

**News and Current Events :: Piper Denounces Prosperity Preachers, Playful Worship in Last Sermon****Piper Denounces Prosperity Preachers, Playful Worship in Last Sermon - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2013/1/3 10:10**

In his last message as pastor for Preaching and Vision at Bethlehem Baptist Church, John Piper condemned prosperity preachers for enticing worshippers into a faith that's not real Christianity.

"If you entice people with wealth, ... ease, health, chipper, bouncy, light-hearted, playful, superficial banter in your worship service posing as joy in Christ, you will attract people, oh yeah, you can grow a huge church that way. But Christ will not be seen in his glory and the Christian life will not be seen as the Calvary road that it is," said Piper on Sunday.

After 32 years of preaching at Bethlehem in Minneapolis, Piper handed the baton to Jason Meyer, who will be installed on Jan. 20. ...

read more: <http://www.christianpost.com/news/piper-denounces-prosperity-preachers-playful-worship-in-last-sermon-87588/>

**Re: Piper Denounces Prosperity Preachers, Playful Worship in Last Sermon - posted by rufnrust (), on: 2013/1/3 14:07**

Does Mr Piper believe that anyone who is more joyful in their walk with Jesus than he or his group is lacking authenticity?

I was under the clear impression that Jesus wanted us to experience fullness of joy. I wonder what that would look like?

Ruf

**Re: Piper Denounces Prosperity Preachers, Playful Worship in Last Sermon - posted by Keylla (), on: 2013/1/3 16:38**

Can you say me about dr. Charles Stanley ? is he trustfull? Does he preach the right gospel ?

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/1/3 21:42**

This is what Piper said:

---

"If you entice people with wealth, ... ease, health, chipper, bouncy, light-hearted, playful, superficial banter in your worship service posing as joy in Christ, you will attract people, oh yeah, you can grow a huge church that way."

---

Maybe you misunderstood?

I know what Piper is talking about. I have attended services like this and I left feeling like my time was wasted. The worst was when we attended a Christian wedding service where the officiating pastor talked like a comedian all the way through. Now I love humor and love to laugh - all who know me will agree to that - BUT there is a place and a time to be serious. I did not say one cannot say anything humorous in worship service but when it becomes a comedian's routine, I think I will go elsewhere. It just does not seem to be holy or something. The Holy Spirit seems to be absent.

My opinion..

**Re: - posted by Robert\_79, on: 2013/1/4 3:56**

I realize that this is not entirely on topic, but is in reply to Keylla's question: I want to be very careful in how I speak about others, but I also want to be bold to defend the truth. Much of what Charles Stanley teaches sounds true, but there is a deadly poison mixed with it. I do not believe that what he teaches is the real gospel.

In his book, *Eternal Security*, he makes this statement:

"There are many similarities between salvation and marriage. A person does not become married by acting married. Neither does one gain a divorce by acting divorced. A man and woman are married by entering into a legal contract. Obtaining a divorce is a legal matter as well. Whether they ever act married or not is irrelevant. I have known several couples who separated and adopted lifestyles that gave no evidence of their marital status. Yet they were as married then as the day they said their vows... Salvation, as we have seen, occurs at a moment in time when we by faith accept God's free gift... Just as there are married people who act as if they are not, so there are Christians who show no evidence of their Christianity as well. But that does not change their eternal status, any more than a lost man can change his eternal destiny by acting saved."

Stanley says that there are Christians who show no evidence of their Christianity. But Jesus said, "You will know them by their fruits." In 1 Corinthians 6 and Ephesians 5, Paul taught that the unrighteous would not inherit the kingdom. In both passages, he says, "Do not be deceived." Those who teach that the unrighteous can inherit the kingdom are deceivers.

What Charles Stanley and many like him teach is that salvation happens at a point in time and we are justified with God and can never lose our salvation. But what he does not teach is that true salvation always produces fruit. James 2 tells us that faith without works is dead. This kind of faith will not save. We are not saved by our works, but true faith will produce good works. But Mr. Stanley says that there are Christians who show no evidence of their Christianity. This is a blatant rejection of Scripture and a serious one, as this doctrine is giving false hope to millions who have not been born again.

For a deeper understanding of this subject, I would highly recommend Charles Leiter's book *Justification and Regeneration* or any sermons on *sermonindex* by Paul Washer.

Ezekiel 13:22 has this to say about the false prophets: "Because with lies you have made the heart of the righteous sad, whom I have not made sad; and you have strengthened the hands of the wicked, so that he does not turn from his wicked way to save his life."

Mr. Stanley and many like him are strengthening the hand of the wicked by promising them that they can continue living in sin, loving sin, and still have eternal life. May we pray for them as Paul did, even with tears, for they are the enemies of the cross of Christ.

Above all, spend time reading God's Word humbly and prayerfully. So many are deceived by preachers twisting texts or ignoring the great themes of Scripture because they do not know God's Word. May the Lord protect you, me, and all on this forum from deception in the days when iniquity abounds and the love of most grows cold. He is able to do this in our lives, and may God continue to raise up many godly men (such as those whose sermons are on here) who are preaching the true Gospel with the power of the Holy Spirit. Christ is worthy!

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2013/1/4 6:11**

dear robert, i do not think you read or heard brother stanley state that you can be loving sin and living in blatant sin and be saved. he would probably say that they were never saved. this is a topic that this site would rather have not brought up for it stirs fights that have not been resolved since the reformation. dr. stanley is a great man of God that holds true to baptist doctrine.jimp

**Re: Piper Denounces Prosperity Preachers, Playful Worship in Last Sermon, on: 2013/1/4 7:34**

Quote:  
-----"There are many similarities between salvation and marriage. A person does not become married by acting married. Neither does one gain a divorce by acting divorced. A man and woman are married by entering into a legal contract. Obtaining a divorce is a legal matter as well. Whether they ever act married or not is irrelevant. I have known several couples who separated and adopted lifestyles that gave no evidence of their marital status. Yet they were as married then as the day they said their vows... Salvation, as we have seen, occurs at a moment in time when we by faith accept God's free gift... Just as there are married people who act as if they are not, so there are Christians who show no evidence of their Christianity as well. But that does not change their eternal status, any more than a lost man can change his eternal destiny by acting saved." Robert\_79.  
-----

Sometimes the difficulty we have in believing or accepting a truth lies not just in the fact that truth is only ever really comprehended when the revelation of it is met with a willingness to obey it, but also in the way that truth is then presented by those who have laid hold of it.

This presentation by Mr Stanley is a good case in point. In sharing this I do so because I happen to agree with the underlying truth which Mr Stanley is making. Namely that there is an eternal security in believing in Christ's name. However to use marriage in this way is to really miss the reality of what in fact marriage is before God. If marriage were simply a matter of a certificate then it would be necessary to agree that God Himself can be deceived. Just as men are deceived when a man presents a certificate of marriage but has in reality never known his legal wife. We could argue all day long about whether or why some one might have a certificate but have no actual union of bodies. Well God cannot be deceived and so such a certificate without union would be a falsehood. Which begs the question what is marriage before God?

Marriage is the union of one man and one woman period. The certificate whilst necessary is just that a certificate which is given as a public witness of an intention. All reasonable presumption is that they will go off and the marriage will be consummated. But if no such consummation took place the man and the woman would not be married before God they would only be married before men. This may seem like a mere semantic because in reality the man and the woman in such an instance would be treated as though they were married regardless of their personal physical relationship. In the same way whilst divorce is a certificate, it too may be just that. It may be legal and so on but if for example the party who was rejected had not in fact committed adultery and the one seeking the divorce had lied, then before God they would be still married yet before men they would be divorced. Perhaps it would be inevitable that the one doing the rejecting would go on to be joined to another woman, but this is besides the point.

With God there is no such lack of reality. In speaking about the life relationship between a believer and Christ no certificate is issued. If you like the evidence is in the one who says they believe. The reality of divorce is not the certificate, it is the adultery. The certificate is just the outward evidence of it. In the same way the outward evidence of having received eternal life are fruits of eternal life. Whilst it was never God's will that men and women divorce the only scriptural reality which is recognised as a basis for issuing a certificate of divorce is adultery.

The reality of marriage is not a certificate it is union between one man and one woman. The reality of divorce is not a certificate it is adultery (the union between one man and another woman) and the reality of eternal life is fruits of eternal life. We should concern ourselves with reality according to God and not men otherwise we will simply lose sight of what is real and what is imagined to be real.

**Re: - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2013/1/4 9:52**

Really, then comparing marriage with salvation muddles both issues... Am not sure scriptures draws parallels between the two, does it?

**Re: Piper Denounces Prosperity Preachers, Playful Worship in Last Sermon, on: 2013/1/4 10:22**

Quote:  
-----Really, then comparing marriage with salvation muddles both issues... Am not sure scriptures draws parallels between the two, does it? GinnyRose  
-----

I wonder if all of us don't sometimes suffer from a sound idea, but a broken way to explaining it. Certainly I am often disappointed with my own efforts. If there is a correlation between the union of a man and a woman and salvation it is several and not a single idea. For example salvation is in reality Christ Himself. Christ is our saviour and it is in receiving Him that we are saved. Clearly to become one flesh with a woman, from the man's perspective has to be the foundation of marriage in reality of experience, but if there is no experience how can there be a true marriage. "Know ye not that he who is joined to a harlot becomes one flesh". If this is true of a harlot then it cannot be less true for one's wife. The scripture is correspondingly pressed to an understanding regarding faithfulness to Christ. It has to do with idolatry and as is often the case in Scripture harlotry also means faithlessness. Faithlessness means adultery and sleeping with a harlot or prostitute is the same as taking her as your wife.

The mystery is not that a man and a woman become one flesh, because this is amply evidenced by our children. The mystery is that Christ is one with His church. In this Christ is the head and the Church is the body of Christ. Christ in all and all is Christ. Adam was one man and Eve was one woman. Clearly they could not have been faithless to one another or to anyone else. They were physically set so as to determine faithfulness. Yet they were capable of being faithless towards God. Marriage if taken in its perfect intention of God is by definition holy and therefore it is by definition a matter of separateness. The putting aside of the wives and children when Judah came out of exile speaks of this same reality. It seems harsh on the face of it to say this yet the connection between faithfulness and faith is often linked scripturally to marriage and cannot be denied. The question at the root of the concern which prompted my response had to do with whether salvation could be taken as an eternal confidence from the outset of faith in Christ. I say yes it can. Yet so what I hear. There is the difficulty in seeking to use marriage itself as an example of union and persistence of outcome, if marriage is held in such contempt. God is not so faithless and His intentions never change. He intended Adam and Eve to remain faithful for life and He intends to remain faithful through Christ unto eternity. Beyond that.....

**Re: - posted by andres (), on: 2013/1/4 10:25**

Marriage and Salvation.. the closest thing I can find is in Ephesians 5..Christ and the Church  
andy

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2013/1/4 10:46**

hi, in both you enter into a covenant relationship, hopefully with the shedding of blood, to the end of life, in both it is love that keeps each faithful. in both (and you can believe me ) there is a cost for sin. in both we become one flesh. hid with Christ in God...etc. many things are the same. jimp adam knew eve intimately and we must know Jesus intimately as He must know us the same. to know Him.... depart...for i never knew you...

**Re: - posted by Robert\_79, on: 2013/1/4 23:21**

Dear jimp,

Thank you for the reply. I appreciate your heart and truly know that we should be quite careful in how we speak of others. I grew up in a godly home where Charles Stanley was highly respected, and I was very surprised by the statements that I read in his book, Eternal Security. I have tried contacting him with my concerns but received no reply.

I am not trying to slander anyone and have no hard feelings towards Mr. Stanley, but the doctrine he promotes is not the Gospel. I would encourage you to read the book if you have not and you feel it is an important issue. True godly brothers over the centuries have differed on the question of whether or not a believer can lose his salvation. But what is promoted in this book is something different than the historical doctrine of the perseverance of the saints.

What is promoted in this book is what I posted before, namely that "there are Christians who show no evidence of their Christianity". That is a direct quote in its proper context from the book Eternal Security. This is not merely a matter of whether a believer can lose his salvation, which is debatable. It is a matter of whether you can be a Christian and have no evidence of Christ in your life. The Scriptures are clear that a man who is a believer will bear fruit. Orthodox, historical

Christianity would label the doctrine that a Christian can show no evidence of his Christianity as a heresy. Calvinists and non-Calvinists alike have denounced this doctrine.

Are you disagreeing with the idea that a true Christian will bear fruit, or are you merely saying that Mr. Stanley does not promote this idea? The bigger question is the doctrinal one, not what Mr. Stanley does or doesn't promote. But in seeking the Lord on this matter, I have felt that he is a man that we should warn people about, as the idea that someone can be a Christian and show no evidence of it but still go to heaven when he dies gives false comfort to millions of American churchgoers who have not been born again and are on their way to eternal damnation.

I know this is strongly worded, but it is a serious issue. There are many things we can disagree on, and even be wrong about and still have fellowship. But the Gospel is not such an issue. My understanding of Scripture would lead me to believe that a teaching which gives false assurance to unconverted people is not an issue on which we can be silent or even have fellowship with those who teach it.

May the Lord bless you as you continue to seek Him.

In Christ,

Robert

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2013/1/5 4:02**

hi, very well stated brother robert..jimp

**Re: - posted by Keylla (), on: 2013/1/5 10:23**

Hi

I think it is hard to believe a preacher that preaches about sin in his church that he is also saying you can go to heaven even if you don't leave sin. My question is only because I really don't know him very well, but I have heard him speaking about sin and that a Christian can not expect blessing from God living in sinful life. So it is hard to believe Dr. Stanley say you can go to heaven without evidence of repentance. I think he speaks much about blessing and love of God than sin, he sometimes I think it could be a soft gospel... Should I desconsider him as a man of God? His sermons has been blessing to me...can someone else give his opinion?

**Re: - posted by astancel (), on: 2013/1/5 11:23**

To reply to Robert 79 and Charles Stanley remarks: I look to the book of Hebrews when thinking of this response, Hebrews 5:11-6:20 with the 3rd warning and Acts 8 with Simon. I believe those who think that are saved but act differently are not really saved at all. I don't believe that if you have truly accepted Christ as your Lord and Savior and believe in the One True Living God that you can lose your salvation. The question arises is that are those people who say they are Christians truly saved at all- have they truly accepted Christ as their Lord and Savior. I don't believe that Simon in Acts 8 was truly saved and neither are some people who are proclaiming to be Christians today. we must pray for them and for Charles Stanley- I don't know if he is a blatant false teacher but I don't agree with everything he says and I don't listen to him. we aren't going to agree with everyone but that doesn't mean that they are false teachers.