

Articles and Sermons :: DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM

DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/1/16 20:00

SOME QUOTATIONS FROM THE BOOK

“Most of those today, including evangelical leaders, who hold Calvin in great esteem, are not aware that they have been captivated by the writings of a devout Roman Catholic newly converted to Luther’s Protestantism only two years previously (in the early part of 1533). Oddly, in spite of its paramount importance and his voluminous writings, we have no clear testimony in Calvin’s own words concerning his salvation. He refers only to ‘a sudden conversion’ which subdued his ‘over-much hardened’ heart, but gives no description of how or what happened. ... By any standard, this young man, though unusually bright, was far from mature in the Christian faith. ... Unquestionably, his Institutes could not possibly have come from a deep and fully developed evangelical understanding of Scripture. Instead, they came from the energetic enthusiasm of a recent law graduate and fervent student of philosophy and religion, a young genius devoted to Augustine and a newly adopted cause. ... At the time of writing his Institutes Calvin, far from being an apostle like Paul, was a brand-new convert to the faith who had scarcely begun to walk with the Lord. Therefore, it could not have been spiritual maturity under the guidance of the Holy Spirit that brought forth the Institutes, but the power of Calvin’s brilliant legal mind.” (pp. 38, 39, 40)

“Calvin’s almost complete agreement with Augustine is nothing short of astounding. Calvin called himself ‘an Augustinian theologian.’ Of Augustine he said, ‘whom we quote frequently, as being the best and most faithful witness of all antiquity.’ It is Calvinists themselves who insist upon the connection between Calvin and Augustine. McGrath writes, ‘Above all, Calvin regarded his thought as a faithful exposition of the leading ideas of Augustine of Hippo.’ ... How could one of the principal leaders of the Reformation embrace so fully the doctrines of one who has been called ‘the first real Roman Catholic’ and the ‘principal theological creator of the Latin-Catholic system as distinct from ... evangelical Protestantism...?’” (p. 51)

“Calvinism offers a special definition of human depravity: that depravity equals inability -- and this special definition necessitates both Unconditional Election and Irresistible Grace. ... There is not a verse in the Bible, however, which presents Calvinism’s radical idea that the sinner is incapable of believing the very gospel which offers him forgiveness and salvation and yet he is condemned by God for failing to believe. ... To say that God commands men to do what they cannot do without His grace, then withholds the grace they need and punishes them eternally for failing to obey, is to make a mockery of God’s Word, of His mercy and love, and is to libel His character.” (pp. 93, 94, 96)

“Why does God waste His time and effort and the time and effort of His many prophets pleading with those who, allegedly, cannot hear Him and who, even if they could, being totally depraved, would never respond to His appeal by believing and obeying Him? Why create this elaborate fiction of mourning and weeping over multitudes who God knows will not only refuse to repent but who, unless He regenerates them, cannot repent because of their total inability to do so?” (p. 107)

“Take a human understanding of ‘dead,’ mix it together with the young John Calvin’s immature understanding of God’s Word, tainted by Augustinian philosophy, stir it up and out comes the theory of Total Depravity.” (p. 119)

“Yes, man is totally unable to contribute one iota to his salvation. It does not then follow, however, that he therefore cannot receive the salvation freely offered in Christ.” (p. 121)

“It is clear that Calvinism rests upon a mistaken view of what it means for God to be sovereign. ... The basic problem for the Calvinist is a failure to see that God could sovereignly give to man the power of genuine choice. ... Giving man the power to make a genuine, independent choice need not diminish God’s control over His universe. Being omnipotent and omniscient, God can so arrange circumstances as to keep man’s rebellion from frustrating His purposes. In fact, God can and even does use man’s free will to help fulfill His own plans and thus be even more glorified.” (pp. 128, 129)

“Suggesting that God would be lacking in ‘power’ (and thus His sovereignty would be denied) if He made a genuine offer of salvation, and some rejected it, is to frame the proposition wrongly. Power has no relationship to grace and love,

which provide salvation. In fact, as we shall see, there are many things which God cannot do, and a lack of 'power' is not the reason for any of them, nor is His sovereignty mitigated in the least." (p. 136)

"There is no escaping the fact that in Calvin's entire Institutes of the Christian Religion there is not one mention of God's love for the lost!" (p. 151)

"So once again, rather than looking to men, no matter how great their reputations, we are driven to come to our own conclusions on the basis of Scripture alone." (p. 162)

"Of course salvation is not our doing; but that we cannot earn salvation does not prove that we cannot freely choose to receive salvation as a gift of God's love." (p. 182)

"The Calvinist insists, however, that salvation cannot be conditioned upon any act or belief on man's part... This declaration is made repeatedly: 'To reject election is to reject salvation by grace and promote salvation by works.' Yet if anything is clear in Scripture it is the undisputable fact that faith is not work but its very antithesis. 'By grace are ye saved, through faith... not of works' (Ephesians 2:8-9). Nothing could be clearer than the fact that, by believing, one is doing no work. In fact, faith and work are contrasted." (pp. 190, 191)

"... in contrast to the literally hundreds of places where God's love is clearly expressed for all of Israel (most of whom rejected Him) and for the whole world (most of whom also reject Him), nowhere does the Bible declare that God does not love and desire the salvation of all." (p. 206)

"God's sovereignty would no more be undermined if some accepted the offer of salvation and others rejected it than for billions of humans continually to disobey the Ten Commandments." (p. 206)

"Furthermore, would it not be a misrepresentation of the worst sort to offer salvation to whosoever will, when in fact it was only intended for a select few? ... to claim that 'all' means only a select group called the elect does violence to the plain meaning of language and impugns the character of God; and it does this in order to force upon the Word of God a system of religion which cannot be derived from it." (p. 208)

"One of the sad features of Calvin's Institutes is the demeaning language he continually employs (much like Luther) to vilify all who disagree with him." (p. 233)

"There is no way that Christ's death could be limited to paying only for the elect's sins. To deliver even one person from eternal punishment, no matter how few or many the sins he may have committed, Christ had to pay the penalty demanded by His infinite justice for sin. By very definition, then, the death of Christ on the cross paid the penalty for sin itself which hangs over the heads of the entire human race." (p. 251)

"At times, Calvin himself seemed to be ambivalent on this subject. He made statements both supporting unlimited atonement and at other times in favor of limited atonement. Referring to Isaiah 53:12 he said, 'on Him was laid the guilt of the whole world.' Concerning Mark 14:24, 'This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many,' Calvin said, 'The word many does not mean a part of the world, but the whole human race.' On 1 John 2:2, Calvin declared, 'Christ suffered for the sins of the whole world, and in the goodness of God is offered unto all men without distinction, his blood being shed... for the whole human race.' ... Calvin is quoted as the authority when it suits today's Calvinists, and at other times he is ignored. Yet this confusing doctrine upon which its adherents do not agree among themselves or even with Calvin is still called 'Calvinism' by everyone." (p. 262, 263)

"As we shall see when we come to Perseverance of the Saints, a major problem for Calvinists is how to be certain that one is among that select group for whom alone Christ allegedly died. We see this uncertainty in Calvin himself. In his will, drawn up shortly before his death. Calvin wrote, 'I humbly seek from God... to be washed and purified by the great Redeemer's blood, shed for the sins of the human race...' How is it that this greatest of exegetes seemed uncertain in spite of Scripture's promise of absolute assurance: 'these things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God; that ye may know that ye have eternal life...' (1 John 5:13)? Such assurance comes not by a special revelation that one is among the elect, but by simple faith in Christ." (p. 253)

"Tragically, Calvinism's misrepresentation of God has caused many to turn away from the God of the Bible as from a monster." (p. 287)

“Indeed, just as God himself cannot force anyone to love Him (a coerced response is the opposite of love), so it would be the very opposite of grace to force any gift or benefit of ‘grace’ upon anyone who did not want to receive it.” (p. 291)

“God truly and powerfully works within the believer and we can do nothing but by the leading and empowering of the Holy Spirit. At the same time, however, we must give ourselves willingly to the work of God through us. Most Calvinists admit this cooperative effort when it comes to living the Christian life, but insist that there can be no such willingness in believing the gospel and accepting Christ.” (p. 298)

“Surely the continual disobedience both of unbelievers and believers proves that God’s grace is not ‘irresistible.’ Nor does man’s disobedience diminish God’s sovereignty in the least. Obviously, freedom of choice itself is part of God’s plan!” (p. 299)

“If Paul did not want a single Jew to go to hell and was in continual agony of soul for their salvation, willing even to be accursed of God if that would save his ‘kinsmen according to the flesh’ (Romans 9:1-3), would God, who surely put this selfless love in Paul’s heart, be any less loving and concerned for lost humanity on its way to hell? Surely not the God of the Bible! ... Could Paul have been wrong in his continual agony over the lost sheep of the house of Israel (and indeed all men), and Calvin right in his lack of concern for the lost?” (pp. 301, 302)

“... my firm disagreement with Calvinism is not over God’s sovereignty, which I fully embrace and to which I submit. The issue is whether God loves all without partiality and desires all to be saved. Unquestionably, Calvinism denies such love; but the Bible, in the clearest language repeatedly declares God’s love to all and His desire that all should be saved and none should be lost.” (pp. 301, 302)

“We consider TULIP to be a libel against our loving and merciful God as He reveals himself both in His Word and in human conscience.” (p. 304)

“The very fact that Paul, Apollos and the other early evangelists expended so much time and energy in persuading men to believe the gospel is completely contrary to the concept of both Total Depravity and Irresistible Grace.” (p. 324)

“... the Calvinist has boldly changed ‘world’ to mean ‘elect’ in no fewer than twenty scriptures. He has changed ‘whosoever’ and ‘all’ into ‘elect’ at least sixteen times each. In addition, the phrase ‘every man’ has been turned into ‘elect’ six times and ‘everyone’ into ‘elect’ three times. In every instance where these changes have been made there is nothing in the text to justify ‘elect’ as the meaning of the word for which it must be substituted. The change has been made for one reason only: to accommodate Calvinism!” (p. 332)

“No one naturally seeks the Lord; we all seek our own selfish desires, and no one can come to Christ except the Father draw him. But the Holy Spirit is in the world to convict all of their sin and need (John 16:8-11), the gospel is being preached, the Father is drawing everyone (even through the witness of creation and conscience).” (p. 339)

“Rather than any natural brilliance, Calvin’s arguments reflect a bias toward the sacramentalism he learned as a Roman Catholic from Augustine, which he elaborated upon and thereafter was compelled to defend. His logic often betrays a spiritual immaturity. Incredibly, Calvin argued: ‘... But if baptism was of God, it certainly included in it the promise of forgiveness of sin, mortification of the flesh, quickening of the Spirit, and communion with Christ.’ These astonishing statements reflect a sacramentalism which maintains that the physical act of baptism has spiritual power and imparts regeneration. To be baptized by Roman Catholic priests who were not even Christians but held to and promoted a false gospel, was perfectly acceptable to Calvin because they used the name of God when they administered it!” (p. 341)

“Why doesn’t God’s irresistible grace that is so powerful toward sinners create perfectly obedient lives after sinners are saved?” (p. 354)

“Who would say that man can come to God ‘unassisted’ by the Holy Spirit? Not even the rankest Arminian! But Calvinism makes that false charge against those who disagree with its extremism.” (p. 369)

“Moreover, it is foolish to suggest that receiving a gift means we deserve it. ... A drowning man who yields himself into the hands of his rescuer has nothing to boast about, nor has he done any work to assist in his rescue. So it is with the lost sinner.” (p. 370)

“Before beginning what turned into an urgent and in-depth study of Calvinism, I had thought that I was at least a one-point Calvinist. Surely my belief in eternal security, the assurance of salvation eternally in God’s presence, must be the same as Calvinism’s Perseverance of the Saints. That turned out, however, not to be the case. Why? Biblical assurance of salvation does not depend upon one’s performance but upon the gospel’s declaration that Christ died for the sins of the world and upon His promise that whosoever believes in Him receives the gift of eternal life. In contrast, the Calvinist’s assurance is in God having predestined him to eternal life as one of the elect -- and his performance plays a large part in helping him to know whether or not he is among that select group.” (p. 377)

“Doubts even assail leading Calvinists. Zane C. Hodges points out that ‘the result of this theology is disastrous. Since, according to Puritan belief, the genuineness of a man’s faith can only be determined by the life that follows it, assurance of salvation becomes impossible at the moment of conversion.’ And, one might add, at any time thereafter as well, for reasons we will show. ‘... No wonder, then, as R.T. Kendall has commented, that ‘nearly all of the Puritan ‘divines’ went through great doubt and despair on their deathbeds as they realized their lives did not give perfect evidence that they were elect.’ Arminius, on the other hand, contrary to the false label attached to him by his enemies, had perfect assurance and said that the believer can ‘depart out of this life ... to appear before the throne of grace, without any anxious fear.’ ‘... Congdon writes, ‘Absolute assurance of salvation is impossible in Classical Calvinism. ‘... Since works are an inevitable outcome of ‘true’ salvation, one can only know he or she is saved by the presence of good works. But since no one is perfect ... any assurance is at best imperfect as well. Therefore, you may think you believed in Jesus Christ, may think you had saving faith, but be sadly mistaken ... and because unsaved, be totally blind to the fact you are unsaved.’” (p. 378)

Re: DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM - posted by tjservant (), on: 2009/1/16 20:27

Greg

Have you read this book?

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/1/16 20:46

No,

I have not read the book but have glanced at it a few times. I put this out there for consideration and perhaps some people that have read the book can share some of the valid views or problems they saw from the book itself. Or assertions that are correct and worth taking note of.

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2009/1/16 21:09

Quote:
-----I put this out there for consideration and perhaps some people that have read the book can share some of the valid views or problems they saw from the book itself

This book has been brought up several times on SI. It has also been refuted just as many times. These books do little to change people's minds, they typically just use them to bolster their opinions. Dave Hunt is king of the straw man.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/1/16 21:18

If Hunt is going to be brought up, then may I suggest that folks view this as well to be balanced in what they hear-

(http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZlYlgoBTH8&feature=channel_page) Dave Hunt Calvinism

And may I also suggest that people look at this site to see refutations and corrections of of Hunt(scroll down a tad)-

(<http://www.corkfpc.com/calvinismindex.html>) Calvinism Index

All of these are only so people can be Bereans and not just swallow something that may or may not be Biblical.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/1/16 21:27

This video in particular deals with "What Love is This" by Dave Hunt-

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tw-Q41TKBxQ>) Hunt on Calvinism

This one would be of interest in this topic as well-

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q2IBvETGVD0&feature=related>) John 6

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/1/16 21:50

Quote:

-----This video in particular deals with "What Love is This" by Dave Hunt-

Hunt on Calvinism

I feel this video is very revealing showing truly a prevalent spirit of intellectualism and exactitude on theology. But no emphasis on "life" or "godliness" James White could be anybody, in Calvinism the person is not as important as the doctrine. God sees it in reverse and the whole point of doctrine to lead to life and godliness in believers.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/1/16 22:01

Brother I don't know if you have ever heard Mr. White preach?

He would agree with you that Scripture leads to life and godliness. But the desire for life over and above the truth of Scripture is not proper.

Zeal for zeal's sake does not mean that someone has a right theology.

But again the attitude of anti-intellectualism comes out and I do not understand it. Scripture commands us to "rightly divide the word of truth". So we need to work to understand things like context, language, background, writing style etc.

To ignore those can lead into dangerous practices.

But just so we may clear, I say these things in love, and I do hope you know that above all else.

Re: - posted by strawrifle (), on: 2009/1/16 22:05

Hi Greg !! I love Dave's ministry, but many state his arguments were rather weak on this subject...

An excellent book with more hmmm scholarly credentials : Roger E Olson Arminian Theology: Myths and Realities. He's Professor of Theology at Baylor University...

Great book!

Jesus vs. Calvinism - posted by iansmith (), on: 2009/1/16 22:08

Jesus' own words are one of the strongest refutations of Calvinism (in a strict sense).

Luke 13:34 O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not!

Luke 19:41-42 And when he was come near, he beheld the city, and wept over it, Saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes.

Does this sound like a God who denies mankind a choice to reject him through predestination. This sounds more like a God who offers the free gift of his love to everyone, and it is the choice of every person whether to accept that free gift of Grace or reject it.

Jesus is bigger than Calvinism or Arminianism!

Re: Jesus vs. Calvinism - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/1/16 22:15

Quote:

-----Jesus is bigger than Calvinism or Arminianism!

Amen!

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2009/1/16 22:23

Dear brother Greg,

I very much I appreciate what you have posted. I have read it and my spirit rejoices in the truth of God.

Thank you brother for all your faithfulness to the truth. His word is truth and will stand alone without all the "isms" that so entangles men.

Re: DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM - posted by Koheleth, on: 2009/1/16 23:01

I feel like I want to say something, but don't want to cause any debate! ;-)

I think everyone needs to beware of elitism. (I am not excluding myself.) I don't think it matters if Greg has read this or any other book. I want to know how many times he has read the words of Jesus. I am not putting down teachers or books, but are any statements made more valid because one has read the whole book? That should not be the point here.

I am not any more pro-Dave-Hunt than I am pro-James-White. I am not a Calvinist, but I don't appreciate that a book with an Arminian reference in the title was brought up. Is there one Christian who has ever seen a single soul saved because of a Calvinism-Arminianism debate?

Quote:

-----"Beware you are not swallowed up in books! An ounce of love is worth a pound of knowledge."- John Wesley

I appreciate this quote from the other thread. We need to beware of any books or authors or perspectives that might obscure or slant Christ in the least. I read a lot, and I have to confess that the more I read the more I appreciate the words of Christ. I have a stack of books I really like, but I am not going to try to promote an author or a book to you. There is nothing on this earth as refreshing as reading through one of the gospels. There, Jesus comes through pure and undefiled. Glory to God for the Gospels!

"-isms" always lead to schisms. Avoid them like the plague.

Re: DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM - posted by int3grity (), on: 2009/1/16 23:25

Brother Greg, I have been saying over and over how misinformation and misrepresentations of this issue is what causes suspicion and division in the body of CHRIST.

Please, sermon index readers who have read this grievously wrong and deliberately deceptive diatribe called, "What Love is This?" by Dave Hunt, please listen to this honest critique of his book which looks at some of the lies and errors perpetrated in it and exposes the faulty scholarship Dave Hunt employed in creating this Church-dividing book.

You can download it here:

<http://www.box.net/shared/42v9bprxfv>

It is a critique by Philip Johnson who is an editor who is an authority on Church history, Greek scholarship, and historical

theology. He is definitely qualified to review a book like this.

Do you know that Dave Hunt admitted publicly of his ignorance about the reformers (their history and writings) on a radio interview and TWO MONTHS LATER submitted his first manuscripts for his erroneous and divisive book, "What Love is This?"

He is grossly unqualified to have written on such an issue and even though his close friends pointed out the LIES, HISTORICAL ERRORS, AND MISREPRESENTATIONS that permeate his book he STILL published it without heeding ANY correction. It is the height of pride and arrogance.

Re: DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM, on: 2009/1/17 13:59

Quote:

sermonindex wrote:

Â"There is no way that Christ's death could be limited to paying only for the elect's sins. To deliver even one person from eternal punishment, no matter how few or many the sins he may have committed, Christ had to pay the penalty demanded by His infinite justice for sin. By very definition, then, **the death of Christ on the cross paid the penalty for sin itself which hangs over the heads of the entire human race.**" (p. 251)

So according to Hunt, Christ has also died for the sin of unbelief, thereby proclaiming a universalism. If all sin has been atoned for, including the sin of unbelief, then hell would be empty. The fact of the matter is that is not the case, but if Hunt understood what sin actually was, he wouldn't be so foolish.

Old Joe

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2009/1/17 14:26

Quote:

-----So according to Hunt, Christ has also died for the sin of unbelief, thereby proclaiming a universalism. If all sin has been atoned for, including the sin of unbelief, then hell would be empty. The fact of the matter is that is not the case, but if Hunt understood what sin actually was, he wouldn't be so foolish.

So you're not forgiven for your sin of unbelief before you were converted? Or you do assume that you have always had faith in Christ?

If you think that you are forgiven for your previous sins of unbelief then the painfully obvious thing is that his death can also atone for the sin of unbelief.

Here are the options you have:

- 1) You have never had unbelief. Therefore, you don't need forgiveness for the 'unforgivable' sin.
- 2) You are not and will not be forgiven of your previous sins of unbelief because Christ's death cannot atone for the sin of unbelief.
- 3) You are forgiven of your previous sins of unbelief, which means that Christ's atonement can forgive the sin of unbelief.

What do you believe? Or is there an option I'm missing?

I always thought that if you repented, you could be forgiven. If you can repent and be forgiven for something, either the atonement has no relation to the forgiveness you can receive (this is obviously false) or it does have a relation (which in turn must mean that Christ atoned for it.)

I think you are just misinterpreting Hunt. Do you have some proof he teaches that all men will go to heaven ie universalism?

Re: - posted by int3grity (), on: 2009/1/17 14:52

Christ paid for the sin of unbelief that Christians live in BEFORE they believe. This unbelief has an ending point. The unbelief of the lost goes on for eternity in hell. People are not sanctified in hell. "The doors of hell are locked from the inside" as C.S. Lewis said. Jesus could not die for a sin that has no ending point. The sin of all who would believe has an end, the sin of those who will not believe continues forever. That is why hell is eternal; unbelief is eternal.

Please stop insulting us with illogical accusations which imply we are a bunch of idiots. Do you not think that someone who believes something that is difficult to accept has not thought and wrestled through it? I really grow weary of always being told that I believe in a straw man and then hearing the straw man burned and declarations of victory from those who just set it aflame.

Those who believe in the doctrines of grace, please make sure you rightly understand the other position also so that you don't misrepresent it.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/1/17 15:11

1 John 2:2 And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world.

I posted this before and do again, i think it is simple and a correct comment upon this verse.

And he is the propitiation - The atoning sacrifice by which the wrath of God is appeased. For our sins - Who believe. And not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world - Just as wide as sin extends, the propitiation extends also .

all who repent and believe will be saved universally. All men have a choice to accept Christ and believe and repent. Some do and their unbelief are payed for, some dont and they still have a debt to pay.

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2009/1/17 15:15

Having once held your view concerning 1 John 2:2, Christian, may I submit a brief rebuttal?

It is found (<http://www.sovereign-grace.com/pink/appendix-d.htm>) here at this link.

By this exegesis I was sufficiently persuaded of my former misunderstanding.

Re: - posted by int3grity (), on: 2009/1/17 15:35

Please read 1John 2:2 and then compare it to the parallel passage that John wrote in John 11:52.

Scripture interprets Scripture. If the same author writes two parallel passages and one of them gives clarification and detail, then you can be sure the less clear one means the same thing.

Re: - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2009/1/17 15:46

Just for posting purposes:

" What if Calvin's Camels are God's Truth"

(<http://www.corkfpc.com/camels.html>) What if Calvin's Camels, are God's Truth

I am not Calvinist (meaning I do not label myself anything but Christian), but I do hold to the things of scripture (that more so get labeled as Calvinism) as the truth of Holy Writ.

Blessings to the people of God

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/1/17 16:21

thanks Michael for the link i read it, i understand the reasoning behind it but i think it is to much explaining away what is plainly there in my own view and understanding of the verse. And when reading it with other verses as scripture explaining scripture it depends on what scriptures we compare to, we can compare to the ones suggested and come to one conclusion, or we can continue to search the scriptures and compare to others such as Joh 3:16 and 2Pe 3:9 and Act 17:30 then it makes sense to me plainly, i need not explain the verses with hundreds of words since one get a sense what God is saying just by scripture.

But i understand how you think brethren, i just hope we examine all scripture so we dont miss what God is saying. Myself is just tired reading much things that make scripture our what it is not, have seen horror interpretations of all sorts of theologians trying explain away certain things that seem very easy if we just read them as they say.

Like Paul Washer says, "if the bible says the barn is red it means the barn is red"

its simple i think we make it hard sometimes :-)

anyway, Grace and Peace

Re: - posted by int3grity (), on: 2009/1/17 17:01

Brother Hmmhmm, there is a big difference between comparing verses that mean different things and comparing verses that are parallel, written by the same author, and speak on the exact same subject as 1John 2:2 and John 11:52.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/1/17 17:06

Quote:

int3grity wrote:

Brother Hmmhmm, there is a big difference between comparing verses that mean different things and comparing verses that are parallel, written by the same author, and speak on the exact same subject as 1John 2:2 and John 11:52.

well yes it is true, but Joh 3:16 is by the same author, and all authors have the same source of inspiration so i guess as long as they deal with the same subject we are ok. I think the verses i gave are linked to 1Joh 2:2 in many ways and is not wrong in comparing to this verse. Do you agree?

Re: DAVE HUNT'S POWERFUL REFUTATION OF CALVINISM - posted by philologos (), on: 2009/1/17 17:10

I am puzzled. Haven't we been encouraged to avoid the topic of Calvinism on SI?

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/1/17 17:17

Quote:

philologos wrote:
I am puzzled. Haven't we been encouraged to avoid the topic of Calvinism on SI?

I will stop discussing it . Thank you for reminding us of our slow obedience.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/1/17 17:27

Quote:

-----but Joh 3:16 is by the same author

Brother John 3:16 does not refute what is known as Calvinism. If anything, it only serves to uphold what we(Calvinists, if I must use the term)hold as true.

I know that you are probably saying that the word "whoever" must apply to every human being, but that is not what the language of this text suggests.

There is no Greek word for "whoever" and the wording here would best be translated, "the ones who believe" or "the believing ones".

Here again the Scriptures are limiting the extent of salvation to the ones who believe. Not all will believe(we agree on this), but then the next logical question is "why don't they believe" or "why do some believe"?

Here are some other texts from John that show that he is not jumping from one belief to another-

Consider what is being said by Christ here-

John 17:1 When Jesus had spoken these words, he lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, "Father, the hour has come; glorify your Son that the Son may glorify you,

John 17:2 since you have given him authority over all flesh, **to give eternal life to all whom you have given him.**

So let us pause for a moment and look at what is being said here by Christ: all authority over all men has been given to Him, eternal life is his to give to men, and it will be given to those whom the Father has given Him.

So our next logical question would be, "what is eternal life?" The next verse answers it-

John 17:3 And this is eternal life, that they know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent.

If eternal life must be given, then how does anyone say man can have when he wants it? Or how can any say that man is free to choose life?

There is also this section from the same author(John)-

Joh 12:37 Though he had done so many signs before them, they still did not believe in him,

Joh 12:38 so that the word spoken by the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled: "Lord, who has believed what he heard from us, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?"

Joh 12:39 Therefore they could not believe. For again Isaiah said,

Joh 12:40 "He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they see with their eyes, and understand with their heart, and turn, and I would heal them."

Notice the pronouns used especially in verse 40- "He". This He refers to God. Look at what He did, He blinded them. This would be contrary to the view that God loves ALL men in a saving way would it not?

Lastly look at another passage by John-

1Jn 5:1 Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ **has been born of God**, and everyone who loves the Father loves whoever has been born of him.

Does this not suggest that the ones who believe were born first? As this is the way the language is structured(i.e. something has happened to cause them to believe). I am not trying to be "intellectual" as I know that is highly disliked, but I am being fair to what the Scriptures declare and what the author's intentions were when he wrote this.

And once more, may it be known that I am presenting this in love, not to trumpet a doctrine, but instead to look honestly at what Scripture says and glorify our God and Savior.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/1/17 17:31

Amen Ron. I posted some of these threads on some "other" points of view so they would at least give some people options to believe different viewpoints etc.

I have been getting alot of emails and private messages over people feeling overwhelmed by all the Calvinistically minded brethren pushing their theology in every thread.

I personally am at the point of not allowing any of it anymore for it causes strife and dissension. The Moderators and myself will be crafting together a statement on proper ways to discuss theology on the website and stating if people have agenda's to convert others to their theological persuasion in such extreme ways as Calvinism or others they will be asked not to participate in the forums.

Thank you for your prayers and patience in this saints. I do apologize for my getting "in the mix" of all these discussions on this issue.

This thread is being **locked**.

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2009/1/17 17:36

Quote:

philologos wrote:

I am puzzled. Haven't we been encouraged to avoid the topic of Calvinism on SI?

I am glad you posted this, brother. I was afraid to!

Just want to chime in with some agreement. It will be a blessing to focus on some other topics for a while.

By the way, good discussion you have going on the church (and other topics) over in the other thread. I have not read every post, but what I have taken in has been an enjoyable read and a refreshing exchange. It is a blessing to see such a lengthy thread develop that has been kept free of strifes. May it and all posts continue so for Christ.