



General Topics :: RANSOM?

RANSOM? - posted by Mekdi (), on: 2005/4/6 2:21

Ransom? It has more or less a meaning of payoff. To whom did Jesus pay?

Re: RANSOM? - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/6 4:12

Hi Mekdi,

I would look at it from a different angle,

in the physical sense when a ransom is paid with cash. for example when a kidnap has occurred, the payment has **satisfied the requirements** in the same way Christ satisfied the requirement as we were sold unto sin slaves to sin due to that old nature.

So I think you have to look at the word ransom in a different way

Christ also satisfies the whole requirement of the Father

there's lots of pictures and descriptions about the work of salvation in the scriptures.

So hope that opens the discussion for you.

what do you think?

I think the word payoff comes far too short in describing Christ's work

pay off gives the impression that it's a quick fix answer

The more I dwell on it the more I think... Christ fully satisfied and laid down his own life, no greater love etc.... :-)

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/6 5:05

Mekdi, you have got my thoughts going :-)

the more I think about the word payoff the more it is so inadequate a way to link Christ's work.

payoff also conjures up pictures of secrecy and an exchange done in an isolated spot where no one is!

Christ made an open spectacle of the devil and powers making an open declaration very very public... what says you?

Re: - posted by Mekdi (), on: 2005/4/6 8:48

Dear Delboy, What I mean actually is "to give something in exchange for something else". hmmm shall I put it in a phrase? To pay someone who holds a thing illegally in order to take from him what the thing he holds or to give something in exchange. You're right. Maybe the word payoff doesn't fit here. But the essence of what I want to bring to discussion here is- To whom did Christ pay in order to free us?

Re: Most interesting thought - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/6 9:52

Here's a few more to chew on:

Exo 21:29 But if the ox were wont to push with his horn in time past, and it hath been testified to his owner, and he hath not kept him in, but that he hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and his owner also shall be put to death.

Exo 21:30 If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall **give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid up on him.**

Exo 21:31 Whether he have gored a son, or have gored a daughter, according to this judgment shall it be done unto him.

Not to over spiritualize it but the comparisons with:

Mat 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom* for many.

Still leaves out the 'to'

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

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

General Topics :: RANSOM?

d.

***To give his life a ransom for many** - The word "ransom" means literally a price paid for the redemption of captives. In war, when prisoners are taken by an enemy, the money demanded for their release is called a ransom; that is, it is the means by which they are set at liberty. So anything that releases anyone from a state of punishment, or suffering, or sin, is called a ransom. People are by nature captives to sin. They are sold under it. They are under condemnation, Eph_2:3; Rom_3:9-20, Rom_3:23; 1Jo_5:19. They are under a curse, Gal_3:10. They are in love with sin They are under its withering dominion, and are exposed to death eternal, Eze_18:4; Psa_9:17; Psa_11:6; Psa_68:2; Psa_139:19; Mat_25:46; Rom_2:6-9. They must have perished unless there had been some way by which they could be rescued. This was done by the death of Jesus - by giving his life a ransom. The meaning is, that he died in the place of sinners, and that God was willing to accept the pains of his death in the place of the eternal suffering of the redeemed. The reasons why such a ransom was necessary are:

1. that God had declared that the sinner shall die; that is, that he would punish, or show his hatred to, all sin.
2. that all people had sinned, and, if justice was to take its regular course, all must perish.
3. that man could make no atonement for his own sins. All that he could do, were he holy, would be only to do his duty, and would make no amends for the past. Repentance and future obedience would not blot away one sin.
4. No man was pure, and no angel could make atonement. God was pleased, therefore, to appoint his only-begotten Son to make such a ransom. See Joh_3:16; 1Jo_4:10; 1Pe_1:18-19; Rev_13:8; Joh_1:29; Eph_5:2; Heb_8:2-7; Isa_53:1-12; This is commonly called the atonement. See the notes at Rom_5:2.

Barnes Notes

Re: - posted by deltadom (), on: 2005/4/6 10:03

Sorry to bring this up in C S Lewis's book peralandra the character is called Ransom

Re: voyage to venus - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/6 10:36

Hi deltadom, yes your right and what a great trilogy of books.I've recently re-read peralandra.I first read it donkeys years ago when my understanding was young.I must confess i really enjoyed it this time round :-)

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/6 10:42

Hi Mekdes,
you ask

Quote:
-----To whom did Christ pay in order to free us?

I think Mike's points 1-4 are great...
But what do you think?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/6 11:28

If you can get a hold of "the apostolic preaching of the cross" Leon Morris will take you through the word groups that are used to proclaim 'redemption'. It is a classic and should be in everyone's library!

The atonement of Christ did not cause or create God's love., on: 2005/4/6 18:21

God in the exercise of His unselfish love, mercy and compassion went after the salvation of sinners. He did this by way of the birth, life, teachings and atoning death of Jesus Christ. The atonement of Christ did not cause or create God's love . It did not make God loving nor did it appease His anger. The atonement was the expression and result of God's preexisting love.

It is this love we must see. We should understand the suffering and death of Christ, but we need to see the love behind it that made it and caused it. The atonement was a result of God's love.

Deception occurs when some teach that the sufferings and work of Christ on the cross somehow appeased an angry God. They teach that the shed blood of Christ has soothed and calmed a vengeful God full of wrath. This is not true! God's

infinite love was the source and cause of the atonement. God is not some bloodthirsty deity that needs appeasement by the shedding of blood.

Some think that when God sees blood it makes Him loving and forgiving. This is not true because He allowed poor people to bring fine flour as an acceptable sin offering. Lev. 5:11 "But if he be not able to bring two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, then he that sinned shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering; he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon: for it is a sin offering."

Christ's blood was not a peace offering made to appease an angry God. The death of Christ on the cross intended to change man, not God. God had never changed. The blood was Christ's life. He freely poured out His life for sinners. Christ poured out His life to show man the nature of God's love and the crime of sin. The sinner is humbled by his guilt when he sees God's love.

The blood of Christ does not change God in any way. It does not cause Him to view sinners as obedient and holy. The real purpose of Christ's blood is to cause a heart realization in the sinner. Many are deceived. They believe the facts of the atonement. They believe Christ died for them but they have no heart realization of their personal guilt and responsibility for their sin! They remain unchanged in their chosen selfish state. They do not see that their selfishness has crucified Christ afresh. Christ freely died to reveal the fact of His love and their sin.

The blood of Christ is not magic. It by itself removes no sin. Christ's death saves no one. The atonement is only a method that God used to show His love and make salvation possible. A sinner needs to be broken and humbled by first seeing his own guilt and then how Christ freely gave up His life for him. With a repentant heart he will throw himself down at God's feet for mercy. Christ sets the sinner free from selfishness when he truly repents.

Without this heart realization God cannot forgive any sinner. God's interest in a person goes beyond him just believing in the facts of the atonement.

Many know the facts of Christ's death but remain sinners. The sinner must realize the horrible crime of his sin before God will forgive him. If the love of God displayed and expressed in the atonement does not conquer the sinner's selfishness then it is hopeless for him. Nothing else can accomplish this and the sinner will remain selfish.

Another area of deception is the teaching that Christ paid for all sin. Christ did not pay God or anyone for man's sin. The work on the cross was not some type of commercial transaction. A debt is only satisfied after making payment or when forgiven. An example of a debt is if you had borrowed \$50 from someone. This person now has genuine claim against you. Now let's say for some reason you become unwilling or unable to pay back this debt and another person pays the debt for you. This satisfies the claim against you and removes your obligation. This involves no forgiveness or pardon.

If on the other hand no one pays the debt and you are released from your obligation, then you are forgiven. Forgiveness is the relaxation of a genuine claim. It is impossible to have any genuine claim both satisfied and forgiven.

If Christ truly made payment for all sin then:

1. God could never forgive man because a debt paid is a satisfied debt and excludes forgiveness.
2. All sinners would go to heaven because Christ paid for all sin.
3. Christ's love is greater than God's because Christ suffered to satisfy an unforgiving Father.
4. If Christ only made payment for those who receive him, then all future personal obedience is no longer necessary for these.
5. One could break the law, without being truly guilty.

Many believe that the atonement shields a person from the penalty of hell while he continues to break the law. This is totally untrue. The true Christian loves God and keeps His laws. He is not living any more in a supremely selfish state. He is now obedient and conformed to God. He is only saved from the penalty while he remains this way.

The gospel intends to bring man into personal obedience to God and the law. The atonement does not release anyone from

om present or future obligation to the law. God does not look at man through Christ's blood and somehow see rebellious criminals, holy and obedient. God does not accept imperfect obedience as genuine.

There was no literal payment made by Christ. The scriptures that seem to suggest that He paid for sin are not literal. They are figurative and metaphors. They point to Christ providing a way to set aside the execution of the penalty when a person meets the conditions of the gospel. He opened a way for all in which they might have forgiveness. Instead of paying a debt He displayed God's respect for the law and certainty to support it. He showed God's hatred of sin and His love for holiness.

Christ suffered about five or six hours. He never felt any remorse or guilt because he was not guilty. The sufferings of Christ were substituted for the punishment of sinners. These sufferings accomplished the same purpose and goal, which would have been accomplished by all sinners going to hell. This made a greater impact than the literal execution of sinners ever could have.

Christ's death by itself saves no one. The atonement removes all but one remaining barrier before man can have a right relationship with God. Now each person must come to God in repentance and faith to remove the final obstacle to salvation. If a sinner refuses to obey and dies, God will treat him as if the atonement did not exist. God only pardons repentant sinners and sets them free from the penalty of sin and death. It did cost Him and God a great deal. Salvation is not cheap. A sinner, when truly seeing his own rebellion and the love of God shown and expressed in the atonement, will break down and repent. He will cease rebelling and will become obedient. This is the effect of true gospel preaching.

Some teach that Christ was punished. He did not suffer the penalty of the law. The law had no claim or demand against Christ. The law can only make demands against the offender. God did not punish nor discipline Christ for sin or for any other reason. Christ was sinless and suffered without being guilty of anything. God did not make him guilty nor was any guilt transferred to Him. Punishment implies guilt and is completely involuntary. Christ's sufferings were willfully and voluntarily chosen.

Punishment must exist because it expresses the law is valuable and violation of the law is evil. Punishment does not reform nor can it ever reform any sinner. Punishment will never make any person's moral character better. No amount of punishment will ever make a sinner less guilty. Punishment is not disciplinary in its nature. Reformation in hell is impossible. The design of punishment is not for revenge or vengeance. It exists because sin deserves such an expression.

The sinner is a criminal and truly deserves the punishment of hell forever. The infliction of the penalty on the sinner is always just, proper, fair and right. God gets no pleasure or satisfaction in sending a sinner to hell. God is heartbroken and grieved but the sinner must get what he truly deserves.

The execution of the penalty shows God's intense hatred for sin and His respect for the law. It also shows His great desire for obedience and happiness in this world. Any plan to drop the need of this awful execution must also express God's thoughts and desires. He has done this by the suffering death of His only Son.

Deception also occurs when a person teaches that Christ satisfied the law for mankind. No person, even Christ, can love God with more than all his heart. Christ could never obey beyond or above the law's requirements. Christ's obedience could never be credited or transferred to any person's account. He had to fulfill the law for Himself. If He had disobeyed, He would have been guilty.

God cannot accept any being's obedience for another. A person's obedience can never replace another person's disobedience. It is impossible. No obedience of Christ could ever remove or set aside the law's claim against the sinner. The obedience of Christ is not enough to remove any of the obstacles that made the atonement necessary.

If this teaching was true, then the following statements are true.

1. Christ's obedience would have satisfied the law. He would not have needed to suffer and die for the sins of the world.
2. Without law, obligation would disappear. God could not require repentance, faith or any obedience. All would go to heaven.
3. Sinners would have a legal claim for salvation and could justly demand it. Grace and mercy could not exist.

General Topics :: RANSOM?

The purpose of the atonement was not to save us from hell in our disobedience. It was to save us from our sins and bring us back into a love relationship with God. God has made a way possible for man to come to Him and enjoy freedom of sin. Now each person must make a decision on whether he enters this freedom or not.

Some teach that the atonement was just for a few, not for everyone. This teaching is wrong for the following reasons:

1. This teaching goes against the character of God. He has provided salvation for everyone.

Tim. 2:3,4 "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior; Who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth."

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

I John 2:2 "And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

2. No one could exercise faith without truly knowing whether the atonement included him or not. How can a person repent knowing there is only a chance that Christ died for him?

3. God commands all men to repent under the penalty of death. Acts 17:30b "but now commandeth all men every where to repent."

4. God does not give impossible commands.

Re: RANSOM?, on: 2005/4/6 19:32

I just love these kinds of discussions, it really helps us think about the words that we use everytime we quote scripture and gets us to think about what we actually believe.

But as to this Ransom business, I am with Mike on this one and if I may add my bit.

I was reading this line in Matt18:30

"And he would not: but went and cast him into prison, till he should pay the debt."

I've read the context of this, but this one line really stands out.

How can anyone who owes money to someone pay thier creditor off while in prison?

Karl

Re: Ransom - posted by Mekdi (), on: 2005/4/7 2:24

What an enlargement here! God bless you all! This truly is edifying. For point 3 on Mike's post I need further details—

“3. that man could make no atonement for his own sins. All that he could do, were he holy, would be only to do his duty, and would make no amends for the past. Repentance and future obedience would not blot away one's sin.”

What is remission of sins in the past? Does the Bible mean the past dispensation? Or is it the redeemed individual's past? So what are we going to do about sin committed on present? What is God's term of a sinner anyway? Are we really called a sinner after we accepted the Savior? So how do we define the present and future failures(sins) after we receive d the Savior? Another question -What is the function of the blood of Jesus to God-ward, man-ward and devil-ward?

Mekdi

Re: God was not appeased? - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/7 3:28

Quote:
-----The atonement of Christ did not cause or create God's love. It did not make God loving nor did it appease His anger. The atonement was the expression and result of God's preexisting love.

The underlined section is what is sometimes referred to as the Moral Government Theory of Atonement and was strongly taught by Charles Finney. It has long been rejected by most evangelicals but it has a strong following among the leaders of YWAM and followers of Charles Finney. A leading UK evangelical (Steve Chalke) was recently publicly opposed by the UK Evangelical Alliance for teaching this theory.

freed is absolutely consistent in his espousing of Finney's Theology which is why these threads have taken the direction they have.

Bible words have histories, rather than definitions. Tracing the word for 'atonement' shows us how God educated His people to understand truth. **The Hebrew verb is 'kaphar'**. "Yom Kippur" is the Day of Atonement.

The first instance of the word shows the 'covering' aspect of 'atonement' and is found in Gen 6:14 KJV Make thee an ark of gopher wood; rooms shalt thou make in the ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch. The second instance is in the story of Jacob and Esau as recorded in Gen 32:20 KJV And say ye moreover, Behold, thy servant Jacob is behind us. For he said, I will appease him with the present that goeth before me, and afterward I will see his face; peradventure he will accept of me. The next instance is in Exo 29:33 KJV And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate and to sanctify them: but a stranger shall not eat thereof, because they are holy. But by this time the primary senses of the word have already been laid down; a covering and an appeasement. If you say the word 'appeasement' slowly you will hear the word 'peace'. It is the sense carried in Eph 2:14-15 NASB For He Himself is our peace, who made both groups into one and broke down the barrier of the dividing wall, (15) by abolishing in His flesh the enmity, which is the Law of commandments contained in ordinances, so that in Himself He might make the two into one new man, thus establishing peace, **The noun which comes from 'kaphar' is 'kapporeth' which means the place at which 'kaphar' was accomplished.** The KJV uses the phrase 'mercy seat' to translate this word. It was the 'gold slab' cover of the Ark of the Covenant. Atoning (propitiating) blood of animals was sprinkled here signifying the 'propitiation' that would be accomplished by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God on the cross. The proper English word would be 'the propitiatory' ie place of propitiation. In Biblical language 'propitiation' is the price paid to remove the offence'

Modernist and liberal scholars have changed the word in the New Testament from propitiation to expiation. This is somewhat technical but 'the offended person is propitiated' while the 'sin is expiated'. They did not like the idea of an 'angry God' so they chose the word 'expiate' rather than 'propitiate' believing that the idea of an angry God who was propitiated by an offering was a pagan notion. See eg 1Jo 2:1-2 RSV My little children, I am writing this to you so that you may not sin; but if any one does sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; (2) and he is the expiator for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world. The RSV insists that Christ is not a propitiation but is an expiation. the NASB has reverted to the word 'propitiation'; 1Jo 2:1-2 NASB My little children, I am writing these things to you so that you may not sin. And if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; (2) and He Himself is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.

I think perhaps the sweetest Bible reference to God's anger being 'turned away' is in Isa 12:1 NASB Then you will say on that day, "I will give thanks to You, O LORD; For although You were angry with me, Your anger is turned away, And You comfort me. Reading the remainder of this wonderful chapter will show that we are talking about the 'Day of Salvation' and 'Salvation's Wells being opened. I cannot imagine a clearer statement of 'God being appeased'. "you were angry but your anger has been turned away" is a definition of the the word 'appease'.

It is the foundation of justification by faith as Paul shows in Rom 3:23-26 NASB for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, (24) being justified as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; (25) whom God displayed publicly as a propitiation in His blood through faith. This was to demonstrate His righteousness, because in the forbearance of God He passed over the sins previously committed; (26) for the demonstration, I say, of His righteousness at the present time, so that He would be just and the justifier of the one who has faith in Jesus. (Again the RSV changes 'propitiation' to 'expiation'.) Jesus Christ was a public 'propitiation' ie price paid to remove the offence and on this penal substitution rests the whole doctrine of justification by faith.

Finney was wrong here and so is freed.

flour has no blood, on: 2005/4/7 6:07

Why did God allow flour for a sin offering?
Was His anger turned away by flour?
Did flour pay someone off?
Did flour make God more loving?

He allowed poor people to bring fine flour as an acceptable sin offering. Lev. 5:11 "But if he be not able to bring two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, then he that sinned shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering; he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon: for it is a sin offering."

IT was God's LOVE behind and the reason for the atonement.

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

Re: flour has no blood - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/7 8:16

For the law having a **shadow** of good things to come, and **not** the very image of the things, **can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.** For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. **But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year.**

For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

Wherefore **when he cometh into the world**, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast **had no pleasure.** Then said I, Lo, **I come** (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.

Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law;

Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. **He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.** By the which will we are sanctified **through the offering** of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

And every priest standeth daily ministering and **offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins:**

But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;

From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. **For by one offering** he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.

Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before, this is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;

And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. **Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.**

Heb 10:8-18

General Topics :: RANSOM?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/7 8:59

Quote:
-----Finney was wrong here and so is freed.

Absolutely Finney was wrong and that error has caused some serious problems in the body of Christ here in the Midwest among folk of the holiness persuasion. Bro. Mike quoted the exact passage I would have quoted.

Finney was a revivalist, but he was no theologian. It is this exact issue of his blatant misunderstanding of the Gospel that has caused me to rethink continuing the Revival Lectures series. The enemy of our souls loves to get ahold of this error of Finney and bring people into despair of soul even unto the grave. frankly some of the stuff freed wrote borders on blasphemy in my opinion:

Quote:
-----The blood of Christ is not magic. It by itself removes no sin. Christ's death saves no one. The atonement is only a method that God used to show His love and make salvation possible.

This is heresy to state that the blood cannot take away sin. The only way this is not heresy is if the meaning is that the blood takes away no sin until faith is exercised in it. Christ died for more than to prove His love- He died to take away our sins. Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. I defer to Bro. Mike's post.

Quote:
-----If on the other hand no one pays the debt and you are released from your obligation, then you are forgiven. Forgiveness is the relaxation of a genuine claim. It is impossible to have any genuine claim both satisfied and forgiven.

This is also false. With men salvation is all impossible, but with God ALL things are possible. Through the work of the cross the sin is atoned and forgiveness granted by grace through faith. This is God's grace at work through the blood in the lives of people who are being perfected in this life through the multiplied means of God's working including chastening. A common theme of the Gospel is that Christ came to give His life as a ransom for many. That is not my words; it is God's word:

for even the Son of Man came not to be ministered to, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many. (Mark 10:45 YLT)

Ransom is the Greek lutron and it means:

- 1) the price for redeeming,
- 2) ransom paid for slaves, captives
- 3) for the ransom of life
- 4) to liberate many from misery and the penalty of their sins

It comes from Luo which means "to set loose."

The falsehood of the Moral Government theology is why the followers of Finney have no assurance of salvation whatsoever from one millisecond to the next. Saved damned saved damned. This is out and out madness and folly. Moreover, for those who have not read Finney they might need to know that much of his teachings dealt with outward things such as the modernity of a persons clothing and the like. a woman in high heels would certainly be lost in his theology. Any questionable act is sin- and therefor if you do something that is questionable you are lost. He also taught that it was sin to have any kind of excitement or pleasure not totally spiritual. Fishing for sport was sin and so on. A softball game would be

sin and so would a game of checkers. This is madness. No wonder we have lost so many of our teenagers in America in holiness circles. This is dead dried up twice dead and plucked up by the roots religion and nothing more. This is a brown twig hanging from a green vine. There is none left but the plucking.

Re: - posted by Mekdi (), on: 2005/4/7 9:16

So to whom was the blood poured? Is it to appease God?

Mekdi

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/7 9:19

Quote:

-----Why did God allow flour for a sin offering?

Was His anger turned away by flour?

Did flour pay someone off?

Did flour make God more loving?

the which is an image for the present time, according to which both gifts and sacrifices, unable to perfect as to conscience him that worshipped, are offered, (Hebrews 9:9)

The entire sacrificial system of the Old Testament was a metaphor. It was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins. Therefore it would make no difference whether it were flour or animal blood at the end of the day because only Christ's blood could take away sins. The poor people could only bring what they could bring- but they were under no illusions as to what God required for the sin offering. the message here is that the poor and the rich can be saved. If God had not made the provision for the poor then only the aristocrats could have been saved. Yet, the blood of Christ is for us requires no offering on our part. God has made the acceptable offering- He has provided for Himself a Lamb and we receive what He provided by grace through faith. Nothing in my hand I bring- simply to thy cross I cling.

God was not implying that flour can take away sins. Cain was made a vagabond in the earth and that process began with his misunderstanding of what a sin offering should be. Vegetables won't do it. Not for Cain and not for those who brought the fine flour- and not for those who brought the blood of bulls and of goats. Salvation was for those who through faith looked to the blood that would take away sins- to the promised Seed that would come and give His life as a ransom for many. Did they understand these things? maybe not, but they walked faithfully in the revelation they had and God counted it to them for righteousness.

Re: Types and shadows and... - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/7 10:11

Yes! My, this is just tremendous... and why?

Goodness, where to start.

Thank you Robert! For the long tenure and for all that you have brought forth here over these many months, what just grips and proves and states so well...

We **can** change our mind! Thank God for a Berean mindset... So much is just that of *gleaning* for this misfit. Times of deep, serious study into things, that make one think and brood, the challenges to predispositions, 'schools of thought' as it were.

Much good that was gleaned from someone like Finney, especially in those lectures of months past and yet also some things that left me puzzled. Like going back and re-listing all your past sin's, recall at the time being caught in between, 'am I chaffing at this because I don't *want* to do this? Or is it really necessary? Is it even really biblical?' Furthermore, some of the very same things you brought up regarding these legalistic 'requirements' as it were, outward things, games and dress, 'associations' of conduct and so forth... Pharisaical? So it seems.

General Topics :: RANSOM?

But what really stands out loudly is just that *willingness* to scrap it all, if need be;

Quote:
-----Finney was a revivalist, but he was no theologian. It is this exact issue of his blatant misunderstanding of the Gospel that has caused me to rethink continuing the Revival Lectures series. The enemy of our souls loves to get ahold of this error of Finney and bring people into despair of soul even unto the grave.

To "rethink". Thank God, so much that is heart warming in that. To be just honest enough to work through all these things and not feel constrained to 'hold' to this or that school of thought no matter what upbringing or traditions we may have come through or are presently 'aligned with'. That it is all **subject** to change. Keep stealing snippets from and a bit ahead of where it is currently at, referring to the other OC thread, but again...;

"Worship is giving the best we have unreservedly to God. Jesus Christ was entirely merciful because He kept nothing at all. We are merciful in spots, in a fragmentary way, because we will stick to our opinionettes. Whatever makes us spiritually satisfied will twist our mercy at once, because an opinionette is attached to every spot where we are satisfied, and when anyone comes in contact with that spot of satisfaction we are merciless to them. Jesus Christ was never merciless, and it is only as we draw on His life that we are like our Father in heaven;. The only safety is to live the life hid with Christ in God;. As long as we are consciously there, we are not there. It is only when we are there that it never occurs to us that we are, but the evidence is strong because others are getting the blessings of God through us and are helping themselves to us, even as Jesus Christ was made broken bread and poured-out wine for us. God cannot make some of us into broken bread because there are bits of unbaked dough in us that would produce indigestion. We have to go into the furnace again to be baked properly until we are no more like Ephraim, a cake not turned.;"

Oswald Chambers

So just felt compelled to lift up this aspect for praise. There are other times where the tendencies seem to be, "Oh just to keep it simple", the only problem with that despite the truth of it is often times to get there is a difficult and laborious task, thinking is hard work.... but the benefits!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/7 10:38

Quote:
-----God cannot make some of us into broken bread because there are bits of unbaked dough in us that would produce indigestion. We have to go into the furnace again to be baked properly until we are no more like Ephraim, "a cake not turned."

What an awesome quote that speaks to me today. Was it Polycarp that said that his body would be ground up like wheat by the lions that he might be made pure bread?

I hope not to come off too strong on these things, yet I am very concerned that we don't head down the road that Finney went down when it comes to soteriology. I think what happens is that when God sends revival there is a tendency to keep tightening the 'holiness' bolts (as it were) until the metaphorical heads snap off. We have all done that at one time when working on the bicycle, lawn mower or car. I wonder if this is tight enough and then wham! The whole thing breaks off in our hand. That's what happens when the revivalist hangs around too long at one congregation. I think I see a progression here:

- 1) They repent of MAJOR sins such as idolatry, fornication, adultery, theft, etc. and simply "turn back to God."
- 2) They then get a blast of preaching on sins of the heart such as covetousness and the like and they repent of that.
- 3) They then get a blast of preaching on loving God with all their heart, denying self, etc. and they repent of that.

4) They then get a blast of teaching on putting God first in all things and utterly abandoning all amusements that are not 'spiritual exercises' and they repent of that.

5) They then get a blast of teaching on eating for pleasure and salting the food. No salt and pepper shakers in the house because that would be indulging in the flesh. Smoking at this point is a serious sin- not because of health reasons, but because it costs money and we are to be good stewards.

6) They then get a blast of teaching on wearing certain cloths and going to certain 'worldly shops.' Clothes must look plain or they are worldly. High heels on women make the sounds of "sounding brass and tinkling symbols" on the floors.

7) If you do not keep all these things and more... you are not saved and need to repent. If you commit one of these sins you are on equal ground with a sinner.

Sound silly? I have seen it all and often.

Re: Back to the issue at hand - posted by crsschk (), on: 2005/4/7 10:42

Coming back to the discussion here...

Medkes asked

Quote:

-----So to whom was the blood poured? Is it to appease God?

Think it goes right back to the whole of Hebrews, that of types and shadows. Another comes to mind, make that a couple:

Gen 9:4 But flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat.

Gen 9:5 And surely your blood of your lives will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man.

Gen 9:6 Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God made he man.

Pro 16:14 A king's wrath is a messenger of death, and a wise man will appease it.

Again

Heb 9:22 And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

Not sure if I am drawing the right analogy here that I want to, would defer to much better exposition in the (https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id1212&forum36) Propitiation and the red heifer thread for more on all this.

But to draw alongside Robert here in regards to some misunderstandings earlier in this thread, that of the blood having...
From Freed

Quote:

-----The blood of Christ is not magic. It by itself removes no sin. Christ's death saves no one. The atonement is only a method that God used to show His love and make salvation possible.

Whooo... that's a remarkable statement and perhaps it didn't come out in the way it was intended, but you couldn't get any farther from the truth.

Whose blood and **whose** death *is* **His** love.

paid for our sins is a metaphor, on: 2005/4/7 11:01

An allegory is a story that is created, we're talking about biblical allegories now, an allegory is a story created to portray a spiritual truth. It can be taken literally with the details pressed for meaning. An allegory is a story that is created to portray a spiritual truth and it can be taken literally with the details pressed for meaning. A religious metaphor, on the other hand, while it is also intended to convey a spiritual truth, is not to be taken in a literal, physical way. An example of a metaphor is that He is the door. Metaphors are stories that are meant to convey or word pictures meant to convey some spiritual truth but we don't press these metaphors for some kind of literal or physical meaning. And if we do, well, we're going to have to recreate the universe. Another metaphor is you are bought with a price. That is a biblical metaphor that is very often interpreted as an allegory. Another thing that you might find interesting, is that in that scripture where we are told that we are bought with a price, the word price can be translated to read honor. Now there's a concept here, there's a cost factor that God is trying to convey. He's trying to say, "now listen, it cost a great deal to bring you back to Myself, it wasn't cheap, it cost a lot". But He is not trying to convey some exact literal transfer, some legal transfer again where 'X' number drops of blood paid literally for 'X' number of sins. Where ever analogies from legal procedure are employed (in the Bible), they are usually assumed to prove the presence of the objective or judicial view of the Atonement. There is need, therefore, of the greatest caution in the exegesis of the language used in the Atonement". All of this legal terminology, these words that we put down that we have to be very careful about how we approach these words and phrases and not just immediately jump on them and begin to form this whole concept of a legal transfer between the first and second members of the Trinity. It will mess up our understanding of the character of God and it will also fail to provide a powerful sin deterrent barrier in our lives in the future.

This matter of ransom, this payment idea, is a figurative expression to help us understand that God came and intervened on our behalf when we were held bound by the kidnapper of sin. And God offered something of great value that we might be released from the power of sin. That's true. But it is not true that God was the one that was holding us captive in sin and therefore He should receive some kind of literal payment in order to release us. God wasn't holding us captive. In fact, the whole time, all along, He was the one trying to set us free. And if He wants to set us free, why does He need any kind of payment. Only in His role as a governor, the righteous moral governor of the universe, does He have certain requirements. Not on a personal level or a personal basis.

Re: paid for our sins is a metaphor - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/7 11:36

Quote:
-----Another metaphor is you are bought with a price.

I see this as a literal truth. I have been bought with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without spot or blemish. I have been 'redeemed'. I was sold unto Sin and now I am the property of God. The issue of a transaction has been written on extensively with many theories; yet sin carries a price tag. The price of sin(s) is death and the wages of Sin is death.

Quote:
----- It will mess up our understanding of the character of God and it will also fail to provide a powerful sin deterrent barrier in our lives in the future.

The only real barrier to sinning is to love God with all our hearts and delight in Him. Soteriological fear causes great resentment for a Child of God who is doing their best to walk in the Spirit and are constantly under fear of their soul. I knew a woman named Rosie who lost her mind because of that type of teaching. She was 70+ years old and in a nursing home wondering if she was going "to make it" (to Heaven). Someone taught her a horrendous theology and the last time I saw her she was in a cage in the hospital. She went insane. What was it? She knew she was getting older and ready to die and had served God ALL of her life in holiness and yet she wondered if she was going to "make it." That is a works based theology that militates against the Gospel. I utterly reject ANY such teaching as false.

Sinners should fear and tremble, but the children of God function in their relationship with God out of love. If we flip that around and make the main thrust of a Christians relationship with God 'fear based' were are in as much error as those who preach sloppy grace. Christians are not like animals wearing shock collars. They are the children of God who relate t

o Him with that ABBA father and child relationship. The dog may have the shock collar on (God forbid) but the children do not. Preaching God in such a way as to make the relationship 'fear based' is NOT God's intention in bringing many sons unto glory.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: A song of debt, on: 2005/4/7 11:56

I was just musing these wonderful posts that everyone is participating in and I got to humming a tune concerning this great debt that Jesus paid it goes like this:

"He paid a debt He did not owe
I owed a debt I could not pay
I needed someone to wash my sins away.

And now I sing a brand new song, amazing grace
Christ Jesus paid a debt that I could never pay".

Karl ;-)

God is not a blood-thirsty being, on: 2005/4/7 16:07

God is not a blood-thirsty being. That just seeing Christ's blood and just seeing His suffering and just viewing His death was not what God was after.

The sacrifice was not to have an impact on God. God was not the object of the act. The sacrifice itself, what was done, what was taking place was to have an impact on man. Man needed to change. Man needed to be affected. If man was not affected, if his heart was not changed, if there was no impact, no humility, no contrition by the blood sacrifice, it didn't work. So, it is. The poured out life of Jesus Christ must have an impact on our lives and on our hearts or else it doesn't work.

Re: - posted by nimble, on: 2005/4/7 17:02

What do Finney, FreeCd etc exactly make of Jesus' death on the cross then? I don't really understand it...
Why did Jesus need to actually be separated from the Father?
What was He referring to when he said "It is finished"?
What does Corinthians mean when it says He was "made sin"?

I don't know if those are silly questions but they just occurred to me when reading those ideas.

Re: God is not a blood-thirsty being - posted by Compton (), on: 2005/4/7 17:10

FreeCds' provocative man-centered comments caused me to recall Watchman Nee's insights on the blood in Normal Christian Life. Edit: If you are pressed for time skip this and make time for IntheLights' post right above mine. His is even more on point!"

"It is God's holiness, God's righteousness, which demands that a sinless life should be given for man. There is life in the Blood, and that Blood has to be poured out for me, for my sins. God is the One who requires it to be so. God is the One who demands that the Blood be presented, in order to satisfy His own righteousness, and it is He who says: 'When I see the blood, I will pass over you.' The Blood of Christ wholly satisfies God.

"The Blood is first for God to see. We then have to accept God's valuation of it. In doing so we shall find our valuation. If instead we try to come to a valuation by way of our feelings we get nothing; we remain in darkness. No, it is a matter of faith in God's Word. We have to believe that the Blood is precious to God because He says it is so (1 Peter 1:18,19). If God can accept the Blood as a payment for our sins and as the price of our redemption, then we can rest assured that the debt has been paid. If God is satisfied with the Blood, then the Blood must be acceptable. Our valuation of it is only according to His valuation—neither more nor less. It cannot, of course, be more, but it must not be less. Let us remember that He is holy and He is righteous, and that a holy and righteous God has the right to say that the Blood is acceptable

e in His eyes and has fully satisfied Him."

"But I want to ask myself, am I really seeking the way into the Presence of God by the Blood or by something else? What do I mean when I say, 'by the Blood'? I mean simply that I recognize my sins, that I confess that I have need of cleansing and of atonement, and that I come to God on the basis of the finished work of the Lord Jesus. I approach God through His merit alone, and never on the basis of my attainment; never, for example, on the ground that I have been extra kind or patient today, or that I have done something for the Lord this morning. I have to come by way of the Blood every time. The temptation to so many of us when we try to approach God is to think that because God has been dealing with us—because He has been taking steps to bring us into something more of Himself and has been teaching us deeper lessons of the Cross—He has thereby set before us new standards, and that only by attaining to these can we have a clear conscience before Him. No! A clear conscience is never based upon our attainment; it can only be based on the work of the Lord Jesus in the shedding of His Blood."

Initially, our standing with God was secured by the Blood, for we are "made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13). But thereafter our ground of continual access is still by the Blood, for the apostle exhorts us: "Having therefore... boldness to enter into the holy place by the blood of Jesus... let us draw near" (Heb. 10:19,22). To begin with I was made nigh by the Blood, and to continue in that new relationship I come through the Blood every time. It is not that I was saved on one basis and that I now maintain my fellowship on another... No, my initial approach to God is by the Blood, and every time I come before Him it is the same. Right to the end it will always and only be on the ground of the Blood.

"We may be weak, but looking at our weakness will never make us strong. No trying to feel bad and doing penance will help us to be even a little holier. There is no help there, so let us be bold in our approach because of the Blood: 'Lord, I do not know fully what the value of the Blood is, but I know that the Blood has satisfied Thee; so the Blood is enough for me, and it is my only plea. I see now that whether I have really progressed, whether I have really attained to something or not, is not the point. Whenever I come before Thee, it is always on the ground of the precious Blood. Then our conscience is really clear before God. No conscience could ever be clear apart from the Blood. It is the Blood that gives us boldness.

"No more conscience of sins": these are tremendous words of Hebrews 10:2. We are cleansed from every sin; and we may truly echo the words of Paul: "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin" (Romans 4:8)."

Re: God is not a blood-thirsty being - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2005/4/7 17:11

The Blood Is Primarily For God

The Blood is for atonement and has to do first with our standing before God. We need forgiveness for the sins we have committed, lest we come under judgment; and they are forgiven, not because God overlooks what we have done but because He sees the Blood. The Blood is therefore not primarily for us but for God. If I want to understand the value of the Blood I must accept God's valuation of it, and if I do not know something of the value set upon the Blood by God I shall never know what its value is for me. It is only as the estimate that God puts upon the Blood of Christ is made known to me by His Holy Spirit that I come into the good of it myself and find how precious indeed the Blood is to me. But the first aspect of it is Godward. Throughout the Old and New Testaments the word 'blood' is used in connection with the idea of atonement, I think over a hundred times, and throughout it is something for God.

In the Old Testament calendar there is one day that has a great bearing on the matter of our sins and that day is the Day of Atonement. Nothing explains this question of sins so clearly as the description of that day. In Leviticus 16 we find that on the Day of Atonement the blood was taken from the sin offering and brought into the Most Holy Place and there sprinkled before the Lord seven times. We must be very clear about this. On that day the sin offering was offered publicly in the court of the tabernacle. Everything was there in full view and could be seen by all. But the Lord commanded that no man should enter the tabernacle itself except the high priest. It was he alone who took the blood and, going into the Most Holy Place, sprinkled it there to make atonement before the Lord. Why? Because the high priest was a type of the Lord Jesus in His redemptive work (Hebrews 9:12,12), and so, in figure, he was the one who did the work. None but he could even draw near to enter in. Moreover, connected with his going in there was but one act, namely, the presenting of the blood to God as something He had accepted, something in which He could find satisfaction. It was a transaction between the high priest and God in the Sanctuary, away from the eyes of the men who were to benefit by it. The Lord required that. The Blood is therefore in the first place for Him.

Earlier even than this there is described in Exodus 12:13 the shedding of the blood of the passover lamb in Egypt for

Israel's redemption. This is again, I think, one of the best types in the Old Testament of our redemption. The blood was put on the lintel and on the door-posts, whereas the meat, the flesh of the lamb, was eaten inside the house; and God said: "When I see the blood, I will pass over you". Here we have another illustration of the fact that the blood was not meant to be presented to man but to God, for the blood was put on the lintel and on the door-posts, where those feasting inside the house would not see it.

-from *The Normal Christian Life* by Watchman Nee

Re: flour has no blood - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/9 4:05

Quote:

-----IT was God's LOVE behind and the reason for the atonement.

Of course it was. Holy Love, not human sentiment. If your concept of love does not include righteousness it is defective.

1 'TIS finished! The Messiah dies,
Cut off for sins, but not his own:
Accomplished is the sacrifice,
The great redeeming work is done.

**2 'Tis finished! all the debt is paid;
Justice divine is satisfied;
The grand and full atonement made;
God for a guilty world hath died.**

3 The veil is rent in Christ alone;
The living way to heaven is seen;
The middle wall is broken down,
And all mankind may enter in.

4 The types and figures are fulfilled;
Exacted is the legal pain;
The precious promises are sealed;
The spotless Lamb of God is slain.

5 The reign of sin and death is o'er,
And all may live from sin set free;
Satan hath lost his mortal power;
'Tis swallowed up in victory.

6 Saved from the legal curse I am,
My Saviour hangs on yonder tree:
See there the meek, expiring Lamb!
'Tis finished! he expires for me.

7 Accepted in the Well-beloved,
And clothed in righteousness divine,
I see the bar to heaven removed;
And all thy merits, Lord, are mine.

8 Death, hell, and sin are now subdued;
All grace is now to sinners given;
And lo, I plead the atoning blood,
And in thy right I claim thy heaven!

Charles Wesley

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/9 4:09

Quote:

-----I don't know if those are silly questions but they just occurred to me when reading those ideas.

No, these are not silly questions. There is no such thing as a 'silly question' for those seeking to understand God's truth. ;-)

Re: paid for our sins is a metaphor - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/9 4:12

Quote:

-----paid for our sins is a metaphor

Almost every Bible symbol is a metaphor, that does not reduce their importance. Christ as Light, Bread, Door, Truth, Life, Way are all metaphors. These are divinely chosen metaphors designed to give light and instruction to seeking souls.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/9 20:22

Quote:

-----Almost every Bible symbol is a metaphor, that does not reduce their importance. Christ as Light, Bread, Door, Truth, Life, Way are all metaphors. These are divinely chosen metaphors designed to give light and instruction to seeking souls.

In the spirit the above-mentioned metaphors become real, as real as anything you or I see. The bible is a spiritual book and it must be looked at as such. Anything short of that serves no purpose but glorification of ourselves. We should all be cautious of the intent driving out search and study of the scriptures lest we attempt to glorify ourselves rather than God. If we look at the bible as we would any other book, not much of it makes sense, but viewing it in the spirit makes all the difference, it all falls into place and makes perfect sense. In the spirit the bible becomes what it should be, literal, powerful an insight into the character of God, food for the spirit man, literally. We know the bible to be the word of God spoken by Him and born of His spirit and it requires His spirit to interpret and instruct us accordingly. We have libraries upon libraries of varying interpretations of things in the bible in a myriad of languages, but if all those volumes were not the product of the instruction of the spirit of God then they serve no purpose but the glorification of man and lead brethren astray. At the end of the day if my interpretation of what a passage of the bible means is not born of the holy spirit, it helps no one and can potentially mislead many. There were and are many biblical scholars out there, some had no leading of the spirit and others that did and yet we hold such scholarship in high esteem. A few big words here and there, a nice sounding phrase now and again and we're hooked. The pharisees knew the holy writs better than anyone and yet Christ had nothing good to say about them. Let us not fall into the trap of becoming slaves to spewing biblical verses on demand without being slaves to the spirit of God. I mean what good is a spiritual book if it is not looked at as such? This has been weighing heavy on me in spirit for some time now. God has opened my eyes and ears to a lot of hot air which we spew forth to take the place of things which the spirit of God should be saying and how it makes it difficult for new followers in Christ to learn and grow in the faith. It is astounding how much of this hot air has been going around from even the very inception of the church.

The time to seek God in spirit and truth is now more than ever, for what is about to happen will require that our spirits be quickened and in tune with the will of God, lest we be swept away by the coming judgement.

Re: A figure of speech? - posted by Jimm (), on: 2005/4/9 23:27

Quote:
----- We should all be cautious of the intent driving out search and study of the scriptures lest we attempt to glorify ourselves rather than God. If we look at the bible as we would any other book, not much of it makes sense, but viewing it in the spirit makes all the difference, it all falls into place and makes perfect sense. In the spirit the bible become what it should be, literal, powerful an insight into the character of God, food for the spirit man, literally.

Yes Farai, I must agree with you very strongly there. The Bible is simpler than we make it. Let us remember whom it was written to. A group of largely "unlearned" "unlettered" folk to not only read and meditate on the Gospel according to John and the epistle to the Hebrews, but also to understand them. We complicate things a lot more than we should quiet frankly. If something is meant as a metaphor or parable it is stated plainly, and to that which is not we must interpret to be literal. Our intelligence causes us to jump to wrong conclusions and precepts. From my experience, that which is spoken of literally is literal and that which is a metaphor or a parable is stated as such. We are not left to our devices to examine the book as if it were literature and to draw conclusions thereof but, the more literally we take the Bible the further we will advance spiritually.

Quote:
----- The pharisees knew the holy writs better than anyone and yet Christ had nothing good to say about them. Let us not fall into the trap of becoming slaves to spewing biblical verses on demand without being slaves to the spirit of God.

The reason there is so much confusion is because of several things, which I believe to stem from a lack of spiritual authority. We have in our day and age, many mental authorities of the Bible but not many who are noted for divinely appointed spiritual authority. Leading scholars do not impress me at all. If you are able to show me practical results from a form of doctrine than I am all ears, but if all we have is theory and conjecture what pray tell, do we have our faith based on? Is not our God alive and living and powerful...and literal?

Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this, said, This is an hard saying; who can hear it? When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life. But there are some of you that believe not. (John 6:60-64)

James

Re:figures of speech; metaphors and similies. - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/10 3:07

Quote:
-----If something is meant as a metaphor or parable it is stated plainly, and to that which is not we must interpret to be literal.

This is a deadly philosophy. Metaphors never come with 'warning labels'. That is what a metaphor is. A 'simile' comes with a warning label usually the word 'like' or 'as', but a metaphor, by definition, has no warning label. Let me illustrate simply The reason there is so much confusion is because of several things, which I believe to stem form a lack of spiritual authority. (your sentence) Do you really believe that the absence of "spiritual authority" is some kind of plant or shrub growing in the earth with branches developing from the main stalk or 'stem'? Of course you don't, but if I take your words literally I must interpret your word 'stem' in this way. Your 'metaphor' like all metaphors had no 'warning label'. A metaphor is a simile without a warning label.

The Bible was written in human languages for human beings, and human beings always use pictures to explain things. Metaphors are 'word pictures' used without 'warning labels'; so are parables. God has used 'human language' in the way that we all use it, and to say that everything which is not specifically labelled as a metaphor is literal is really a very extreme position and I don't believe you hold it.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/10 9:25

Quote:
-----Do you really believe that the absence of "spiritual authority" is some kind of plant or shrub growing in the earth with branches developing from the main stalk or 'stem'? Of course you don't, but if I take your words literally I must interpret your word 'stem' in this way. Your 'metaphor' like all metaphors had no 'warning label'. A metaphor is a simile without a warning label.

Indeed it is, while it may not be visible to the eye of the flesh in the spirit it is such a plant, a poisonous one at that that can kill the spirit. If all the things Christ said of that are said in the bible are metaphorical, then where do we draw the line? When Christ said that I will give you a new spirit was that a metaphor? if so does this spirit require metaphorical spiritual food or real spiritual food? Bro Ron you have said yourself on some place in this forum that you are a teacher of the word. You will have much to answer for before God if what you teach is not given you by the holy spirit. If what you teach isn't given you by the Holy spirit, then that misleads many who then go on to mislead others and where does it end? For others out there who are teachers the very same applies. Not to say that this doesn't apply to me or others but for the teachers, they will be judged more harshly because people look to them for a word from God.

Bro Ron every time you have explained something you have always quoted something from the BDB (don't quite remember what that stands for) or some renowned theologian or scholar, never have you mentioned that the spirit gave me a revelation of this or that. I submit to you that if all these theologies and products of scholarship had equal power in the spirit, by God the enemy and his minions would be on their knees pleading for us to stop putting the boot to their backsides! But look around you, who is getting the whooping? This is evidence that all these great libraries are full of nonsense! Hot air! What really sucks is that this stuff has taken the place of the ministry of the holy spirit and it sounds so good that nobody wants to give it a second thought. I guess we are more impressed by big words and nice-sounding statements. This is the same stuff the pharisees were spewing and which Christ was so against because it is hard for anyone to understand. If my interpretation of scripture, your interpretation of scripture is not a thing taught by the Holy spirit then it is nothing but useless and we need to realize that. I guess you may have a problem with that as will many other theologians, scholars etc because so much time and resource has been invested into fashioning all this stuff and now to be told that it is useless? THAT WOULD SUCK for anyone who had done all this and has come to the realization or been convicted that it has not been born of the spirit and has been a waste of time. It will not withstand the fire as it is a work of wood hay or stubble rather than gold of precious stone...or maybe that too was a metaphor...

Quote:
-----Metaphors are 'word pictures' used without 'warning labels'; so are parables. God has used 'human language' in the way that we all use it, and to say that everything which is not specifically labelled as a metaphor is literal is really a very extreme position and I don't believe you hold it.

In the spirit these things become literal and of course if you look at them any other way they will look like nice metaphors or similes and all. The scriptures are so simple to comprehend in the spirit. We've taken them, concluded that they are too simple and have set about the business of complicating them to the point where if you have not been to some bible college or been taught by a theologian or scholar they make no sense. There are some scholars and theologians out there that indeed are teaching as per the leading of the spirit but a lot of them are not as evidenced by the lack of manifestation of power in all the many books that have been written.

God's hand has been heavy on me concerning this (yes literal hand has been pressing on my spiritual body) to speak for th. He's allowed me to feel the grief He feels, the indignation at all this and at first I paid no attention to it but now I feel these things all the time. Man I pray that you all get to feel what I've felt or seen what God has shown me and even greater things in your own lives. You will never look at God the same again once you've experience Him in the spirit. You get hooked on it once you realize that there is no substitute for meeting God in the spirit.

Seek God in the spirit and you will want nothing less.

Inkhorns - posted by Jimm (), on: 2005/4/10 9:59

Quote:
-----The Bible was written in human languages for human beings, and human beings always use pictures to explain things. Metaphors are 'word pictures' used without 'warning labels'; so are parables. God has used 'human language' in the way that we all use it, and to say that everything which is not specifically labelled as a metaphor is literal is really a very extreme position and I don't believe you hold it.

Our religion in Christ is the most extreme one there is...or haven't you noticed. I am weary of humanizing spiritual things. If, as Farai put it, we look at scriptures in the spirit then we will be amazed as to how literal they are. The Bible is clear as to which of the discourses of Jesus were parables and the others we are to take literally. We are trying too hard to make the fleshly mind and faculties profit from scriptures but our Lord said to us, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."

The Spirit has pressed upon me to give this as an illustration:

Ezekiel 9:1-4 1 He cried also in mine ears with a loud voice, saying, Cause them that have charge over the city to draw near, even every man with his destroying weapon in his hand. 2 And, behold, six men came from the way of the higher gate, which lieth toward the north, and every man a slaughter weapon in his hand; and one man among them was clothed with linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side: and they went in, and stood beside the brasen altar. 3 And the glory of the God of Israel was gone up from the cherub, whereupon he was, to the threshold of the house. And he called to the man clothed with linen, which had the writer's inkhorn by his side; 4 And the LORD said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof.

Now then, is this passage literal or metaphorical? Is there "ink" in the spiritual realm or this also metaphorical? If we have spiritual ink and ink horns then how many other things are literal in the spiritual realm?

James

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/10 11:42

Quote:
-----Bro Ron every time you have explained something you have always quoted something from the BDB (don't quite remember what that stands for) or some renowned theologian or scholar, never have you mentioned that the spirit gave me a revelation of this or that.

Would you be more impressed if I did? Its the steam going through the pistons that gets the job done, not that which goes through the whistle. 8-)

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/10 11:57

Quote:
-----Would you be more impressed if I did? Its the steam going through the pistons that gets the job done, not that which goes through the whistle.

Actually I wouldn't but if there was evidence of power in the spirit from the sources you quote and esteem so highly then I would be most impressed, more importantly so would God.

General Topics :: RANSOM?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/4/10 13:22

Quote:
-----Actually I wouldn't but if there was evidence of power in the spirit from the sources you quote and esteem so highly then I would be most impressed, more importantly so would God.

I am wondering whether to continue this foolishness or not. Let me say simply that I have never quoted an 'authority' (btw BDB is Baker Dictionary of the Bible and is free with e-sword) except as confirmation of my own leading in the spirit. I never go to the authorities, except at the end of my meditation. I never begin there. I bring 'out of my own treasure things new and old' (Matt 13:52)... and in that order.

...but a true Spirit-led man is never afraid to listen to what others have to say; even his enemies. It is the fanatic who dares not listen to the safety which exists in the multitude of counsellors. (Prov 11:14) I do not believe that I am infallible, but I do believe that God speaks to me. Like Paul I am not afraid to go to 'Jerusalem' to talk to other saints, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. (Gal 2:2)

John Wesley Wesley said of certain he met that they had sundry excellent qualities, but unfortunately they knew everything and therefore learned nothing. I do not want to join that company.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/10 14:34

Quote:
-----I welcome and encourage challenge of my views. I am constantly rethinking my beliefs and interpretations of scripture. I have been doing so for almost 50 years and will do so to my last breath. I don't regard challenge as a threat. I have nothing to lose but my errors.

His/Yours
Ron B

After reading that from the propiciation and red heifer (pardon the spelling I may have gotten it wrong) and this

Quote:
-----I am wondering whether to continue this foolishness or not. Let me say simply that I have never quoted an 'authority' (btw BDB is Baker Dictionary of the Bible and is free with e-sword) except as confirmation of my own leading in the spirit. I never go to the authorities, except at the end of my meditation. I never begin there. I bring 'out of my own treasure things new and old' (Matt 13:52)... and in that order.

Quote:
-----...but a true Spirit-led man is never afraid to listen to what others have to say; even his enemies. It is the fanatic who dares not listen to the safety which exists in the multitude of counsellors. (Prov 11:14) I do not believe that I am infallible, but I do believe that God speaks to me. Like Paul I am not afraid to go to 'Jerusalem' to talk to other saints, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. (Gal 2:2)

I am confused. you're not even entertaining what I have to say and yet you say you are open to challenges to your views on scriptures
:-? What's the deal with that...oh wait...never mind

Re: The apostolic preaching of the cross - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/11 6:25

Ron recommended the book by Leon Morris, on bible expressions "The apostolic preaching of the cross" just to let folk know there are some second hand ones on Amazon.co.uk just received mine... excellent, thanks Mr B :-)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/4/11 8:53

Quote:
-----Bro Ron you have said yourself on some place in this forum that you are a teacher of the word. You will have much to answer for before God if what you teach is not given you by the Holy Spirit. If what you teach isn't given you by the Holy Spirit, then that misleads many who then go on to mislead others and where does it end?

Don't assume to know too much about Bro. Ron, you will certainly regret it in the end. The more I learn of his teachings the more I realize how wrong I was when I first encountered him. Truly we all will give an account of what we teach. I would suggest listening to at least 10 of his sermons and then re-engage this thread.

Quote:
-----Bro Ron every time you have explained something you have always quoted something from the BDB (don't quite remember what that stands for) or some renowned theologian or scholar, never have you mentioned that the Spirit gave me a revelation of this or that.

It is not a virtue to forsake valid resources in order to make a show of great spiritual insight. Actually, Bro. Ron has received revelation from God on issues such as Propitiation and the Red Heifer and *then* after being a good Berean to insure what was revealed squared with scripture was accused of looking to validate his teaching by quoting concurring resources later. He has taken it from both ends of the stick.

Quote:
-----I submit to you that if all these theologies and products of scholarship had equal power in the Spirit, by God the enemy and his minions would be on their knees pleading for us to stop putting the boot to their backsides! But look around you, who is getting the whooping? This is evidence that all these great libraries are full of nonsense! Hot air! What really sucks is that this stuff has taken the place of the ministry of the Holy Spirit and it sounds so good that nobody wants to give it a second thought. I guess we are more impressed by big words and nice-sounding statements. This is the same stuff the Pharisees were spewing and which Christ was so against because it is hard for anyone to understand. If my interpretation of scripture, your interpretation of scripture is not a thing taught by the Holy Spirit then it is nothing but useless and we need to realize that.

I hear what you are saying here, but again, don't underestimate who you are dealing with. You should get Bro. Ron's series "Having begun in the Spirit."

The Spirit and the Word agree. There are lots of 'big words' that have very deep meanings in the New Testament. I submit that many are on the milk and think it is spiritual- when it is not spiritual it is evidence of sin in their life. Everything proceeds from revelation and what is revealed must square with scripture. You shall know the TRUTH and the Truth shall make you free. It is the Anointing that destroys the yoke. That, combined, is the Sword of the Spirit. The anointed truth of God's word. We can't bring a plastic knife to battle and pray we have enough anointing that it will prevail. We need a mighty sword and the anointing and wisdom to wield it as the Spirit leads.

Quote:
-----I guess you may have a problem with that as will many other theologians, scholars etc because so much time and resource has been invested into fashioning all this stuff and now to be told that it is useless? THAT WOULD SUCK for anyone who had done all this and has come to the realization or been convicted that it has not been born of the Spirit and has been a waste of time.

Laziness in study is no virtue. Study is hard work. Piecing the scriptures together by the Spirit to form the huge picture God has presented takes a lot of mental RAM. It takes a mind fully fixed upon God. The reason why there is so much despair now over the whole understanding of salvation is because people want a 10 cent answer to a million dollar question. Bible issues are very important. Again, it does not have to be one or the other. Paul was a greater theologian than all we will ever know. Yet, God used him in the Spirit in ways we can't imagine. Was Paul's study time at the feet of Gamaliel a hindrance to the Holy Ghost or an asset? When God anoints a man who is greatly versed in the understanding of His word- the enemy is in trouble. again, the enemy wants it one or the other- but God can raise up men with BOTH knowledge and anointing.

Quote:
-----In the spirit these things become literal and of course if you look at them any other way they will look like nice metaphors or similes and all. The scriptures are so simple to comprehend in the spirit. We've taken them, concluded that they are too simple and have set about the business of complicating them to the point where if you have not been to some bible college or been taught by a theologian or scholar they make no sense. There are some scholars and theologians out there that indeed are teaching as per the leading of the spirit but a lot of them are not as evidenced by the lack of manifestation of power in all the many books that have been written.

I am Pentecostal. If you cut me I would bleed Pentecost. Yet, what is it as Pentecostal's that so many thing that study is contrary to the Spirit?

Quote:
-----God's hand has been heavy on me concerning this (yes literal hand has been pressing on my spiritual body) to speak forth. He's all owed me to feel the grief He feels, the indignation at all this and at first I paid no attention to it but now I feel these things all the time. Man I pray that you all get to feel what I've felt or seen what God has shown me and even greater things in your own lives. You will never look at God the same again once you've experience Him in the spirit. You get hooked on it once you realize that there is no substitute for meeting God in the spirit.

Seek God in the spirit and you will want nothing less.

Beyond the sacred page we seek Thee Lord... That is the opening prayer to one of Bro. Ron's Rora 2003 messages. There are certain things that are appropriate on these forums and others are not. What I mean is, things can only get so 'prophetic' in a scene like this. There is much teaching here- but true ministry is more readily realized in settings when people are face to face. Don't interpret silence in these things as absence of these things. There is a time and a place for everything.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/11 9:17

I must agree with Robertw although Ron does not need us to defend him.
IRONMAN you are indeed coming across like iron,...please do listen to some of bro Ron's sermons they will bless you
I do believe he really does talk the talk and walk the walk!

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/11 11:29

bro Robert

Quote:
-----It is not a virtue to forsake valid resources in order to make a show of great spiritual insight. Actually, Bro. Ron has received revelation from God on issues such as Propitiation and the Red Heifer and then after being a good Berean to insure what was revealed squared with scripture was accused of looking to validate his teaching by quoting concurring resources later. He has taken it from both ends of the stick.

I'm not saying that we should forsake valid sources but rather use valid sources that are inspired by the spirit of God and not all sources are inspired by the spirit. That is one of the things that God has been pressing heavily on me. I'm sure as to why He would use me in this capacity at this time except that He feels it necessary for someone to learn something, I have learned much I know that. Perhaps it is more for me to learn something or for us all to learn something. I'm not underestimating Ron, or assuming I know much about him. If his teachings are inspired by the spirit then there is nothing to worry about. It is vital that they be because he has taught and will teach many. It's just that in the days ahead the leading of the spirit in all things will have to take on centre stage. For teachers it is vital because as the mouthpieces of God, they will affect more people than most.

Quote:
-----Laziness in study is no virtue. Study is hard work. Piecing the scriptures together by the Spirit to form the huge picture God has presented takes a lot of mental RAM. It takes a mind fully fixed upon God. The reason why there is so much despair now over the whole understanding of salvation is because people want a 10 cent answer to a million dollar question. Bible issues are very important. Again, it does not have to be one or the other. Paul was a greater theologian than all we will ever know. Yet, God used him in the Spirit in ways we can't imagine. Was Paul's study time at the feet of Gamaliel a hindrance to the Holy Ghost or an asset? When God anoints a man who is greatly versed in the understanding of His word- the enemy is in trouble. again, the enemy wants it one or the other- but God can raise up men with BOTH knowledge and anointing.

I'm not advocating laziness in study at all, rather I'm for diligent study as per the instruction of the holy spirit, anything outside of that serves no purpose. Paul's epistles were written simply to be understood by a largely unlearned group of people but the interpretations of those epistles and others in the word have become exceedingly complicated to the point that one almost needs to go to bible school to understand them. That concerns me it makes certain things almost inaccessible to the masses who may not have the time/money to do such. it seems to me the bible is a lot simpler than we make it out to be and that concerns me. Surely a revelation in the spirit which God intends to be shared with everyone would be simple for the concerned persons to understand? Maybe my concerns are unfounded. It's just that lately in God's dealings with me He has shown me that things are a lot simpler than they appear. Paul studying under Gamaliel was useful to him after he allowed the holy spirit to lead Him appropriately. I may be wrong but didn't Paul lean more on the holy spirit than what he had learned on that he spoke as the holy spirit instructed him to? Did not all that he learned as a pharisee now have life because the holy spirit breathed life into them?

Quote:
-----Beyond the sacred page we seek Thee Lord.... That is the opening prayer to one of Bro. Ron's Rora 2003 messages. There are certain things that are appropriate on these forums and others are not. What I mean is, things can only get so 'prophetic' in a scene like this. There is much teaching here- but true ministry is more readily realized in settings when people are face to face. Don't interpret silence in these things as absence of these things. There is a time and a place for everything.

I feel that bro Robert. Perhaps God is weighing heavily on me these things for the purpose of planting seeds (I know that sounds cliché and linked to many prosperity gospel) for many a prophetic ministry which He will raise up for the times ahead. God has been showing me all sorts of things in the spirit which speak of an unprecedentedly powerful move on God's part in the days ahead. I'm not sure when it will happen but I feel it to be imminent.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/11 11:59

Quote:

-----I must agree with Robertw although Ron does not need us to defend him.

Quote:

-----IRONMAN you are indeed comming across like iron,...please do listen to some of bro Ron's sermons they will bless you

This dialogue with Ron (or monologue) is not an attack. If his teachings are inspired by the spirit then it is all good. The thing that God has placed on my heart is the importance of being sure that all teachings concerning Him are inspired by the holy spirit. for teachers it is vital because many will learn from them. There are a lot of sources out there which may seem valid but are not inspired by the spirit, the only sources that are truly valid are those that have been inspired by the spirit and we all need to find those ones from the myriad of others. That's what this is all about. God has been laying this heavily on me I feel because the teachers are about to get very busy in this new season and this is how they should prepare, be sure that they are being led by the spirit in all things.

Re: - posted by Delboy (), on: 2005/4/11 18:25

Dear friend, you responded

Quote:

-----The thing that God has placed on my heart is the importance of being sure that all teachings concerning Him are inspired by the holy spirit.

How on earth will you manage to police all teachings out there?

I think you may have a big job on your hands...surely we are to take our lead from scripture...with all humbleness and meekness, Bro Ron is as i said walking the walk and talking the talk
ironman or son of thunder whats all that about? :-)

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2005/4/11 19:16

Delboy

Oh no, my job isn't to police the teachings here, just to pass on the message from on high to be sure that we are lead in the spirit in all things, teaching included. And for one who is a teacher people learn from them and if the lesson is wrong the people are misled and we have a bad situation. The scriptures themselves are a product of the spirit of God and require that same spirit for interpretation hence the need to be led in the spirit. It is everyone's responsibility who is doing anything concerning God that they be lead by His spirit in these things so that they line up with His will and are thus pleasing to Him. does that help?

IRONMAN, an old nickname from college, I worked out a lot hence IRON MAN, Son of Thunder, it is said God's voice can be like thunder, and I am an of Him. See now :) Um if I may ask, where does delboy come from?

Re: Barnabas, Simeon, Lucius, Manaen and Saul - posted by Jimm (), on: 2005/4/11 20:17

Dear friends

I hope you will forgive our (Farai and I) outbursts and charge it to our lack of experience rather than our intent. We are trying to fit into a difficult ministry (as are all ministries at some point). All that was said was said in good faith, but whether our level of faith allows us to see, as we should is another question. Watchman Nee had a saying, "the Spirit of Christ in me will not fight the Spirit of Christ in you". I am embarrassed when I find myself in a quarrel with brethren because I have misrepresented God's attributes and probably at some point, I have been carnal in my judgment. "In the mouth of two or three witnesses" has its weight even on the forum setting and now that you have stated your point of view my dear brothers, your concerns are both noted and well founded. I think this is a misunderstanding more than anything else... "Philologos", "Jimm" and "IRONMAN" are at best shadows of the person behind them and we

cannot really make any fair judgments of a persons entire character based on what we see here alone.

I have respect for most of the SI members and your opinions are meaningful to me and, as part of the body of Christ, your rebukes are taken seriously. Farai and I are in very close intimate fellowship and what he says usually is what I would say so indirectly a rebuke to him reflects also on me, and now that his mouth has spoken for our side, a second mouth (mine) will now speak. Please bear with me as I attempt to explain our position.

When we started fellowship with each other I was just learning to listen to the voice of the Lord. He woke me up one morning and told me, "go and pray with your brother". That evening we prayed together and we both filled with the Spirit and instructed to pray with a third brother and thus began our (the three of us) prophetic ministry. We have largely been ministering to each other mostly as the Lord has been teaching us something about his church. There is nothing special or outstanding about any of us but as it so happens it pleased the Lord to give us this office not "unto ourselves" but to the church; that is, we consider ourselves the property of Christ directly and indirectly (His Church). All the messages he has given us have been confirmed by our spirits bearing witness and with others signs of the Spirit.

The signs of the Spirit began subtly as we began to be in an agony (spiritual) whilst breaking bread with each other as we partook of the Lords super. This was one of the first prophetic signs experience by us all as we read scriptures and broke bread in tears. As our fellowship tightened we continued to follow the guidance of the Spirit, listening to messages from SI and reading articles to each other written by other saints and the praying, worshiping and prophesying. The pace at which this all happened was staggering and humbling and, as if over night our entire outlook on Christianity had changed. We have hardly had time to stop and examine our paradigms. The theme our walk began with was, (thus saith the Lord) "judgment begins with the house of God" and for this reason, fellowship has been difficult on our souls and egos. There is only so much you can hide about yourself in this setting and the discernment and rebukes are at times uncomfortable and always humbling. It has not been a "you must save the church" type gathering and in fact all the lessons we give out are lessons that have been given to and applied to us first.

Quote:
----- Beyond the sacred page we seek Thee Lord... That is the opening prayer to one of Bro. Ron's Rora 2003 messages. There are certain things that are appropriate on these forums and others are not. What I mean is, things can only get so 'prophetic' in a scene like this. There is much teaching here- but true ministry is more readily realized in settings when people are face to face. Don't interpret silence in these things as absence of these things. There is a time and a place for everything.

You are completely right here Brother Robert; "things can only get so 'prophetic' in a scene like this". The weight of the message is largely lost on the forum. Art Katz once said:

"Prophets and teachers rarely get along, the reason being that prophets are too broad minded and concerned with the 'bigger picture' and teachers are too narrow minded and concerned with the 'line upon line precept upon precept'. The prophet is in danger of not being able to stop and recognize the fine details of the plan of God and the teacher is in danger of forgetting the purpose of the fine details with which he is concerned. Antioch was such an perfect picture not only because of the diversities of races but this captured me more than anything else, "prophets and teachers... ministering to the Lord" (Acts 13). This is more than just singing hymns but it is a deep spiritual union horizontally first (with each other) and then vertically (unto the lord)."

I inquired of the Lord as to what he source of our disagreement was and He explained it to me thus, "The are many false prophets that have gone into the world and they (teachers) and there are many false teachers that have gone into the world and you (prophets) recognize that. Be patient with each other and leave the separating of the wheat from the tares to me."

We are blessed with Sermonindex and the earnest prayer of my spirit is that we would recognize in each other more similarities than differences. The essence of what Farai speaks of comes from a realization that much of his own time has been wasted with false and empty doctrine and he has genuinely been given instruction to "try the spirits whither they are of God". The trying is sometimes very brash but, hopefully we have nothing to hide and do not mind answering the tough questions. Concerning the things of God, Farai does not do the "wondering in himself" thing very well, he will confront you head on and demand an explanation not for his own good or ego but in the interest of getting to the bottom of the issue quickly without beating around the bush. He will tell exactly what he thinks and he does so in good faith as he tries to discern what is behind the shadow. It is nothing personal and, even I get the old "Son of thunder" sword sometimes as he "withstood me to the face", but I am better for it. The essence of Farai, at least now is this;

General Topics :: RANSOM?

Quote:
----- God's hand has been heavy on me concerning this (yes literal hand has been pressing on my spiritual body) to speak forth. He's all owed me to feel the grief He feels, the indignation at all this and at first I paid no attention to it but now I feel these things all the time. Man I pray that you all get to feel what I've felt or seen what God has shown me and even greater things in your own lives. You will never look at God the same again once you've experience Him in the spirit. You get hooked on it once you realize that there is no substitute for meeting God in the spirit.

In the love of Christ

James