

**General Topics :: Grow In Holiness****Grow In Holiness - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/7/5 17:16**

Grow in Holiness.

Is it possible that we can grow in Holiness, I see scripture that says you can grow in Grace 2 Peter 3:18, I can see that c  
an abound more and more 1 Thessalonians 4:1 but I don't see any scripture about growing in Holiness, yet I see it repea  
ted again and again...

For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness. Thessalonians 4:7

Can we grow from being Unclean to being Holy.. does abstaining from unclean thing make us clean as we try to live a H  
oly life?

I would say no because the unclean desire would still lurk in our heart.

Holiness means absolute purity of your walk before God, the words coming from your mouth, and every thought in your  
mind— placing every detail of your life under the scrutiny of God Himself.

He came to save us because He created us to be holy, the atonement through the Cross of Christ means that God can  
put me back into perfect oneness with Himself through the death of Jesus Christ, without a trace of anything.

Why oh why do we keep on insisting that we can grow in Holiness, is it because we are so independent and don't won't t  
o surrender 'our lives' to him to God?

**Re: Grow In Holiness - posted by davidkeel (), on: 2013/7/6 4:17**

Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holi  
ness in the fear of God. 2 Cor 7v1.

Put to death whatever belongs to your earthly nature Col 3 v 5

**Re: Grow In Holiness - posted by acarrollfan (), on: 2013/7/8 8:44**

Perhaps being Holy simply means setting ourselves apart.

I am not talking about you not going to work when your colleagues are non-believers so that you set yourself apart.

When the world thinks it is okay to have a marital affair in today's world, Christians don't think it is okay, for example.

I am not too sure, though.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/8 12:32**

Holiness is not necessarily setting ourselves apart physically from other people. Jesus walked amongst sinners and ate  
with them regularly.

Holiness is a matter of the heart first and foremost and expresses itself in many ways.

Be ye holy, as I am holy.

How was Christ holy? That is how we are to be holy.

Lev\_11:44a For I am the LORD your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy...

1Pe 1:15 But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation;  
1Pe 1:16 Because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy.

Tit 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/8 13:27**

Quote: Holiness is a matter of the heart first and foremost and expresses itself in many ways.

Exactly, God in the new Covenant promised us that gives a new heart a heart of flesh to replace the heart of stone Ezekiel 36:26

It is the new heart that will cause us to be Holy, it is God's work to make us Holy we don't grow in Holiness.

Christ gave himself so he could have a Holy people Tit 2:14

**Re: , on: 2013/7/8 18:05**

I actually do believe we grow into His likeness (maturity) and with that, experience righteousness and holiness more and more as we are steadily conformed to Christ. And yes, it is the work of the Lord. We are to go from victory to victory in our lives, yielding more of our heart each time to the Lord.

2Pe 1:5 And beside this, giving all diligence, add to your faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge;

2Pe 1:6 And to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness;

2Pe 1:7 And to godliness brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness charity.

2Pe 1:8 For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

2Co 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might BE MADE the righteousness of God in him.

It's about "growing" in the Lord.

ginomai

ghin'-om-ahee

A prolonged and middle form of a primary verb; to cause to be (gen -erate), that is, (reflexively) to become (come into being), used with great latitude (literally, figuratively, intensively, etc.): - arise be assembled, be (come, -fall, -have self), be brought (to pass), (be) come (to pass), continue, grow...

I am not of the school that just declares themselves righteous as I believe there must be real fruits of righteousness which abound greater and greater.

Heb\_12:11 Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterward it YIELDETH the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.

Holiness is separation and separation is God's first principle of righteousness as we see in the garden.

He separated the day from the night and called it good (righteous). All of Creation has the principle of separation in it and God called it "righteous" (good).

God's righteousness permeates His creation and the foundation of His righteousness is holiness (separation).

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/8 19:26**

Quote: I actually do believe we grow into His likeness (maturity) and with that, experience righteousness and holiness more and more as we are steadily conformed to Christ. And yes, it is the work of the Lord. We are to go from victory to victory in our lives, yielding more of our heart each time to the Lord.

Hmmm I do believe that the Spirit leads you further into knowing God "Grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" 2 Peter 3:18 and that

2Co 5:21 For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might BE MADE the righteousness of God in him.&#8232;&#8232;

Quote: It's about "growing" in the Lord.

I agree that there is growth but it's growth in grace 2 Peter 3:18.

Quote: I am not of the school that just declares themselves righteous as I believe there must be real fruits of righteousness which abounds greater and greater.

It was much more simpler for me, I believed what my heart was telling me, I knew Jesus and he was real for me, I can't say that I had real fruits of righteousness but I was forgiven and I had met the living God and I was saved.

But I grew in that gift of grace that I had freely received and I got to know God more and more.

But none of that is Holiness; Holiness is being separated unto God and the biggest hindrance for us is Sin, so we need to be separated from Sin so that we can be Holy and that does come through growth but through death. For he that is dead is freed from sin Rom 6:7

It's not growth we need for Holiness it's death...

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/7/8 19:35**

good thoughts,

Something I discovered when studying this subject in the past is that holiness and sanctification are from the same Greek words.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/9 0:26**

"He must increase and I must decrease." We are to experience the increase of Christ in our lives as we exercise ourselves unto Godliness and the fruits of righteousness manifest and increase in our lives. These are not just words on a page but are supposed to be an experiential reality in our lives.

The formation of His righteousness does not come instantaneously. For this reason Jesus said, 'But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.' Matt 6:33

Those of the kingdom should experience a daily 'hunger and thirst for righteousness', (Matt 5:6).

The satisfying of this hunger comes as we receive this righteousness into our lives. Righteousness must become our life.

If we seek His kingdom we must seek His righteousness, for the foundation of God's kingdom is righteousness.

I see the extension of God's character through His authority. 'For the kingdom of God is righteousness... (Romans 14:17) You could say the scope of His righteousness is the scope of His authority. Or one could also say His authority esta

blishes His righteousness. Righteousness involves the kingdom of God.

As His authority increases over every area of our lives (authority that we yield to and accept) then His righteousness is being established in those areas, too. This is how you grow in righteousness and holiness. This is "land" that is coming under the rule of Christ.

Mixture is contrary to righteousness. In all creation mixture was not found except for a tree called 'the tree of knowledge of good and evil,' which became the place of man's fall. Evil comes through mixture. Here one finds the first principle of evil. The incorporation of evil is sin. It is the nature of sin to break down order and cause disintegration. All kinds of disorder come until all the life support systems of one's life are destroyed. The working of evil is always death.

The working of the Holy Spirit in our lives is to remove all "mixture" (principle of separation).

It is mixture of good and evil that destroys righteousness. Evil can look good, but when evil comes in, it destroys all that righteousness has made. How many of God's people are feeding upon mixture? The tree could be a book, a TV, a movie, a magazine, a philosophy or a relationship. The world today is full of mixture. It will excite the flesh but result in death for the soul.

Through mixture one loses the discernment of evil. In looking upon evil, one comes to accept evil; to experience evil, one loses the discernment of evil; and when discernment of evil is lost, evil has overcome. Not following the first principle of righteousness allows evil to enter. A prophet pronounced judgment upon a nation because they had lost discernment. "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!" Isa 5:20

God's people must separate themselves from evil and draw the line between the clean and the unclean, between the holy and the profane. Fathers must teach their children to draw this line. The mixture of evil must be eliminated from the home and from the church. How much one allows the principle of separation to work in his life will determine how much God's righteousness will work in his life.

Righteousness brings order and peace.

And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance for ever. And many people shall dwell in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting places;  
Isa 32:17-18

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/10 8:12**

Quote: The formation of His righteousness does not come instantaneously.

Genesis 15:6 says that Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness.

The moment he believed it was accounted to him for righteousness.

I know that when I was born again it happen instantly, I was born of the incorruptible seed by the word of God. I was declared righteous. I didn't have to be righteous I didn't try to be righteous I was righteous.

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

Having said that though I was a "babe in Christ" still prone to carnality but I was still righteous.

Quote: As His authority increases over every area of our lives (authority that we yield to and accept) then His righteousness is being established in those areas, too. This is how you grow in righteousness and holiness.

Is Carnality something we can grow out of, does the carnal nature decrease as the Spirit increases?

Look at Paul's cry desperate cry in Rom 7 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

He cried out for deliverance from carnality he didn't ask to decrease so the Spirit could increase, it was a desperate cry from desperate man. What is crying to be delivered from "the body of death"

Paul is crying out for deliverance because he can't act the way he wants when he would do good evil was with him.. and he relates it all back to the body of sin..

What the answer for Paul's dilemma crucifixion.

Rom 6:6 Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

Our old man (Adam) was crucified with Christ so that what? The body of sin might be destroyed. What was Paul crying out for deliverance for who shall deliver me from the body of this death.

So how is righteousness and holiness shown forth in our bodies.

Using the Amplified bible to help understand this verse better.

2 Cor 4:10 Always carrying about in the body the liability and exposure to the same putting to death that the Lord Jesus suffered, so that the life of Jesus also may be shown forth by and in our bodies.

The life of Jesus is shown forth by and in our bodies by carrying about in the body the liability and exposure to the same putting to death that the Lord Jesus suffered.

2 Cor 4:11 While we are alive, we are constantly being handed over to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may be clearly shown in our mortal bodies. And so death is at work in us, but life is at work in you.

Constantly being put to death... so that the life of Jesus may be clearly seen..

**Re: , on: 2013/7/10 8:33**

There are two camps regarding Romans 7. Many think that Paul is describing his own experience as a mature believer. I used to think this too, and I respect many who do hold this position. I can picture someone not liking my post thinking, Paul had to be talking about a believer because I struggle the same way he describes. Who gets to define spiritual maturity? And is this verse referring to spiritual maturity and the way a mature Christians struggle with sin? I don't think so, however I would point them over to Galatians 5:17 which teaches what they are feeling.

Galatians 5:17

For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh:and these are contrary the one to the other:so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. Others, think the Apostle Paul is describing his life under the law as a Jew. That is the view I hold to.

Paul was referring to himself in the past, prior to his conversion when he was a religious person, zealous of the law.

Many Christians say, "God only requires one to be righteous. His Son". The thought goes that since He is righteous, God does not require me to be righteous. This is a typical response coming from Christendom, today.

Does God require men to be righteous? Here many Christians would respond, "No". They take a view called positional holiness that can be expressed as follows: "Oh, yes, I am very unholy and I commit sin; I sin in thought, word and deed every day, but by virtue of my position in Christ, all Christ's perfect righteousness is accredited to me so that God does not even see my sin; He sees only Christ and since I have my position in Christ, I remain holy before God."

The logic is, because of my position in Christ, God does not see me, He sees only Christ. Since Christ is righteous, I am righteous.

In this view one sees righteousness as a legal position in Christ rather than a life of righteousness. They would say you can

cannot be righteous, only reckoned righteous. Faith enters into a legalistic reckoning of all sins, past, present and future, as already remitted. A permanent justification encompasses all the future sins he may commit, and nothing he does will change his position in Christ. Faith has completed the work, he no longer is responsible to repent.

Also a certain gnosticism has entered the church that says the knowledge of it makes it so. In this view, righteousness is just a matter of knowledge. If you know it, then it is yours. Confess it, and it will be so. This accommodates the positional view of righteousness. But, does a confession of righteousness make one righteous?

Is faith a substitute for repentance?

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/11 8:32**

Quote: And is this verse referring to spiritual maturity and the way a mature Christians struggle with sin? I don't think so, however I would point them over to Galatians 5:17 which teaches what they are feeling.

Okay when I was typing out my response I contemplated what verse to put in... I did think to use Galatians 5:17 but decide to go with my conviction and that is Rom 7 which does not describe a spiritually mature Christian, but rather a Christian that is struggling with Carnal nature which is what Gal 5:17 is describing as well...

Now if we are saying up that Gal 5:17 is describing a Spiritually mature Christian and that's all we can hope to expect on earth, then no wonder the church is defeated...

There is more.....defeat can be replaced with victory..

Lets compare the Romans verses with Gal 5:17

Galatians 5:17 For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other

Rom 7: 22-23 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

Paul is describing the war between the two opposing sides the Spirit in his inward man and the flesh that opposes God. so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

Rom 7:19-20 For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

Now because of the war between Spirit and flesh you can't do the things that you would and you keep falling into sin..

So for me they both are dealing with the same issue. What Paul describes in Romans and Galatians is not what a Spiritual Mature Christian should be are both fleshly and are controlled by the Flesh...

Here is a description from Galatians and Romans on a Spiritual Mature Christian and the method of how you get there.

Rom 8:13-14 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. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

Gal 5: 24-25 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/11 8:53**

Thank you for your response, Colin. However, since you have a different view of Romans 7 than I do, we would continue the discussion comparing "apples with oranges" and get no where. No sense in trying to force a square block into a round hole and I know you would agree.

Blessings to you.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/12 1:56**

Quote: Rom 7: 22-23 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man

Here we have a clue. A Jew could not delight in the law of God after his inward man. Paul is speaking about the spirit of man here. The Jew obeyed the commandments after the outward man. He did not know yet that lusting after a woman was the same as committing adultery. He did not know that being angry with someone was the same as murder. He only knew that murder and adultery were against the 10 commandments and if he avoided them and the rest of the old law, he was justified.

Quote : Rom 7:19-20 For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do

Here we have another clue. Paul says elsewhere that when he was a Jew he believed he kept the law perfectly.

As anyone knows, who has come to a point in the life as a believer when they see that they have failed to live up to the picture presented in the sermon on the mount because they have been walking in their own strength, the Spirit convicts them in the same manner. Even if they did succeed in making a good show outwardly, they know inwardly that they did not and they have lusted and they have hated.

Paul then entered the experience of Romans 8 where he knew the crucifixion of the flesh, in having it put out of action, whereby he could now walk in the Spirit.

**Re:Murrcorl - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/7/12 2:42**

Quote:

-----Can we grow from being Unclean to being Holy.. does abstaining from unclean thing make us clean as we try to live a Holy life?

I would say no because the unclean desire would still lurk in our heart.

Now because of the war between Spirit and flesh you can't do the things that you would and you keep falling into sin..

So for me they both are dealing with the same issue. What Paul describes in Romans and Galatians is not what a Spiritual Mature Christian should be are both fleshly and are controlled by the Flesh...

-----

I am not able to understand exactly what you are trying to say here, as I find a contradiction between your statements.

I do not agree with you that we cannot grow in Holiness. We are justified by the work that Jesus did for us. But that does not mean we are holy and attained the maximum growth, which means the Gospel has ended there. But the Gospel does not end there, we have the Holy Spirit whom God is willing to pour to us so that we can grow in Holiness. If an evil spirit comes into a person he gradually starts being dominated by evil spirit and grows in evil. Same way Holy Spirit should cause us to grow in holiness. The difference is The Holy Spirit is gentle and will not possess us like evil spirits. He wants us to submit willfully to his work. Very simple logic, I am not sure why there is so much confusion on Holy Spirit, it is because people of the world do not know him. They have not experienced him, but try to write a theology on his work. If you can write a book on the direction of wind and predict it perfectly then you can write a Theology on Holy Spirit's work.

Romans 7:14-25 is not about a life of a Spirit-filled Christian. It is a deception. I know a poster in SI who believed in the same and kept disagreeing to all other scripture based on Romans 7. If you read Romans 7 carefully, Paul has mentioned in verse 9 -"I was once alive apart from the Law; but when the commandment came, sin became alive and I died;". The phrase "I was Once" clearly means he is talking about his past life. He is continuing about his past life in verses 14 to 25.



5. It was a life when he lived as a Jew without being filled with the Spirit.

How is this applicable to us? When we gentiles come to know Christ, the old man who lived a sinful life dies and we are born of the Spirit. This new man instead of living by Spirit will start living by law. We try in our flesh to keep the laws but we fail and fail. This is the stage explained in Pilgrims progress when Christian takes the route of Legalism. He struggles until the evangelist frees him. I went through this stage in my life and finally through brokenness I was dead to the law and united with Spirit (Romans 7-4).

Romans 8, is about the next phase where we are united by Spirit and walk by the spirit. We are no longer obliged to obey our lusts (Romans 8-12). We live an overcoming life, growing in holiness. If this is impossible to attain then Paul is asking us to do the impossible in Romans 8.

Our Spiritual growth should be like building a house (1 Peter 2:5). No matter how tall it becomes it is always rooted on the same foundation. Jesus Christ is the rock of our salvation, the Foundation of our spiritual house. We can never have a foundation of our own. A foundation by itself can never become a happy dwelling house no matter how powerful and strong it is.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/12 11:34**

Quote: Rom 7: 22-23 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man

Quote: Here we have a clue. A Jew could not delight in the law of God after his inward man. Paul is speaking about the spirit of man here. The Jew obeyed the commandments after the outward man. He did not know yet that lusting after a woman was the same as committing adultery. He did not know that being angry with someone was the same as murder. He only knew that murder and adultery were against the 10 commandments and if he avoided them and the rest of the old law, he was justified.

Dont need to say more than that...

**Re: Rom 7:22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: , on: 2013/7/12 12:41**

Rom 7:22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man:

The "inward man" is a straightforward term. As opposed to the outer man (the body of flesh) the inward man is the non-material self. It is not a part of the soulish self, it is the entirety of all that one is apart from the body. This is not a term for regenerate, only. All men are an inward man, that you cannot see and an outward man, that is made of flesh of blood. Of that, you cannot contest.

Many argue that the unregenerate cannot delight in the Law of God, but this is opinion enduring long enough to sit on the shelf of presuppositions. What is commonly accepted as orthodoxy is often nothing more than error that has been held for several generations. David in the Psalms, and Solomon in Proverbs, along with many others, are represented in Scripture as "delighting in the Law of God".

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/12 13:48**

Quote: I do not agree with you that we cannot grow in Holiness. We are justified by the work that Jesus did for us. But that does not mean we are holy and attained the maximum growth, which means the Gospel has ended there. But the Gospel does not end there, we have the Holy Spirit whom God is willing to pour to us so that we can grow in Holiness.

Okay when you were justified you received the gift of salvation and your spirit was born again so in that sense you were separated by God unto himself so you are a Holy vessel separated unto God. However after conversion most find that there is something that remains in you that hinders you and causes you to fall into sin. So we are Holy because we are separated unto God however the fruit shows we are not pure and our actions by falling into sin would say we are not holy and pure in heart..

So how does this Christian become spiritually mature, perfect, Holy is it by growth does he grow out of the tendency to sin, does he grow out of impurity into purity, do they grow from being a child of God into a Son of God?

Quote: If an evil spirit comes into a person he gradually starts being dominated by evil spirit and grows in evil.

Sorry if evil spirit enters a person then that person is dominated from the moment it enters, likewise when it leaves from that moment he is free.



Quote: This new man instead of living by Spirit will start living by law. We try in our flesh to keep the laws but we fail and fail. This is the stage explained in Pilgrims progress when Christian takes the route of Legalism. He struggles until the evangelist frees him. I went through this stage in my life and finally through brokenness I was dead to the law and united with Spirit (Romans 7-4).

You bring up an excellent point, now before I start I haven't heard this preached and I am just forming my views on it..

We must consider something when we are born again it's our spirit that born again, our and our body remains the same. So the new man is birthed into your spirit, however the soul remains unaffected, for example if you smoke before conversion then you're still going to crave for a cigarette (unless you're delivered from that addiction at the time of conversion). Just using that as a example it's not and fast it could anything..

So now that we established and I hope you agree that most don't get it all at conversion. However the order from the Garden of Eden must be restored the Spirit must lead and we must follow so there must be a sanctifying work to make the soul Holy and pure.

Now as the Soul is un-pure and the Soul resists the Spirit that been birthed in us, you could say that the soul is of the old man, the old carnal nature. So what does God use as the tool to bring us to Christ in that area of our life? The Law...

So when we are not yielded to the Spirit but are acting in rebellious way which is simply doing something that we are pleased to do, then we are obliged to fulfill the law...

This then takes us to Romans 6 and Holiness, because the old nature can't grow in Holiness there is only one remedy and that is cross...

The soul needs to be planted together in the likeness of his death so that the soul can also be resurrected into the likeness of Christ the new man...

That is why I say we cannot grow in Holiness, because the cross is required to allow us to step from defeat to victory from impurity to purity, from sin to separation from sin and the soul becomes separated unto God (Holiness) and we are led by the Spirit of God...

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/12 13:57**

But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the LORD, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people Jer 31:33

I think Paul had this verse in mind when he wrote that Rom 7:22 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man.

Old testament Outward --- New testament Inward.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/12 16:00**

Quote:  
-----We must consider something when we are born again it's our spirit that born again, our and our body remains the same. So the new man is birthed into your spirit, however the soul remains unaffected, for example if you smoke before conversion then you're still going to crave for a cigarette (unless you're delivered from that addiction at the time of conversion). Just using that as a example it's not and fast it could anything..  
-----

Your soul remains the same, too. It was not changed the day you were born again.

That is why the mind must now be renewed, the will strengthened by God's word and one's emotions healed and reclaimed (experientially) for the will of God.

Our soul was not changed the day we were born again. So, there is a process of sanctification that we now begin to walk in as we experientially take back all the "land" that the enemy has stolen from us. The land is before us, it is there, and it is ours, but God wants us to deal with things in our heart and our past and we must, by faith apprehend these victories

that await us.

Rom 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.

Eph 4:17 This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind,

Eph 4:18 Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart:

Eph 4:19 Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.

Eph 4:20 But ye have not so learned Christ;

Col 3:5 Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry:

Col 3:6 For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience:

Col 3:7 In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them.

Col 3:8 But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth.

Col 3:9 Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds;

Putting off the old man and putting on Christ are part of our daily walk of sanctification.

As we walk closely with Christ our mind is renewed, emotions healed and our will is strengthened. This does not all happen in 1 day.

Let me ask you a question: Did the Hebrew children possess all the land in one year? Did they drive out all the enemies in one year? The answer to both, are NO. In fact, God even said that He would not drive them out all at once. Even that was progressive.

Exo 23:29 I will not drive them out from before thee in one year; lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/12 17:17**

Quote by Justin: Our soul was not changed the day we were born again. So, there is a process of sanctification that we now begin to walk in as we experientially take back all the "land" that the enemy has stolen from us. The land is before us, it is there, and it is ours, but God wants us to deal with things in our heart and our past and we must, by faith apprehend these victories that await us.

Yes that is what we are taught throughout Christianity today that sanctification is a process but is it the truth?

Rom 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.

We can clearly see that a transformation need to occur Paul's say this done by the "renewing of your mind" what is the mind your soul because it is said to be you mind, will and emotions.

Mind – Nous Strong's G3563 the mind, comprising alike the faculties of perceiving and understanding and those of feeling, judging, determining.

So we see when they say mind it does not only say understanding and perception but also feeling which emotion, determining which is will power.

So you could say here be ye transformed by the renewing of your soul...

Look at what the word transform

Strong's G3339 – metamorpho#333; To change into another form, to transform, to transfigure

Look at what the word renewing

Strong's G342 - anakain&#333;sis renewal, renovation, complete change for the better

So let's amplify the scripture..

Rom 12:2 And be not conformed to this world: but be ye change into another form by a complete change for the better of your soul, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.

God can't grow that which is corrupted; he doesn't set up a process for change like what we would do. What he does is takes what is old and applies the cross and it's put to death and it was put to death 2000 years ago but because it is put to death we can then be then raised with Christ and have his life.

All we need to do is believe it and will be sanctified...

Quote: This does not all happen in 1 day

It can happen in a moment

**Re: , on: 2013/7/12 18:06**

Hi murcc,

You left me speechless only because I have never met anyone where it happened to them in a moment. Of course with God all things are possible. Are you for real? Are you being honest? Is this your experience or someone else you might know?

2Ti 2:21 IF A MAN THEREFORE PURGE HIMSELF from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour, sanctified, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work.

2Co 7:1 Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, LET US CLEANSE OURSELVES from all filthiness OF THE FLESH AND SPIRIT, PERFECTING HOLINESS in the fear of God.

1Jn 3:3 And every man that hath this hope in him PURIFIETH HIMSELF, even as he is pure.

1Pe 1:22 SEEING YE HAVE PURIFIED YOUR SOULS IN OBEYING THE TRUTH through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently:

Psa 119:9 BETH. Wherewithal shall a young man CLEANSE HIS WAY? by taking heed thereto according to thy word.

1Th 5:14 Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feebleminded, SUPPORT THE WEAK, BE PATIENT TOWARD ALL MEN.

1Th 5:23 And the very God of peace SANCTIFY YOU WHOLLY; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

1Th 5:24 Faithful is he that calleth you, WHO ALSO WILL DO IT.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/12 18:21**

I edited my previous post in case you missed it.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/12 18:35**

I am a witness to an instant sanctification. It happened after a time of severe trial, I was on the point of giving up my faith. I longed to know God better and have a more authentic walk but I had failed so many times and could not stay 'on the mountain top'. I was tired and weary of being in the valley.

Then I read a book that explained to me that all I had to do was believe that Christ had done it for me and I could enter into it immediately by faith. I could be released from the power of sin that I still found in me. I just could not gain victory over the problems I had which caused me not to trust Christ entirely, or to have fears. My worst problem was anger, the leftover from a terrible childhood.

It was like a light had been turned on, I suddenly saw that what I read was the truth and immediately my whole life changed. I had been struggling in my own strength and now, I was in rapture, having the Lord appear to me as my sanctification. In three days the scriptures were opened up to me and I understood all of the things that were difficult before that.

I barely slept for three days and spent the whole time praising Him after being in the dust asking for forgiveness. Eventually I had to ask Him to reduce the intensity as it felt like my heart would not stand it much longer.

Soon after I began to understand what had happened to me by reading Christian writings about this.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/12 19:40**

I don't have any problem with your testimony Kraufrau and maybe that is what Murrco meant. I was referring to the day of salvation. I have never met or heard of anyone that had your experience on their day of salvation. Of course my experience is limited.

But, let God be true and every man a liar.

Have you maintained your deliverance and sanctification? It's not automatic, is it?

You don't have to answer that.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/7/12 21:24**

Quote:

-----by murrco on 2013/7/12 8:34:28

Quote: Rom 7: 22-23 For I delight in the law of God after the inward man

Quote: Here we have a clue. A Jew could not delight in the law of God after his inward man. Paul is speaking about the spirit of man here. The Jew obeyed the commandments after the outward man. He did not know yet that lusting after a woman was the same as committing adultery. He did not know that being angry with someone was the same as murder. He only knew that murder and adultery were against the 10 commandments and if he avoided them and the rest of the old law, he was justified.

Dont need to say more than that...

-----

There are 2 flaws in this logic. The major flaw is not all the 10 commandments are external. The 10th command is internal. God kept it so that man could not win their salvation. It is do not covet. Paul mentioned this one command in Romans 7:7 and said he could not keep it. No unregenerated Jew can keep it.

Jesus called the Pharisees white washed tombs. If there is no inner man then what did he call dead?

The inner man Paul meant here is conscience, which bears witness of our sins. It is common for both believers and unbelievers.

A simple question, if Paul was still defeated as explained in Romans 7 then how could he witness that is conscience is absolutely clear before God and Man? There are numerous places in acts where he mentions it. Also to 1 Cor 4.

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2013/7/12 21:34**

Quote:  
-----I am a witness to an instant sanctification. It happened after a time of severe trial, I was on the point of giving up my faith. I longed to know God better and have a more authentic walk but I had failed so many times and could not stay 'on the mountain top'. I was tired and weary of being in the valley.  
-----

I have a similar testimony as well. But I will not call it instant sanctification because there is no such thing in bible. To be I received Power to overcome. The flesh was still the same and temptations were same but I got power to stand for god. Power that comes by resting in the bosom of Jesus.

If you believe you are already sanctified then are you now free from sin? This should contradict 1 John 1:8. In a practical way after that experience did you never get angry? Did you never lust?

I seen testimonies were people were delivered from few addictions the moment they were born again. Like smoking, drugs etc. but that does not mean they are sanctified. There are other sins that they need to overcome.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 2:44**

Quote just-in : Have you maintained your deliverance and sanctification? It's not automatic, is it?

After that experience, I soon found that although I was able to withstand temptation over conscious sins, there was still unconscious sin. I later had another encounter whereby I was entirely sanctified. The first was sanctification. Some second blessing teachers only get that far and it colours their understanding of the doctrine. The point is that the Holy Spirit enables us to walk as our Lord walked.

I have had periods of failing to keep to this and then times of longing to get back. I don't know why it has been so hard to maintain but others have said so too and even Peter fell from it for a while until Paul's rebuke restored him although it is not clear I think we can assume it.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/7/13 3:16**

how do you know that you had unconscious sin ,were you conscious of it

the periods of falling and you saying it has been hard to maintain ,,this sounds like normal christianity and baptism in the holy spirit ,,,

have you met any one who never falls ,,  
HAVE you met any one as sanctified as the lord

the more I hear about this teaching ,the more it seems like Christianity defined differently

blessings

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 3:31**

Quote sree : Jesus called the Pharisees white washed tombs. If there is no inner man then what did he call dead?

For most of the Jews, they did not have the inner cleansing, although there were exceptions as some were righteous but it was because they understood that it must be through faith in God, like Abraham, and not dependence on the the keeping of the law. The law of life which opposed the law of sin and death, was ratified on the cross but applied through all times.

Paul was not one of these and relied on the keeping of the law as seen when he said that, concerning zeal, persecuting the church, touching the righteousness which is in the law, he was blameless Phil. 3:6. His testimony does not match that which we find in Romans 7 as would be expected as he was no longer a Jew there but a fleshy believer.

But when he was a Jew, he thought with his human thinking that he was justified before God due to keeping the law and obviously thought that he was not envying his neighbour but realised this through the revelation he gained as a believer..

The inner man is not the soul and therefore the mind as the mind is still the outer man as evidenced by what Jesus said about the outer coating being thought of as washed.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 3:37**

Quote sree : If you believe you are already sanctified then are you now free from sin? This should contradict 1 John 1:8. In a practical way after that experience did you never get angry? Did you never lust?

During my walk(s) in the Spirit, being entirely sanctified, I never got angry or lusted. It was exactly as 1 John said, that he who is righteous is righteous indeed. He said it was in practise as well as belief. This is what I found.

Why does 1 John 8 & 10 contradict the rest of the letter where John says that he that sins is of the devil do you think? How do you reconcile them without coming to the understanding that you are misinterpreting the very few contradictory verses?

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 3:49**

brothergary

It is very unfortunate that those who oppose this teaching, become more and more unable to accept it and it makes me wonder at times whether it should be discussed with those who have not yet been convicted of their walk in the flesh. Maybe it is best to say to them, leave whatever in this discussion does not apply to you at this present time. The more the mind will find reasons to oppose it the harder it is for them to 'hear' the Holy Spirit within them leading them to seek holiness.

I have read many testimonies especially of revival times when brothers and sisters testified like myself. It is however very rare today as we are in dark times. I do know that others agreed with their testimonies even spouses so I have no reason to disbelieve them since I see it in scripture now.

I knew there was unintentional sin when God showed me I had sinned otherwise I would not know.

**Re: - posted by brothergary, on: 2013/7/13 5:38**

I think that is a foolish thing to say that those who oppose this ARE walking in the flesh

Whitfield opposed it ,,but weasly the biggest propgater of the doctrine ,said nothing of the sort ,but said the man was full of virtue and we should drink of his spirit  
you say the opposite

can you see how what you say seems very proud and argnt if we place it beside weaslys sermon about whitfield at his funeral ,,,,personally I cant see how some body would not consider what weasly actual said about others that denied this doctrine rather than your self ,,,,do you know what im meaning ,,,,im not trying to offend you ,its just an observation

blessings

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/7/13 6:04**

I rember some verses from 2peter that touch on growth  
the context being found in peace with out spot and blameless also growth in knowlage

holiness is the reason, grace is the power that brings about knowlage and holiness 3:14 Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless.

3:15 And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you;

3:16 As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which t hey that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.

3:17 Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness.

3:18 But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ev er. Amen

BUT GROW IN GRACE 3;18 ,why do we need to grow in grace ,,,

to perfect HOLINESS in the fear of the lord  
till we all come to the perfect man to the measure and stature of the fullness of Christ

till Christ be formed in us

blessings

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/13 8:23**

Quote:  
-----During my walk(s) in the Spirit, being entirely sanctified, I never got angry or lusted. It was exactly as 1 John said, that he who is rig hteous is righteous indeed. He said it was in practise as well as belief. This is what I found.  
-----

During your walk(s)you never "got" angry or lusted. But the question Sree asked was in the present: are you "now" free f rom sin? To validate your perfectionism dogma, you will need to answer him in the simple present tense. Otherwise your experience is not uncommon to many believers who walk in the spirit for a season. To put it more bluntly: since your exp erience, have you been totally, unequivocally and perfectly free from all sin and to this very moment still walking in this sinless perfection, perpetually void of all conscience infraction? If you answer "yes", you are bearing witness of your own accord and if one really wants know the actual truth of your estate, it would be prudent to interview your husband, childre n, work associates, neighbors - those who have daily contact with you to attest to what you claim. Your life and conduct must be beyond all reproach, endlessly. But I've found that most people who espouse sinless perfection are not married and/or live alone. It seems to be very convenient to not have a spouse to validate their arrival!



**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/7/13 8:58**

Quote: There are 2 flaws in this logic. The major flaw is not all the 10 commandments are external. The 10th commandment is internal. God kept it so that man could not win their salvation. It is do not covet. Paul mentioned this one commandment in Romans 7:7 and said he could not keep it. No unregenerated Jew can keep it.

Or vice versa can someone who is regenerated keep the law? Specifically you shall not covet if they are still dominated by the flesh? Is it not one of the works of the flesh?

Quote: The inner man Paul meant here is conscience, which bears witness of our sins. It is common for both believers and unbelievers.

The inner man is the Spirit of a man the part that gets "Born Again" at the new birth... Take for example Nicodemus a Pharisee a teacher of the Jews he asked "how can a man be born again" he didn't understand and he didn't know.

Quote: A simple question, if Paul was still defeated as explained in Romans 7 then how could he witness that his conscience is absolutely clear before God and Man? There are numerous places in Acts where he mentions it. Also to 1 Cor 4

With a simple answer Paul is speaking of a time after being Born Again but before he got victory over the body of death. But after he got victory over it he could state his "conscience is absolutely clear".

This reminds me of Duncan Campbell's testimony on the battlefield of the First World War where he testifies as being cleansed until he felt "as pure as an angel". This in his own words was a second blessing after conversion that gives you victory over the flesh.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/7/13 9:23**

Quote: During your walk(s) you never "got" angry or lusted. But the question Sree asked was in the present: are you "now" free from sin? To validate your perfectionism dogma, you will need to answer him in the simple present tense. Otherwise your experience is not uncommon to many believers who walk in the spirit for a season. To put it more bluntly: since your experience, have you been totally, unequivocally and perfectly free from all sin and to this very moment still walking in this sinless perfection, perpetually void of all conscience infraction? If you answer "yes", you are bearing witness of your own accord and if one really wants to know the actual truth of your estate, it would be prudent to interview your husband, children, work associates, neighbors - those who have daily contact with you to attest to what you claim. Your life and conduct must be beyond all reproach, endlessly. But I've found that most people who espouse sinless perfection are not married and/or live alone. It seems to be very convenient to not have a spouse to validate their arrival!

I think that question is harsh and unloving, and it turns from a question into your expectation, what if she was divorced through no fault of her own her husband ran away with another woman. Then she has failed in your eyes because she is single..

Quote by Sree: I have a similar testimony as well. But I will not call it instant sanctification because there is no such thing in the Bible. To be I received power to overcome. The flesh was still the same and temptations were the same but I got power to stand for God. Power that comes by resting in the bosom of Jesus.

Quote by Kartuf: After that experience, I soon found that although I was able to withstand temptation over conscious sins, there was still unconscious sin. I later had another encounter whereby I was entirely sanctified. The first was sanctification. Some second blessing teachers only get that far and it colours their understanding of the doctrine. The point is that the Holy Spirit enables us to walk as our Lord walked.

The question should be simple and to both people Sree and Kartuf is your conscience clear before God and man.

Re: , on: 2013/7/13 9:46

PaulWest

I don't find it useful for a discussion to become based on trying to catch someone out, which is what usually happens so I usually prefer to desist from saying what my spiritual condition is at present.

I will say however that before my husband deserted me for the bottle, he actually did answer on a forum to declare that he found me to be without sin but it did no good as people said that he was probably blinded by love. Well his desertion put paid to that idea.

But anyway, to find others who can attest to someone they know to be sinless is not as easy as it sounds as even Jesus was declared to be of satan.

Re: Grow In Holiness, on: 2013/7/13 9:50

Quote:

-----Is it possible that we can grow in Holiness, I see scripture that says you can grow in Grace 2 Peter 3:18, I can see that can abound more and more 1 Thessalonians 4:1 but I don't see any scripture about growing in Holiness, yet I see it repeated again and again...  
-----

You don't see the phrase "grow in holiness" but you do see many references to be separate, separate yourselves, purge yourselves, etc. You also see scriptures about light and that we need more and more light (revelation) from the Lord to help separate us from darkness.

In reading different posts I don't believe everyone is on the same "track" and that they may have different definitions for holiness.

If holiness is akin to a spiritual separation (light from darkness), then yes, light can be dim, yet grow brighter and brighter (until the noonday), dispelling (separating from) more and more darkness.

Psa\_37:6 And he SHALL BRING FORTH (a process) thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday.

It takes several hours for the light of the sun to be at noonday.

2Pe\_1:19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts: (Again, we see a process. The sun does not come straight up to noon, in an instant. It gradually dispels the darkness).

Do you have a complete revelation of God when you are first saved? Do you have all the light you need, and have no blind spots (darkness) in your heart?

Holiness is indeed, separating yourself from the profane and walking in greater and greater light.

2Co\_6:17 Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you,

We are responsible for the light that God gives us and we receive more and more light (revelation) from Him as we hunger and thirst for righteousness.

Psa\_36:9 For with thee is the fountain of life: in thy light shall we see light.

Psa\_37:6 And he shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday.

Light is brought forth gradually in our lives just as it rises in the morning.

Pro\_4:18 But the path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth MORE AND MORE unto the perfect day.

Psa\_43:3 O send out thy light and thy truth: let them lead me; let them bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy tabernacle  
S.

Heb\_7:26 For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens;

So, I am not saying that someone cannot be perfectly walking in the light that they have. There is a separation/sanctification process that is part of our walk down here and we are responsible to respond in faith to the increase of revelation (light) that the Lord brings to us. This faith response will bring a deeper separation, holiness unto the Lord.

Luk\_3:17 Whose fan is in his hand, and he will THOROUGHLY PURGE (a process) his floor, and WILL GATHER (denoting another process) the wheat into his garner; but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable.

2Ti\_2:21 If a man therefore purge himself from these, HE SHALL BE (another process) a vessel unto honour, SANCTIFIED, and meet for the master's use, and prepared unto every good work.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/13 10:20**

Quote: Holiness is indeed, separating yourself from the profane and walking in greater and greater light.

We must get away from the notion that self can separate us from the unclean, you can't separate yourself from the unclean because self is unclean..

This why I say there you can't grow in holiness because you can't self is corrupted it can never be Holy..

One of the verses which clearly describe the pathway that leads us out of our self-life into the fullness of the Christ-life, is Galatians 2:20: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live. But it is no longer I that live but Christ Who lives in me."

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 10:48**

Who is talking about self? It is the "new man" that is walking in faith and putting to death the deeds of the flesh.

I think you are the only one talking about self.

Through the power of the Holy Spirit we mortify the deeds of the body (flesh).

Rom\_8:13 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.

When God gives you more light, what do you do with it? Do you receive it and come into agreement with His light (truth)? And if you receive it, what effect does this have on your walk. How is receiving God's light and truth in your life manifested? What kind of separation does it cause within you?

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 11:31**

Quote:  
-----We must get away from the notion that self can separate us from the unclean, you can't separate yourself from the unclean because self is unclean..

This why I say there you can't grow in holiness because you can't self is corrupted it can never be Holy..

One of the verses which clearly describe the pathway that leads us out of our self-life into the fullness of the Christ-life, is Galatians 2:20: "I am crucified with Christ; nevertheless I live. But it is no longer I that live but Christ Who lives in me." murrcoir  
-----

Please don't misunderstand my motive in saying this brother. There is a view that somehow all flesh is evil. That after regeneration every thought is wicked and that every ambition is a slave to corrupt selfishness. I have to say that I cannot comprehend such a gospel at all. It is one thing to speak of the universality of being in Adam with the consequences inherited by that means for all men (Romans 5). It is similarly one thing to speak of the universality of being in the last Adam (Romans 7).

The profound reality of these things cannot be comprehended by natural means. Not only this but the sum of these things cannot be altogether understood even when we are born again. Even though we now agree in the inner man that the Law of God is holy, righteous and good, this only serves to produce momentary victory and perhaps not even victory at all though we may cease from many sins as they are outwardly measured. Even unbelievers can do that which is good and these as it is written are a law unto themselves. How much more then is the believer who knows that the Law of God is holy, righteous and good in the inner man able to do that which is good in the renewing of the mind. It seems to me that beyond this lies something more full and gives greater hope in a desire to please God who gave His Son for us. This other thing is the revelation of Romans Chapter five, six and seven together. Not one part from which one kind of hope is afterwards lost again, but rather a living hope by which we are able to walk with our gaze fixed permanently on Christ.

For me at least when I read of brethren describing this revelation which can only come by the Holy Spirit of God speaking of permanency of victory over the body and the soul I am at once pressed to believe that they have taken ownership of the knowledge of God and made of His revelation a thing of their own as though they had some part in it beyond the activity of God. Herein lies a terrible deception, not the revelation itself, but a failure to comprehend that the soul can do that which is good, and at the same time that which is evil is within its grasp also. Perhaps to complete the passage from Galatians which you have quoted will make more sense of it:

I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave himself for me.

It is not simply a matter of Christ living in me, it is more especially a matter of my living by faith in Christ Who gave Himself for me. It is not the flesh or the soul which is our chief difficulty it is our very selves and our inclination to wander about because we have become so confident that we are greater than the wolf who is seeking to devour us. Yet as it is written, "you shall go in and go out and find pasture". There is no condemnation yet there must be wisdom of God else we are become instructors of ourselves by reason of revelation brought to our remembrance. Surpassing revelation is not a basis for walking. The "I" of each one of us cannot surrender to the obedience of the finished work of the cross. Yet with the revelation of that finished work even the "I" can be brought to obedience through death. This is not however a once and for all time revelation. It is a daily obedience. Recognising your position before God in Christ would make you sing and dance for joy in praise of the Father and of Christ His Son. Yet failing to recognise that apart from that which we are in Christ Jesus we are yet in the flesh will in the end produce many tears.

**Re: Krautfrau, on: 2013/7/13 11:53**

You said;

"Then I read a book that explained to me that all I had to do was believe that Christ had done it for me and I could enter into it immediately by faith."

What is the name of this book that you read?

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 12:10**

tuc

It was The Normal Christian Life by Watchmen Nee and although I do not agree with Nee over certain things, the Lord used this book.

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/13 12:56**

Quote: The profound reality of these things cannot be comprehended by natural means.

Yes your 100% right... here is a short testimony of Derek Prince you see how things need to be revealed.

Now God made this vivid to me personally many years ago now. I was for about eight years the pastor of a small Pentecostal congregation in the center of London, England. And some people who know me today would find it hard to believe this, but we conducted open air services three times every week in the center of London at a place that's known as Speaker's Corner, Marble Arch. And that was where we got our fish. We went out and fished for sinners, brought them in. And we saw over the years hundreds of sinners saved through those meetings at Speaker's Corner.

But one night during this period I had a very vivid dream. And in my dream I saw a typical open air meeting. A circle of people standing around and a man in the middle preaching. And as I watched the man and listened to him I said to myself, "What he's preaching is pretty good." But there was something I didn't like about the man. It was like he was hunchbacked and he had a club foot and altogether he looked crooked. So I woke up and I thought, "I wonder what that meant," and dismissed it. But about two weeks later I had the same dream again. So this time I said to myself, "God must be trying to tell me something. I wonder who the man is?" And it was like the Holy Spirit said to me what Nathan said to David, "thou art the man."

And it opened up to me a completely new aspect of salvation. I was soundly saved by most standards, baptized in the Spirit, serving the Lord, but there was something in me that was crooked and unacceptable to God. It was the old man. I didn't have any gospel understanding of God's program for the old man. I had to find my way through these things.

Well, about the same time Easter was coming on and because of the Easter season somehow I had in my mind a mental image of the hill of Golgotha and the three crosses on it. But the middle cross was much taller than the other two. And it was like the Holy Spirit put me through an examination. He said, "Now tell me, for whom was the middle cross made?" But it was as if he said, "Be careful before you answer." So I stopped and thought and I said, "It was made for Barabbas." And he said, "That's right." Because it really was not made for Jesus. Do you understand? Barabbas was due to be executed. But he was released at the last moment, Jesus took his place. So then he said, "But Jesus took the place of Barabbas." I said, "That's right." Then the Holy Spirit said, "But I thought Jesus took your place?" I said, "Yes, that's right." Then he said, "You must be Barabbas."

And at that point I saw it. I never try to argue with people about that, it's a revelation. But I saw that I was the criminal for whom the cross was made. It was exactly to my measure. It was appropriate for me. But Jesus took my place.

That made it so vivid to me, God's program for dealing with the old man. This is quite distinct from the forgiveness of sin. The forgiveness of sins is wonderful but you're never going to have a life of victory or real fruitfulness as long as that old rebel is still alive inside you. God's provision is the execution of the rebel. God's mercy is the execution took place when Jesus died. Our old man was crucified with him. The Old King James says "is crucified" which is the perfect tense. But the more correct translation is "was crucified." It's a simple past tense, it's an actual, historical fact that took place.

This doesn't matter whether we know it or believe it, it's true. But knowing it and believing it is going to change you and me.

[http://www.dpmuk.org/Mobile/default.aspx?article\\_id=109310](http://www.dpmuk.org/Mobile/default.aspx?article_id=109310)

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/13 14:02**

Brenda, in truth I had no knowledge of your marital history. I was making a general statement of a pattern I've noticed among the adherents of sinless perfection; i.e. the lack of third-party attestors to their "arrival" at perfection. I'm sorry that it was taken as a personal affront, and I certainly can see your justification in taking offense. I sincerely apologize.

Quote:  
-----to find others who can attest to someone they know to be sinless is not as easy as it sounds as even Jesus was declared to be of s  
atan  
-----

Theologically, yes. But in the Jews' eyes He was satanic on account of being a Sabbath-breaker and claiming to have the power of forgive sin - not because of actual "sinning" as we are discussing it. Even His own words and challenge in John 8, "Which you convicteth Me of sin?" went unanswered. His social conduct was always pristine; His words endlessly impeccable. His detractors could only get Him on the violations of their own man-made traditions and interpretations of the law. He drove out demons, they thought, via the power of Beelzebub to rationalize what they already perceived Him as due to their religious framework being crushed by His Truth.

For the record, your claims of sinless perfectionism are not being challenged by people ignorant of the New Covenant and unsympathetic to the doctrines of regeneration, justification, sanctification and glorification.

Quote:  
-----I don't find it useful for a discussion to become based on trying to catch someone out, which is what usually happens so I usually prefer to desist from saying what my spiritual condition is at present.  
-----

I understand this, but you seem to be promoting a sinless perfection agenda which is commonly seen as heretical in most evangelical circles. As such, it should be challenged, first scripturally (which you can't seem to make) and if it fails here, to prove its fallibility via the demonstration of its practical impossibility.

Brenda, please try not to take it personally. I have absolutely no animosity or malice toward you.

**Re: - posted by davidkeel (), on: 2013/7/13 14:28**

I think accusing Paul West of being unloving speaks volumes of the kind of tactics that are used in efforts to counteract an argument. The people who are in favour of the spirit baptism being a cure for all eternity and for all sin are always the ones who try to hide the fact that they aren't perfect. Accusing people of being haters and unloving seem to be their weapons of war when they can't give a proper explanation when asked about sin in their body. And not explaining verses when they are confronted head on with them is just another weapon you seem to use. Especially when the verses totally refute and contradict your statement of belief.

I know you are rejoicing in your experience and your doctrines are swerved by that. But your experience is not the whole doctrine of God.

Have you ever asked God to forgive you of anything in your daily life since you had your experience?

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 15:50**

Paul

Apologies accepted but I have no idea why you thought I took offence nor why you think I do not like to be challenged, or provide scriptures which I have done on here over the years very frequently whenever asked and have never ever showed any sign that I was offended by questioning. In contrast, you have failed to engage with me when I have posed questions regarding the things you have written.

Also why you call the doctrine I believe in heretical when many writers and speakers on this site believed that man can walk without sin in this life. It really is strange that you should make so many mistakes.

"I was making a general statement of a pattern I've noticed among the adherents of sinless perfection; i.e. the lack of third-party attestors to their "arrival" at perfection"

You may have witnessed it these days, but it is my experience that there are many false claimants today. In the past however, those who preached holiness and led large revivals, had many followers who attested to their claims.

" His detractors could only get Him on the violations of their own man-made traditions and interpretations of the law."

Yes that proves my point that in their eyes He was sinning.

"not because of actual "sinning" as we are discussing it."

Jesus and His disciples broke the commandments in their eyes

**Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2013/7/13 15:52**

There are two things that have helped open my eyes to the truth of our holiness in Christ.

1)The tri-part nature of man. We are a spirit, we have a mind, and we live in a body. Because we are "in Christ" our spirit is holy and perfect and is what was "born again" at regeneration. Our minds are in a continuous process of being renewed until Christ comes again and then we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. This is subjective or demonstrated holiness, not just imputed holiness. Our flesh never changed at rebirth and won't until we get glorified bodies at Christ's second return.

2) Our spirit learns gradually to trust or walk in the Spirit and reject and refuse solicitations from the flesh. Imputed holiness of the spirit at regeneration is the basis for practical holiness of walk and conduct. Holiness always starts from the inside and works its way to the outside as long as we do not quench the Holy Spirit's workings. Some people try to act holy thinking that when they get it done outwardly then they will be holy inwardly. They have it backwards and I'm sure some will accuse me of preaching passivity for saying that. I'm not. Holiness is a work of grace and is a humbling process. You have to admit you can't do it on your own by your own efforts or resources alone. Then you have to have it revealed to you that Christ's provision of his death (delivered from the dominion of sin) and resurrection (receiving new life of Christ's Spirit to overcome and walk in victory) is the key to holiness and power. Christ gets the glory, not you and your self-effort. Receive the provision by faith (reckon yourself) and be filled with the Holy Spirit.

While I think people who believe and teach doctrines of perfectionism, sinlessness, complete sanctification, etc., are sincere and mean well, those teachings have caused much confusion and despondency to the hearers. Many become discouraged and fall away, the others live in denial of any sin in themselves and are effectively hypocrites. Again, I do not want to cause strife here. I would just like to show a more excellent way. I am not against holiness or righteousness. Just the opposite. I am not an antinomian.

Below are links to essays on this topic. I feel they are balanced and well-said. It is best to read in the order listed. The first is a testimonial from someone who was in the instant holiness movement and what tragic consequences he saw it having.

<http://www.puregospeltruth.com/holiness-the-false-and-the-true-by-ha-ironside.html>

<http://www.puregospeltruth.com/fatal-trap-of-holiness-preaching.html>

<http://puregospeltruth.com/leaven.htm>

<http://www.puregospeltruth.com/the-heretical-theology-of-jesse-morrell-of-open-air-outreach.html>

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 15:55**

David

Colin was referring to Paul West not Paul Washer, and he has never made a claim that he is sinless. Reading more carefully would help you to avoid making false statements. Colin was defending an unfair and without evidence presumption.



**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 16:31**

TrueWitness

Just because there has been a lot of error and damage to peoples faith, does not prove that the doctrine is wrong.

I have read a number of testimony's of people like the first writer, who have been encouraged to believe that a 'second blessing' will enable them to live without sin and as has been frequently reported, they found out that their sin nature was still active though subdued.

This is because they only received sanctification rather than entire sanctification which is actually a third blessing. If they had received this teaching they would have been saved a lot of disappointment.

Is there any wonder why Satan is so active around this doctrine. He hates ES'ed believers as he has no more power over them so there is a vast amount of confusion over the doctrine.

Tell me where to find in scripture, that the power of God is inadequate to enable a man to find a way to escape all temptation?

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/13 16:44**

Quote:

-----Yes that proves my point that in their eyes He was sinning.  
-----

Was John 8:46 rhetorical?

Brenda, this is why it is difficult to continue engaging you, and why I feel you can't meet the task. Scriptures previously mentioned are usually glided over and forgotten - and this isn't the first time. What has always made me wary is that have to bring you back to the unaddressed scriptural points. And when I bring you back, you seem to produce an unnatural exegesis that does not gel with other verses found elsewhere on the same issue. My original question remains unanswered as well: Why did you answer Sree in the past, when he asked the question of your perfection in the present continuous?

Quote:

-----You may have witnessed it these days, but it is my experience that there are many false claimants today. In the past however, those who preached holiness and led large revivals, had many followers who attested to their claims.  
-----

I would like to know who these men were that claimed to arrive at absolute sinless perfection. Surely, they wrote some books. Can you give us a name that we all would know? I do not mean just a teacher who wrote that sinless perfection was attainable. I would just like to know of someone who officially arrived at this state and was henceforth observable either through ministry or close, prolonged third-party witness. Can you give us one name we would know out of all the teachers and preachers featured on SermonIndex?

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 17:05**

Paul

" Can you give us one name we would know out of all the teachers and preachers featured on SermonIndex?"

Indeed I can - George Fox.

Quote from Journal ;

" Â“At last they asked me whether I was sanctified. I said Â“Sanctified? Yes, for I was in the Paradise of GodÂ” They said had I no sin Â“Sin?Â” said I Â“Christ my Saviour hath taken away my sin and in Him there is no sinÂ” They asked how we knew that Christ did abide in us I said Â“By His Spirit that He has given usÂ” They temptingly asked if any of us were

Christ I answered "Nay, we are nothing, Christ is all" They said "If any man steal is it no sin?" I answered "All unrighteousness is sin".

Fox made it clear that he was not talking about being sanctified as a 'position' nor that the blood of Jesus hides our sins and God does not see them. He said that all unrighteousness in actions is sin, but further, that the 'holy men' pleaded for holiness in HEART and life, and conversation here' (Journal) He was in agreement with the Apostle John in his first letter, who said in 3:7 Little children, let no man deceive you, he that doth righteousness IS righteous, even as He is righteous. There is no imputed righteousness, the doctrine over which the Puritans refuted Fox. It is an imparted righteousness.

Fox was known amongst his contemporaries as being a holy man which no-one ever disputed. He claimed that he was sinlessly perfect.

I have dealt with the scriptures which are supposed to refute the doctrine ie 1John and Romans 7 repeatedly and it becomes rather tedious to have to go through it again as there is no easy way to quote old posts. I will happily carry them around on my signature but it will take up a lot of space.

Of course you will consider my interpretation does not gel with other verses you disagree with me over. I don't just use texts, I also use the story of the children of Israel and the example of the disciples to prove my points.

I have explained why I said to Sree that that I prefer not to discuss my present spiritual standing. I have not purposely ignored questions, but I might have missed some due to memory difficulties.

"Was John 8:46 rhetorical?"

It does not say that they had no reason to accuse Him, just that they had not up till then - perhaps they were gathering evidence.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/13 17:13**

Fox was referring to his experience of baptism of the Spirit called coming up through the flaming sword, which he and the early Quakers taught would make a man holy and without sin. Their biggest detractors were Calvinists who of course taught imputed righteousness.

It was experienced by him after he become a believer. He clearly shows three events.

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/13 17:31**

Brenda, George Fox is probably not a good example of arriving at sinless perfection. Some of the things he did can be picked apart in light of scripture and found wanting, like refusing to pay state-mandated taxes to the church of England and a lack of customary deference to his superiors.

I have respect for Fox in certain areas, but in other areas he falls short and is not a good model to emulate. A sinlessly perfect man or woman should be worthy of complete emulation, no questions asked. This, of course, is only Jesus Christ, who never erred, spoke a harsh word, raised his fist, cheated with money, or disrespected authority. Even Paul (whom you probably count as being sinlessly perfect) did things unworthy of emulation, like circumscizing Timothy, shouting at Ananias, arguing with a co-missionary, etc. I have found that God will often reveal something about a man that falls short of sinless perfection if He sees we are in danger of idolizing him.

Do you have any other names? I thought you would mention Brengle!

Re: , on: 2013/7/13 17:32

more on Fox

'It is real practical holiness in thought and action which the Â'preacher of righteousnessÂ' (Apocalypse of the Word, Douglas Gwyn 25) as Fox called himself and testified of himself :-Â"As He is so are we IN THIS PRESENT WORLD, and that the saints are made the righteousness of God, that the saints are ONE in the Father and the Son, that we shall be like Him, that all teaching which is given forth by Christ is to bring the saints to perfection even to the stature and fullness of Christ, this the scripture doth witness and this I DO WITNESS TO BE FULFILLEDÂ" (Journal 135) This message, as he went about preaching, produced a violent reaction:- Â"The world swelled and made a great noise like great raging of the sea. Priests and professors, magistrates and people were all like a sea when I came to proclaim the Day of the Lord amongst them and to preach repentance to themÂ" (Journal 33)

The Â'Day of the LordÂ' is the message in 1John 1:6 If we say that we have fellowship with Him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth because (v5) God is light and in Him is no darkness at all and that (2:6) he that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked and (3:6) Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him neither known Him. Â"Hating the light, you hate ChristÂ" (Journal 135) This put paid to the error on the subject of sanctification, that we are in Christ if we are hoping for sanctification at some time in the future, or as some think, we will gradually sin less and less until one minute we have no control over our thoughts or we have reduced down to having just one sinful thought occurring, and then, lo and behold, the sinful thought will occur no more.

Re: , on: 2013/7/13 17:43

"like refusing to pay state-mandated taxes to the church of England and a lack of customary deference to his superiors."

The Quakers refused to pay taxes and went to prison as a result of obedience to God who said that we should love our enemies not go to war with them and the government sanctioned war. The Quakers were obeying Christ in not giving titles to mankind as He said that all men were equal.

I am surprised then that Fox is printed on this site if he was so deceived.

The circumcision of Timothy was allowed by God, his refusal to take Barnabus was confirmed later as God's will and he was right to stand against him having his leadership challenged. And it was Peter not Paul speaking to Ananias, not shouting as you say.

A sinless man will still make errors of judgement.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/13 17:44

Quote:

-----"Was John 8:46 rhetorical?"

It does not say that they had no reason to accuse Him, just that they had not up till then - perhaps they were gathering evidence.

I'm sorry. I do not see that at all with that verse, given the context and how it was asked in the climax of the confrontation. Why even ask it? It makes no sense at all if they could answer it to Christ's detriment. It would invalidate the point He was making. He knew they couldn't refute it.

I feel you have to put a wrench to it and hypothesize from the obvious to make it say anything different.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/13 18:09

Quote:  
-----And it was Peter not Paul speaking to Ananias, not shouting as you say.  
-----

It was Paul. Acts 23. He reviled the High Priest after being slapped, admitted he was wrong, and repented.

Quote:  
-----The circumcision of Timothy was allowed by God  
-----

Are you assuming this because Paul circumcised him?

Quote:  
-----his refusal to take Barnabus was confirmed later as God's will  
-----

True, but the end never justifies the means. Plus, they didn't know God's will beforehand, like they did with the choice of Matthias to replace Judas. There were other ways short of arguing to amend the situation.

Quote:  
----- The Quakers refused to pay taxes and went to prison as a result of obedience to God who said that we should love our enemies not go to war with them and the government sanctioned war. The Quakers were obeying Christ in not giving titles to mankind as He said that all men were equal.  
-----

We love men and we pay our taxes. We honor the King and show him respect. Scripture does not give us conditions governing the payment of taxes; we pay them regardless and then we take our grievances to God in prayer. A Christian living in victory is to be beyond reproach in all these areas. What testimony did a Quaker have in jail from a refusal to pay his taxes? Even heathen hate to pay their taxes!

Quote:  
-----I am surprised then that Fox is printed on this site if he was so deceived.  
-----

George Fox has much to be admired for, and he deserves to be on SermonIndex and there is a lot to gain from his ministry and journal. But I don't think he had "light" in these areas. But who has total light apart from the "dark glass" this side of eternity? I do applaud his objection to war, refusal to take arms, views on slavery, women, etc.

Quote:  
-----A sinless man will still make errors of judgement.  
-----

This one statement opens an entire Pandora's box and is a very convenient fortress to hide behind.

Re: , on: 2013/7/13 19:01

Quote:  
-----Unfortunately in these dark days, we only find these books written in the past. Some claim to be entirely sanctified but it is easily to be seen that they are using the term in a different way. They say that they are positionally so or their idea of sinlessness is a very loose one and anyone can see very soon that they are in fact still sinners. Fox and John are both clear, if we sin then we are not in the light and the Day of Judgment is near. It comes when we are presented with this message and we must make a decision in the same way that men and women had to make that decision when Fox brought them the message. Will we accept it as the truth and know that God has spoken? If we do not then we have chosen our path and it is the path of darkness, without knowing the cleansing of Christ inwardly. Fox believed that there was only one Day of the Lord. Brenda Jackson 2003  
-----

This is the difficulty Brenda for me at least. Apart from the heart felt desire to understand all heresy and a love for the one who has entered into it, I also am burdened for those who hear it and by it stumble into denying the gospel of Christ crucified for sin and raised for our justification. It is a profound mistake to take a precious truth and attest to a man's greater reality of it than the witness of the Holy Spirit which many here on this site as well as in every place bear witness to, that no one born of God practises sin, but if we do sin we have an advocate with the Father.

[http://www.christianquaker.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=46:entire](http://www.christianquaker.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46:entire)

In this short passage Brenda you identify sinning as the same in meaning as not "knowing the cleansing of Christ inwardly". This is to deny that the one who sins is born again. If our conscience was not washed from whence would we have our confidence before the Father in heaven? In finality sister you say Fox believed that there is only one day of the Lord. I know what you mean to say! It is that those like Fox who have had their one day of the Lord are the truly saved. Well sister I am looking for the physical bodily return of Christ the Messiah of Israel. Whether I am by that hour alive or dead I belong to Him according to the purchase of His blood. Whether He beats me and imprisons me for a thousand years I will praise His name because He is worthy. Beyond that I care for nothing...only that I should see Him in His day. Sister I have known Christ in visibility already. Yet I sin daily. Am I to be the more pitied? It is not a boast either in Christ or the flesh it is simply the truth sister.

Re: , on: 2013/7/14 3:26

Paul

John 8:46

Adam Clarke writes that the verse is about falsehood rather than sin :

“It is probable that &#945;&#788;&#956;&#945;&#961;&#964;&#953;&#945;, sin, is put here in opposition to &#945;&#955;&#951;&#952;&#949;&#953;&#945;, truth, in the same verse, and then it should be rendered falsehood. The very best Greek writers use the word in the same sense: this, Kypke proves by quotations from Polybius, Lucian, Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Plutarch, Thucydides, and Hippocrates. Raphelius adds a pertinent quotation from Herodotus, and shows that the purest Latin writers have used the word peccatum, sin, in the sense of error or falsehood” (Commentary)

The discourse was concerning the truth. What you say makes no sense because they had seen that Jesus and His disciples had eaten from the crops on the Sabbath and He had healed on the Sabbath. There must have been many more occasions where they interpreted suchlike behaviour as sin. They wanted to arrest Him for blasphemy and for claiming He was equal to God as that held the death penalty but eating the crops on a Sabbath, I assume did not. They wanted Him arrested for the 'big stuff' not the small stuff.

Acts 16:3

Paul applied his principle from 1 Corinthians 9:20, “To the Jews I became a Jew in order to win the Jews.” Certain Jewish practices moreover were allowed to continue such as attending the synagogue on the Sabbath which even Jesus practised in order to teach.

Trying to prove that Paul or the other apostles sinned, does not however disprove holiness doctrine (Peter sinned when

he feared the Jews) As Peter fell, but was confronted by Paul and restored, many men in fact all of them who have been baptised into holiness, do experience a fall or two before they learn how to abide. The fall is usually caused by using their own understanding instead of walking in the Spirit. Wesley commented on it in countless places.

Paul committed this fault when he refused to listen to the Holy Spirit and went ahead into Jerusalem where he was arrested. He was too preoccupied with visiting the brethren to hear the Spirit. This fault will lead to sin.

Acts 23

Paul may have not recognised the high priest due to his eyesight problems.

“What testimony did a Quaker have in jail from a refusal to pay his taxes? Even heathen hate to pay their taxes!”

It has always been well known that Quakers refusal to pay war tax is on the grounds of their peace testimony and the command to love our enemies not kill them.

“This one statement opens an entire Pandora's box and is a very convenient fortress to hide behind.”

It is not a fortress, it is the difference between man not having divine knowledge and purity of heart and of course what I have said, that a man may fall from holiness for a season, then hopefully restored, but it is not the same thing as the average walk of believers as they are opposing the power of God in saying they cannot cease from sin. The fallen spiritual one does not deny the power of God over sin.

"But I don't think he had "light" in these areas. But who has total light apart from the "dark glass" this side of eternity?"

A man is given degree of light agreed meaning knowledge, but as far as sin goes, the power of God enables him to walk as Christ walked.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/14 4:04**

amrkelly

We are not told to understand and be patient with heretics, but to admonish them twice then reject them Tit 3:10 so I am surprised that you inhabit a forum that publishes the writings of a man (and others) who clearly taught the doctrine you oppose and therefore guilty of causing stumbling in your eyes.

On the contrary, those who taught the doctrine of entire sanctification, were all greatly used by God and led thousand upon thousand to Christ, led revivals and fired the missionary movement and it is those who say that the power of God cannot deliver a man from sin who are denying the gospel and are heretics..

There are only two types of believer, those who say man cannot live on this earth without sinning as his normal condition and those who say that with God all things are possible and Christ came to save us from sin.

The fact that there are writings on this site which contradict the doctrine you espouse of a gradual sanctification but was not noticed previously apparently, does demonstrate whether one has discernment which only comes when one has truly been baptised in the Spirit.

"This is to deny that the one who sins is born again."

Brother, I will deal with this one in another post.

**Re: WHAT SHALL WE DO TO BE SAVED?, on: 2013/7/14 4:08**

Peter said to them 'repent and be baptised' and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost' Acts 2:38

'He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved' Mark 16:16

'In the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls were saved by water, the like figure, whereunto EVEN BAPTISM DOTHS ALSO NOW SAVE US not the putting away of the filth of the flesh but the answer of a good conscience toward God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ' 1Pet 3:20-21

And what of the man who is in the kingdom? Shall he still sin? No said John 'Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not' not just according to the light he has been given,

'He that doeth righteousness, is righteous EVEN AS HE IS RIGHTEOUS Be ye holy He said As I am holy. There is no gradual sanctification.

The scripture could not be clearer, the one baptism (one Lord, one faith one baptism) that Protestants believe in, not the baptism of water, saves a man that is, the baptism of the Holy Spirit, saves man and delivers him from sin, not as a process, but as an event, and furthermore, it says in Galatians 3:27 that

'as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ'

So there is no putting on of Christ without baptism of the Holy Spirit. In the event of baptism of the Holy Spirit a man puts on Christ and is delivered from sin.

Does this occur when we first come to Christ for forgiveness? Lets look at the disciples. Did the Holy Spirit fall on them when Jesus first called them? No it happened at Pentecost where they were made holy, Before that they were immature and full of doubts and fears.

As carnal believers they needed another work of God and that occurred when He rose from the dead and found them cowed and afraid. He breathed the Holy Spirit on them sanctifying them and enabling them to be bold and in agreement so they gathered in the upper room waiting for the promised baptism of the Spirit which absolutely and utterly changed their characters in one fell swoop. No process of gradual sanctification. They became holy because the HOLY Spirit baptised them.

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/14 6:26**

Quote:  
-----What you say makes no sense because they had seen that Jesus and His disciples had eaten from the crops on the Sabbath and He had healed on the Sabbath.  
-----

This is why I said they could only get him on on the technicalities of violating their own traditions. Healing on the Sabbath was not a real sin in God's eyes, nor was eating grain on the Sabbath, as Jesus proved from David's account with the showbread in scripture. These were all trumped-up charges based upon their own traditions, of which he had already refuted and rendered his accusers speechless. He knew they could not charge Him with legal, God-sanctioned sin. This was why they needed to find false witnesses for His trial.

Quote:  
-----It is probable that 'sin', is put here in opposition to 'truth', in the same verse, and then it should be rendered falsehood.  
-----

I prefer not to entertain "probables" when the actual meaning is black and white and staring right at me in the Greek. The position of Christ's observable perfection supports itself in life all the way to His scandalous trial and execution based upon a rigged political agenda.



His real perfection was in stark contrast to Paul's limitations of the flesh. Observe, for example, the discourse for both Jesus and Paul with a High Priest during interrogations. At one point, Caiphus ordered Jesus to be struck. Jesus' response was unrepachable. Ananias likewise ordered Paul to be struck. Paul's response necessitated repentance. This incident, by the way, was near the end of Paul's life - after years of walking in so-called "sinless perfection".

Quote:

----- Paul may have not recognised the high priest due to his eyesight problems.  
-----

Sinless perfection should be sinless perfection, regardless of one's eyesight. Paul sinned, and admitted it. Can a physical disability temporarily override Holy Spirit discernment and cause a man to stumble? Either way, a sinlessly perfect man would not revile another human being, High Priest or not. Would Jesus revile anyone?

Quote:

-----It is not a fortress, it is the difference between man not having divine knowledge and purity of heart and of course what I have said, that a man may fall from holiness for a season, then hopefully restored, but it is not the same thing as the average walk of believers as they are opposing the power of God in saying they cannot cease from sin. The fallen spiritual one does not deny the power of God over sin.  
-----

Does this "falling for a season" preclude his sinless perfection for a season? I hope you can see that falling, even once, is not a sign of perfection while the falling is occurring (unless you mean perfection in the positional sense). I do not doubt you can be restored to victory after a fall through grace, but this is not sinless perfection. You know I teach it is possible to overcome sin through grace, and to walk in total victory over all deliberate, conscious sin. But this is effectuated by grace, through humility, and not a one-time experiential inoculation.

Brenda, this has been my whole purpose in confronting you here, as I believe your delusion can be very dangerous and misleading to young believers. They need to see that the Lord indeed is able to keep them from falling and show them how to mortify and take all thoughts captive and keep themselves as vessels of purity in collaboration with leadings of the Holy Spirit, but there are no short-cuts or magic experiences of finality. The possibility for any believer to fall is ubiquitous through budding pride and a gradual neglect to walk in the spirit, and spiritual darkness is opportunistic.

Quote:

-----It has always been well known that Quakers refusal to pay war tax is on the grounds of their peace testimony and the command to love our enemies not kill them.  
-----

I am not talking about war tax. I am talking about mandated taxes to the church of England, and a failure to remove their hats before their superiors. This violates scripture in "rendering honor to whom honor is due" and in paying tribute to the government, through which the Church of England was lawfully established. It was the "temple tax" of the day.

Quote:

-----A man is given degree of light agreed meaning knowledge, but as far as sin goes, the power of God enables him to walk as Christ walked  
-----

Light is knowledge, I agree. It was a play with the Quaker term of "inner light", showing that "light" obviously wasn't given to them in the areas of taxes and simple deference.

Is George Fox the only name you have? Are there any others to look at?

Re: , on: 2013/7/14 7:08

Brenda why don't I cut right to the chase and say what I mean about what you are saying.

First of all sister this business of entire sanctification is a complete ruse. I don't doubt you have laid hold of a reality as far as understanding Romans chapter six is concerned. It is a great passage of scripture and by it many believers have found both a hope and an experience of resting from trying to live sin free and actually experiencing a sinless life in seasons of obedience by faith. But this is not where you are at. Your belief, which you insist is the work of other "great men" is far more significant than this even with regard to entire sanctification. You are in this regard about sinless perfection. You have said so plainly and if you want me to find the quotes and post them all I will do.

I have to say however that I am not even slightly interested in this doctrine of entire sanctification or sinless perfection it is but the toys of children compared to that which truly concerns me. It requires a form of gnosticism to even begin to make sense of it. Sister I have an occult mind in the flesh and so when the Holy Spirit teaches me I can make a very good and sharp distinction between the nature and source of revelation of God and occidental and oriental knowledge which leads to gnosticism. Please don't misunderstand me Brenda. Believe what you will. No doubt given the great length of time you have been processing these things you have a mind made up in any event.

Just a few days ago in a post you sought to assert that teachings about the book of Revelation were essentially a work of Satan. Again If you want me to produce the posts I will do. In that OP I raised this deeper concern of mine with your presentation and the likely effect your teachings were going to have. Another brother agreed with me and I have no doubt this is because he saw the very same thing. You replied to my post by simply quoting one line of what I said and made no substantive reference to the clear and unequivocal meaning of my words. I can press this sister more fully than you realize. But to what end I ask myself? Well if for one purpose it is fruitful then it must be fruitful. This is to protect those believers who come here to seek out an understanding of those things which they are thinking about. If in the course of these brethren are led astray because they are not able to discern spiritual deception when it is woven into the fabric of others posts then the cost may not be known here, but it will be real in their lives regardless and will lead at least to unnecessary suffering and heartache.

So to that end sister I post something you have written on another site and by it make perfectly clear where you do in fact stand and precisely why it is gnostic and heretical.

"Perfection is what true Christianity is all about. But the church does not see it. That's because they are not willing to give up ALL of their sins. And what is the point if God cannot help us with our biggest problem ie sin which is caused through living in a sin filled world, although we are born innocent (I do not accept that we have to suffer for Adam) and having had emotional damage done to us from our parents onwards. We are damaged so we cannot love properly. God can fix this problem easily as He just has to heal the damage to the soul. All of the promises are for this life not the next (I'm not sure I believe in a physical resurrection. Jesus did not have a solid body). Once one is willing to give up all rights to ourselves and submit fully to God and accept anything that he does with us in the future then He can deliver from sin totally. It usually happens somewhere along the line when we find out just how corrupted we are and how even our most selfless act is full of self actually and how much pride we have." So the church twists and turns and tries to make perfection into something that looks like it, but is not. Read 1John. Whosoever sins is of the devil. Period. But the church has to make this into something else like habitual sin. Wrong. The scripture means what it says simply and straightforwardly. If we are in Christ we do not sin and I have not found any one person today who claims this. But there were some in the past like Wesley and George Fox who started the Quakers with this doctrine."

You wrote this Brenda eight years ago. I can post as many similar things, though less explicit, which you have posted on this site in the last few weeks which clearly demonstrate that you hold the same understanding today.

I have watched your posts over the last few months and seen an increased boldness to express this gnostic heresy and it is because of this increase that I have posted as I have lately. Sister if by your own admission what you believe is rejected by all other men do you not think that at very least you ought to re-examine what it is you have believed and regardless as to the seeming meanings prescribed by forms of words, recognise that in the midst of it is true and dangerous heresy? Please forgive me for writing this but you have set your face and have wilfully withstood the clearest presentation that at your teachings are not about sanctification but are gnostic and mystical. I have stated it clearly several times Brenda in such terms that knowing what you know of your own thoughts could not have been a mere passing conception or an argument. Why did you not comprehend this and draw back?

In the end you have asked me why I post into a forum if there is in its folds heretics? By this you infer my obvious though

not then openly stated belief that you are an heretic. Yet you deflect this to mean George Fox. Sister you have no ability to press me in this way as though to make me change my mind. Now you have my answer. I support this forum because I am a beneficiary of its ministry and because I love the truth. I care nothing for debating in an occult way. If you had stated openly what you have in your thinking you would have been supported. As it is your thoughts were hidden and mingled in a garment with a few golden threads of truth and your ambition is that others should wear it.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/7/14 7:40**

I know your right Andrew „you could debate and pound this issue with words and scripture and wisdom but what would come from it „,,,,,,denial of a physical resurrection should make it clear what spirit it being expressed here ,need I say

weasly didn't teach this type of sinless perfection ,and refused to even use that word as a description because it was misleading to what he believed

to be honest iv dialogued with Robert the moderator of sermon index and men like ron baily „,and the humility is so refreshing tho we may have big theological disagreement but when I come across debates about sinless perfection those who propose the extreme end of this doctrine , seem to me to be the lest humble and most judgmental people ,and love to argue and have the last word „,they seem to need to be right ,and every one else is the heretic,,,,,tho im not speaking about murcol „,a present exception

bless you Andrew kelly and paul west for at least standing your ground „, I don't feel my contributing further will achieve much „,

god help us

brother gary

**Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/7/14 8:26**

Brethren, my aim is to show that although some may teach and preach sinless perfection, no man has ever truly "arrived" at this state. Every proponent of this heresy has either:

1. Demonstrated over time character flaws clearly unchristlike and in violation of scripture.
2. Admitted such a state of perfection is possible but they themselves have not yet attained it.
3. Said they attained it at one time, but are silent about the present for fear of being exposed and measured against the perfection of Christ.
4. Live alone without parents, siblings, husbands, wives, children, neighbors or work associates available to confirm their arrival at perfection.
5. Said they knew someone who had attained it, but the person is now dead and their life is unobservable.

Mature believers who are even moderately well-versed in scripture can decimate this heresy very quickly. Others are taken in through soul power and the writings of fallible men. I hold no animosity toward those entrenched in this error, but I do have a sense of responsibility in warning weaker believers of this heresy, especially on a public form such as this. They should be able to see both sides of the spectrum and judge for themselves.

Before I exit the discussion, I would still like to see just one example of a man (or woman) who officially arrived at the state of "sinless perfection". Throughout two millennia of church history there should be hundreds of examples to read about in the very least. Where are they?

**Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/7/14 12:30**

Wow what a lot of posts I don't where to start.

Let me say this for me it's all about being Holy and having a pure heart so that we can live a Godly life. We have been through it all not that long ago about sin-less perfection but I don't mind sharing briefly what I have found again.

What I seen through my studying into this subject is this, that there was an element of Gnosticism somehow managed to get into the Holiness movement and that has tarnished it. But that doesn't mean all the Holiness people practiced Gnosticism.

However we should ask ourselves how Holy and pure can God make a saved sinner?

Can God sanctify a save sinner entirely from sin?

Can we be Holy and pure without touching the occult aka Gnosticism.

Quote by Paul West: Brethren, my aim is to show that although some may teach and preach sinless perfection, no man has ever truly "arrived" at this state. Every proponent of this heresy has either.

In your quest to stamp out the false, be careful that you don't cause damaged to the truth...

Edit: spelling and add Pauls quote.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/14 15:12**

Guys please give me time to provide responses before adding any further posts. Thanks.

Quote : Sinless perfection should be sinless perfection, regardless of one's eyesight. Paul sinned, and admitted it. Can a physical disability temporarily override Holy Spirit discernment and cause a man to stumble? Either way, a sinlessly perfect man would not revile another human being, High Priest or not. Would Jesus revile anyone?

-----  
Well this is the problem, how you are interpreting 'sinless perfection'. The usual error is to make it mean one must not 'miss the mark' but in fact it means absolute obedience with a pure heart, but we have human mind still as we develop the mind of Christ.

Wesley explained what perfection means by giving the example of thinking the motives of a man to be better than later proven. We cannot read another's mind so there will always be mistakes in this area. The error is to make the goal post too high. We were not created to be omnipotent.

Paul had come to Jerusalem by walking in the flesh, and therefore at risk of falling into sin and it may well be that he did sin, though Jesus had some very harsh things to say to the Pharisees, 'whitewashed sepulchres' comes to mind.

Quote : Does this "falling for a season" preclude his sinless perfection for a season? I hope you can see that falling, even once, is not a sign of perfection while the falling is occurring (unless you mean perfection in the positional sense). I do not doubt you can be restored to victory after a fall through grace, but this is not sinless perfection. You know I teach it is possible to overcome sin through grace, and to walk in total victory over all deliberate, conscious sin. But this is effected by grace, through humility, and not a one-time experiential inoculation.

-----  
I don't believe in a one-time experiential inoculation. It is a moment by moment ability to have the blood of Christ applied so that the power of God can keep our heart cleansed and can only be effective as long as a man depends on the Holy Spirit alone and as soon as he starts to use his human reasoning he is in danger of a fall. And even the most mature can still fall. Like Paul.

Quote : Brenda, this has been my whole purpose in confronting you here, as I believe your delusion can be very dangerous and misleading to young believers.

-----  
And is George Fox also dangerous and deluded?

Quote : This violates scripture in "rendering honor to whom honor is due"

-----

We are only to obey the authorities so far as we do not disobey God.

Quote : Is George Fox the only name you have? Are there any others to look at?

-----

There are many writers and speakers here who believe in 'second blessing' holiness but not many like the early Quakers who believed in a third crisis where the presence and not just the power of sin is removed.

Quote : Before I exit the discussion, I would still like to see just one example of a man (or woman) who officially arrived at the state of "sinless perfection". Throughout two millenia of church history there should be hundreds of examples to read about in the very least. Where are they?

-----

The second blessing preachers taught that a man can walk in sinless perfection but do not accept that unintentional sin is classed as sin. They say as I am sure you know, that sin is a deliberate transgression. There are writers from the holiness movement and from Wesley's time who taught freedom from unintentional sin (so long as a man is in that state) but I have studied the early Quakers more than any other period.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/14 15:34**

Andrew

Quote : It requires a form of gnosticism to even begin to make sense of it.

-----

It is the opposite of Gnosticism which says that a man is pure in his spirit so his body can sin and he remains in the kingdom. Actually gradual sanctification is saying that.

Quote : Just a few days ago in a post you sought to assert that teachings about the book of Revelation were essentially a work of Satan.

-----

You are either misunderstanding me or misrepresenting me but what I was saying is that Satan encourages man to see Revelation as a future event only and for men to spend all of their time and energy working it out when the deeper spiritual meaning goes un-noticed.

Quote : (I'm not sure I believe in a physical resurrection. Jesus did not have a solid body).

-----

I DID NOT SAY THIS. I have never believed it. It has been added to my words. Where did you find it?

Quote : Please forgive me for writing this but you have set your face and have wilfully withstood the clearest presentation that your teachings are not about sanctification but are gnostic and mystical. I have stated it clearly several times Brenda in such terms that knowing what you know of your own thoughts could not have been a mere passing conception or an argument. Why did you not comprehend this and draw back?

-----

Andrew what is wrong with saying that a man who believes that Christ will give him the ability to escape all temptation and walk in complete obedience? That is far from any Gnosticism or mysticism.

Quote : As it is your thoughts were hidden and mingled in a garment with a few golden threads of truth and your ambition is that others should wear it.

-----

Brother you will have to speak more clearly before I can understand you. I asked you why you support a forum where a heretic is quoted. Accusing a member of heresy is very serious and I question how you are qualified to throw it around when you don't know much about the doctrine I believe in, which you repeatedly show rather than finding out just what I believe by asking questions. Not very loving is it?

**Re: , on: 2013/7/14 16:41**

Quote:  
-----Brother you will have to speak more clearly before I can understand you. I asked you why you support a forum where a heretic is quoted. Accusing a member of heresy is very serious and I question how either you or Paul are qualified to throw it around when neither of you know much about the doctrine I believe in, which you repeatedly show rather than finding out just what I believe by asking questions. Not very loving is it?  
-----

I don't recall Mr West calling you a heretic Brenda. I did however and therefore must support that if you are saying that I was false to do so.

You have said that the words "I'm not sure I believe in a physical resurrection. Jesus did not have a solid body" were added. Does that mean that you recognise the quote as a whole? It is part of a greater post in which the poster shares some personal details about their walk including a successful walk for 18 months without sinning. It is a post made in defence of entire sanctification on a site where it was being slammed as heretical by the site owner. The post was made on 28/11/2005.

**Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/7/14 16:48**

Okay last post from me on this thread..

What God has once made holy is thereafter always holy Â– there can be no degrees in the state of absolute holiness....

Our moral growth is not a growth into holiness out of a state of comparative unholiness, as holiness is effected by a supernatural act of God...

That is why I say there is no growth in Holiness.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 0:50**

amrkelly

Please give a link for the quote stated. The rest was written by me but "I'm not sure I believe in a physical resurrection. Jesus did not have a solid body" was not written by me, it has been added. I have held to the Apostles Creed since I came to Christ 40 years ago. Jesus came in the flesh and I have never used the term 'solid body'.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 1:42**

[http://www.jcnot4me.com/Items/cults/Entire%20Sanctification/Responses%20to%20Entire%20Sanctification.htm#Brenda\\_Jackson\\_11-28-05](http://www.jcnot4me.com/Items/cults/Entire%20Sanctification/Responses%20to%20Entire%20Sanctification.htm#Brenda_Jackson_11-28-05)

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 2:04**

Thanks Andrew I have written to the author of the site to ask him to remove the post.

How on earth could anyone think that the statement I am supposed to make is genuine that I agree with the writers anti-christian rants.

What also stands out is that after the author made a comment, the apparent answer from me was not a reply to the question, it looks like a continuation of what I had written before the question. The comments by the author look like they have been inserted in something he has picked up from somewhere else, and inserted a false statement to back up his own anti-Christian beliefs. I do not remember ever writing on that site and don't see why I would do that as the author is obviously not a believer.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 7:06**

Given that there is an outstanding matter of my having posted this link and the attendant words with a clear statement about gnosticism, clearly I cannot leave the matter there as though saying that a brother or sister is heretical was a trivial matter. I want you to know that I spent the whole of the night searching the internet in order to establish materially that this post was in fact from yourself including all of its parts. It has taken me no less than 10 straight hours. Of course at the back of my mind was always the possibility that this may not have been you at all so whilst I was concerned about my own ability to discern accurately I was equally concerned that I had in fact misrepresented yourself and thereby falsely accused you of heresy. I have reread all the posts which I have made directly to yourself over the past few months here on SI and am satisfied that I have in fact drawn attention to several spiritual realities and their attendant doctrines precisely because many of the things you have shared yourself raise serious concerns.

Please can I assure you Brenda that I personally don't make judgements amounting to condemnation about people and rarely come to the conviction that they may not be born again. I am not doing this here either. It has happened before that I have had such a conviction and clearly in that circumstance I must be obedient to the Holy Spirit and look into the matter for the sake of that individual as well as the Lord's sake. In this instance my conviction is other than this. As Mr. West said in his posts, the heretical doctrine of sinless perfection is easily recognised by any mature believer with a good knowledge of Scripture. No particular discernment is required it is more a matter of intuition of the spirit of the individual rather than an express leading of the Holy Spirit.

It is in fact the case that 15 months ago I received an e-mail from Greg Gordon reminding me that I was not a moderator and advising me that "speaking" directly to another member, whilst appropriate on occasions would be unhealthy if that were done too often. How much more then would it be "unhealthy" to press a person directly on so grave a matter if that were to prove troubling for them or else led to an unnatural influence in a ministry and drew attention away from the centrality of the ministry itself to a man who has no part in it? You can see the difficulty which spiritual realities present when they cannot be persisted in. I did say that you would not be able to press me so as to change my mind and this is so. I accept that you have shared previously issues with your memory and so I am not at all surprised that you cannot remember two random posts made nearly eight years ago. However the content of these two posts corresponds to your membership of other sites relating to conservative Quakerism, a relationship which has lasted some ten years and can scarcely be out with your memory.

I will finish by simply saying that the conservative doctrine of sanctification is a doctrine of demons. It is a doctrine which carries a number of dreadful realities when it occupies the heart and mind of a man. The first is that it denies the finished work of the cross and its principle benefit so as to make of a man a mere clay jar which can be at once filled and thence saved, or else emptied and thence perishing. Its other effect is that it includes a belief in sinless perfection to the one filled



d up. It amounts to the very clay itself being transformed into another nature, even as Christ was transformed through death and resurrection, denying at once a physical reality and by reason of knowledge claiming to be a spiritual man, even as Christ became a life giving spirit .

There is another variant to the doctrine of conservative sanctification which is that sanctification is eternal. This heretical doctrine does not mean what it ought to mean but has to do with all of the above threads of meaning but with an attended benefit. The one believing this latter doctrine is assured of their eternal position if they indeed are able to continue in it s delusion, and thus they are at once delivered from the constant pain of dealing with their sin. The vessel now no longer empties and fills as unto life or else eternal death, but can abide in its knowledge and find some peace.

So when I shared previously that you have woven a garment with a few golden threads and you desire others to put it on this is precisely what I intended to say. This can be read as my explanation which you previously asked for.

To quote yourself Brenda:

Entire Sanctification by Brenda Jackson CQIM

"Fox made it clear that he was not talking about being sanctified as a 'position' nor that the blood of Jesus hides our sins and God does not see them. He said that all unrighteousness in actions is sin, but further, that the 'holy men' pleaded for holiness in HEART and life, and conversation here' (Journal) He was in agreement with the Apostle John in his first letter, who said in 3:7 Little children, let no man deceive you, he that doth righteousness IS righteous, even as He is righteous. There is no imputed righteousness, the doctrine over which the Puritans refuted Fox. It is an imparted righteousness.

It is real practical holiness in thought and action which the 'preacher of righteousness' (Apocalypse of the Word, Douglas Gwyn 25) as Fox called himself and testified of himself :-"As He is so are we IN THIS PRESENT WORLD, and that the saints are made the righteousness of God, that the saints are ONE in the Father and the Son, that we shall be like Him, that all teaching which is given forth by Christ is to bring the saints to perfection even to the stature and fullness of Christ, this the scripture doth witness and this I DO WITNESS TO BE FULFILLED" (Journal 135) This message, as he went about preaching, produced a violent reaction:- "The world swelled and made a great noise like great raging of the sea. Priests and professors, magistrates and people were all like a sea when I came to proclaim the Day of the Lord amongst them and to preach repentance to them" (Journal 33)

The 'Day of the Lord' is the message in 1John 1:6 If we say that we have fellowship with Him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth because (v5) God is light and in Him is no darkness at all and that (2:6) he that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked and (3:6) Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him neither known Him. "Hating the light, you hate Christ" (Journal 135) This put paid to the error on the subject of sanctification, that we are in Christ if we are hoping for sanctification at some time in the future, or as some think, we will gradually sin less and less until one minute we have no control over our thoughts or we have reduced down to having just one sinful thought occurring, and then, lo and behold, the sinful thought will occur no more. Actually no one has ever testified to it happening like this. At 60 70 and 80 years of age, believers, even Conservative Quakers, are still waiting. There should be witnesses that tell you about the day that the gradual became the complete, and they should be testifying in books (at least to refute such as myself!) The only books that are written are by those who say that the gradual view is error and not scriptural and that entire sanctification is an entering in to a state where sin is removed.

Unfortunately in these dark days, we only find these books written in the past. Some claim to be entirely sanctified but it is easily to be seen that they are using the term in a different way. They say that they are positionally so or their idea of sinlessness is a very loose one and anyone can see very soon that they are in fact still sinners. Fox and John are both clear, if we sin then we are not in the light and the Day of Judgment is near. It comes when we are presented with this message and we must make a decision in the same way that men and women had to make that decision when Fox brought them the message. Will we accept it as the truth and know that God has spoken? If we do not then we have chosen our path and it is the path of darkness, without knowing the cleansing of Christ inwardly. Fox believed that there was only one Day of the Lord."

[http://www.christianquaker.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=46:entire-sanctf&catid=34:articles-cg&Itemid=82](http://www.christianquaker.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=46:entire-sanctf&catid=34:articles-cg&Itemid=82)

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 10:23**

I am not denying having written that article for a Quaker site, it is the other link containing a statement from me that Jesus did not come in the flesh.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 15:11**

Quote:

-----Thanks Andrew I have written to the author of the site to ask him to remove the post.

How on earth could anyone think that the statement I am supposed to make is genuine that I agree with the writers anti-christian rants.

What also stands out is that after the author made a comment, the apparent answer from me was not a reply to the question, it looks like a continuation of what I had written before the question. The comments by the author look like they have been inserted in something he has picked up from somewhere else, and inserted a false statement to back up his own anti-Christian beliefs. I do not remember ever writing on that site and don't see why I would do that as the author is obviously not a believer. Brenda

-----

To address this specific post Brenda is very simply. Whether to believe that you made this post or not would be a matter of knowing what you have or else do believe with regard to the physical resurrection of the Lord from the dead. That is the best indicator as to whether or not your thinking was or else has continued in the gnostic path. Given that this post contains some clear statements and ideas with regard to the posters personal thoughts (experience) of early life (childhood) means that there is a basis for considering these things in other places on the internet. Of course this is to go the investigative route (which I have done as elaborated in the last post I made). However this is not very satisfactory as it would do no more than draw physical connections which in any event could be misleading of themselves. As to the claim that the website owner of the anti-christian site you inadvertently posted into...your initial question was not answered, although you suggested an e-mail might be desirable. In any event the "Round Two" comment takes the precise same format as every other post in the site. So either the site owner deliberately alters everyone's posts just to blacken their character or he has followed the same formula for every single user. It is possible as you say that he has added the specific comment about physical resurrection. That too must be something of an irrelevance because whilst it would be the most visible statement giving rise to a gnostic heresy, your participation in other sites provides a basis for understanding why you would at least be thinking about what is meant by the scripture "raised a spiritual man" with regard to the Lord's body.

As you already understand your on-line activities and participation with Conservative Friends (Quakers) preceded by just over 18 months this post which you say is a fake. That particular site didn't really get off the ground because from its inception one member came to understand that this group were advocating a complex argument as to what physical resurrection actually means. The objector was a Mr Cummings. He sought to challenge the doctrine but eventually gave up. In response to his concerns another member of the Conservative Friends based in Scotland wrote a rebuttal intended to put to bed the claim that this group was essentially a cult and that the doctrine which made it so was gnostic heresy based on the spiritual resurrection of Christ from the dead. This all took place just three months before you joined the site and so by the time you joined the battle was over. From that point in time onwards there were no more than a handful of other posts interspersed over the years.

Your joining came with a question which had to do with your understanding of sanctification or holiness teaching, particularly the contrast between Wesley and Fox. The brother you asked wouldn't answer your question and after that there are no more posts. The reality is that the members were worn down by the preceding infighting and the fact that their own statement of rebuttal to the Conservative Friends Doctrine of Resurrection demonstrated an extraordinary subtlety of turn in its answer, both seeming to emphatically state the truth and then simultaneously denying it. In short it is a really good occult piece of literature. To the one who reads it and is sincerely trying to understand its meaning it would be just perfect as a snare and a trap. To the one who seeks to contend with it it would be like contending with the Devil himself in its cleverness. Mr West alluded to this same spirit when he spoke of George Fox's refusal to bend to all authorities church and

d state.

This is the post which kicked off the row:

Quote:

-----Dear Themis,

I got the report on Quaker beliefs from the the group you say is telling lies about the True Quaker faith.

They are right about Quakers. Even most Orthodox Friends do not believe in the bodily resurrection of Jesus.

I say this after leaving the Society of Friends after associating with them from 1977 to 1996. During that time I was a pastor in FUM Friends churches, and attended a unprogrammed meeting for a while. My wife and I even had a Friends house meeting from 1984 to 1994. Most Friends would not come, except for a few, because we were "two Christ-centered". Then we started to seek an association with Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends, and finally found out that they DO NOT BELIEVE IN THE BODILY RESURRECTION OF JESUS. That was the final straw, because Scripture-the Bible, says that if Christ is not risen we are still in our sins.

Quakers are not Christians, though a very few are Christians in spite of classical Friends' beliefs.

I do not believe George Fox was a true Christian. Over and over he said he had no sin, and the First Letter of John says that "if we say we have no sin, we are liars and the truth is not in us." This means that George Fox was a liar and did not know the truth, therefore he was not saved and was not a Christian. He was more like a new age guru. I used to think that liberal Quakerism was an aberration, but in reality they are the norm for classical Quaker belief. People who are Christians and want to see Primitive Quakerism as Christian, read a Christian veneer over the Quaker writings. Fox was not what he claimed to be, rather he was a liar and fraud, and an antichrist.

Peace in the real Jesus,

Gary Cummings

-----

Any way Brenda it is clear to me that you came to Quakerism via difficulties regarding how your belief on entire sanctification was received in your previous "protestant" experience; a leaving which was largely predicated on the doctrine and meaning of baptism. In such a circumstance to then add a new "faith" which was so perfect to you that you stated that you believed George Fox to be the most authentic saint after the early apostolic church must have been a real blessing for you to have discovered his writing in the "Journal". I do not agree with everything Mr Cummings has said in his first shot across the bow, I very much doubt that things were that simple in the 1700's, but having read the rebuttal produced by the Conservative Friends in Scotland I see that regardless as to what George Fox did or did not in reality believe, his refusal to bend the knee just once to the Anglican Church and use the words "Christ was raised from the dead physically" would have spared all the present opportunity for gnostic thinking which informs so much of what Quakerism has become in its orthodoxy. Today it is without doubt a basis for serious heresy and has lent itself to a myriad of complex and sophisticated occult theosophical and gnostic thinking.

This is not intended Brenda as a little chat. Nor is it an intellectual exercise. I have been a little surprised at the ease with which you have continued to press sinless perfection in the other thread as though these posts of mine were something of a tea and biscuits affair. Still the Lord knows.

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 16:00**

Paul

You asked me if I could show you someone else with the same doctrine, and I have found someone. He is Edward Burrough who wrote a most explicit statement of belief concerning holiness and the early Quakers in 1657.

"We believe that the saints upon the earth may receive forgiveness of sins and may be perfectly freed from the body of sin in and death, and in Christ may be perfect and without sin and may have victory over all temptations by faith in Jesus Christ. And we believe every saint called of God, ought to press after perfection, and to overcome the devil and all his temptations....and we believe they that faithfully wait for it shall obtain it, and be presented without sin in the image of the Father and such walks not after the flesh but after the Spirit and are in covenant with God and their sins are blotted out and remembered no more."

**Re: , on: 2013/7/15 16:02**

amrkelly

I did not join that site. The owner has cut and pasted (and added to) a post from another forum. I did not know his beliefs apart from him saying that those who teach entire sanctification should mean that it is about complete sinlessness and offered to discuss it further to see where he was coming from but he did not respond.

Jesus rose from the dead physically.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/7/15 16:08**

Saints,

We are thankful for the many contributors to this thread. We feel it has run its course. We do ask that towards any personal inflammatory or even accusatory (to the least) we ask saints to try and avoid this. We must consider the truths at hand and try and not with limited view of each other judge etc. There is a time when we write anything publicly for saints to comment, and even correct in love. We must be open to this and to be willing to repent and clarify at where possible.

It is true that if we are cleansed with the blood of Christ at that moment we can be in a sense free from sin at least on the level of our conscience. The Lord will bring us step by step to show greater inward sin that we commit day by day, hour by hour. Only those who are truly children of God will grow up in Him and be constantly cleansed from inward impurities.

Scriptures clearly do not teach a one-time solution to be 100% free from sin. This is a narrow way our Lord taught to be conformed to the image of the Son. Christ died for ALL sin and only in Him is our answer in daily abiding and trusting in His sacrifice for us and His resurrection.

If the Son has set you free you are free.

We are going to lock this thread and ask that any converted opinions and points not be resurrected in further threads.