can fall. We see this with Angels, Adam and the earth, all created, all have fallen. Christ was not created and thus has not the power to fall into sin, it was not in His nature, though he was tempted at all points, and knows of human frailty , and even knows the effects of sin (the cross and death) he has no knowledge or desire to sin. Satan may tempt all he wants, but Christ is the Rock, He will not be moved..

-- andy

Re: , on: 2010/7/1 19:17

by philologos on 2010/7/1 10:03:30

Gregg

Do you think He is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him?

Do you think he is able to make all grace abound towards us?

g:

Definitely, He is "able to." This doesn't imply that we are walking in the fulness of this. Both issues are appropriated by faith, and according to faith expressed, grace manifests.

R:

As you want to keep the focus on Christ, how about the seed that fell into the ground and died? Is this to produce something which approximates to Christ or is it to produce Christ in me?

g:

It's assumed that you are not referring to the synoptic accounts of the sower parable, but rather Jn. 12:24 ?

Christ in me is what comes to life, producing much fruit.

R:

I reject that the notion that man becomes spiritually bi-polar. Genuine regeneration effects the end of the power of the old man and co-raises with Christ.

g:

This notion assumes there is no need to mature or be fine-tuned (aka:perfected). So, what you are saying is that we are completely perfect when we are regenerated, knowing all things to do (as we have already become like Him), walking in fullness of power, love, and no longer have need of our Saviour to deliver us "to the uttermost?" IF this is the case, there is neither any need for chastisement as we no longer see in a glass dimly, correct?

IF this is your view, there is no need for approximately 2/3rds of the New Testament.

You are separating spiritual from physical and this just is not so. What is a man without a body? What is a man without a spirit? Every action a human does is an expression of the soul, and this requires the interaction of spirit and body in the process, not one or the other. Everything is spiritual, yet without the physical, there is no reflection for us to perceive.

Everything that was made was made from what is invisible. How much more spiritual can physical get?

Jesus died in His body and was raised in His body, yet this whole revelation of resurrection is spiritual. The two are inseparable.

There is a vast difference between Jesus and us. He did not need to die. We must die to our own will and ways DAILY.

To think a new creation is bi-polar is a misnomer. Bi-polarity is not good and bad. It's all bad.

R:

The question here is not whether or not it is possible to me but whether it is possible to God.

Considering what you state above, before your last statement, please explain how this all occurs in an instant. ...and what is the use of a Bible anyway if we are already perfect in our salvation.

He is perfect, we are not.

Agape,
gregg

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/7/1 20:19

2 Corinthians 1:10 Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us ;

Spirit, soul and body

Body;
1 John 3:2 Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.

Soul;
Romans 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

Spirit;
Romans 8:9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

We are saved in Spirit. We are being saved in our soul-mind by the revelation of Christ by the Holy Spirit, who works in our mind, will and emotions. We will be saved when Christ comes for His Body the Church, as we will have bodies just like His. "We will be like Him", complete and full sanctification then and only then.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: , on: 2010/7/1 23:59

Thank you Andy for the post on "Christ could not sin."

Seeing it from this perspective, it takes me from Him not wanting to (Jn. 14:30) into what I knew in my heart, yet never considered this scripture relative to it---> Is. 46:10. (seems that 'endnote' of God's, answers a lot more questions than most realize.)

This issue has never been heard or seen asked until seeing it in this forum. (I maintain the stance that God is right, and everything else just might be wrong, so the scriptures are looked to, and all else is questionable.)

Agape,
g

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2010/7/2 10:05

Quote:
-----g:
This notion assumes there is no need to mature or be fine-tuned (aka:perfected). So, what you are saying is that we are completely perfect when we are regenerated, knowing all things to do (as we have already become like Him), walking in fullness of power, love, and no longer have need of our Saviour to deliver us "to the uttermost?" IF this is the case, there is neither any need for chastisement as we no longer see in a glass dimly, correct?

IF this is your view, there is no need for approximately 2/3rds of the New Testament.

No it doesn't. It simply means that we have to 'grow in grace'. Christian Perfection as John Wesley pointed out is not Divine Perfection nor Angelic Perfection but is the implication that at any point we may be where God wants us to be in our experience and thus 'perfect'. Just as a child may be perfect but is not the mature man.

Quote:
-----Gregg
Do you think He is able to save to the uttermost those who come to God through Him?

Do you think he is able to make all grace abound towards us?

g:

Definitely, He is "able to." This doesn't imply that we are walking in the fulness of this. Both issues are appropriated by faith, and according to faith expressed, grace manifests.

So are you saying that God is able to give me the faith to 'appropriate' the 'uttermost' salvation now or do I have to wait for physical death?

I feel that we have somewhat hijacked this topic. Would it be more appropriate to begin another thread?

Re: , on: 2010/7/2 12:04

Through Yashuvah Maschiach's faith(fulness) towards we who place as much confidence as we know how in Him, with Ya' all things are possible; through we ourselves, they are not.

It is the power of Yashuvah that changes us through our childlike trust and obedience.

Because He loves us, recognizing this, we love Him back and do as He says do: Heb 12:2, keeping Yaweh's commands because He desires the very best for us. Keeping the Word of Yahshuvah ever before our reasonings and affections we experience Yaweh resident withing (Jn. 14:23).

It's thought that this thread was hijacked when it went off topic from the original post. Intentions were through writing just what sanctification is all about, to turn it back to the issue of the sinlessness of Yahshuvah and our relation to this.

Here's the bottom line that has been alluded to since the onset of 'hijacking' this thread. There is no such thing as a second work of grace, nor striving towards entire sanctification. It is all part and parcel in salvation through taking up our cross daily, and letting the mind of Meschiach Yahshuvah be in us. Changes in ourselves are forthcoming through revelation into realization.

God recognizes us as already there. Our job is to align ourselves to what He already declares of us in this, through volition and perception: words expressed, intellection, and actions.

That's all.

It would not have been very charitable of me to begin railing anybody specific, so the posts inserted into this thread were general towards pseudo-doctrinal issues and not specifically naming names. It was approached as wrong doctrine being an affront to what Ya' says in His Testaments.

That's all.

Agape,
gregg
Acts 20:32