



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Looking for feedback: Free From Sin Teaching

Looking for feedback: Free From Sin Teaching - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 11:45

From time to time I get accused of legalism, salvation by works, and holding the Gospel to high. I would love to get some feedback on this short article.

Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness... But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. -- Rom 6:18, 22

- 1) A person that desires to become a child of God must bring forth fruits to God that are consistent, worthy, keeping with, and befitting repentance (Mat 3:8). Fruits befitting repentance have no merit in becoming a child of God but are scriptural requirements.
- 2) A person must have godly sorrow (2Cor 7:10) for their sins and repent of their sins (Luk 13:3) to become a child of God. Sorrow and repentance have no merit in becoming a child of God but are scriptural requirements.
- 3) Repentance is a complete change in attitude toward your past sinful life and a commitment to completely change and reform your life by the power of God.
- 4) Becoming a child of God is by grace through faith and is not based on the merit of any works but is the gift of God (Eph 2:8).
- 5) When by grace with godly sorrow and repentance through faith and you believe in your heart (Rom 10:9) on the merits of the death and resurrection of Jesus, and ask God for forgiveness of sins, and believe by faith God has forgiven you (1Joh 1:9; Act 4:12 1Pet 1:9), you are converted and have become a child of God.
- 6) Freedom from sin (Rom 6:18) is obtained at the moment a person becomes a child of God (1Joh 3:8).
- 7) The sin that a person is freed from is willful acts of sins of commission and omission (Jam 4:17).
- 8) In order for a child of God to maintain victory over sin, the flesh, and the world (1Joh 2:15, 16), they must abide in Christ (Joh 15:4-6), in prayer obtain grace to help in time of need (Heb 4:16), be diligent to add the fruits of the Spirit to their life (2Pet 1:4-10), humble themselves before God (1Pet 5:5), built up their faith through reading the Word of God (Rom 10:17), hunger and thirst after righteousness (Mat 5:6), work out their salvation with fear and trembling (Phi 2:12), and be led by the Spirit of God (Rom 8:14).
- 9) If at any point a Christian commits a willful sin they no longer have eternal life abiding in them (1Joh 3:15) and have become a child of the devil (1Joh 3:10).

Re: Looking for feedback: Free From Sin Teaching - posted by LoveGodsWay2, on: 2008/12/8 12:41

Quote:
 -----1) A person that desires to become a child of God much bring forth fruits to God that are consistent, worthy, keeping with, and befitting repentance (Mat 3:8). Fruits befitting repentance have no merit in becoming a child of God but are scriptural requirements.

I would change this to:

- 1) A person who has become a child of God will bring forth fruits to God that are consistent, worthy, keeping with, and befitting repentance (Mat 7:15-23). Fruits befitting repentance have no merit in becoming a child of God but are scriptural requirements.

Quote:
-----9) If at any point a Christian commits a willful sin they no longer have eternal life abiding in them (1Joh 3:15) and have become a child of the devil (1Joh 3:10).

#9 - That does not seem correct. See 1 John 2:1-2.

Re: Looking for feedback: Free From Sin Teaching - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/8 14:02

Hi Bob,

This question may seem unrelated, but it will help me in understanding your position more.

Could you explain what happened on the cross? Who did Christ make propitiation for, and in what manner? Since Isaiah 53:6 seems to speak of individual's sins being laid upon him, I am wondering who those people are, and when/if Jesus took the punishment for those sins on the cross?

-- Taylor

Re: - posted by ANewInHim, on: 2008/12/8 14:24

Thank you, TaylorOtwell I could not have said it better myself, even if I tried?

You can apply all of these scriptures and that is grand, but it is not until the word of God is rooted in you, that your life begins to change. It not until you understand the power (IN) the word of God that your sins are forgiven.

Quote:
-----3) Repentance is a complete change in attitude toward your past sinful life and a commitment to completely change and reform your life by the power of God.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 14:36

LoveGodsWay2

>>>I would change this to:

1) A person that desires to become who has become a child of God must will bring forth fruits to God that are consistent, worthy, keeping with, and befitting repentance (Mat 3:8) (Mat 7:15-23). Fruits befitting repentance have no merit in becoming a child of God but are scriptural requirements.

I think you make a good point that I should have something about a faith that produces good works and I will add that.

How ever I would hold that the Bible teaches according to Mat 3:8 a person must bring forth fruits befitting repentance to be saved.

Thanks for the suggestions.

Re: Looking for feedback: Free From Sin Teaching - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/8 14:48

bobmuch

I think some of your comments are putting the cart before the horse and show signs of the theology I sometimes call 'justification by sanctification'. This finally works its way out in your conclusion that a single willful sin reconstitutes someone as a child of the devil. How many times can a person dip in and out of the family of God. This is not a life lived in grace but a life lived on a tightrope.

I preach 'freedom from sin' but I find very few points of agreement with your version of things.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 14:48

TaylorOtwell

>>>Could you explain what happened on the cross?

Christ made an atoning sacrifice for our sins and not ours only but for the sins of every person that is living, has lived, and will live. (1Joh 2:2).

>>>Who did Christ make propitiation for, and in what manner?

I noted above who the atoning sacrifice was for but I am not sure what you mean by "what manner"?

>>>Since Isaiah 53:6 seems to speak of individual's sins being laid upon him, I am wondering who those people are, and when/if Jesus took the punishment for those sins on the cross?

These people again would be not only us but every person that is living, has lived, and will live. I would hold that the Bible teaches he paid the price for all sins.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 14:54

ANewInHim:

>>>You can apply all of these scriptures and that is grand, but it is not until the word of God is rooted in you, that your life begins to change. It not until you understand the power (IN) the word of God that your sins are forgiven.

I would hold your life changes when you are born again. 2Co 5:17 Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

While I am not sure what you mean by "the word of God being rooted in you" but if you are holding that it is some period of time to learn the word before old things are passed away and all things are become new I would disagree with that.

I would hold that your sins are forgiven when you have met the new covenant conditions and accept by faith that God has saved you. I am not sure if "understanding the power in the word of God" is a condition of salvation. Did you have a scripture for that one.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 15:24

philologos

>>>I think some of your comments are putting the cart before the horse and show signs of the theology I sometimes call 'justification by sanctification'.

If you feel that way like me ask you a couple of questions. Do you feel like a person needs to bring forth fruits meet for repentance according to Mat 3:8, needs to repent according to Luk 3:13, and needs to have godly sorrow according to 2Co 7:10, to be saved?

>>>This finally works its way out in your conclusion that a single willful sin reconstitutes someone as a child of the devil.

I would base this on 1Joh 3:15 which says "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." It is my understanding that this is the standard Wesleyan-Arminian view point.

>>>How many times can a person dip in and out of the family of God. This is not a life lived in grace but a life lived on a tightrope.

Well a live of grace is not a life and sinning and repenting. Grace is my view is "grace to help in time of need" (Heb 4:16) some thing that makes an allowance for willful sins and repenting.

Living a live of obedience is not one of pleasure for his commandments are not grievous and it is the love of God that we keep his commandments.

I would say living a life of sinning and repenting is living a life on a tight rope never knowing when the Lord will call the whole world into judgment and if he comes on a bad day you would be lost.

>>>I preach 'freedom from sin' but I find very few points of agreement with your version of things.

So would you feel when Paul says in Romans 6 we are "made free from sin (vs16) that is experimental? The Greek verb that is translated made is in the past tense (aorist).

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/8 16:06

Hi Bob,

Thank you for your response.

In light of your response, could you explain how a person whom Jesus has propitiated (historically and eternally, on the cross) for could become a child of the devil, as you suggest in point 9 of your post?

Thanks,
Taylor

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 16:20

TaylorOtwell:

>>>In light of your response, could you explain how a person whom Jesus has propitiated (historically and eternally, on the cross) for could become a child of the devil, as you suggest in point 9 of your post?

Christ make an atoning sacrificed for every person living, who has ever lived, and will live but it is only effectual when the terms of salvation are meet and keep.

When a person gives into the spirit of disobedience and commits sin they have broken the terms and requirements for salvation.

How do you deal with 1Joh 2:15.

Small note. If you hold to the Calvinist or ES/OSAS I have no desire to try to convince you otherwise and have no interest in a back and forth which will not help either of us.

If you have honest questions on my position I don't mind telling you my position but I have no interest what so ever in debate for the sake of debate.

Only God can show a Calvinist or ES/OSAS their doctrinal error.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/8 16:35

Bob,

Thank you for your response.

I still would like to get a little more clarification, if that's ok.

So, since you believe that Jesus made an atoning sacrifice for every person living of all time, would you agree in saying that the Lord propitiated (2000 years ago on the cross) for those sins that you were referring to in point 9 of your original

post? If not, why not?

If the Lord did indeed propitiate for those sins, would you agree that those people will be punished for sins that the Lord Jesus propitiated for, therefore, punishment for those sins would be inflicted on two individuals (Jesus 2000 years ago, and the person in eternal hell)?

If you do not believe Jesus propitiate for those sins, I assume you would believe that Jesus only propitiated for "unwillful" sins?

Thanks,
Taylor

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 16:50

TaylorOtwell

>>>If the Lord did indeed propitiate for those sins, would you agree that those people will be punished for sins that the Lord Jesus propitiated for, therefore, punishment for those sins being inflicted on two individuals (Jesus and the person)?

As I have clearly stated already I would hold the scriptures teach that Jesus was an atoning sacrifice for the sins of all people that have lived, are living, and will live. Also I would hold that most of those people will be lost and punished for their own sins.

>>>If you do not believe Jesus propitiate for those sins, I assume you would believe that Jesus only propitiate for "unwillful" sins?

No, I would hold that Jesus was an atoning sacrifice for all sins.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/8 16:54

Bob,

Thanks for your response.

In light of that response, could you please explain how a person could be eternally punished for sins Jesus propitiated for, since propitiation would mean God's wrath was satisfied in punishing Christ, yet seems to not be satisfied - as the individual is still punished?

Thanks,
taylor

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/8 17:00

Quote:
-----Bob's: In order for a child of God to maintain victory over sin, the flesh, and the world (1Joh 2:15, 16), they must abide in Christ (Joh 15:4-6), in prayer obtain grace to help in time of need (Heb 4:16), be diligence to add the fruits of the Spirit to their life (2Pet 1:4-10)

The trouble with this line of reasoning is that it misses the fundamental relationship between God and the sons and daughters He is bringing unto glory. It is possible for one to say all the right things and check all the boxes and still miss the genuine expression of life in the Spirit. We run the risk of a sort of hybrid religion that is a mix between law and grace. This is what the book of Galatians is about.

It is difficult for some holiness people (I speak now from experience) to understand that God's grace is able to keep us from falling, while at the same time recognizing that if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous and He is the price paid to remove the offense.

So then the basis upon which my relationship with God as His child exists and functions is the blood of Jesus Christ and the perpetual High Priestly office by which He offered Himself once without spot to God and has perfected forever them

which are being sanctified.

Therefore is is of faith that it might be by grace. The basis upon which I am made acceptable to God is the blood of Christ alone. The legal process of my condemnation as a sinner stopped when God declared me righteous based upon my right response to Him (faith).

You will notice that in both of the below passage 'lying' is either stated or implied:

He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. (I John 2:4)

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. (I John 1:8)

So we have the ongoing challenge of understanding that it cannot be one or the other: both statements have to be true in our lives. We do by nature walk in the commandments because love worketh no ill towards his neighbor. But at the same time scripture sobers our lofty thoughts of ourselves by stating clearly that if we say we have not sin- we deceive ourselves. Notice it did not say we deceive 'others'. Others *clearly* see our shortcomings.

So we see then that we have to take the aggregate body of revelation or else we end up believing that my salvation is based upon my performance. If I am sinless in my own eyes then somehow God accepts me on that basis. If not I must swiftly repent and show godly sorrow lest I die quickly and be damned for the last sin I committed. This is nonsense and madness and completely overlooks the Father and child relationship that we now have with God. We simply cannot suggest that we are on the same footing as a sinner when we commit a sin. Proof text?

For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life. (Romans 5:10)

It is not necessary to develop a hair trigger damnation theology in order to fearfully threaten folk into sinless perfection or pains of eternal death. This modus operandi is neither godly nor practical. It leads to absolute despair and shipwreck of faith. One cannot do with such a theology what only God can do by his grace. I believe it is the devil's brand of Christian Perfection that has harmed many good people that desired to please God. I have seen people lose their minds over such doctrines after serving God for 70+ years. Selah.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 22:26

TaylorOtwell:

>>>In light of that response, could you please explain how a person could be eternally punished for sins Jesus propitiated for, since propitiation would mean God's wrath was satisfied in punishing Christ, yet seems to not be satisfied - as the individual is still punished?

As I have noted to you already Taylor, I hold the scriptures teach that Christ was an atoning sacrifice for all of mankind.

With the line of reasoning you are following you have two choices. Limited atonement or universal redemption.

The atoning sacrifice that Christ made has conditionals for it to be effectual for a person and conditionals for it to continue to be effectual for a person. I am willing to provide you with scriptures for this view that I hold if you like.

So instead of asking me the same question 4 times why not just make your point and we can move on. I have no interest in debating any doctrine and certainly not limited atonement.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/8 22:57

RobertW:

>>>It is difficult for some holiness people (I speak now from experience) to understand that God's grace is able to keep us from falling, while at the same time recognizing that if any man sin we have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous and He is the price paid to remove the offense.

I am not sure if you are implying if this is hard for me to understand but if you are I can tell you I have no problem grasping that concept.

First I have no problem about God's grace being able to keep us from falling into willful sin and I certainly have no problem grasping if a Christian blows it and goes back to the vomit and excrement of willful sin that they have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous.

What I would have a problem grasping and hope I never is do is why a person would want to do that or even hold that up as an option.

>>>The basis upon which I am made acceptable to God is the blood of Christ alone.

I fully agree. I hold that the good works that God both works in us to will and to do have no merit what so ever in our right standing with God.

>>>The legal process of my condemnation as a sinner stopped when God declared me righteous based upon my right response to Him (faith).

I think our condemnation as a saint stops when God delivers us out of the power of darkness and translates us into the kingdom of his dear son (Col 1:13) and continues as long as we walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit (Rom 8:1) and don't walk in darkness (1Joh 1:6).

It is my view that the scriptures teach that any one that can commit willful sin and not experience condemnation that they have departed from the faith and have their conscience seared with a hot iron.

>>>If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.

I would hold that this refers to those in verse 3 that John addresses as those that don't have fellowship with him. Those that claim to be free from sin aside from the atoning sacrifice of Christ are deceived and the truth is not in them.

>>>or else we end up believing that my salvation is based upon my performance

I would reject that our salvation is based on our performance. Our salvation is by grace through faith and not of works. At the same time there are conditions to be receive salvation and conditions to keep it.

>>>If I am sinless in my own eyes then somehow God accepts me on that basis.

We all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God. We come to Christ with nothing but a plea for mercy based on the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ. We meet the conditions of godly sorrow and repentance, we believe in our heart on the merits of the death and rising of Jesus and his atoning sacrifice paying for our sins. We confess our sins and by faith believe that God accepts us based on the Word of God.

This is the only way to be accepted by God.

When we have partaken of the divine nature we have escaped the corruption that is in the world though unlawful desires (2Pet 1:4). We stay free from that corruption by the grace of God through faith. Through faith we are kept by the power of God (1Pet 1:5), we stand (2Cor 1:24), we quench all the flaming arrows of the evil (Eph 6:16), and we have victory over the world (1Joh 5:4).

>>>If not I must swiftly repent and show godly sorrow lest I die quickly and be damned for the last sin I committed.

No you must get delivered from the spirit that works in the child of disobedience (Eph 2:2) and hold to the promises of G

od (1Cor 10:13, 2The 3:3, 2Pet 1:10, Jud 1:24) and go and sin no more (Joh 5:14; 8:11).

>>>This is nonsense and madness and completely overlooks the Father and child relationship that we now have with God. We simply cannot suggest that we are on the same footing as a sinner when we commit a sin. Proof text?

1Jn 3:15 Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/9 1:01

Quote:
-----Bob's: We meet the conditions of godly sorrow and repentance, we believe in our heart on the merits of the death and rising of Jesus and his atoning sacrifice paying for our sins. We confess our sins and by faith believe that God accepts us based on the Word of God.

I think we need to stop and distinguish between what we might call 'proof text' salvation and the genuine born again experience. I'm not convinced that what man is looking for in godly sorrow is in fact what God is looking for. God said we must 'confess' or acknowledge our sins. Nathan coming to David to deal with the matter of Uriah was exemplary. God showed us through that situation what He requires. A consciousness that we have sinned against the Lord. When we acknowledge that God will put away our sin.

Truly a sinner must respond rightly to God (faith) when God is dealing with them through the preaching of the word of God. That is, when He (God) is quickening His word to their heart they must respond rightly. Faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the word of God. This is God speaking to the person and when God speaks they *will* hear; how they respond is another matter.

For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel. (1 Cor. 4:15)

Notice again the language 'begotten'. These people were born again. They were no longer in Adam they were in Christ. They were children of God. Truly their nature is to be obedient children. They have been freed from slavery to Sin through the finished work of the cross. The spirit of disobedience is replaced with the Holy Spirit, etc. etc.

However, we still must reckon with:

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. (1 John 1:8)

The personal pronoun 'we' is used repeatedly in 1 John 1. There is no reasonable way to see in my estimation how the 'we' that is referred to all through the passages is suddenly a different 'we' when we get to verse 8.

If we say that we have fellowship with him, and walk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth:

But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.

If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.

The 'we's, 'ourselves, 'us' and other personal pronouns mean what they mean in our times. If 'we' means 'we' in verse 8 then, "we is we".

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/9 7:20

Quote:
----->>>This finally works its way out in your conclusion that a single willful sin reconstitutes someone as a child of the devil.
I would base this on 1Joh 3:15 which says "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him."
It is my understanding that this is the standard Wesleyan-Arminian view point.

Your misconception is caused by your misunderstanding of Greek. This is not a reference to an individual event of a sin but the the continuing character of a 'brother hater'. This is the nominative definite article followed by the present participle and has the sense of 'permanent character'.

You need to do some serious study into the nature of Biblical Greek before you launch into these crusades.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/9 8:54

Quote:
-----As I have noted to you already Taylor, I hold the scriptures teach that Christ was an atoning sacrifice for all of mankind.
With the line of reasoning you are following you have two choices. Limited atonement or universal redemption.
The atoning sacrifice that Christ made has conditionals for it to be effectual for a person and conditionals for it to continue to be effectual for a person. I am willing to provide you with scriptures for this view that I hold if you like.
So instead of asking me the same question 4 times why not just make your point and we can move on. I have no interest in debating any doctrine and certainly not limited atonement.

Bob,
Thank you for your response. The reason I kept asking questions about the atonement, is the **root** issue here is the atonement. I'm trying to get to the foundational assumptions in your thinking on which you have built your premises.
For instance, we read in John 6:35-40 that the Father has given a people to our Lord Jesus to redeem, and that the Lord Jesus will lose none of those people. Now, if you will read the passage, these people were given to Christ even before they came to Christ. And, since they cannot be lost by Christ, it would be impossible for a child of God to become a child of the Devil.

Christ **actually propitiated** for the sins of his people, Bob. He didn't build a bridge half-way across the gulf of sin, which man must complete. Our Lord built a bridge all the way across this horrific gulf between man and God.
We also confess that our Lord is just, and if the Lord Jesus has made propitiation for our sins, in other words, the wrath of God has been poured out upon him for our sins, than we confess that our just Lord will not require double payment for those sins - even men do not require double payment for debts.

Yes, repentance and faith are required for salvation. But, with holy Isaiah, we confess that "all our works God has done for us" (Isaiah 26:12). With holy Paul, we confess that "it is God who works in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Phil 2). With holy James, we confess that "God, of his own will, begat us by the word of truth" (James 1:18). With holy Peter, we have an inheritance "reserved in heaven for us, who are kept by the power of God" (1 Peter 1:3-4). And, we confess with our holy Lord Jesus, that the Father will surely answer his prayer: "I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am" (John 17:24).

And let it never be said that these glorious things are some excuse for sin, for that cannot be proven historically or Biblically. Biblically, we read that God not only justifies his flock, but also sanctifies his flock - giving them a new heart and **causing** (Ezekiel 36:26-27) them to walk in his statutes. Historically, who can lay a charge against the circumspect and godly walk of the Puritans - not to mention the Apostles? All of which confessed these truths.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 9:57

TaylorOtwell:

>>>For instance, we read in John 6:35-40 that the Father has given a people to our Lord Jesus to redeem, and that the Lord Jesus will lose none of those people. Now, if you will read the passage, these people were given to Christ even before they came to Christ. And, since they cannot be lost by Christ, it would be impossible for a child of God to become a child of the Devil.

If you hold to unconditional election that would be the way you would reason thing yes. I reject unconditional election as unbiblical and hold the Bible teaches conditional election.

>>>Christ actually propitiated for the sins of his people, Bob.

I would hold that Christ was an atoning sacrifice for all people as stated. If you choose to hold to limited atonement then that is your choose.

>>>He didn't build a bridge half-way across the gulf of sin, which man must complete. Our Lord built a bridge all the way across this horrific gulf between man and God.

This is nothing new to me Taylor. I hold as does every Wesleyan-Arminian that God with the atoning sacrifice build a bridge from God to man and I would except that you know that. So I am not sure why you would imply that the view I espouse would deny that point. You should feel free to say it is your view that my view denies that point and that is fine with me if you feel that way.

>>>We also confess that our Lord is just, and if the Lord Jesus has made propitiation for our sins, in other words, the wrath of God has been poured out upon him for our sins,

As I have noted before that I hold the scriptures teach that the atoning sacrifice of Christ was for the sins of all mankind not just for a select few. But it has conditionals for it to be effectual for a person and conditionals for it to continue to be effectual for a person.

>>>than we confess that our just Lord will not require double payment for those sins - even men do not require double payment for debts.

Well we could get into what justice men does and don't require and the justice of God by discussing how Calvin's God refuses to enable the majority of mankind to come to him but still damns them to hell for not coming. But I have learned a long time ago that there is little fruit in going over such issue. If you have time to argue it I suggest you take your time and use it well by reading Fletcher's checks.

>>>Historically, who can lay a charge against the circumspect and godly walk of the Puritans - not to mention the Apostles?

While I will allow there were many godly Puritans I reject the system of Calvinist them espoused. Both systems have had there godly leaders. Who can lay a charge against the godly walk of Wesley, Clarke, Fletcher and many others. This doesn't make them right or wrong in there doctrine.

As stated before TaylorOtwell I am looking for feed back on some article I have written. I have no interest in a Calvinism Wesleyanism debate or discussion.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 10:02

philologos:

>>>Your misconception is caused by your misunderstanding of Greek. This is not a reference to an individual event of a sin but the the continuing character of a 'brother hater'. This is the nominative definite article followed by the present participle and has the sense of 'permanent character'.

Thank you for making this point. I will be looking into this and will try to get back to you. These are the kind of points I am looking for. Thanks!

>>>You need to do some serious study into the nature of Biblical Greek before you launch into these crusades.

As noted in the original post I am looking for feedback on the articles position. The best way to do this is to put it out before educated people that can point out flaws in my position, reasoning, and how I am translating the original languages. Thanks again for this point.

Do you see any other objections you can make against the article?

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/9 10:06

Quote:
-----As stated before TaylorOtwell I am looking for feed back on some article I have written. I have no interest in a Calvinism Wesleyanism debate or discussion.

But, your article necessitates a discussion on this topic, Bob, because that is the root issue of your assumptions.

Quote:
-----If you hold to unconditional election that would be the way you would reason thing yes. I reject unconditional election as unbiblical and hold the Bible teaches conditional election.

Then, could you support your claims by providing an exegesis of John 6:35-40?

- Taylor

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 13:27

RobertW:

>>>>I'm not convinced that what man is looking for in godly sorrow is in fact what God is looking for.

Well God has left us the record by Paul that godly sorrow works repentance. So why you may not be convinced what man is looking for in godly sorrow may not be what God is looking for I am convinced that God requires godly sorrow.

The idea that are person can come to God and repent (change of mind, attitude, and direction as relates to sin) and not have godly sorrow is impossible.

>>>A consciousness that we have sinned against the Lord. When we acknowledge that God will put away our sin.

Under the new covenant I would hold that repentance is much more than a consciousness and acknowledge that a person has sinned. We must bring forth fruits befitting of repentance.

>>>Notice again the language 'begotten'. These people were born again.

I am not sure what your point was here unless you are referring to the many problems in this congregation?

>>>However, we still must reckon with:

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. (I John 1:8)

The personal pronoun 'we' is used repeatedly in I John 1. There is no reasonable way to see in my estimation how the we that is referred to all through the passages is suddenly a different 'we' when we get to verse 8.

The we's, ourselves, 'us' and other personal pronouns mean what they mean in our times. If we means we in verse 8 then, "we is we".

There are difficult scriptures like this else where. We find a similar issue in Roman's 7 where in vs 14 Paul moves from aorist to the present tense and uses "I" 27 times, "me" 7 times and "my" and "myself" 5 times.

In Mantey's Manual Grammar we are told that "The present tense is thus employed when a past event is viewed with the vividness of a present occurrence." Many may not accept this position as it will disagree with their doctrinal position. However the position is supported by Greek grammar.

Historically Wesleyan teachers have dealt with this scripture in two different ways. JFB applies it to the carnal sin nature while JWN applies it to those that before they are saved hold they have no sin to be cleansed from.

I will try to post more on this to you a bit later Lord willing.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 13:33

TaylorOtwell:

>>>But, your article necessitates a discussion on this topic, Bob, because that is the root issue of your assumptions.

I am sorry Taylor but I am going to pass on this. I have made 5 posts that have basically all said the same thing to almost the same question.

If you feel like you need to make a statement or point on limited atonement feel free to do so but I am not really interested in seeing this thread be hijacked to discuss limited atonement.

If you feel the need perhaps you should open up a thread on limited atonement and take quotes from my post to point out what you feel like are misapplied scriptural principles and Lord willing I might make a comment.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/9 13:35

Fair enough. May the discerning reader judge what is the truth that accords with godliness, by God's grace.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/9 14:04

Quote:
-----Well God has left us the record by Paul that godly sorrow works repentance. So why you may not be convinced what man is looking for in godly sorrow may not be what God is looking for I am convinced that God requires godly sorrow.

But what does godly sorrow look like and what is the measure by which man can look on the outward and determine whether a person has come to 'godly' sorrow? If I go by what I see I may preach repentance and possibly hell fire because certain individuals have not attained to my concept of what godly sorrow ought to look like. This is a terrible danger.

Quote:
-----Under the new covenant I would hold that repentance is much more than a consciousness and acknowledge that a person has sinned. We must bring forth fruits befitting of repentance.

I agree. However, I insist that we allow God to be the judge as to what He requires as the fruits of repentance. He puts His finger on things that are often totally disjointed from what we traditionally think a person should be repenting of. We have

ve our 'list' but is it God's list? Typically ours include outward things when God is looking much deeper and turning the heart on a level that may not entertain the prospective repentance inspector.

Quote:
-----In Mantey's Manual Grammar we are told that "The present tense is thus employed when a past event is viewed with the vividness of a present occurrence." Many may not accept this position as it will disagree with there doctrinal position. However the position is supported by Greek grammar.

I am still not convinced. I have no doctrine to defend other than to dismiss sinless perfection and salvation by sanctification. The plain sense of the context is that in I John 1 is that the 'We' is 'Us'. The 'we' cannot be some sinner that has rejected Christ. They or your may well be appropriate pronouns to describe someone else, but I would never say 'we' and not include myself in the communication. If the Holy Spirit meant 'they' or 'you' or 'your' He would have used those terms. They surely would have dismissed any confusion and stated with certainty that sinners are the intended audience of that verse. God is not the author of confusion. He says precisely what He means.

I am fairly comfortable with Wesley's Entire Sanctification; but even Wesley held views that lent towards despair. So we must understand Christian Perfection in light of the grace of God. We simply cannot have a Finney type view of salvation and a Wesley type view of perfection at the same time.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/9 14:17

Quote:
-----Under the new covenant I would hold that repentance is much more than a consciousness and acknowledge that a person has sinned. We must bring forth fruits befitting of repentance.

You are confusing causes with effects. The fact that we have such a phrase as 'fruits of repentance' shows that repentance and its fruits are not the same thing.

You have missed a key element of the doctrine of justification, namely that God 'justifies the ungodly'. Take a look at Ezekiel 16 and particularly the position of the word 'then in v 9'. You will see that cleansing follows acceptance and is not a precondition to it.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 16:13

philologos:

>>>You are confusing causes with effects.

Not at all. Godly sorrow works repentance unto salvation. Where have I confused causes and effects. Godly sorrow and repentance bring about salvation.

>>>The fact that we have such a phrase as 'fruits of repentance' shows that repentance and its fruits are not the same thing.

I believe the phrase is "fruits repentance.

And I would agree that fruits meet for repentance and repentance are difference things.

>>>You have missed a key element of the doctrine of justification, namely that God 'justifies the ungodly'.

Are you inferring I don't hold that or that I should have put that in as a point or just what do you mean by your above statement.

>>>Take a look at Ezekiel 16 and particularly the position of the word 'then in v 9'. You will see that cleansing follows acceptance and is not a precondition to it.

For new covenant repentance salvation I would be inclined to use new covenant examples and scriptures referring to new covenant repentance and salvation as there is a clear difference between the old covenant and new covenant salvation.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/9 16:43

Quote:
-----For new covenant repentance salvation I would be inclined to use new covenant examples and scriptures referring to new covenant repentance and salvation as there is a clear difference between the old covenant and new covenant salvation.

I am not confusing the Covenants but God Himself does not change. God's heart is to forgive and to cleanse... in that order.

You suggested I think that others have described your teaching as legalistic; on the evidence of your posts so far I can why they would do so.

I am not arguing for sin in the life of the regenerate, In fact on these pages I usually find myself on the other side of the argument but the whole weight of your posts leans towards a salvation that is based on righteousness rather than a salvation which first imputes and then imparts righteousness.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/9 16:57

Quote:
-----as there is a clear difference between the old covenant and new covenant salvation.

Hmm, I'm not so sure about this. Seems more like radical dispensationalism to me.

Believers (Old and New Covenant) are all justified by grace through faith in the Christ.

Could you provide Scriptural proof for this?

-- Taylor

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/9 17:06

Justification is the same in both covenants but the New Covenant is the 'better' covenant based on better promises with a better mediator. Romans 5 has a few 'much more' passages which are the distinctives of the New Covenant.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 17:41

philologos:
>>>I am not confusing the Covenants but God Himself does not change. God's heart is to forgive and to cleanse... in that order.

Well I don't think I implied God himself changes. The Word however is very clear he changes the way he does things and certainly there is a huge change between the old covenant and the new covenant.

Old Covenant was replaced with a better covenant (Heb 7:22), that has better promises (Heb 8:6), that has a better priesthood (Heb 7:12), with a better hope (Heb 7:19).

The Spirit of life in Christ set the converted free from the law of sin (Rom 8:2), as the law was weak and couldn't deliver (Rom 8:3). We that are converted are freed from all the things which they couldn't be freed from under the law (Act 13:39).

>>>but the whole weight of your posts leans towards a salvation that is based on righteousness rather than a salvation which first imputes and then imparts righteousness.

Not at all. I hold to a salvation that imputes and imparts righteousness at the same time. One that delivers people out of the bondage of the Romans 7 experience and sets them free from the bondage of committing sin.

And not only do I hold to it but I have by the grace of God experienced it.

>>>Justification is the same in both covenants but the New Covenant is the 'better' covenant based on better promises with a better mediator. Romans 5 has a few 'much more' passages which are the distinctives of the New Covenant.

While the legal standing of justification is the same under the new covenant as the old covenant, people under the old covenant were only justified and left in the Romans 7 experience and were not born again as people are now under the new covenant.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 17:48

TaylorOtwell

>>>Hmm, I'm not so sure about this. Seems more like radical dispensationalism to me. Believers (Old and New Covenant) are all justified by grace through faith in the Christ.

Well I am not a dispensationalist as far as being a pre-mill dispensationalist but I clearly believe in the dispensation of the old covenant and the dispensation of the new covenant.

>Could you provide Scriptural proof for this?

Let me just repost what I posted to our brother that is giving me Greek lessons.

Old Covenant was replaced with a better covenant (Heb 7:22), that has better promises (Heb 8:6), that has a better priesthood (Heb 7:12), with a better hope (Heb 7:19).

The Spirit of life in Christ set the converted free from the law of sin (Rom 8:2), as the law was weak and couldn't deliver (Rom 8:3). We that are converted are freed from all the things which they couldn't be freed from under the law (Act 13:39).

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/9 19:33

Quote:
-----While the legal standing of justification is the same under the new covenant as the old covenant, people under the old covenant were only justified and left in the Romans 7 experience and were not born again as people are now under the new covenant.

Most of what you have said I agree with in your posts. Where we differ is on the grounds of justification. I affirm that Romans systematically demonstrates the order in which salvation takes place. Clearly justification is dealt with first.

As we comprehend the riches of the finished work of the cross we must keep justification by faith front and center. If we shift into a performance based acceptance with God we are in great danger. This is particularly true as we press towards perfection. Such tends to lead to constant introspection.

What complicates the matter is that so-called sins of the heart (as you alluded to a few times concerning hating a brother) are seen in our lives based on the most trivial of facts and biblical proof texts. This is exacerbated by an evangelistic approach that flushes out any trace of compromise in an attempt to show a sinner their sins.

Now, imagine trying to maintain a pure conscience once you have mastered the craft of flushing out sinners from behind every bush (as C.G. Finney would say). You could not hide from yourself nor your own critical eye and would ultimately become your own accuser in even the most trivial of affairs damning yourself to enemy of God status. This is the fertile ground upon which legalism and bondage takes root and ensnares its victims.

The consequences? When things go well and victory is on the right hand and the left a sense of acceptance with God based on that victory develops. The sad reality is, for many, this is the basis upon which their assurance rests. If they are in perfection- they feel as though God loves them; if they are in compromise, they believe God hates them.

This is why justification by faith must be preached as strongly as Paul preached it. To shift the PH level of the Gospel away from grace and towards law is to scald the minds and hearts of men with a misrepresentation of the New Covenant. RARELY have I found a minister that has justification and sanctification in their proper biblical balance.

And this is why I believe God has passed by many of preacher that prayed and fasted their whole life for Revival. God refused to authenticate their unbalanced and unbiblical version of the New Covenant with an out pouring of the Spirit.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 20:41

RobertW:

>>>But what does godly sorrow look like and what is the measure by which man can look on the outward and determine whether a person has come to 'godly' sorrow?

I think when a sinner feels godly sorrow they know it. They are sorry for their sins. It is not up to man to dictate what godly sorrow is for each person but we must advise those that we call to salvation that there must be sorrow for their sins.

>>>If I go by what I see I may preach repentance and possibly hell fire because certain individuals have not attained to my concept of what godly sorrow ought to look like. This is a terrible danger.

It is not our place to dictate how and what is sorry. People have different make ups one can cry profusely at the prayer bench and only have worldly sorrow. Another can be dry eyed and have deep godly sorrow. It is not for us to vet a person's godly sorrow it is for us to tell them that the Word of call requires that they are sorry after a godly sort for their sins.

>>>However, I insist that we allow God to be the judge as to what He requires as the fruits of repentance.

Amen!

>>>We have our 'list' but is it God's list?

My friend I have no list. I leave that up to God.

>>>I am still not convinced. I have no doctrine to defend other than to dismiss sinless perfection and salvation by sanctification.

I never use the term sinless perfection and it seems to mean something different for each person.

Here is what it says in FST in the glossary.

This definition is found on page 589.

"SINLESS PERFECTION: a theological view that holds that a believer can 'arrive' at a state in which (1.) his walk in obedience and holiness is not dependant on the Grace of God, and that (2.) he no longer has the ability to sin. Finney rejected this view entirely."

I have a short article on Sinless Perfection. I like to use the term "free from sin" teaching. That is a Biblical term.

I also reject salvation by sanctification.

>>>The plain sense of the context is that in I John 1 is that the 'We' is 'Us'.

I have not had time to follow up on a proper explanation on that and will try with the help of the Lord to get back to you on that one Lord willing.

>>>He says precisely what He means.

Right that is what the Mormons say about baptism for the dead.

1Co 15:29 Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they then baptized for the dead?

We both know there are lots of Scriptures that are not cut and dry and need to be interpenetrated.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 20:56

RobertW:

>>>I affirm that Romans systematically demonstrates the order in which salvation takes place. Clearly justification is dealt with first.

Again I agree!

>>>If we shift into a performance based acceptance with God we are in great danger.

There should be no shifting just putting forth what the Word teaches. Fruit befitting for repentant, godly sorrow, repentance.

>>>You could not hide from yourself nor your own critical eye and would ultimately become your own accuser in even the most trivial of affairs damning yourself to enemy of God status.

I have never had this problem. I have a tender conscience but I don't give room for the accusations of the devil. So I am not really sure what you are talking about here. Please explain further.

>>>This is the fertile ground upon which legalism and bondage takes root and ensnares its victims.

Give me a definition of legalism please. I would hold that it is an over emphasis of rules that can only be supported by "Bible principle".

Do this, don't do that, can't you read the signs kind of teaching.

And then worse yet being coming smug about all your good rules and casting a critical eye toward those that don't have all the "light and understanding" that you do. I reject this type of spirit.

>>>The sad reality is, for many, this is the basis upon which their assurance rests. If they are in perfection- they feel as though God loves them; if they are in compromise, they believe God hates them.

If we fall into compromise we should be concerned. Look at the many warnings in the Word for those that fall back. While our assurance shouldn't rest on the good works God works in us to will and to do we do need to be alarmed in our spirit when we grow lazy and cold toward the things of God.

>>>This is why justification by faith must be preached as strongly as Paul preached it. To shift the PH level of the Gospel away from grace and towards law is to scald the minds and hearts of men with a misrepresentation of the New Covenant.

I am all for the preaching of keeping the law but not the old covenant law the ministration of condemnation (2Cor 3:9). Let us hold Christians to the keeping of the new covenant perfect law of liberty and the two greatest commandments.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/9 22:15

Quote:
-----Robert:You could not hide from yourself nor your own critical eye and would ultimately become your own accuser in even the most rival of affairs damning yourself to enemy of God status.

Bob:I have never had this problem. I have a tender conscience but I don't give room for the accusations of the devil. So I am not really sure what you are talking about here. Please explain further.

There is a danger to becoming preoccupied with self-examination. There is also a danger that we lose sight of how God's still loves us in spite of our failures and sins. But (and I can say from experience) that constant evangelistic emphasis of exposing peoples shortcomings in preaching- coupled with hard preaching on God's judgment- leads to ultimate despair.

I am becoming more and more convinced that in our attempt to balance an easy-believism 'Gospel' we have in some circles shifted too far from God's grace and mercy. Surely there is an assurance that a child of God can rest in.

Warnings? I suppose I have been sure to memorize all of those (almost) and live in them; but the life I have lived has been an overshadow of death. Can I really know the true nature of God living in constant godly sorrow? The fact is any given preacher can expose an area of our lives that needs correction. As I recall, and unless I misunderstood, one minister said at the conference that if we did not have a devotion daily we were backslidden (to that effect). Can that be true? I didn't talk to my wife for 8 days when I was in the UK, but by e-mail when possible. Did that mean I did not love her or somehow my heart was turned from her?

You see, when men offer up the commandments of men as the laws of God (based on their so-called spiritual principals and matters of the heart, etc.) and couple *that* with Christian perfection and then add the dreadful salvation by sanctification you end up with a misery of unfathomable proportions in the life of a believer. No joy. No peace. In fact, they had more peace as a sinner in many cases. Why? Because at least as a sinner they didn't have a steady dose of accusations about their shortcomings.

The truth is the Holy Spirit is supposed to be bringing the word of God to our hearts. But men have lost sight of this and take up the word of God as a machete to hack away at the Saints and sinners. But God intended for the word of His grace to be in the mouths of the people and the ministers speaking the heart of God- in the Spirit and nature of Christ. Yet men will seek to work the righteousness of God from their finite minds and prejudices. God help us. God save us from our selves!

Legalism is simply anything that men put on other men in the name of God and apart from God's direction. It exists and thrives in atmospheres where men are not seeking to be utterly sensitive to the Holy Spirit when they speak- and with an eye on I Cor. 13. In their hands the word of God is the sword of men. The pharisees could prove a false doctrine from scripture; but what is Christ saying right now to the churches? What is He saying to me?

It is high time that we inquire of the Lord who walk in the midst of the lampstands. We need the Oracle's of God in our midst that speak into our lives and bring LIFE! All of men's strategies and methods fail miserably trying to work out in us *what only a fresh word from God can do*.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/9 22:30

Quote:
-----I am all for the preaching of keeping the law but not the old covenant law the ministration of condemnation (2Cor 3:9). Let us hold Christians to the keeping of the new covenant perfect law of liberty and the two greatest commandments.

Yea, let us who *having begun in the Spirit* know we cannot be made perfect by the flesh. Let us consider so as not to incur the anathema of Galatians 1. May we understand that this walk is spiritual and requires the ongoing empowerment of the Holy Spirit in a real and verifiable way.

Let us go on unto perfection, but not by constantly laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works and faith towards God. Let us that have begun in the Spirit also walk in the Spirit. And in so doing we will not make void the Law, yea, we establish the law.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/9 23:10

RobertW:

>>>There is a danger to becoming preoccupied with self-examination. There is also a danger that we lose sight of how God's still loves us in spite of our failures and sins. But (and I can say from experience) that constant evangelistic emphasis of exposing peoples shortcomings in preaching- coupled with hard preaching on God's judgment- leads to ultimate despair.

Really Robert you see danger everywhere. Danger in self-examination, danger in telling people the requirements of salvation, danger in telling people they must have godly sorrow, danger of teaching people that fruits befitting of repentance are a Bible requirement, danger of proof texting salvation, danger in missing the life in the Spirit. Is there any thing you don't see a danger in.

How about the danger of not telling people what the Word of God says about the conditions of obtaining and retaining salvation.

You seem to be like Chicken Little who thinks the sky about to fall everywhere.

The Bible tells us to examine ourselves to see if we are in the faith (2Cor 13:5).

I don't know Robert you seem to see boogie men every where. I am starting to wonder what kind of life experiences you have had. Have you seen a lot of this stuff going on?

>>>I am becoming more and more convinced that in our attempt to balance an easy-believism 'Gospel' we have in some circles shifted too far from God's grace and mercy.

Well everywhere I see people pushing easy-believism. I guess you must be being exposed to misuse.

>>>Can I really know the true nature of God living in constant godly sorrow?

I am not show who you are reading. Where did I say a person should live in constant godly sorrow. I said that godly sorrow is a condition to be saved. Not a condition one must live in to be saved. I think perhaps you are on a different page that I am on.

>>>As I recall, and unless I misunderstood, one minister said at the conference that if we did not have a devotion daily we were backslidden (to that effect).

Well that to total over-preach. Now we are talking about legalism, over-preaching, and some one behind a pulpit that shouldn't be there.

Who hasn't missed their daily devotions at some point.

>>>Can that be true? I didn't talk to my wife for 8 days when I was in the UK, but by e-mail when possible. Did that mean I did not love her or somehow my heart was turned from her?

LOL of course not but I do require my wife to call me twice a week when she goes to campmeeting.

What kind of a group you spending time with any way.

>>>You see, when men offer up the commandments of men as the laws of God (based on their so-called spiritual principles)

pals and matters of the heart, etc.) and couple that with Christian perfection and then add the dreadful salvation by sanctification you end up with a misery of unfathomable proportions in the life of a believer. No joy. No peace. In fact, they had more peace as a sinner in many cases. Why? Because at least as a sinner they didn't have a steady dose of accusations about their shortcomings.

Well I can tell you Robert that is not what I am involved in or ever have been.

>>>The truth is the Holy Spirit is supposed to be bringing the word of God to our hearts. But men have lost sight of this and take up the word of God as a machete to hack away at the Saints and sinners.

Shame on them.

>>>But God intended for the word of His grace to be in the mouths of the people and the ministers speaking the heart of God- in the Spirit and nature of Christ. Yet men will seek to work the righteousness of God from their finite minds and prejudices. God help us. God save us from ourselves!

It doesn't sound good where you are at.

>>>Legalism is simply anything that men put on other men in the name of God and apart from God's direction. It exists and thrives in atmospheres where men are not seeking to be utterly sensitive to the Holy Spirit when they speak- and with an eye on I Cor. 13. In their hands the word of God is the sword of men.

Sound like to me you are being beaten by Babel's lords. Might be time to come up and be separate.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2008/12/10 3:14

Quote:
-----While the legal standing of justification is the same under the new covenant as the old covenant, people under the old covenant were only justified and left in the Romans 7 experience and were not born again as people are now under the new covenant.

What you need to do is to distinguish, not divide, between justification and regeneration. They may be synchronized but they are not synonymous; they each present a different image of God's dealings with men and women.

Although this thread has widened my initial involvement was because you were implying that a single infraction jeopardized salvation. Is this your position?

Re: Chicken Little? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 5:01

Quote:
-----I don't know Robert you seem to see boggy men every where. I am starting to wonder what kind of life experiences you have had. Have you seen a lot of this stuff going on?

In my circles these types of things have almost ruled the day for decades. Almost everything you talk about I have taught and preached with more zeal than my fathers. In fact, you only need listen to (<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/viewcat.php?cid306>) one of my messages to hear the word of repentance. I have not changed in my views of all these essential truths.

However, this is not what we are talking about at all. The 'danger' I keep referring to is preaching all of these things with a Finney view of justification and assurance. He believed and taught that saints are on the same ground as sinners when they sin. He then reserved the right to define sin. When I read your works I hear Charles Finney. I have a keen ear for it. I guess I ought to (lectures on revival, been on an Oberlin grave visitation pilgrimage, etc.).

Bob, do you salt your food? Do you eat for pleasure? You don't have to answer me, just think about it. Finney would have called you a sinner and to repentance for it. I dare say that very very few people would enter heaven if Finney's criteria were

ere used as the standard. Where I'm from smokers are at risk for eternal damnation. In fact, I have heard it said that if a person were traveling at 60 MPH willingly in a 55 mph zone and were suddenly killed they would go to hell for not obeying the laws of the land.

Moreover, most people I know never feel a sense that God really loves them. And the reason why is your first article. That is theology they have lived by for decades. This is the religion that has been passed down to them. Holiness or hell type preaching that says that if you give 8% as the tithe of your gross salary; you are tipping God and might just go to hell for it.

Quote:

-----Well everywhere I see people pushing easy-believism. I guess you must be being exposed to misuse.

So you admit that this is the motivation for your caustic Gospel? And, yes, I have been exposed to a type of assurance-less salvation that you teach my whole life. God had to deliver me from it. In fact, just a few weeks ago. It's the first real peace I have known in my life.

Quote:

-----I am not show who you are reading. Where did I say a person should live in constant godly sorrow. I said that godly sorrow is a condition to be saved. Not a condition one must live in to be saved. I think perhaps you are on a different page that I am on.

Bob, trust me, if you are not careful what I am describing will be the natural consequence of your teaching whether you intend it or not.

Quote:

-----Sound like to me you are being beaten by Babel's lords. Might be time to come up and be separate.

Revivalism theology seeks to keep a person in fear of their salvation at all times in order to induce what the revivalist believes is 'godly sorrow'. I submit that if it were a godly sorrow then God would have come and bound up the wounds. But because the revivalist is taking the people by the hand with one hand on the ARK of God, their experience is probably the highest form of abuse.

Quote:

-----What kind of a group you spending time with any way.

Well, mainly folk who have been influenced by Finney and view it their job to help God bring them to godly sorrow and repentance. I have spent time with people that believe they are one sin away from damnation based on a similar line of salvation theology to yours. And at the risk of you thinking I'm a nut case and others reading this thinking I'm antinomian, etc.

I have tried to share with you the natural consequence of a theology that ties justification to sanctification. When you preach the Gospel, what profit is there in distilling the severe and demanding elements of the Gospel (as it were) from the mercy and grace of God? They have to go together as a unit or it is not the Gospel, it is abuse.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 6:08

Just to be sure I am not misunderstanding you Bob I gave a look at your blog. ;-) I pulled out this one entry (<http://morechristlike.com/spiritual-death/>) Sinning Brings Spiritual Death. In this blog you equate Eve's Sin with our sin. Error begets error. This is probably a place to start looking at your soteriology.

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (Romans 5:12)

This is Sin the dynamic. This is Sin the 'root' entering into Adam and consequently all that are in Adam. He stood in the beginning as the head of the human race. His actions would have consequences that my sin or your sin could not possibly have.

For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.(I Cor. 15)

And because Adam fell and became corrupt, all of the generations are born in Adam (Genesis 5), but to be born again is to be in Christ into the generation of Jesus Christ (Matthew 1:1). Children of slaves are the property of their masters. We are all born 'children of Adam' and hence are all born slaves to sin. When we are born again we become slaves to Christ

For when you were the slaves of sin, you were free from righteousness.

What fruit did you have then in those things of which you are now ashamed? For the end of those things is death.

But now, being made free from sin, and having become slaves to God, you have your fruit to holiness, and the end everlasting life. (Romans 6)

As slaves to God, what prevents 'spiritual death' when a believer sins? Can regeneration be 'undone' by a single sin? No to the regeneration of scripture. Finney's could be because it was not biblical regeneration; it was philosophical regeneration.

Answer? It is the priesthood and eternal sacrifice of Christ our advocate. Adam had no priestly construct on which to atone for His sins and consequently his fellowship with God was cut off and so also for all of those that are in him that have not entered into covenant with God. But we have entered into the New Covenant that are born again. That New Covenant is better than the old in many respects. It contains the promise of an utterly changed creature while at the same time providing an atonement to make possible ongoing fellowship as God is bring us into ever increasing glory.

Scripture plainly teaches that sin entered and death by sin. BOTH Adam and Christ held authority on a level no other human being has held. They could pass on their *nature* to their progeny. Adam enjoined the human race to Sin. Jesus Christ is the great baptizer in the Holy Spirit enjoining us to Him and all that His nature is.

And this is the great error of Finney. He neither believed in Original Sin (original pollution) nor in penal substitution. He also rejected imputed righteousness. He did not believe sin or righteousness could be imputed. This effected his view of the atonement that reduced Christ's death to a mere demonstration of God's anger at sin designed to satisfy public justice and bring respect for His laws. This is utterly unbiblical and dangerous (I suppose at risk I will keep pointing out the dangers).

Error begets more error. My sin does not carry the same consequences as Adam's sin *for me* because I am in covenant with God that is maintained by an atoning sacrificial system (i.e. the New Covenant and the High Priestly office and sacrifice of Christ).

Finney's theology is such that taken to its final conclusion Jesus Christ did not need to die for our sins. He believed God forgave based upon His mercy at the time of asking. Though God does forgive when we confess our sins, etc., his view of the atonement and Christ's sacrificial death is borderlining on blasphemy if not full-on blasphemy.

It is this fundamental misunderstanding that kept Finney from appreciating what God had done through the cross of Christ. This is Finney's version of Christian perfection. It has no real construct for maintaining the relationship when a sin is committed other than to come through godly sorrow and be broken down and mellowed again. All the while the wrath of God looms overhead.

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. (Hebrews 10)

The Gospel cannot be preached unless we include what I have underlined and preach it with the same fervor as we do the sinless aspects.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 9:51

philologos:

>>>What you need to do is to distinguish, not divide, between justification and regeneration. They may be synchronized but they are not synonymous; they each present a different image of God's dealings with men and women.

Clear I have noted that they are not synonymous and I have clearly distinguished between the two already in this thread but let me make that distinction again.

I would hold that the Bible teaches justification and regeneration happen at the same time. Justification is the legal standing before God or what God does for a person. Regeneration is the change that is made in a person and is what God does to us.

>>>because you were implying that a single infraction jeopardized salvation. Is this your position?

Yes I would hold if a person go out and commits adultery the wrath of God abides on them and if they would die without having godly sorrow and repenting for that sin they would be lost.

Some thoughts on Godly Sorrow - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 9:58

We have an example of Godly sorrow in the life of David in the matter of Uriah the Hittite. You will recall that David went to great lengths to cover his sin from the eyes of the people. He tried to bait Uriah to Bathsheeba and when that did not work he calculated a move by which he could assume Uriah's wife at his death. If the plan worked, David's sin may in fact gain the praise of men. For he had taken and comforted the grieving wife to himself to take care of her in Uriah's stead.

But when God put His finger on David at first David was angry. He could not see himself in Nathan's story. But when he did see Himself- his reaction is quite telling:

And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the LORD. And Nathan said unto David, The LORD also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die. (1 Samuel 12)

Here David acknowledged his sin. But more than that he started into a process by which he left off trying to fool men and focused on what He had done before God. It was almost as if what people thought about him no longer mattered. He could almost care less what people knew; now it was between him and God. I submit that this is a classic course that those that sin follow. The first reaction is to destroy evidence. This attitude demonstrates a fear of man and an esteem for their opinions that is unreasonable; but it is quite common.

In time David had a time of reflection. And this is what I think godly sorrow is; it is sorrow 'God-wards'. Almost as if we could care less what everyone else thinks. We could care less about what we have done to our reputation. We concern ourselves with what we have done to God and His reputation. What was David's answer?

Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest. (Psalm 51)

Let God be true and every man a liar. The focus, I think, is on the word 'let'. We need to allow God to be true. We need not to make excuses. We need not to try to justify ourselves. God is a God of tender mercies and there is no reason to maintain the denial or justification. Just 'let God be true'. And when we acknowledge that we have sinned we affirm the truth of His commandment and the reality of His willingness to forgive. To make excuses is to leave the impression that we serve a harsh and reluctant God. "I have SINNED against the Lord." others were involved, but *against thee only have I done this evil*. And in so doing may we blind ourselves to the opinions of men and focus on God alone.

This is why I think it is dangerous to look for evidence of repentance if we don't know what to look for. I'll tell you what I look for- it's an attitude that says, "I don't care what everyone thinks about me or what I have done, *I have sinned against the Lord* and He is the primary offended party. To dunge with my reputation!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 10:00

Quote:
-----Yes I would hold if a person go out and commits adultery

What if their last act in this life was to look with lust?

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 10:18

RobertW:
>>>He believed and taught that saints are on the same ground as sinners when they sin.

Finney taught that Christians that sinned were still Christians.

>>>When I read your works I hear Charles Finney.

Not at all. You need to read more of Fletcher, Clarke, and Wesley.

>>>Bob, do you salt you food? Do you eat for pleasure? You don't have to answer me, just think about it. Finney would have called you a sinner and to repentance for it.

Finney didn't teach that salting your food was sin. Now it would depend on what you mean by "eat for pleasure" on whether he could consider that sinful.

I am in no shape of the word a Finneyite.

>>>Where I'm from smokers are at risk for eternal damnation.

I would hope at least they would teach that truth.

>>>In fact, I have heard it said that if a person were traveling at 60 MPH willingly in a 55 mph zone and were suddenly ki

lled they would go to hell for not obeying the laws of the land.

I think that is wrong to teach that.

>>>Moreover, most people I know never feel a sense that God really loves them.

I feel the love of God every day. I have a love relationship with the Lord.

>>>Holiness or hell type preaching that says that if you give 8% as the tithe of your gross salary; you are tipping God and might just go to hell for it.

We must give the Lord 100%. The OT tithe was 23% or 33% not 10% (10% to the priesthood, 10% to the poor every third year, 10% to the King, and some think there is a 3rd 10% in there). And that is not counting the first of the herd and all the sin sacrifices etc.

Sounds like you are under legalism.

>>>So you admit that this is the motivation for your caustic Gospel?

Not at all. Please don't put words in my mouth.

>>>And, yes, I have been exposed to a type of assurance-less salvation that you teach my whole life.

I am sorry Sir I don't teach an assurance-less salvation. I have full assurance of my salvation.

>>>It's the first real peace I have known in my life.

Lord have mercy! And you are preaching to others. Unbelievable.

>>>Revivalism theology seeks to keep a person in fear of their salvation at all times in order to induce what the revivalist believes is 'godly sorrow'.

How different from what Wesley taught and his disciples experienced. Perfect love casts out fear. To me God is my friend that I go around the house talking to. While I have reverence toward God I don't fear him nor have I ever been under fear except when I have been in sin making bricks for the devil.

Godly sorrow is what people need to have when they come to Christ for salvation.

>>>But because the revivalist is taking the people by the hand with one hand on the ARK of God, their experience is probably the highest form of abuse.

And you have been involved in preaching this for how long?

>>>I have spent time with people that believe they are one sin away from damnation based on a similar line of salvation theology to yours.

Well we are all one sin away from damnation and this should work a carefulness in us. But keep in mind that perfect love casts out all fear.

We have wonderful promises in the Word of God's keeping power. 1Cor 10:13, 2The 3:3, 2Pet 1:10, Jud 1:24.

>>>I have tried to share with you the natural consequence of a theology that ties justification to sanctification.

Again I don't tie justification to sanctification. Perhaps you are referring to what you used to teach. But you started off with saying I do this so here I will deny it again just in case.

Sanctification is defined by the Wesleyan as a growth in grace and when entire or wholly is put in front of the word a 2nd work of grace where the heart is purified from the Adamic nature and the Holy Spirit that was with you is not within you.

Justification is our legal standing with God when we get saved.

Here is a couple of articles on the Promise of the spirit that will clarify this.

Promise of the Holy Spirit
What the Promise of the Holy Spirit Does

>>>When you preach the Gospel, what profit is there in distilling the severe and demanding elements of the Gospel (as it were) from the mercy and grace of God?

I don't understand what you mean here. Please clarify.

>>>I submit that this is a classic course that those that sin follow. The first reaction is to destroy evidence. This attitude demonstrates a fear of man and an esteem for their opinions that is unreasonable; but it is quite common.

This is the reaction of a religious hypocrite and we know what Jesus said about religious hypocrites.

>>>And this is what I think godly sorrow is; it is sorrow 'God-wards'. Almost as if we could care less what everyone else thinks.

Well godly sorrow works repentance unto salvation where worldly sorrow works death (2Cor 10:7).

>>>This is why I think it is dangerous to look for evidence of repentance if we don't know what to look for.

Well then if I understand you correctly you are instructing John the baptism here also.

Mat 3:4-8 And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leather girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey. Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, And were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance:

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 10:19

RobertW:

>>>What if their last act in this life was to look with lust?

Mat 5:28 But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 11:25

Quote:
-----Well we are all one sin again from damnation and this should work a carefulness in us. But keep in mind that perfect love casts out all fear.

This is what I am talking about right here. This is the Gospel message that I was raised under. This has been the source of more distress in my life than I can count. Truly, I have no more questions.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 11:39

Quote:
----->>>When you preach the Gospel, what profit is there in distilling the severe and demanding elements of the Gospel (as it were) from the mercy and grace of God?

I don't understand what you mean here. Please clarify.

I explained earlier that the point of having a sacrificial system is to allow for the relationship to continue if we should sin.

What I mean by distilling the demanding elements away from grace is to try and explain away passages that recognize that Christians can and do sin; even though it is not their nature to sin.

We live in a fallen world. We are subject to human desires in a world loaded with sinful means of expressing those desires. This opens up a whole front of conflict while we are yet in the world.

And this is why our sin is not like Adam's sin. We are not one sin away from damnation. Even though I am very versed in the keeping passages, I am not talking about those now. I believe in Christian Perfection. I just do not believe it with Finney's hard trigger damnation theology. I can never believe that God has His children hanging by a thread over hell in a fallen world such as ours. The regenerate are His children and He loves them. He loves them more than we love our children and grandchildren.

So I know with certainty that I do not love my kids more than God loves His children and I would never think to instill fear in my progeny so as to say that if they walk in sinless perfection of heart and deed they are accepted and if not I would cast them into outer darkness. Bear in mind, I am not saying it is OK to sin and would never teach that. But this kind of hair trigger doctrine is extremely dangerous and those reading it should run for the hills!

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 11:55

>>>I just do not believe it with Finney's hard trigger damnation theology.

Please provide me with one clear reference from Finney where he says that a Christian that sins is no longer a Christian. You will find no such reference.

>>>I explained earlier that the point of having a sacrificial system is to allow for the relationship to continue if we should sin.

So you would hold that some one the intermittently commits adultery is still a Christian?

>>>So I know with certainty that I do not love my kids more than God loves His children and I would never think to instill fear in my progeny so as to say that if they walk in sinless perfection of heart and deed they are accepted and if not I would cast them into outer darkness.

This example doesn't hold any weight unless you would be willing to send your children who refuse to obey and practice disobedience to a fire where the worm doesn't die to burn for all eternity.

>>>But this kind of hair trigger doctrine is extremely dangerous and those reading it should run for the hills!

If it is wrong then I agree. But on the other hand we can say the same thing about your doctrine if it is wrong.

Therefore we have to look at the Word of God and see what it says.

>>>This is what I am talking about right here. This is the Gospel message that I was raised under. This has been the source of more distress in my life than I can count.

I can see where it would cause distress if you were falling into sin all the time. This teaching causes no distress in my life what so ever.

We don't have to sin. God offers full grace. Yes the flesh wants to see but if we are diligent to add to our faith the fruits of the Spirit we have the promise that we will never fall.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 12:02

Quote:

-----I can see where it would cause distress if you were falling into sin all the time.

What is sin?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 12:15

Quote:

-----Please provide me with one clear reference from Finney where he says that a Christian that sins is no longer a Christian. You will find no such reference.

UNITY OF MORAL ACTION

Lecture 9

Rev. Charles G. Finney

Objection: Does a Christian cease to be a Christian, whenever he commits a sin? I answer:

1. Whenever he sins, he must, for the time being, cease to be holy. This is self-evident. Whenever he sins, he must be condemned; he must incur the penalty of the law of God. If he does not, it must be because the law of God is abrogated. But if the law of God be abrogated, he has no rule of duty; consequently, he can neither be holy nor sinful. If it be said that the precept is still binding upon him, but that, with respect to the Christian, the penalty is forever set aside, or abrogated, I reply, that to abrogate the penalty is to repeal the precept; for a precept without penalty is no law. It is only counsel or advice. The Christian, therefore, is justified no longer than he obeys, and must be condemned when he disobeys; or Antinomianism is true. Until he repents, he cannot be forgiven. In these respects, then, the sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are upon precisely the same ground.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 12:35

Did you not take time to read the paragraph that following the one you quoted.

"2. In two important respects the sinning Christian differs widely from the unconverted sinner:

(1.) In his relations to God. A Christian is a child of God. A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God. An unconverted sinner is a child of the devil."

Unity of Moral Action

I know enough of Finney that he didn't teach that one sin will make you a child of the devil.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 12:40

Hi Bob,

This is from the Lectures on Revival series. Consider that Finney believed that men ought to eat for survival. Salting food would be sin because it can be hurtful to the body. He also believed that any expenses on ourselves that could be sent towards evangelism is sin. Consider this:

How to promote a Revival (3)

Do you deny yourself even the hurtful superfluities of life, such as tea, coffee, and tobacco? Do you retrench your style of living, and scruple not to subject yourself to any inconvenience to save them? Do you daily pray for them in private? Are you laying by something to put into the treasury of the Lord when you go up to pray? If you are not doing these things, and if your soul is not agonized for the poor benighted heathen, why are you such a hypocrite as to pretend to be a Christian? Why, your profession is an insult to Jesus Christ!

From: Conscience Seared With a Hot Iron

.When you can waste God's money in administering to your lusts, when you can buy tobacco, tea, coffee, and such like fashionable but pernicious articles without deep compunction and remorse, your conscience is seared with a hot iron.

Would you say that Coffee and Tea are sin? Finney suggests that to partake of such is to have a seared conscience.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 12:46

Quote:

-----Did you not take time to read the paragraph that following the one you quoted.

Yes, in fact the proof of it is that many of them (though not this one) are here on SI audio. ;-)

Quote:

-----"2. In two important respects the sinning Christian differs widely from the unconverted sinner:

(1.) In his relations to God. A Christian is a child of God. A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God. An unconverted sinner is a child of the devil."
Unity of Moral Action

All this is saying is that God would condemn a child of God to hell if they died before they repented. The explanation he gives does not help his case. It complicates it.

Moreover, the source of the problem is Finney's false view of penal substitution and imputed righteousness. Because Finney did not appreciate the finished work of the Cross he can believe no other than he believed. It is the consequence of not accepting the biblical revelation of the atonement of Christ.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 12:57

RobertW:

You know Robert you are digressing into making statements that cannot be supported. You can state it is your view that Finney held to use salt was sin but you can't prove it with a quote.

>>>Salting food would be sin because it can be hurtful to the body. He also believed that any expenses on ourselves that could be sent towards evangelism is sin.

As I noted before Finney didn't teach salt was sin nor did he teach that "any expenses on ourselves that could be sent toward evangelism is sin". If you want to hold that opinion that is fine but please don't state it as a fact because it is not true. If you are going to state it as a fact please support it with a clear quote.

>>>Would you say that Coffee and Tea are sin? Finney suggests that to partake of such is to have a seared conscience.

Personally I don't drink coffee or black tea. I do however drink herbal teas. I think it is fair to say that Finney taught coffee and black tea were sinful.

I don't think a minister has the right or liberty to try to bind their views like this on Christians and tell them coffee and tea are sinful. I would consider that legalism. If Finney wanted to count coffee and black tea as sin for himself well "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth" (Rom 14:22).

>>>What is sin?

Defination of Sin

In short Wesley held and taught the position that sin was "an actual, voluntary transgression of the law; of the revealed, written law of God" (The Great Privilege of Those That Are Born of God section II.2) and that "even babes in Christ are so far perfect as not to commit sin" (Plain Account of Christian Perfection section 12.2).

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 13:10

RobertW

Bob said: Please provide me with one clear reference from Finney where he says that a Christian that sins is no longer a Christian. You will find no such reference.

I don't think you know Finney as well as you claim. Finney is closer to the P in TULIP than to one sin makes you a child of the devil.

>>>All this is saying is that God would condemn a child of God to hell if they died before they repented. The explanation he gives does not help his case. It complicates it.

So are you backing up on your claim that Finney taught that one sin made you a child of the devil?

>>>Moreover, the source of the problem is Finney's false view of penal substitution and imputed righteousness. Because Finney did not appreciate the finished work of the Cross he can believe no other than he believed. It is the consequence of not accepting the biblical revelation of the atonement of Christ.

Finney had many errors but one thing he did have that neither you or I have is results. He likely did more in an average day than you or I will do in a life time. So while you may disagree with his system, as I also do, making statements like he "did not appreciate the finished work of the Cross" and "not accepting the biblical revelation of the atonement of Christ" is quite an indictment of a man of God considering you have professed on this thread that you just lately gained the peace of God and you are a professed minister?

I think this thread has been taken pretty far off topic and I am not sure if at this point we are really going anywhere.

Nice to have met you and I am sure I will see more of you around here but I think at this point I will leave off further conv

ersation along this line. If you would like to pick this up on email you can get me at bobmutch at gmail dot com.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2008/12/10 13:45

Quote:
-----Finney had many errors but one thing he did have that neither you or I have is results. He likely did more in an average day than you or I will do in a life time.

For I can testify about them that they are zealous for God, but their zeal is not based on knowledge. Since they did not know the righteousness that comes from God and sought to establish their own, they did not submit to God's righteousness. - Romans 10:2-3

Quote:
-----I think this thread has been taken pretty far off topic and I am not sure if at this point we are really going anywhere.

Bob, to get this back on topic - I am wondering if you could provide an exposition of John 6:35-40 that is consistent with your 9 points you outlined in your original post. I still haven't seen this done - you can even PM it to me if you would like.

Thanks,
Taylor

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 14:01

Hi Bob,

Quote:
-----Finney had many errors but one thing he did have that neither you or I have is results. He likely did more in an average day than you or I will do in a life time.

I won't ask you to explain this. I know it is hyperbolic in nature. My comment on Finney and salt is is a simplification of my overall understanding of the man's views based upon his teachings. If I am wrong I would more than happily retract it and forsake the notion all together. But we still have to reckon with coffee and tea being a sin.

The point is, is that in revivalism theology there is an ongoing attempt to expose people sins so as to bring them into godly sorrow and manufacture personal revival. It is the whole 'breaking up the fallow ground' thing. We can break up our fallow ground as we come before the Lord, but we must allow God to do the work. It takes the word of His grace to change a man. But this is not what men do, especially Finney. He looked and listened for what he esteemed as compromise and then pressed the points.

Quote:
-----So are you backing up on your claim that Finney taught that one sin made you a child of the devil?

I have wondered why you press this question? If a believer is one sin away from condemnation as you have affirmed at least twice, then why this question?

Quote:
-----Nice to have met you and I am sure I will see more of you around here but I think at this point I will leave off further conversation along this line. If you would like to pick this up on email you can get me at bobmutch at gmail dot com.

Well, Bob, you asked for input in the beginning. I'm a real life case study of the effects of such a doctrine that ties justification to sanctification. And I live among people that also have grown up under this. I have seen it's devastating effects in the twilight hours of people's lives. Christian Perfection without a biblical view of justification can only ever bring despair. It may not be true in your life, but it has been true in mine. It has been true also in others I know personally.

I have studied Finney, but am not an expert on him. He is hard to follow in his views because of his mix of philosophy and law into the Gospel. I believe He was 'profitable for the ministry'. That is why I undertook to share his Lectures on Revival on audio. there are some good things there. But we have to distinguish the good from the false.

At last my concern is for anyone that does not fully appreciate New Covenant justification. You mention Wesley also as if you have studied his views of Entire Sanctification. I believe in walking in Romans 8. I believe the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart and a good conscience. I have many writings and sermons to that effect. But I am also conscious that I am not perfect. I need the blood of Christ. I need our Great High Priest. I need a loving Heavenly Father. I need a Comforter that will come alongside to help. I need grace. I need mercy. I need an advocate with the Father. And I need to know that God loves me in such a way that if I stumble, though He is able to keep me from falling, that I am not on the same ground with God as would be a sinner. No matter how we end this topic, that is the clear teaching of Finney. It seems to me that you share his view that we are one sin away from being lost. I simply cannot walk a knife edge like that.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 15:13

RobertW:

>>>I have wondered why you press this question?

I asked this question because you made a claim that any one that has studied Finney should know is not true. I ask you for a quote that supported what you were claiming Finney held. You quoted a paragraph that was right above a clear statement where Finney denied what you are saying he held (I think that was very strange).

So when I pointed this out to you just passed over it and when on to some thing different.

So I when ahead and asked you if you could see now that what you were claiming Finney taught was incorrect and at that point you state you wondered why I press this question?

I press the question to get an answer of course!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 15:31

Quote:

-----RobertW:

>>>I have wondered why you press this question?

I asked this question because you made a claim that any one that has studied Finney should know is not true. I ask you for a quote that supported what you were claiming Finney held. You quoted a paragraph that was right above a clear statement where Finney denied what you are saying he held (I think that was very strange).

So when I pointed this out to you just passed over it and when on to some thing different.

So I when ahead and asked you if you could see now that what you were claiming Finney taught was incorrect and at that point you stated why I press this question?

I press the question to get an answer of course!

Well, let me just lay out what I have read:

Finney in response to Objection: Does a Christian cease to be a Christian, whenever he commits a sin? He answered:

1. Whenever he sins, he must, for the time being, cease to be holy. This is self-evident. Whenever he sins, he must be condemned; he must incur the penalty of the law of God. If he does not, it must be because the law of God is abrogated. But if the law of God be abrogated, he has no rule of duty; consequently, he can neither be holy nor sinful. If it be said that the precept is still binding upon him, but that, with respect to the Christian, the penalty is forever set aside, or abrogated, I reply, that to abrogate the penalty is to repeal the precept; for a precept without penalty is no law. It is only counsel or advice. The Christian, therefore, is justified no longer than he obeys, and must be condemned when he disobeys; or Antinomianism is true. Until he repents, he cannot be forgiven. In these respects, then, the sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are upon precisely the same ground.

2. In two important respects the sinning Christian differs widely from the unconverted sinner:

(1.) In his relations to God. A Christian is a child of God. A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God. An unconverted sinner is a child of the devil. A Christian sustains a covenant relation to God; such a covenant relation as to secure to him that discipline which tends to reclaim and bring him back, if he wanders away from God. "If his children forsake My Law, and walk not in My judgments; if they break My statutes and keep not My commandments; then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless My loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips" (Psalms 89:30-34).

Robert's response:

If a person does not have time to go through the chastening process and perishes before godly sorrow and repentance can happen; does the grace of God 'cover' that transgression? Finney seems to suggest that the difference between a sinner and a Christian is that chastening happens to the Christian. I would contend that even a sinner kicks against the pricks and strives with the Holy Ghost. God deals with them also. However, a sinner does not have the relationship with the Father that the sons and daughters have. And I mean to say more than the fact that the Father is willing to chasten the sons. Chastening is not what I am looking for in Finney's qualification here; it is the believers security with God.

Bob's point #9:

9) If at any point a Christian commits a willful sin they no longer have eternal life abiding in them (1Joh 3:15) and have become a child of the devil (1 John 3:10).

Robert's response:

Upon careful consideration of both your statement and Finney's; I see no real difference that would effect the outcome of a person's eternal destiny if they were in sin. Finney says a person that drinks coffee and tea has a seared conscience. If this is true, how then could they be saved? Can drinking coffee, tea and smoking send a person to hell? Really? Spurgeon smoked a pipe for a time? Did he not? The implications of these views are truly horrendous. That Christ came to save sinners and reconcile the world to God and yet they are thrown out for a smoke or a coffee?

As a little side note my pastor told of a story that there was a preacher that preached coffee was a sin years ago that he knew. An older lady in the church stopped drinking it and poured sugar and creamer into hot water lest she offend God.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 15:36

>>>(1.) In his relations to God. A Christian is a child of God. A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God. An unconverted sinner is a child of the devil.

Finney very clearly here doesn't teach that if you sin once you are lost. Not sure why you can't see that but I am not going to chase you around the bush on this one.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 15:37

Quote:

-----In these respects, then, the sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are upon precisely the same ground.

OK, what does this mean?

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 16:14

>>>(1.) In his relations to God. A Christian is a child of God. A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God. An unconverted sinner is a child of the devil.

Really Robert I don't know why we are having this conversation. If English is English it is clear that Finney doesn't hold that a Christian that sins is not saved.

He above states that "A sinning Christian is a disobedient child of God."

Unless you have further quotes from Finney that show different I think this issue should be pretty clear.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 16:40

Quote:

-----Unless you have further quotes from Finney that show different I think this issue should be pretty clear.

In fairness, that doesn't answer my question. Finney often says one thing and then another. What does it mean to be on the same grounds with God as a sinner? Can a disobedient child of God be one and the same as a sinner in the eyes of God?

Quote:

-----9) If at any point a Christian commits a willful sin they no longer have eternal life abiding in them (1Joh 3:15) and have become a child of the devil (1Joh 3:10).

If I understand you correctly you are trying to suggest to me that your view of sin and assurance is more radical than Finney's? Finney would say that a Child of God that sins is still a child of God, but you say they are a child of the devil? *If at any point a Christian commits a willful sin they no longer have eternal life abiding in them (1Joh 3:15) and have become a child of the devil.* If that is true it is the most radical thing I have ever heard in my life and I have lived among some radical people.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 18:14

First off Robert I am not a Finneyite nor do I follow Finney in his doctrine. I follow the Wesleyan-Arminian view of Christian Perfection with the mix of Palmers shorter method.

My point on Finney was that you are just wrong when you say that Finney taught you would be lost and a child of the devil if you sinned. I have posted a clear quote from Finney showing this and pointed out your misquote.

It seems you make statements and then when pressed to prove them you just move to another question. That is not the kind of discuss I want to be involved in.

So I tried to end this nicely 4 or 5 posts back and but you just keep up you questions. So I will have to let you know I consider our discussion finished and Lord willing I don't plan on responding to any more of your posts on this thread. Make your final post and then lets move on. Its bad enough that the thread has been hijacked and I will take part responsibility for that but let's see if we can end up this back and forth in a nice way.

All the best.

Re: Intervention - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/10 18:43

Quote:
-----So I tried to end this nicely 4 or 5 posts back and but you just keep up you questions. So I will have to let you know I consider our discussion finished and Lord willing I don't plan on responding to any more of your posts on this thread. Make your final post and then lets move on. Its bad enough that the thread has been hijacked

I've been following this discussion from a distance, and really haven't noticed a hijacking by Robert or anyone else. You basically made your debut here on SermonIndex by encouraging an open engagement on this subject. You have since been met with challenging disagreements, and with relevant issues being raised to your teaching on this particular subject. This is exactly what you asked for, and your opponents have been engaging you with honorable decorum and polite exchanges.

I am also one who takes issue with some of the interpretations you've presented (as with everyone else here, I can't help but smell "Finneyism"), but I do not see any reason for you to pull out the hijack card. This is a legitimate concern. If you can't take the return volley, don't call for more fire. I sense you are getting flustered and agitated.

Perhaps it would have been wiser to first introduce yourself to the body before assuming a pulpit position and requesting feedback.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 19:18

PaulWest:
>>>If you can't take the return volley, don't call for more fire.

Paul I think the issue was Robert clearly is confused with what Finney taught. As I noted to him Finney is closer to the P in Tulip than to the Christian Perfection that the Wesleyan taught. I felt Robert and I were just going around in circles and after 20 or more posts I didn't think we were getting any where so I bowed out (or tried to) of the exchange as nice as I could.

>>>Perhaps it would have been wiser to first introduce yourself to the body before assuming a pulpit position and requesting feedback.

I am not sure about this forum but I have been posted on forums for the last 10 plus years. Most forums I have been at a new comer is welcome to post a position and ask for feedback. I will presume that this forum is the same until I am told different. Also I am not sure what you mean by a pulpit position. You may want to expand on that a bit.

>>>You have since been met with challenging disagreements, and with relevant issues being raised to your teaching on this particular subject.

Well the discuss has digress to whether Finney held that one sin would make you a child of the devil. Clearly Finney doe sn't hold that view and I don't think Finney is relevant enough to this discuss to merit 10 or 15 posts concerning the relation of his and my positions.

>>>I sense you are getting flustered and agitated.

You have sensed wrong. I do how ever consider the topic hijacked but as you will have noticed I take part response for t hat as I responded to Roberts posts.

Thanks for you input.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 19:19

Quote:
-----It seems you make statements and then when pressed to prove them you just move to another question. That is not the kind of discuss I want to be involved in.

If you honestly want to discuss your points you must be prepared to reckon with how the reader perceives them. I have tried to show you *my perceptions*.

If I have not answered a question I apologize. Point to it and I'll try to answer it again. Jesus often answered questions with questions. I see no foul in doing the same.

I have tried also to zoom out and show how such a theology as is found in point #9 effects the whole. It is a crimson stain in an otherwise acceptable work. It calls into question all sorts of things such as your view of sin and godly sorrow. How you would preach salvation. Whether a person could know true freedom in Christ?

The irony of all this is that I typically stand strong also on the other side of this discussion. But I cannot do that when your view of a single sin making a person a child of the devil exists. That is simply false. I believe a person can fall from grace, but not at all in the sense you describe.

Truly, I don't have time to be debating like this. I have better things to be doing. But impressionable minds linger in these forums. And I cannot stand by and allow such teaching to go unthwarted.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 19:23

Quote:
-----You have sensed wrong. I do how ever consider the topic hijacked but as you will have noticed I take part response for that as I responded to Roberts posts.

Is your view more radical than Finney's or not? Finney is the most radical preacher I know of. That is how your view was associated with him.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 19:31

Quote:
-----Clearly he doesn't hold that view and I don't think Finney is relevant enough to this discuss to merit 10 or 15 points concerning the relation of his and my positions.

He may not hold the view exactly as you state it, but you still have not answered what is meant by:

Finney: The Christian, therefore, is justified no longer than he obeys, and must be condemned when he disobeys; or Antinomianism is true. Until he repents, he cannot be forgiven. In these respects, then, the sinning Christian and the unconverted sinner are upon precisely the same ground.

This can mean nothing less than the person is not saved. In my mind (and I appeal to anyone else to jump in here and comment) that what Finney says is almost identical to what you said in #9. The difference is, and I am not the pedant I could be, is in the use of language.

To say that a person can be removed from justification and on the same grounds as a sinner is to say they are essentially a child of the devil- even if he says that is not what he is saying.

Re: Would Finney have discouraged salting food? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 20:01

In keeping with the overall issues involved in this thread I asked the question; what is sin? If one could potentially become a child of the devil they ought to know the cause. If willful sin be the cause; what is sin? Again, in keeping with what I perceived were Finney type leanings; I asked if Bob salts his food. I did not recall at the time the bibliography for my understanding of that. But after some searching I found the lecture. Consider what Finney says here:

Finney on Innocent Amusements:

Now, in the light of this rule, it is plain that it is not innocent to engage in amusements merely to gratify the desire for amusement. We may not innocently eat or drink to gratify the desire for food or drink. To eat or drink merely to gratify appetite is innocent enough in a mere animal, but in a moral agent it is a sin. A moral agent is bound to have a higher ultimate motive to eat and drink--that he may be strong and healthy for the service of God. God has made eating and drinking pleasant to us; but this pleasure ought not to be our ultimate reason for eating and drinking.

So amusements are pleasant, but this does not justify us in seeking amusements to gratify desire. Mere animals may do this innocently, because they are incapable of any higher motive. But moral agents are under a higher law, and are bound to have another and a higher aim than merely to gratify the desire for amusements.

Therefore, no amusement is innocent which is engaged in for the pleasure of the amusement, any more than it would be innocent to eat and drink for the pleasure of it. Again, no amusement is innocent that is engaged in because we need amusements. We need food and drink; but this does not justify us in eating and drinking simply because we need it. The law of God does not say, "Seek whatever ye need because ye need it"; but, "Do all from love to God and man." A wicked man might eat and drink selfishly--that is, to make his body strong to execute his selfish plans--but this eating and drinking would be sin notwithstanding he needed food and drink.

Nothing is innocent unless it proceeds from supreme love to God and equal love to man, unless the supreme and ultimate motive be to please and honour God. In other words, to be innocent, any amusement must be engaged in because it is believed to be at the time most pleasing to God, and is intended to be a service rendered to Him, as that which, upon the whole, will honour Him more than anything else that we can engage in for the time being. I take this to be self-evident. What then? It follows:

* 1st. That none but benevolent amusements can be innocent. Fishing and shooting for amusement are not innocent. We may fish and hunt for the same reason that we are allowed to eat and drink--to supply nature with aliment, that we may be strong in the service of God. We may hunt to destroy noxious animals, for the glory of God and the interests of His kingdom. But fishing and hunting to gratify a passion for these sports is not innocent. Again, no amusement can be innocent that involves the squandering of precious time, that might be better employed to the glory of God and the good of man.

an. Life is short. Time is precious. We have but one life to live. Much is to be done. The world is in darkness. A world of sinners are to be enlightened, and, if possible, saved. We are required to work while the day lasts. Our commission and work require dispatch. No time is to be lost. If our hearts are right, our work is pleasant. If rightly performed it affords the highest enjoyment and is itself the highest amusement. No turning aside for amusement can be innocent that involves any unnecessary loss of time. No man that realizes the greatness of the work to be done, and loves to do it, can turn aside for any amusement involving an unnecessary waste of time.

Again, no amusement can be innocent that involves an unnecessary expenditure of the Lord's money. All our time and all our money are the Lord's. We are the Lord's. We may innocently use both time and money to promote the Lord's interests and the highest interests of man, which are the Lord's interests. But we may not innocently use either for our own pleasure and gratification. Expensive journeys for our own pleasure and amusement, and not indulged in with a single eye to the glory of God, are not innocent amusements, but sinful.

end of quote

This is important to flush out because until we understand what Bob's view of sin is we cannot accurately assess point # 9 or just what requires repentance and godly sorrow? If smoking is a damnable sin, what else?

Can a Christian Sin and Still Be a Christian? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/10 20:31

Consider this:

And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat.

But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean.

And the voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common.

This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven. (Acts 10)

Clearly the LORD is talking to Peter here. He has just been told 3 times this vision relieving him of any doubt as to what he just saw and who it was that was talking to him. What was Peter's estimation of the vision by his own account?

Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons:(10:34)

What an experience! God has just supernaturally told Peter that He is no respecter of persons. This was not a hunch, this was not a second hand message, it was a first hand directive from God Himself delivered personally.

Did Peter walk in the directive?

But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. (Galatians 2)

The fact that he was eating with the Gentiles at first tells me that he understood and was mindful of God's directive. As a Jew the tendency would have been to dissimilate. But He had the words of the LORD as His counsel. We are not left to speculate as to 'why' he did what he did.

...he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision

This is the same circumcision that persecuted Paul. Scripture states clearly that Peter was to be blamed because he feared the Jews and disobeyed a thrice given directive from God that he himself states...*Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons.*"

Personally, God has never once spoken to me in such bold and awesome theophanic manifestation. If He had I can 'hop

e' with a degree of certainty that I would have held close to it as Paul did His heavenly vision. I would have thought about it every time the subject He discussed with me presented itself. "I forgot" would not be a valid excuse after such an awesome manifestation of God.

Question, did Peter become a child of the Devil at this event? Did he need to be reborn again? Afterall, he had a direct order from God; "What God has cleansed that call not thou common!" He understood this to mean that he was not to be a respecter of persons. This is as close to Adam's transgression as I can think of. He was born again and He defied God for fear of the Jews. What say you?

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/10 23:13

Quote:

-----Also I am not sure what you mean by a pulpit position. You may want to expand on that a bit.

Gladly. This is the equivalent of walking into a church building, not bothering to introduce yourself to anyone, and stepping directly up the podium to begin broadcasting your "teachings". Since you've been posting in forums for the past 10 years (as you stated), one would think you would have learnt better etiquette. We know absolutely nothing about you, save the Finneyesque teachings you are putting forth. We've seen it before, friend. Understand that if you just barge into a thread and start this kind of "teaching" here, expect your theories to be severely crash-proof tested with many protective eyes.

Instead, you ought to have announced a little bit about yourself by way of introduction *before* you launched into your teaching. As it stands, I also find your "insights" harmful to younger, more naive believers...and I now sense agitation on your part due to the "feedback" you've been receiving from Robert and others. This causes me to ask: Did you merely come here to show off your wares and leave, or did you come for genuine fellowship with the saints of God?

Paul

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 23:47

PaulWest:

>>>Gladly. This is the equivalent of walking into a church building, not bothering to introduce yourself to anyone, and stepping directly up the podium to begin broadcasting your "teachings". Since you've been posting in forums for the past 10 years (as you stated), one would think you would have learnt better etiquette.

Wow what a charge. I think your dreaming my friend. This a public forum where people are invited to make posts, ask questions, put forth their views, and ask people to make comments on them.

By the way I am guess that is not in your etiquette FAQ but I will ask any way. Do you state this in your etiquette FAQ?

Unless this is a very sectarian forum where you only accept views of certain doctrine positions and hence those that don't agree with you are not welcome but I am pretty sure that this is not the case.

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/10 23:52

Quote:

-----By the way I am guess that is not in your etiquette FAQ but I will ask any way. Do you state this in your etiquette FAQ?

No, it's not a rule, and not stated in FAQ. It's just manners. Disregard if it doesn't apply to you.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/10 23:57

>>>It's just manners. Disregard if it doesn't apply to you.

Ok. It's a new one to me.

I do trust dyed-in-the-wool Wesleyan-Arminians are welcome here? I am starting to wonder if this is more a Calvinistic board?

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2008/12/11 0:15

Quote:

-----I do trust dyed-in-the-wool Wesleyan-Arminians are welcome here? I am starting to wonder if this is more a Calvinistic board?

This board is neutral, and everyone is welcome here. Our aim, however, is to diffuse any kind of eruption that may result from Cal/Arm debates. Finneyism is welcomed, reformed theology is welcomed, anything and everything pertaining to God and scripture is welcome in discussion; it's when these different camps begin a slugfest with each other where we have to draw the line and step in.

Personally, I don't agree with your take on a few things you've listed, but that's okay. Certain people don't agree with me either :). Your thread is fine, although I (and a few others) have detected what we believe to be serious flaws. I am not Arminian; I am Reformed...but brother Robert, to my knowledge, is Pentecostal and Philologus is not Calvinistic. Taylor Otwell is reformed like myself...yet all of us are finding certain aspects of your theology to be objectionable. It has to make you wonder. Friend, this site is theologically eclectic; it's what makes it unique and wonderful - and most of all, honored by God. Stick around long enough (I hope) and you'll discover this yourself.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2008/12/11 0:25

Well Bob ...

It looks like you are apt to bring over a great deal of content from your blog and have come across not as one looking for discussion and fellowship but as someone with an agenda, namely your own.

Frankly, you have an air that is arrogant and defensive if not accusatory.

This forum is full of a whole host of matters and is not primarily leaning to either of these constructs - A check of the variety of sermons and articles posted here would bear this out.

Try slowing down a bit.

(http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id14144&forum13&post_id&refreshGo) MUST READ: SermonIndex Forum Disclaimer / Community Rules

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 1:21

PaulWest:

>>>This board is neutral, and everyone is welcome here. Our aim, however, is to diffuse any kind of eruption that may result from Cal/Arm debates.

That's good as I don't like debates. That was why I was trying to step away from with Robert. I felt the conversation was going nowhere fast.

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 1:31

crsschk:

>>>It looks like you are apt to bring over a great deal of content from your blog and have come across not as one looking for discussion and fellowship but as someone with an agenda, namely your own.

I think you have read me wrong friend. I am here for discussion and feedback but not going around in circles that go nowhere. I step out of those kinds of conversations and will tent to not enter into conversations with those that do the circle thing.

>>>Frankly, you have an air that is arrogant and defensive if not accusatory.

If I am perhaps accusatory as you say, what will we then call you friend for your charge against me of having an air that is arrogant.

Perhaps you should slow down a bit?

>>>This forum is full of a whole host of matters and is not primarily leaning to either of these constructs - A check of the variety of sermons and articles posted here would bear this out.

I have been on the site a number of times before but posting on your forum is new. Lots of friends listen to the sermons.

>>>MUST READ: SermonIndex Forum Disclaimer / Community Rules

Thanks I will give it a read. I am been posting on forums for probably 10 years and quite a bit in the last 5 years so I am not new to forum rules. But I will take a look see, thanks for the suggest!

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 1:45

crsschk:

Hey I checked the link out -- lots of rules. Good job I read it this way I wouldn't have to be corrected as much.

Here are some interesting ones:

>>>What you can expect

To be misunderstood.

What is not tolerated

Slander. Ill-will. Unnecessary accusations, comments.

Again, ask a question rather than making an accusation.

Hey crsschk you may want to reread that thing yourself.

Well it's late and I need to check in. Talk to you later friend. Thanks for the heads up with the rule link!

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 1:48

PaulWest

Hey Paul it does say to introduce yourself.

>>>As illustrative, picture yourself entering a home for the first time. You are a guest. You are polite. You wipe the mud off your shoes before entering. You make an introduction. You carry yourself with respect to your host.

You really run a tight ship here friend. Now how should I go about this introduction. Is that over in the other forum where I was asking questions. Better late than never!

I guess I should have read the rules before I posted!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 1:59

I had an additional thought to go along with my last post on Peter. Bear in mind I have brought this all up before some years ago in a similar discussion. I think at times we look at the apostles as if they were *perfect* men after regeneration. I have typically pointed out Paul's dealings with John Mark and Barnabus and the issue of Peter and Paul in Galatians.

In the case of Peter we are faced with a sobering problem. here again we read:

But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. (Galatians 2)

GW North once pointed out that almost all such fear is essentially fear of death. We then have to reckon with 1 John 4:18.

There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love.

Phobos is our root in all of these cases. It strikes me that this is the same Peter that swore with a loud oath when pressed concerning his knowledge of Christ. Now here we are some number of years out from his regeneration as well as many wonderful experiences laid out in the Acts. The Holy Spirit has declared to us that Peter:

...walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I (Paul) said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? (Galatians 2)

Peter lived after the manner of the Gentiles? He was no longer keeping the Law for salvation himself? He believed that the end of the Law for salvation had come? He knew that God had broken down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile? And yet Paul had to rebuke him to the face... *why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?*

Adam Clarke calls this behavior hypocrisy. If that is true hypocrisy is to a great extent what Jesus uncovered in the pharisees. And Peter that had been entrusted the Gospel to the circumcision lived like a Gentile until the circumcision came around because of fear? What did Jesus say about that?

And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.

Now if 'light' (revelation) is a factor in determining the severity of a crime surely Peter's first hand, eyewitness account of both our Lord's teaching on fear and the Lord's thrice given directive not to call the Gentiles unclean would cause any such transgression to have aggravating circumstances involved. If responsibility is proportional to revelation than it is impossible to achieve a higher level of accountability than Peter was at at the time of his offense.

1. He was regenerated
2. He had partaken of the heavenly gift and the powers of the world to come
3. He had a first hand directive from God that he was to no longer regard the Gentiles with respect of persons
4. He had been told by our Lord not to fear them that had power to destroy the body.
5. He was in the unique position of being entrusted the Gospel to the circumcision and yet was furling the sail (see Hebrews 10:38, 39) when danger posed itself putting the truth of the Gospel in peril before the eyes of the Jews.

If Peter's level of accountability can be shown to be anything other than full-on understanding and his willful disobedience anything other than sin, then likewise we have all only ever had a lapse in judgment or some lesser thing than sin in any of our dealings. Why? Because we were not eyewitnesses of His (the Lord's) majesty and Peter was. We are the blessed ones that have not seen and yet have believed.

So we have to ask the question, why did the Holy Spirit include this account in the record? Why was the account of Barnabas and Paul recorded? How could these two men that the Holy Ghost had said, "Separate unto me Barnabas and S

aul for the ministry" and then they break off from each other, not based on the *word of His grace*, or some directive from God, but because ... the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other (Acts 15).

At the least we have to reckon with the fact that God has not hidden these matters from our eyes. He did not hide David and Bathsheeba and He did not hide Peter's blatant disobedience and hypocrisy. He has set these things out 'before all Israel'. This plain account of the facts ought to suffice to show us that even the Apostles needed the blood of Christ. The y needed a great High Priest. Not for sins unawares only, but in this case blatant departures from God's clearly given will and purpose and in Peter's case a straight forward directive from the mouth of God. What greater authority did Peter need that he ought to have obeyed? God himself commanded him.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 2:02

Quote:

----- Hey crsschk you may want to reread that thing yourself.

Is this comment necessary? And for all eyes to see and I can clearly say- God spare me from the kind of 'love' that this man has exhibited in withstanding these moderators. I thought the comment some time ago about me being akin to Chicken Little was an aberration, but now I see different.

Brethren, if they show you who they are, believe them!

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 2:19

So we come again to Bob's 9th point;

Quote:

-----9) If at any point a Christian commits a willful sin they no longer have eternal life abiding in them (1Joh 3:15) and have become a child of the devil (1Joh 3:10).

Having already established beyond reasonable doubt that scripture has revealed Peter's behavior as sin, by any definition we can try to come up with, Did Peter *become a child of the devil (1Joh 3:10)* at the point of his transgression? If we ought to be mindful of the commandments of our Lord when temptation presents itself, is Peter any different? If we had been pricked both of conscience and the Holy Spirit at the point of transgression; how much more would have been Peter - the eyewitness of the majesty of Christ? Did Peter become a child of the devil at that point?

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2008/12/11 2:36

Quote:

-----Did Peter become a child of the devil at that point?

I'll answer. God forbid and absolutely not! What was the source of Peter's righteousness? Was it his own good works? Was it his perfect obedience?

Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ: (II Peter 1:1)

God has determined that salvation will be by grace and the means of distributing it is faith. The just shall live by faith. Peter's actions required a rebuke, but they did not make him a child of the Devil in the same way Adam's transgression made him. Peter is in Christ and Christ was/is sinless. The basis of his acceptance with God is still the finished work of the cross.

Re:, on: 2008/12/11 11:17

I know I'm late in the game here, and am probably beating a dead horse but I wanted to give a perspective. I'm not addressing anyone specifically nor am I saying I possess anything without error. But these scriptures have come to mind on this topic (my apologies for any redundancy)and I felt compelled to share a perspective on it. Blessings. Rich

Romans 4

Abraham Justified by Faith

1What then shall we say that Abraham, our forefather, discovered in this matter? 2If, in fact, Abraham was justified by works, he had something to boast about—but not before God. 3What does the Scripture say? "Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness." 4Now when a man works, his wages are not credited to him as a gift, but as an obligation.

5However,

.....to the man who does not work but trusts God who justifies the wicked, his faith is credited as righteousness.....

David says the same thing when he speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God credits righteousness apart from works:

7"Blessed are they
whose transgressions are forgiven,
whose sins are covered.

8Blessed is the man
whose sin the Lord will never count against him."

9Is this blessedness only for the circumcised, or also for the uncircumcised? We have been saying that Abraham's faith was credited to him as righteousness. 10Under what circumstances was it credited? Was it after he was circumcised, or before? It was not after, but before! 11And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness that he had by faith while he was still uncircumcised. So then, he is the father of all who believe but have not been circumcised, in order that righteousness might be credited to them. 12And he is also the father of the circumcised who not only are circumcised but who also walk in the footsteps of the faith that our father Abraham had before he was circumcised.

13It was not through law that Abraham and his offspring received the promise that he would be heir of the world, but through the righteousness that comes by faith. 1

.....For if those who live by law are heirs, faith has no value and the promise is worthless,.....

because law brings wrath. And where there is no law there is no transgression.

.....Therefore, the promise comes by faith, so that it may be by grace and may be guaranteed to all Abraham's offspring.....

—not only to those who are of the law but also to those who are of the faith of Abraham. He is the father of us all. 17As it is written: "I have made you a father of many nations." He is our father in the sight of God, in whom he believed—the God who gives life to the dead and calls things that are not as though they were.

18Against all hope, Abraham in hope believed and so became the father of many nations, just as it had been said to him, "So shall your offspring be." 19Without weakening in his faith, he faced the fact that his body was as good as dead—since he was about a hundred years old—and that Sarah's womb was also dead. 20Yet he did not waver through unbelief regarding the promise of God, but was strengthened in his faith and gave glory to God, 21being fully persuaded that God had power to do what he had promised. 22This is why "it was credited to him as righteousness."

.....The words "it was credited to him" were written not for him alone, but also for us, to whom God will credit righteousness—for us WHO BELIEVE IN HIM who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead.....

25He was delivered over to death for our sins and was raised to life for our justification."

>>>>>> Paul is clear that Abraham was NOT JUSTIFIED AS A CHILD OF GOD IN WHAT HE DID OR DID NOT DO. If, as some have pointed out, transgression was not counted before the law then the Abraham could not use the law as a basis for righteousness. He was not condemned for his relations with Hagar, nor was he justified as a child of God by his works in keeping a law that was non-existent. This point is exclamatory by Paul....."By faith in the promise of a righteous God who will justify those who believe in Him, will righteousness be credited. " Before the law Abraham was justified in faith, after the law David is justified by his same faith. The X factor in both cases is faith.... for before the law righteousness was credited by faith and after the law righteousness was credited by faith.

Why did David say

"Blessed are they
whose transgressions are forgiven,
whose sins are covered.
Blessed is the man
whose sin the Lord will never count against him"

.....if observing the law only was the way to righteousness? Both of these men pointed to the New Testament faith in Christ to be justified.

Paul says that Abraham had the markings of circumcision by his faith even though he was not circumcised outwardly. Therefore he received a 'sign of circumcision' or a 'seal of righteousness' by faith even though circumcision was not in existence. So Abraham is the father of all who are circumcised and not circumcised as an example of New Testament faith in Christ who is our 'seal of righteousness' by faith via the Holy Spirit. I believe Paul implies here that Abraham was a prophetic example of faith to the uncircumcised Gentiles and the circumcised Jews in his faith. In symbolic fashion, Jesus is the Savior of those who are Jews and Gentiles, and the faith of Abraham exemplifies what is necessary to be credited as righteousness for the circumcised and uncircumcised. If we repent of our sins and receive our Savior in faith, it is counted to us as righteousness and we are given the Holy Spirit. From the point of a born again state moving forward, if we are a 'child of the devil' when we sin then we would not be capable of GRIEVING THE HOLY SPIRIT. I would base this on the assumption that a child of the devil has no Holy Spirit.... for a house divided against itself cannot stand. Scripture doesn't say "do not let the Holy Spirit depart". It says do not grieve Him.

Paul reiterates his point of justification in

Galatians 3:

...."Did you receive the Spirit by observing the law, or by believing what you heard? 3Are you so foolish? After beginning with the Spirit, are you now trying to attain your goal by human effort? 4Have you suffered so much for nothing—^{if it really was for nothing?} Does God give you his Spirit and work miracles among you because you observe the law, or because you believe what you heard?

6Consider Abraham: "He believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness." 7Understand, then, that those who believe are children of Abraham.

.....The Scripture foresaw that God would justify the Gentiles by faith..., and announced the gospel in advance to Abraham: "All nations will be blessed through you." So those who have faith are blessed along with Abraham, the man of faith.

10ALL WHO 'RELY' ON OBSERVING THE LAW IS UNDER A CURSE, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who does not continue to do everything written in the Book of the Law." Clearly no one is justified before God by the law, because, "The righteous will live by faith." The law is not based on faith; on the contrary, "The man who does these things will live by them." Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree." He redeemed us in order that the blessing given to Abraham might come to the Gentiles through Christ Jesus, so that by faith we might receive the promise of the Spirit"

Does this mean we use our justification by faith as a free pass to sin? No, for we are now obligated to come into the likeness of The One who redeemed us and whom we have accepted by faith. But the stain of sin is removed from us so we can move forward in becoming like Christ in our love for Him, not by mere obligation to the law for righteousness.

As Paul stated above we do not 'RELY' on the law to overcome sin, because the law cannot take away sin... it can only define what is considered sinful... But, like Abraham before us to the Father, we rely on faith in Christ and His atoning work.... we rely on Him... our High Priest who, being tempted in every way, to strengthen us in our time of need...(Hebrews 4: 4-16) as well as acknowledging our weakness to obey in our own strength, yet we culpable in our decision to come to Him for His overcoming strength and not to fight the battle without Him in our own strength.

My heart desires to be like Christ but, like Paul, some things that I don't want to do, I do....and those things I should do, I do not do. Although these things happen, I should not fall into condemnation, but press forward in my faith of the promise of Christ, always striving to do the will of the Father in Christ. I'm not talking about things like rampant adultery or a murder spree but those things that can cause us to stumble from time to time while keeping a heart that is void of rejecting Christ and the Father altogether. In fact it is in my stumbling that I cry out in my need for The Lord. Does this mean I do not believe I need the Lord unless I stumble? No. I fully admit that I always need Him, especially for strength against stumbling to begin with, but a heart that loves Him will recognize the brief shame and sting of sin yet continue to have a willingness and a desire to do better and move forward in faith.

The Holy Spirit regenerates our heart to not like the sin we want to do, and to want to do the works that bears the fruit of God. We are not always successful in this, but our heart is still full of the desire to please God as Christ wanted to please Him. This is a process, a marathon, it's not instantaneous and it's not about keeping a law abiding 'legalistic score'. It's a process of love.... a love that is relational with the Father in Christ in the progress of overcoming disobedience without condemnation, and the moving forward in a constant regeneration of heart in overcoming and bearing fruit in our faith and our works.

I believe that the falling away from the faith to which there is no sacrifice left, isn't the faith of someone who is progressive and regenerative in the mutual love between God and His creation..... but this falling away is, however, exemplified in the rejection of this love in the atonement of Christ through one's unbelief....or..... in their self serving nature to which they regress in this love via their constant willful sin that has no desire to serve or please God, and have only a desire to get to heaven on their terms. Their theology is the opposite of John The Baptist in that "they must increase, and He must decrease" as a willful choice to be a reprobate which kills the faith that is counted as righteousness. The promise of righteousness is for those who accept the atonement of Christ on the cross in order to become more like Christ as a follower of the Most High God, and to do His Will. It is not to boast and say 'I am righteous', it is not to condemn others, it is not to obsess over right theology, it is not to quarrel over disputable matters, it is not legalistic and paralytic scorekeeping with one's self in their own effort to overcome temptation and sin, it is not to draw attention to one's self in good works (they have their reward), it is not to seek or chase compilations of writings and theologies by great men of God to find your own perfect theology (although there is a secondary place for seeing these men of God as brotherly examples of relationship and good theology, but it is not an end to itself).

IT IS SIMPLY A PROGRESSIVE RELATIONSHIP IN LOVE, which... by faith... has already accepted the gift of Christ by the Father for the atonement of our sins. Christ's atonement relieves me of the pressure to have a relationship with God by works alone. Christ did the work that opened the way for relationship. I can now passionately pursue His Will for me out of my love for Him without having to worry about being perfect in the process. This is freedom!!!

Re: - posted by bobmutch (), on: 2008/12/11 15:34

ccrider:

I am not sure what they think here on cross thread posting but you posted this on another thread and I responded there. You may want to check the FAQ or with one of the mod's on cross thread posting.

My Answer To ccrider Post On Other Thread