

General Topics :: New Book Released: The Better Covenant by Ron Bailey

New Book Released: The Better Covenant by Ron Bailey - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2012/2/29 13:34

Saints,

Ron Bailey has been a long-time contributor to the forums at SermonIndex since its inception. We are blessed to see some of his writings go into print and feel it is suitable and would be encouraging for some here to have access to this volume. We encourage you to take a look below...

About the author:

For over 40 years Ron Bailey has been engaged in pastoral care and Bible teaching in a variety of settings in the UK and in many parts of the world. This has included home groups, formal pastorates, churches, Bible schools and conferences, local radio and TV. He also hosts 'the Biblebase' - a teaching resource for Bible students to be found at www.biblebase.com

The Better Covenant

unlocking the treasures of the New Covenant

Authored by Ron Bailey

<https://www.createspace.com/3554449>

The final hours of Christ's pre-Calvary life focused on the themes of a new Passover, a new Kingdom and a New Covenant. This New Covenant stands in stark distinction to the Covenant enjoyed by the saints of the Old Testament. It is said to be 'new' and 'better' and 'more glorious' but for many its uniqueness has become uncertain. It is frequently described in contrast to the older Covenant; the writer to the Hebrews does this, as does Paul, as did Christ. Perhaps its determining feature can be expressed in the contrast implied in the statement; ...but you know Him, for He dwells with you and will be in you. John 14:17 NKJV

The conscious reception of the indwelling Spirit is the point of entrance into this New Covenant. This receiving of the Spirit effects the work of regeneration and fulfils the promises of the New Covenant made by Jeremiah and Ezekiel in which they see a new and different covenant in which old things would pass away and all things become new. This powerful regeneration/baptism in Spirit takes a man out of Adam and puts him into Christ thereby creating a 'new man' with new powers and instincts.

This book explores the salvation history of the Bible, examining the background to the promise of the New Covenant as introduced in the Old Testament and the fulfilment of that promise in the New Testament. It traces Paul's exciting discovery that the New Covenant contained a 'secret' which opened God's kingdom to all races and conditions of humankind. It examines the implications of this better covenant for a true understanding and practise of daily living in the New Covenant.

Publication Date:

Feb 22 2012

ISBN/EAN13:

1456567829 / 9781456567828

Page Count:

306

Binding Type:

US Trade Paper

Trim Size:

5.25" x 8"

Language:

English

Color:

Black and White

Related Categories:

Religion / Christian Life / Spiritual Growth

You can order it here today: <https://www.createspace.com/3554449>

Re: New Book Released: The Better Covenant by Ron Bailey - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/2/29 14:27

Thanks for this Greg, I really appreciate it. Some of the older SI-ers will know of my passion for the New Covenant and the book gives me time to develop some of the themes in a more leisurely manner. I do long for my brothers and sisters to know and enjoy what God has done for us. I trust the Lord will bless the book to that end.

I am well on with the second book which may interest some old-timers too. Some years ago you asked me to do a series of weekly devotionals touching on important truth and I did 60 or episodes of 'Abraham, my friend'. I have been asked many many times to get these into print and that is the next project. Thank you for being willing to do the foreword for that.

Re: - posted by hulsey (), on: 2012/2/29 17:05

I volunteer to proofread the next book :)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/2/29 20:24

I highly recommend this book. Ron Bailey has a lot of teachings and writings on the internet that are very valuable. This work brings together a lot of material into a comprehensive look at the New Covenant. So many problems we discuss every day could be remedied if we would just get back New Covenant Christianity.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2012/2/29 23:24

My book is ordered! And I can hardly wait to dig into its 306 pages. Knowing Ron Bailey, this will be a book to read slowly and carefully. And it won't be dry theology. It will make the good news of Christ come alive in real life experience.

I am one of those "old timers" here who has been blessed by Ron Bailey's contributions. I also enjoyed his Abraham series and many of his sermons and articles. It is a delight now to have my own book written by Ron Bailey. I hope it will be autographed!

Diane

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/2/29 23:36

hi, as an old man and an old timer: no one on the internet had more insight of the bible or Jesus than Ron. His ability to meekly teach in love was brilliant. I miss him very much here on SI. jimp

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/1 5:23

"I volunteer to proofread the next book :)" hulsey

You're on! Are you reading the printed copy or the Kindle version?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/1 5:54

Diane

would you mind telling us when you receive the book. I am interested in how long it takes with 'Printing on Demand' in the US. Thanks.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2012/3/1 7:59

Quote:

----- Diane

would you mind telling us when you receive the book. I am interested in how long it takes with 'Printing on Demand' in the US. Thanks.

I'll do that, Philologos.

Diane

Re: - posted by hulsey (), on: 2012/3/1 10:35

Hi Ron,

I have the Kindle version. I'm almost through with chapter 6.

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2012/3/1 11:01

I look forward to this! Thanks for the head's up!

Re: - posted by Enochh (), on: 2012/3/2 7:44

got this on my kindle yesterday. on second chapter. all i can say is wow. what a feast. highly recommended.

Re: , on: 2012/3/2 12:05

I have just finished the book. It is very well written - I like the style, and Mr Bailey has an exceptional gift in opening up the scriptures in a way that makes them understandable today. But I find it confusing - his theology that is.

He quotes holiness writers from the past - Murray, Wesley, Chambers and others and seems to be working out their theology as he goes along, but when he gets to the crunch, he denies their teaching.

I just find him very unclear as to whether he believes in second blessing holiness or not as he seems to be saying that those who are not experiencing the promises, have not been really converted yet.

This lack of distinction is very common today and I am disappointed that this book is following the same path.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/3/2 12:40

I finally ordered the hard copy version yesterday as well. It has been a few years in the works so I will be greatly excited to finally receive it. I would also love to see Abraham My Friend in print, but we will see what the Lord will do.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/2 15:02

krautfrau on 2012/3/2 14:05:28

"I just find him very unclear as to whether he believes in second blessing holiness or not as he seems to be saying that those who are not experiencing the promises, have not been really converted yet."

You could always ask him. ;-)

Re: , on: 2012/3/2 15:42

Well ok Ron, what sayest thou?

Re: New Book Released: The Better Covenant by Ron Bailey - posted by SHMILY, on: 2012/3/5 21:37

Greetings Ron

Just thought you might like to know I ordered my book on Feb 29. When I ordered it the estimated delivery date was March 13. The estimated delivery date on the shipping conformation was March 6. It arrived today ~ March 5. I am looking forward to reading it. (I am west of Seattle.)

REJOICE! =)
Mary

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/7 4:30

Thanks Mary. It seems that Createspace perhaps under promises and over delivers! Good to hear.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/7 4:49

Hello krautfrau, my apologies for the delay.

I have too many friends who came into rest as a second experience to deny second blessings but my book endeavours to examine the implications of the New Covenant rather than to toe a particular party line. Wesley clearly distinguished between the two covenants and Chambers, as with a few English holiness teachers, taught that there was a distinction between conversion and regeneration. Wesley, in a Plain Account of Christian Perfection, say "I use indifferently the words , regenerate, justified or believers". Chambers would certainly not have used them 'indifferently'.

I am a passionate believer in 'entire sanctification' but I find some of Wesley's teaching on this a little confusing myself. For example when would Wesley see the 'indwelling Spirit' event? At regeneration or sanctification?

Re: , on: 2012/3/7 8:01

Ah - now I understand the purpose of your book. Thanks. I got the feeling that you were building things up to avoid triggering the switch off due to the later legalistic errors of the holiness movement and the usual misinterpretation of sinless perfection, but the big moment did not arrive. I did get the impression however, that this is the best way to approach things these days and thought the way you seemed to be building up to it was brilliant.

I agree with you about Wesley and have been very frustrated with him at times. Indeed Chambers, one of my favourites, would not use the words indifferently.

My own opinion about Wesley, great man though he was, was that, being a theologian, he had read too many holiness writings before the corresponding experience himself, and that he was badly advised imo to preach till he experienced it. I think that leads to confusion and that one should only preach that which one is qualified for.

I also think that he got confused between the second blessers and the third blessers but this was due to him only reaching the second blessing stage himself.

His theology is certainly confused but I think he taught that the Spirit is present at the first stage and only dwells in His fullness at stage two. I believe that this led on to Keswick theology and it is not the same as traditional holiness teaching, the clearest of which I have found amongst the early Quakers.

The two covenants as I understand it, are both in force, the old one applies when a believer has not entered fully into His rest.

Now I am not clear on the terms you have used ie conversion, regeneration and sanctification. Can you be more specific please? Thanks

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/15 6:32

by krautfrau on 2012/3/7 10:01:24

"The two covenants as I understand it, are both in force, the old one applies when a believer has not entered fully into His rest.

Now I am not clear on the terms you have used ie conversion, regeneration and sanctification. Can you be more specific please? Thanks"

I think this is the line that Andrew Murray takes in his book The Two Covenants. I think his book is great but I think he is wrong here. The Old Covenant, as I tried to spell out in TBC, was a specific agreement between God and the nation of Israel initiated at Sinai and terminated at Calvary. I don't believe the specific curses or blessings of the Old Covenant are still in operation so I do see the New Covenant as both a fulfilment and a replacement of the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant has a very definite start AND finish date. Gal 3:19. The Old Covenant was 'added' and only 'till'.

Back later with the other half.

Re: , on: 2012/3/17 18:51

"I think this is the line that Andrew Murray takes in his book The Two Covenants."

If this is so, then I don't think he is being consistent as along with other Keswickians, he does not believe in 'destroyed' rather, he believes in 'subdued' when we are talking about the old nature. Nor, may I say, do I think you are either.

In the New Covenant, man is restored to what God intended for him from the start. He would have that as his nature, walking as Adam walked but on a higher plane, as Adam was merely innocent not holy. Now, under the New Covenant man is holy as He is holy. They share the same nature. Keswick theology did not accept that in its logical conclusion and claimed that man can still sin, albeit with repentance following and remain in the garden of Eden despite seeing Adam being removed from it when he sinned.

The rituals of the OC, I believe were a shadow but the law still stands, if a man sins then he dies that is spiritually. If he is delivered by the blood of Christ, from the sin nature and the need for sin. He is free and in the NC as some of the OT saints were also and only through faith. There is no dividing line in time, the new was there in OT times and the old is there amongst those who are carnal.

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2012/3/17 19:30

I need to read it

Re: New Book Released: The Better Covenant by Ron Bailey - posted by learjet, on: 2012/3/17 21:55

Hi Ron,

Picked up the book tonight on Kindle, looking forward to reading it!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2012/3/17 22:11

Hi Ron, My book just arrived.

Was ordered Feb. 29, arrived Mar 16.

Looks exciting - but not casual bedtime reading.

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/20 15:18

Keswick occasionally allowed 'eradication' speakers. I think Reader Harris spoke at Keswick.

"The rituals of the OC, I believe were a shadow but the law still stands, if a man sins then he dies that is spiritually. If he is delivered by the blood of Christ, from the sin nature and the need for sin. He is free and in the NC as some of the OT saints were also and only through faith. There is no dividing line in time, the new was there in OT times and the old is there amongst those who are carnal."

The universal moral law still stands, the work of the law written in hearts, but I think the NT emphasis on the law is somewhat different. We fulfil the righteousness requirements of the law by walking in the Spirit rather than my adhering to the written ordinances and rules.

My understanding of this is influenced by the reference in James that "if we know to do good and do not do it, then 'to the man' it is sin." This is why I say that the key is revelation. Faith is right response to revelation; sin is wrong response to revelation. I can respond to neither unless there is revelation. That doesn't mean I excuse murder, all men have the revelation of the 'work of the law' but the specific details of the Sinai version of universal moral law are not valid outside the Old Covenant nor outside the 'Holy' Land.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/20 15:19

I have had a few readers who tell me that they read it through quickly to get the gist of it and are now working their way through more slowly. I am very happy if it gets two readings. Part of the reason for the end of chapter summaries is to encourage folk to think through what they are reading.

Re: , on: 2012/3/22 3:29

"We fulfil the righteousness requirements of the law by walking in the Spirit rather than my adhering to the written ordinances and rules."

Indeed but my point is that it was the same in the Old Testament. Those like Abraham trusted in God to save them and walked by faith and not by trusting in their ability to keep the law which is how most of the Jews understood the requirements of God. It is the same now and since New Testament times, that there are those who trust in the flesh, in the obedience to the written commands in order to stay right with God instead of through faith in God's power to deliver them from all sin. Paul points this out to the Galatians.

So the two covenants have been in force since the beginning, as depicted by the two trees in Eden. We can depend on the flesh, even sanctified flesh, or we can depend on the Spirit. The inauguration of the New Covenant happened in time but it is eternally accessible to those who walk by the Spirit and do not fulfill the lusts of the flesh. It is a mistake to think that flesh only means sin.

The issue for the believer is not sin, that has been settled, or should have been. The issue next is whether we depend on our own understanding or we are led by the Spirit.

Thanks Ron I have not heard of Reader Harris.

Here is something I wrote previously

TWO LAWS

Paul speaks of two laws in Romans 8:2, the law of the Spirit of life and law of sin and death. The law of the Spirit of life is the path of light and the law of sin and death is the path of darkness. The two laws were typified in the Garden of Eden (and also through there being an Old Covenant and a New Covenant) through the two trees, the one of life and the other of knowledge. The tree of life is Christ and when we feed from or live in Christ, we have no sin, but if we do not, we are condemned by it, even though we make a confession that we know Christ, and because we are still in our sin, then we die spiritually and live in notions and according to our own knowledge and the life of Christ is not within us keeping us free from sin and preventing us from falling, as in Jude 24. Now unto Him that is able to keep you from falling and to present you faultless before the presence of His glory with exceeding joy. According to George Fox we are "Out of the light, out of grace, out of truth Spirit and power of God such as resist the Holy Ghost, quench, vex and grieve the Holy Spirit of God and hate the light and turn the grace of God into wantonness and despise prophesying revelation and inspiration, they are dogs and unbelievers that are without the city. (The heavenly city of God, Journal 575) It is very interesting that the

New Covenant existed before the Old Covenant law came in through Moses. It showed up first in the Garden typified in the tree, and then explained more fully with the appearance of Melchisedec King of Righteousness through whom Abraham also became perfect as others did too in the Old Testament and so were delivered from the law of sin and death.

The question remains, how are we to walk in the Spirit and mortify the deeds of the body? Paul deals with this question in Romans. In 8:13 he says For if ye live after the flesh ye shall die but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body ye shall live and have the creature itself delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God Romans 8:21 for He that spared not His own Son but delivered Him up for us all, how shall He not with Him also, freely give us all things. Romans 8:32. Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death that as like Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father; even so we also should walk in newness of life Romans 6:4. It was through His action alone that we are sanctified, through Christ coming into us in all the fullness of the possession of the Holy Spirit and the washing of the blood as an INNER cleansing.

The blood of Christ is not to wash us outwardly, but it is to enter into our very hearts, to sprinkle and make clean and pure so that our heart becomes new. Our polluted blood is now gone. It is this inward cleansing that Paul desired himself and had not yet attained when he saw in Romans 7:22 that although he desired to do the will of God, he was unable (23) to do so to the extent that God required of him and he cried out O wretched man that I am who will deliver me? The answer came in the next verse that the answer was through Jesus Christ and in 8:2 coming into the law of the Spirit and life through accepting that Christ did it on the cross and he had to likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord 6:11.

Yield yourselves unto God as those that are alive from the dead and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God 6:13 But now being made free from sin and become the servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness and the end everlasting life 6:22 I beseech you therefore brethren by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God which is your REASONABLE service 12:1 and be not conformed to this world but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God 12:2

Christ has done it all and has paid the price for us to live without sin. We were crucified with Him 2,000 years ago and it is not something that we must do for ourselves in the future by trying to tame the flesh. Our part is to co-operate with God in His mighty work in us by consenting to conform our will with His Thy will be done and He will be able to swiftly do the necessary work in the application of the blood of Christ into our heart and performing the circumcision which will release us from the law of sin and death so that we can emerge into His glorious kingdom.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/22 6:18

by krautfrau on 2012/3/22 5:29:49

"So the two covenants have been in force since the beginning, as depicted by the two trees in Eden. We can depend on the flesh, even sanctified flesh, or we can depend on the Spirit. The inauguration of the New Covenant happened in time but is eternally accessible to those who walk by the Spirit and do not fulfill the lusts of the flesh."

I think if you think this one through you will see that it doesn't really stand up. The Old Covenant was not 'in force' from the beginning, but only from Sinai until Calvary. To use your analogy, the Old Covenant was NOT 'accessible' to anyone prior to Sinai or later than Calvary. It was a unique covenant designed for a unique people in a unique context and time frame. Similarly the New Covenant is only 'accessible' to those who enter it and, as I see it, entrance into the kingdom and into the New Covenant is effected by the reception of the indwelling Spirit which again, as I see it, was not available prior to Pentecost.

Re: , on: 2012/3/22 10:33

Philologos

When I say it was in force, I mean that the law of sin and death was in force from the start and has always been, which is the basis of the necessity for the Old Covenant in order to provide the shadow of things to come. The Moses covenant was after all, not spiritually effective, this is to say, no-one could keep the law so they all perished who tried but those who walked by faith like Moses and Abraham, were saved. How do you account for them if there was no NC?

best wishes
Brenda

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/3/22 10:58

I think the principle of LIFE was always in effect and the principle of Death was in effect from the time of Adam's fall. Not the 2 covenants.

The principle of faith has always been how God operates and that is why Abel's sacrifice was accepted and Cain's was not. Abel's sacrifice and obedience had everything to do with faith and nothing to do with any covenants since Abel did not have any knowledge of any covenants. Abel was exercising faith towards God and thus was operating according to the principle of LIFE, Cain was operating according to the principle of Death (I, me, my. Self-sufficiency, self-righteousness, coming to God on his terms).

The Two Trees are just that - One represents the principle of Life (God's ways) and the other represents the principle of Death (anything not according to God's ways. The God-way, is the narrow way is the Christ-way).

Does that sound right, Ron and Brenda?

Pilgrim

Re: , on: 2012/3/22 13:39

Hi Pilgrim

Yes that sounds right. The two spiritual laws have always existed, but they have been demonstrated to us through the Mosaic covenant and then through Pentecost as a sort of physical demonstration for us but I still contend that a man can operate according to the principles set forth at Sinai.

Re: - posted by learjet, on: 2012/3/22 14:31

Quote:

-----but I still contend that a man can operate according to the principles set forth at Sinai.

Hi Brenda,

If this was in fact true then the perfect life, death and resurrection of Christ was meaningless. If there was already a covenant outside of the New then there was no reason for a Second Adam since a path of redemption would have already existed outside of Him.

I'm not sure your reasoning that 'a man can operate according to the principles set forth at Sinai' how'd that work for Israel?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/22 14:57

krautfrau on 2012/3/22 12:33:33

"When I say it was in force, I mean that the law of sin and death was in force from the start and has always been, which is the basis of the necessity for the Old Covenant in order to provide the shadow of things to come. The Moses covenant was after all, not spiritually effective, this is to say, no-one could keep the law so they all perished who tried but those who walked by faith like Moses and Abraham, were saved. How do you account for them if there was no NC? "

I think you are equating the New Covenant with Justification by Faith. I don't. All those who put their trust in the word that God had spoken to them were justified by faith. But these were 'all born of woman'. John Baptist was the greatest of those 'born of woman' but he was clearly not in the Kingdom.

Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. Matt 11:11 KJV

Re: , on: 2012/3/22 17:01

Earl

"If this was in fact true then the perfect life, death and resurrection of Christ was meaningless. If there was already a covenant outside of the New then there was no reason for a Second Adam since a path of redemption would have already existed outside of Him. I'm not sure your reasoning that 'a man can operate according to the principles set forth at Sinai' how'd that work for Israel?"

The Old Covenant, that is, obeying the law outwardly with all the rituals and ordinances could not save a man and could only bring a man to Christ which some of the children of Israel did achieve. They responded to the revelation that has stood for all time - that is, by faith alone a man can be saved. Most did not.

There was no path of redemption other than the sacrifice of the Perfect Man. You and Ron are seeing it as starting in Jerusalem but there has still been no answer as to why some were saved beforehand.

The principle behind the Mosaic covenant is that if a man does not obey the complete law he will die or rather, lose his communion with God just like Adam did. Man can still choose to be under this law even though he does not keep the ordinances by trusting in his flesh or his own efforts and most believers do this although they do not know they are doing it, but the fruit is that they do not have the life of Christ in them or the mind of Christ and they see things not spiritually but through the veil of the flesh. Israel did it too in the main apart from a remnant who walked in the Spirit.

Re: , on: 2012/3/22 17:13

Ron

"I think you are equating the New Covenant with Justification by Faith. I don't. All those who put their trust in the word that God had spoken to them were justified by faith. But these were 'all born of woman'. John Baptist was the greatest of those 'born of woman' but he was clearly not in the Kingdom."

Yes this is correct. But I do not put it at the point of first coming to Christ. One is not Justified unless one is Sanctified in my understanding.

I don't think that verse is saying the John was not in the kingdom. I think that Jesus was saying to the people that they considered John as a prophet but those who enter the kingdom are greater than their estimation of how God would see them.

Brenda

Re: - posted by learjet, on: 2012/3/22 18:35

Hi Brenda,

I can understand your train of thought on the issue however, this statement:

Quote:

-----They responded to the revelation that has stood for all time - that is, by faith alone a man can be saved. Most did not.

Cannot reconcile with this statement:

Quote:

-----There was no path of redemption other than the sacrifice of the Perfect Man. You and Ron are seeing it as starting in Jerusalem but there has still been no answer as to why some were saved beforehand.

If people could have been saved by faith alone, it would nullify the purpose of Christ since His coming would not have been necessary.

Both of these statements cannot be true at the same time. Either there was redemption, or there was no redemption. If there was redemption pre-Christ, His coming was meaningless, if there wasn't, then His coming was absolutely necessary. It can't be both.

Re: - posted by passerby, on: 2012/3/23 3:56

Salvation is by Faith even in the OT times, that is why we are after Abraham.

Our Salvation is a plan and work of God. In the OT times they may not know the details on how God will accomplish it, but the efficacy blood of Christ covers Pre-OT, OT, and NT periods.

Re: , on: 2012/3/23 4:03

God exists outside of time. Although there is a point for us in history when the New Testament was inaugurated, it covers eternity as far as God is concerned. Again, how could men be called perfect and walking in faith like Noah, Job, David, Isaiah etc if there was no New Covenant available? They looked forward to Christ so were saved in the same way that we can look backwards. His death was absolutely necessary for all time.

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/3/23 4:14

hi, all salvation is depending upon the blood of the Lamb, Jesus. Abraham believed God and it was accounted unto him as righteousness. This was demonstrated to him when he went to offer Isaac where God supplied a lamb substitute and gained the title of JHWH JAREH. Noah built an ark for the saving of his family and when God shut the door on his ark it demonstrated that God was in charge of his families and his life. When Jesus set the captives free it was the old covenant saints He freed. God is in charge of who was numbered in this group and it is none of my business to speculate. jimp

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/26 7:06

krautfrau on 2012/3/22 19:13:54

"Yes this is correct. But I do not put it at the point of first coming to Christ. One is not Justified unless one is Sanctified in my understanding. "

I think I need you to clarify this point. One of my disagreements with much that has been taught in Holiness Movements is that it tends to move towards what I call 'Justification by Sanctification'. I think this is a serious mistake. Paul boldly affirms that God 'justifies the ungodly'. Our acceptance with God is based on what Christ has achieved NOT on what I have achieved. Can you clarify? Thanks.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/26 9:56

krautfrau on 2012/3/22 19:01:31

"There was no path of redemption other than the sacrifice of the Perfect Man. You and Ron are seeing it as starting in Jerusalem but there has still been no answer as to why some were saved beforehand."

sorry i am getting some of these responses out of order but this seemed an important one.

Here's a story I often tell. We had 7 children and much of their growing years seemed to be spent in queues. On one occasion the queue led to a turnstile which only allowed through those who had 'paid the price'. I told my older children to 'go through' and they obeyed me. Why did the gatekeeper not stop them? Because she saw me coming with the 'price in my hand'. Abraham was justified by faith not because he saw or understood Calvary but because he 'believed/obeyed' God and God allowed him through because he saw the man coming with the price in his hand. Or as Paul expressed it ...

...even the righteousness of God, through faith in Jesus Christ, to all and on all who believe. For there is no difference; for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ

Christ Jesus, whom God set forth as a propitiation by His blood, through faith, to demonstrate His righteousness, because in His forbearance God had passed over the sins that were previously committed, to demonstrate at the present time His righteousness, that He might be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus. Rom 3:22-26 NKJV

That is why God could 'pass over/ over look' the sins of the pre-Calvary saints, because God himself had the price in his hand, the poured out life of his own Son.

Hallelujah

Re: , on: 2012/3/26 11:53

"But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. 6:11).

"According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. 3:5)."

Oh boy this is a big one. Most of the church have believed that Justification and Sanctification occur together. I will quote Barclay (Apology)

"Those then, that come to know Christ thus formed in them, do enjoy him wholly and undivided, who is "the lord our righteousness," (Jer. 23:6). This is to be clothed with Christ, and to have put him on, whom God therefore truly accounteth righteous and just. Therefore it is not by our works wrought in our will, nor yet by good works, considered as of themselves; but by Christ, who is both the gift and the giver, and the cause producing the effects in us, who, as he hath reconciled us while we were enemies, doth also in his wisdom save us, and justify us after this manner."

I think that most of the church is wrong, in that they say that in coming to Christ for forgiveness one is made just. By the lives of those who claim this, one can see that they are not righteous in the Biblical sense, that is, imparted righteousness.

My understanding, and this is not the understanding of Wesley and the majority of the Holiness Movement is that one is made just and holy at a later date if indeed one does not refuse the Light and then later still one may become perfected in holiness. Salvation is simply salvation from sin and if sin remains then there is no salvation and the man is ungodly no matter what he has in his head.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/26 14:23

Brenda

Barclay is hard to get a handle on, as is quite a bit of Quaker theology. Chambers sometimes said that what he meant by regeneration was closer to what many meant by the word sanctification. The Quakers did not major on a single crisis experience but had the notion that all have light even the unregenerate. Barclay also rejects Original Sin which opens up another can of worms. ;-)

you say..

"I think that most of the church is wrong, in that they say that in coming to Christ for forgiveness one is made just. By the lives of those who claim this, one can see that they are not righteous in the Biblical sense, that is, imparted righteousness."

I don't think we can speak of the Biblical sense (singular) or righteousness and we do have to examine the context to see what is in focus. Do you acknowledge imputed righteousness at all or do have no room for this concept in your thinking?

Re: , on: 2012/3/26 15:25

"That is why God could 'pass over/ over look' the sins of the pre-Calvary saints, because God himself had the price in his hand, the poured out life of his own Son."

So why do you think that scripture calls them holy men of God? It says that Job was living a perfect life pre Satan's interference.

Brenda

Re: , on: 2012/3/26 15:38

Ron

"Do you acknowledge imputed righteousness at all or do have no room for this concept in your thinking?"

Yes I acknowledge imputed righteousness in justification and imparted righteousness in entire sanctification. Its just I see three stages.

I am a little unsure of where you stand though.

"Chambers sometimes said that what he meant my regeneration was closer to what many meant by the word sanctification."

I am nearer to Chambers than most.

"The Quakers did not major of a single crisis experience"

George Fox taught third blessing holiness - the second being that one is restored to the state of Adam before he fell (Journal) and the third to a state higher than Adam ie perfection not innocent. This is aka the via triplex amongst other mystics.

"had the notion that all have light even the unregenerate."

I understand that to mean that all men have something inside which if listened to will lead the man to Christ.

"Barclay also rejects Original Sin which opens up another can of worms. ;-)"

Like Finney the early Quakers said that man was born innocent but falls and then needs to be saved. There is a very weak biblical case for original sin but lets not go there :)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/27 5:20

krautfrau on 2012/3/26 17:38:15

" There is a very weak biblical case for original sin but lets not go there :)"

ah, now I see why we are having difficulty. The whole premise of my book is that only the New Covenant deals with original sin. If there is no original sin there is no need for a New Covenant.

I would dispute your opinion that the 'biblical case for original sin' is 'weak'. You probably know that Wesley wrote his longest book endorsing the doctrine of original sin and that he regarded those who rejected the teaching as 'half heathen'.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/27 5:22

krautfrau on 2012/3/26 17:25:01

"So why do you think that scripture calls them holy men of God? It says that Job was living a perfect life pre Satan's interference."

In the externalities of the Old Testament 'holiness' was an outward conformity to the commands of God. In the New Testament 'holiness' is an inward conformity to the nature of Jesus Christ.

Re: , on: 2012/3/27 6:51

One area where we are in disagreement is regarding the `seed` of Abraham which I am reading in your book.

This physical interpretation, that is, that God was speaking of Christ, does not fit with certain verses in the NT such as...

"think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Matthew 3:9)"

"They (the Jews) answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." (John 8:39)

"Â...For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children" (Romans 9:6-7)

"Â.... For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." (Romans 4:13-14)

The seed of Abraham and not any other of the OT figures, are those who live by faith, doing the works of Abraham and so enter into the everlasting covenant which God promised to those who would be His children before creation thereby showing that it existed from the start as Gods promises are in effect from His word as He does not break them.

The seed of Abraham is expressed when one is born again. It is a spiritual inheritance not a physical one. It does not make sense to me that the Father would make the promise to His Son who possessed all things with God right from the start and that the `better covenant` would not exist before the resurrection.

`In the externalities of the Old Testament 'holiness' was an outward conformity to the commands of God.`

I beg to differ brother. Some thought that conformity to the law was what God required but some did not like Abraham who knew it was by faith alone and so was counted as righteous or holy.

`In the New Testament 'holiness' is an inward conformity to the nature of Jesus Christ.`

I cant go along with this either - it is not an conformity it is an impartation of Christ Himself.

Brenda

Re: , on: 2012/3/27 7:00

Ron

" There is a very weak biblical case for original sin but lets not go there :)"
ah, now I see why we are having difficulty. The whole premise of my book is that only the New Covenant deals with original sin. If there is no original sin there is no need for a New Covenant.

I would dispute your opinion that the 'biblical case for original sin' is 'weak'. You probably know that Wesley wrote his longest book endorsing the doctrine of original sin and that he regarded those who rejected the teaching as 'half heathen'."

There is just as much need for a New Covenant to deal with our own sins in fact even more so than for those which we are supposedly responsible for which we did not commit.

Wesley was wrong on a number of things (like us all)

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/27 8:40

krautfrau on 2012/3/27 8:51:19

"The seed of Abraham and not any other of the OT figures, are those who live by faith, doing the works of Abraham and so enter into the everlasting covenant which God promised to those who would be His children before creation thereby showing that it existed from the start as Gods promises are in effect from His word as He does not break them."

And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. Gal 3:29 NKJV

But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. Now if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His. Rom 8:9 NKJV

We become 'Christ's' as a result of 'having the Spirit'. Those who are Christ's are Abraham's seed.

"In the New Testament 'holiness' is an inward conformity to the nature of Jesus Christ."

I cant go along with this either - it is not an conformity it is an impartation of Christ Himself."
I think you are confusing cause and effect. We receive Christ's life through the Spirit; the Spirit of life that was in Christ Jesus. The result of that impartation is holiness. Impartation is the cause; holiness is the effect.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/27 8:46

krautfrau on 2012/3/27 9:00:02

"There is just as much need for a New Covenant to deal with our own sins in fact even more so than for those which we are supposedly responsible for which we did not commit."

One of the distinctives of the New Covenant is that the old heart of stone is removed and replaced with a heart of flesh. The will of God is written on this new heart; this was not so in the provisions of the Old Covenant. Sins were forgivable under the Old Covenant because the man was coming with the price in his hand, but the distinctive inwardness of the New Covenant was not possible until the Spirit was poured out by a victorious Christ.

We are not held responsible for the 'sins' we did not commit but Adam's penalty which was spiritual death, Sin and Death, did spread to all.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/3/27 9:34

#11 – The majority of evangelical Christian teachers object to the distinguishing of “soul” and “spirit” in the makeup of the human being. Why do you consider it so important to differentiate between “soul” and “spirit”?

The earliest language of the Church was Greek, the language in which the New Testament was originally written. The earliest Christian writers who wrote in Greek (such as Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.) made clear distinction between spirit and soul, between the spiritual and psychological function of human beings, indicating that the spirit was the means of relating to God; the soul was the means of relating to other people; and the body was the means of relating to the world around us.

When Augustine came to the fore in the 4th century, he was not proficient in the Greek language, and wrote in Latin instead. Augustine’s thought was greatly influenced by the dualism of Persian Manichaeism and of Christian Platonism. He thought only in terms of the duality of soul and body. His concept of “original sin” was that Adam’s sin caused a defective corruption of “human nature,” especially in the fleshly tendencies of sexuality, whereby all mankind became essentially evil. He did not accept the spirit’s source of sinful character, for the either/or duality reminded him of the dualism of Manichaeism. Slavishly following St.

Augustine, most of Christian thought since the 4th century has adopted his psychopneumatic merging of soul and spirit.

The failure to distinguish soul and spirit disallows the spiritual understanding of the scriptures. It tends to psychologize all spiritual realities (cf. William James – Varieties of Religious Experience).

Scripture connects the spirit of man with the presence of God:

Job 32:8 – “there is a spirit in man, and the breath of the Almighty gives understanding.”

Prov. 20:27 – “the spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord”
– where the light and fire of God are experienced.

The proper differentiation and distinguishing of soul and spirit, of psychological and spiritual function, is key to understanding most of the major doctrines of Christian thought.

It is the key to understanding Christian anthropology – how God made humanity, and how God intended to function within humanity.

It is the key to understanding sin – that the fall of man into sin did not create a defective or corrupt human nature that was inherently sinful.

It is the key to understanding salvation – that salvation is not just saving us from erroneous thinking, or from a sure slide into hell. By the “saving life of Christ,” we are made safe from satanically misused and abused humanity, in order to function as God intended by the presence of the Spirit of Christ in our spirit.

It is the key to understanding sanctification and the Christian life. The inner conflict of “flesh and Spirit” cannot be properly understood unless we differentiate spiritual and psychological function.

If we do not differentiate soul and spirit, we end up with a plethora of religious aberrations that are inadequate for sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ – psychological counterfeits of true spiritual worship – psychological principles of Christian behavior, rather than

“worshipping in spirit and in truth” (Jn. 4:24).

If soul and spirit are not differentiated, then Sigmund Freud is our savior! God forbid!

I thought #9 through #15 were very good. Really challenged my thinking in several areas.

Pilgrim
<http://www.christinyou.net/pdfs/FAQS.pdf>

Re: , on: 2012/3/27 10:54

"We are not held responsible for the 'sins' we did not commit but Adam's penalty which was spiritual death, Sin and Death, did spread to all".

"I think you are confusing cause and effect. We receive Christ's life through the Spirit; the Spirit of life that was in Christ Jesus. The result of that impartation is holiness. Impartation is the cause; holiness is the effect."

I think we are saying the same thing Ron, just expressing it differently.

Brenda

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/28 5:18

pilgrim777 on 2012/3/27 11:34:34

"#11 – The majority of evangelical Christian teachers object to the distinguishing of “soul” and “spirit” in the makeup of the human being. Why do you consider it so important to differentiate between “soul” and “spirit”?"

Did I indicate that I don't differentiate between spirit and soul? If I did I apologise. I do distinguish but I am reluctant to separate. Let me illustrate from Calvin (this is not a man a usually quote!). Calvin noted that in verses where the Son and God are together there is a differentiation and that God in such verses refers to the Father. He also states that when the Son is not mentioned then the term God refers to the triune God. I haven't checked this through but it is one of the things on my 'watch list' and as I read the scriptures I try to be ready to spot these instances and to see if Calvin is right on this. When you consider that he had no Concordance or Bible software, it is a very bold statement, but although I frequently disagree with his theology, his knowledge of the Bible was really extraordinary!

Now let me extrapolate Calvin's statement into the realm of spirit and soul. This is also on my 'watch list'. I am trying to notice, as I read, if 'soul' is used in the sense of 'soul and spirit' and, at the same time, trying to notice the occasions where 'spirit' and 'soul' appear separately in the same sentence.

I am reluctant to think of man as either 'bipartite' or 'tripartite' for the same reasons that I will not think of God as 'tripartite'. God is not made up of three parts, neither is man. There are three persons within the Godhead and there are three areas of function in man, but I am reluctant to split them up.

There are only four instances in the NT where 'soul' and 'spirit' appear in the same sentence; Matt 12:18; 1 Cor 15:45; 1 Th 5:23; Heb 4:12. Hebrews tells us that only the active expression of God's word is able to 'separate' between soul and spirit. "For the word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Heb 4:12 NKJV. I am suspicious of any 'rules of thumb' that are used to 'divide' between 'soul' and 'spirit'; I believe only a word of God is able to make this identification. In the same way that I am reluctant to judge between a 'thought' and an 'intention', so I am reluctant to distinguish between whether an act is 'soulish' or 'spiritual'. I believe these distinctions exist but I think it is unwise to brand actions by these labels unless we have been given a specific word of discernment in the matter.

So, sorry if i mislead you into thinking I equate 'soul' and 'spirit'. ;-)

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2012/3/28 9:10

Quote:

----- I am suspicious of any 'rules of thumb' that are used to 'divide' between 'soul' and 'spirit';

On this point I also have reservations with Jim Fowler and others who divide up the human person.

Psalm 42 says "Why are you downcast, O my soul? Why so disturbed within me?" When I checked references on this word "soul", I discovered that this word was not used to distinguish the nonphysical from the physical entity of man. This psalmist's entire being was distraught— even physically, right to his bones. In those days soul simply referred to the person as a whole.

So then, to love the Lord with all your heart, soul, strength, mind, etc, simply meant: Love God with your entire being. If I understand correctly, this is a style of biblical writing: to list different words to say essentially one thing. So we shouldn't try to make the words say different things with our own dissecting tools.

Here's the question: If I can only love God with my "spirit" does that leave out my body, my "soul"? The great command seems to imply otherwise.

Diane

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2012/3/29 5:40

roadsign on 2012/3/28 11:10:16

"Here's the question: If I can only love God with my "spirit" does that leave out my body, my "soul"? The great command seems to imply otherwise. "

It can have other implications. I have met, but not agree with folk, who claim that for the regenerate the act of sin only takes place in the body. To answer your question more directly, Paul enjoins us to 'present our bodies'. I regard the body as the envelope, if we present our bodies God gets the envelope and ALL that is in it.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2012/3/29 7:54

Hi Ron,

I wanted to acknowledge your reply. By the way, that question was for Jim Fowler and his answer followed. It was not really a question for you. I just wanted to know your thoughts on #11. I really appreciate them, as I do roadsign's and it gives me more food for thought.

Perhaps I will have a comment, later.

Blessings to you and roadsign,
Pilgrim