



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Arminian based commentary?

Arminian based commentary? - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/4/29 17:58

Someone asked me the other day to recommend a good arminian based commentary. I said Adam Clarke.

They asked for more. I said I didn't know of any.

So I ask...do you?

Re: Arminian based commentary? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/4/29 22:54

A bit dated, but John Wesley's.

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/4/29 23:07

Thanks Jimmy, I forgot about that.

Is Arminian theology fading out?

I mean are there any recent, 30 years or so, Arminian commentaries?

I never really thought about it until now.

Re: Arminian based commentary?, on: 2007/4/30 16:17

I don't know of anyone except Wesley, but would like to make a suggestion: ;-)

If you are tending towards Armenianism get a Calvinistic commentary and study it.

If you are tending towards Calvinism, get an Armenian commentary and study it.

If you aren't sure, get both.

Either way - if you don't throw the book out of the window first - you will probably end up being a bit more balanced in your theology on the subject!

Jeannette :-P

Re: PS, on: 2007/4/30 16:20

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

I don't know of anyone except Wesley, but would like to make a suggestion: ;-)

If you are tending towards Armenianism get a Calvinistic commentary and study it.

If you are tending towards Calvinism, get an Armenian commentary and study it.

If you aren't sure, get both.

Either way - if you don't throw the book out of the window first - you will probably end up being a bit more balanced in your theology on the subject!

Jeannette :-P

If you are in the third group you can do weight lifting with a book in each hand. That really would be balanced!

Sorry, but I just can't take Armenianism vs Calvinism very seriously any more. After wrestling with the subject for several years I eventually decided that both predestination and free will are true, and only God understands how that's possible.

Blessings

jeannette

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/4/30 16:29

Quote:
-----After wrestling with the subject for several years I eventually decided that both predestination and free will are true, and only God understands how that's possible.

Amen Sister. I like that alot.

I have have all the commentaries I need.

I was just wondering out loud about the Arminian thing

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/30 16:44

There are so few Arminian commentaries available today because:

- A) Arminianism falters when the context is presented.
- B) Arminians have tried, but become Calvinists once they get to Romans.
- C) Arminians have so many differing views they can't agree on what Arminianism means.
- D) They are too busy seeking the lost to worry about writing commentaries.

:-P

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/4/30 17:05

Quote:

I mean are there any recent, 30 years or so, Arminian commentaries?

I'm no expert on commentaries, but it seems to me these days commentaries tend to be written by a single author concerning a single book of the Bible. Gone are the days where men publish full blown commentaries on the entire Bible.

However, to get an idea of what commentaries out there are coming from what perspective, I came across this little gem in seminary called:

"New Testament Commentary Survey" by D. A. Carson.

This book survey's commentaries, tells the strengths and weaknesses, and tells the general perspective of each commentator.

In my opinion, most evangelical commentaries come from a Reformed point of view, as most commentaries are written by academics, who tend to be of Reformed persuasion, as those of the Reformed persuasion have prided themselves on their standing within the academy.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/4/30 17:39

Quote:

-----A) Arminianism falters when the context is presented.
B) Arminians have tried, but become Calvinists once they get to Romans.

If this is true I must not be the Arminian I thought I was! Actually I don't call myself an Arminian; he was far too Calvinist for my tastes.

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2007/4/30 17:58

Quote:

-----I don't call myself an Arminian; he was far too Calvinist for my tastes.

:~) :~) :~) :~) :~) :~) :~) :~) :~)

Re: Arminian based commentary? - posted by euangelion (), on: 2007/4/30 18:21

Adam Clarke is good. Ralph Earle has put out an abridgment of the 6 volumes. Also, Wesleyan Publishing House puts out a series of commentaries and also
(http://wesleyanbooks.com/Merchant2/merchant.mvc?Screen=CTGY&Store_Code=WB&Category_Code=C) Schmuller Publishing These of course are all *Wesleyan*-Arminian.

Re:, on: 2007/4/30 18:22

Quote:

JaySaved wrote:

There are so few Arminian commentaries available today because:

- A) Arminianism falters when the context is presented.
- B) Arminians have tried, but become Calvinists once they get to Romans.
- C) Arminians have so many differing views they can't agree on what Arminianism means.
- D) They are too busy seeking the lost to worry about writing commentaries.

:~P

HAHAHA, Hi Jay, I thought you would turn up sooner or later :-P

That's very good! Although only one of my hands agrees with you, the other is busy hefting the Armenian tome.

The Calvinism one is the heavier I think. All Martin Lloyd-Jones' commentaries on Romans must weigh a good bit for a start. What does it say in Ecclesiastes about the endless "making of many books"? A chap in the Christian Union in college had all of MLJ on Romans - a whole shelf full...

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by BeYeDoers (), on: 2007/4/30 20:44

Quote:

-----Quote:A) Arminianism falters when the context is presented.
B) Arminians have tried, but become Calvinists once they get to Romans.

If this is true I must not be the Arminian I thought I was!

Ditto!

Quote:

-----he was far too Calvinist for my tastes

Ron, I've seen you say this before. Can you expound on this a little? (I am not trying to hijack the thread, so we can start a new one or if you've done so elsewhere, just point in the right direction!)

d

Re: - posted by death2self (), on: 2007/5/3 14:09

The last outstanding Wesleyan theologian in my view was a man named Richard S. Taylor, who wrote a number of excellent works before his death in 2006. A.M. Hills was also a 20th century theologian, whom I've enjoyed and a number of his articles are on this site. His explanation concerning 1 John 1 is quite good...

J. Kenneth Grider was also a prominent theologian, who also died in 2006 and some of his writings are quite good and others not as good. Henry Orton Wiley was also a prominent 20th century holiness-style theologian.

This is far from a all-inclusive list but I believe the one I enjoy the best is John Wesley, because his theology was more practical and less intellectual...

Just my opinion for what little that's worth...

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/3 18:59

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:
A bit dated, but John Wesley's.

Who cares if they're dated! :-D I use them a lot.

Jordan

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/3 21:58

Quote:

Who cares if they're dated!

No doubt they are still of much value. However, I think one should realize that scholarly discoveries have been made since those days that would probably cause these older commentaries to draw slightly different conclusions regarding passages had they known some of the things we know today.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/5 9:21

Quote:
-----Ron, I've seen you say this before. Can you expound on this a little? (I am not trying to hijack the thread, so we can start a new one or if you've done so elsewhere, just point in the right direction!)

It's a bit of a throwaway line really, like the question 'was I predestined to be an Arminian?' The (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Remonstrants) 'Remonstrants' were really trying to modify the Calvinism of their day and it was they who created a series of protesting counterbalances to Calvinism. In fact, in my understanding, the 5 points of Calvinism were actually a response to the Remonstrants, so we should not think of the Remonstrants as protesting against the 5 points 'TULIP' but the 5 points as an answer to the writings of the Remonstrants. For a modern expression of Calvinism please see; (http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/Articles/ByDate/1985/1487_What_We_Believe_About_the_Five_Points_of_Calvinism/) Piper on the 5 Points of Calvinism.

The Five Articles of the Remonstrants were:**Article I** - That God, by an eternal, unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ, his Son, before the foundation of the world, hath determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ's sake, and through Christ, those who, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this his Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience of faith, through this grace, even to the end; and, on the other hand, to leave them incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath, and to condemn them as alienate from Christ, according to the word of the Gospel in John iii. 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him," and according to other passages of Scripture also.

Article II - That, agreeably thereto, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that he has obtained for them all, by his death on the cross, redemption, and the forgiveness of sins; yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins, except the believer, according to the word of the Gospel of John iii. 16: "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; and in the First Epistle of John ii. 2: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only. but also for the sins of the whole world."

Article III — That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free-will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can of and by himself neither think, will, nor do anything that is truly good (such as having faith eminently is); but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ, through his Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination, or will, and all his powers, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will, and effect what is truly good, according to the word of Christ, John xv. 5: "Without me ye can do nothing."

Article IV — That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of an good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without that prevenient or assisting; awakening, following, and co-operative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements that can be conceived must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But, as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many that they have resisted the Holy Ghost, Acts vii, and elsewhere in many places.

Article V — That those who are incorporated into Christ by a true faith, and have thereby become partakers of his life-giving spirit, have thereby full power to strive against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and to win the victory, it being well understood that it is ever through the assisting grace of the Holy Ghost; and that Jesus Christ assists them through his Spirit in all temptations, extends to them his hand; and if only they are ready for the conflict. and desire his help, and are not inactive, keeps them from falling, so that they, by no craft or power of Satan, can be misled, nor plucked out of Christ's hands, according to the word of Christ, John x. 28: "Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." But whether they are capable, through negligence, of forsaking again the first beginnings of their life in Christ, of again returning to this present evil world, of turning away from the holy doctrine which was delivered them, of losing a good conscience, of becoming devoid of grace, that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scriptures before we ourselves can teach it with the full persuasion of our minds. Articles 3 and 4 above still seem to suggest that regeneration precedes faith. In this they are standing shoulder to shoulder with the Calvinists, but this is not the way I see things. I believe faith precedes regeneration and that 'prevenient grace' is available wherever the gospel is preached in the power of the Holy Spirit. Article 4 above says that 'this grace' which seems to mean regeneration itself is 'the beginning, continuance and accomplishment of any good'. My view of 'prevenient grace' is more Wesleyan than that referred to in

Article 4. I see 'faith' as man's response to God's prevenient grace which is inherent in any 'word' that God add resses to men. The Arminians, in this article, seem to use it to refer to the daily grace necessary to walk in God's will. So in this sense... they are 'too Calvinist for my tastes'...

I bet you wished you hadn't asked. :-D

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/5 11:11

Quote:

Articles 3 and 4 above still seem to suggest that regeneration precedes faith.

This is an interesting idea that I have always been amazed at. The thinking goes that since we are dead in sin, we are unable to respond to God in anyway whatsoever. Thus, God must save us and regenerate us so as to make us able to respond to God.

What I find so interesting about this idea is that the Calvinist still holds that the preaching of the word, faith, and repentance are still a necessary thing. It seems an inconsistent thing to me. If we are saved before we are saved by faith, then how is it that the Calvinist believes in sola fide?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/5 13:26

Quote:

What I find so interesting about this idea is that the Calvinist still holds that the preaching of the word, faith, and repentance are still a necessary thing. It seems an inconsistent thing to me.

I agree and it would be easy to reject the logic of Calvinism out-of-hand if so many godly and sane people had not believed in it. :-o

For the Calvinist regeneration is the start of everything and everything else proceeds from regeneration. So because man is dead the first step, they say, must be for God to raise the dead... hence regeneration. From this sovereign act of regeneration everything else flows... faith, repentance, conversion... all are possible only to the regenerated.

God still requires faith but that is only available to the regenerated. Do they then have a choice to believe or not? This is where 'irresistible grace' kicks in. Those who have been elected and had payment paid for their sins will inevitably believe; so says the Calvinist.

There are a couple of quotes from Wesley and Whitefield that I like to see together, although I think Whitefield's is the sweeter...

Whitefield, asked by a censorious Calvinist whether he thought they might see John Wesley in heaven, replied; "I fear not. He will be so near the throne and we shall be at such a distance that we shall hardly get a sight of him."

Wesley..."had come to know many believers in predestination whose real Christian experience could not be denied..." and added...that this fact stared him "...in the face and was clear proof that predestination is only an opinion, not subversive of the very foundations of Christian experience, but compatible with a love to Christ and a genuine work of grace. Yes, many hold it at whose feet I desire to be found in the day of the Lord Jesus."