

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead

Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead, on: 2009/6/15 18:28

Can anyone tell me if Leonard Ravenhill held to Moral Government Theology?

Also, what about Paris Reidhead?

Any evidence one way or another? Because my research shows that these men fellowshiped in some of the same circles, ones that promoted MGT.

Also, where did they stand on the doctrine of Original Sin?

And the doctrine of substitutionary atonement?

Any information would be helpful.

(May this not turn into a debate about MGT, I don't have the time. Just state any evidence on these men one way or another please.)

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/6/15 18:35

Brother,

Ravenhill and Reidhead were not of a theological camp but of God. There is no argument they had a healthy view of God's sovereignty but they surely did not believe that all are predestined by God to salvation or damnation.

They are men who will have rewards greater than many in heaven. Thank God for such brothers who walk in truth as a great example to us all.

Re: , on: 2009/6/15 18:49

Dear Greg, I understand what you're trying to say but every preacher or teacher has views on Bible doctrines. If they have no views on Bible doctrines then they shouldn't be Bible teachers, since the Bible is full of doctrine. To say that they're "not of a theological camp but of God" is to suggest that you can be of God but hold to no theology, a statement that sits uneasy with me, if I may say so respectfully, dear brother.

I just want to know whether they had leanings towards or held to Moral Government Theology. If the answer is no, then that is all I was looking for, along with evidence or proof. But I'm really just looking for a yes or no answer. I believe it's a wise thing to understand the theological leanings of the preachers we listen to.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/6/15 19:14

Ravenhill would not be near moral government theology though he loved and promoted Finney's writings, which the majority are not MGT but sound biblical exhortations.

Paris Reidhead also I would say would be mostly biblical in his understandings but did view Original sin as not inherited but each person put himself under sin. He willful criminals instead of the victim view.

I believe the biblical view is "both" victim and willful criminal.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/6/15 19:22

Quote:
-----I believe the biblical view is "both" victim and willful criminal.

Amen.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/6/15 20:27

Ravenhill's soteriology so far as I have understood him was Wesleyan-Arminian in view, which would have stood clearly at odds with MGT. Ravenhill can be hard to pinpoint sometimes though, especially since he wasn't ever prone to do any real in depth teaching on any given subject matter save, perhaps, revival.

Re: , on: 2009/6/18 0:07

Quote:
-----Ravenhill's soteriology so far as I have understood him was Wesleyan-Arminian in view, which would have stood clearly at odds with MGT.

I have always thought that Ravenhill was Arminian in the Wesleyan branch too but it just makes me wonder why his #1 recommended book is a book on the Atonement by a Moral Government Theologian. Strange thing if he doesn't embrace that view. And added to it, his fellowship in MGT circles has me wondering.

I know there is a certain heretic promoting some clearly terrible doctrines around that claims that both Leonard Ravenhill and Paris Reidhead believed as he does in Moral Government theology, so that is what triggered my research here. I would rather doubt it, truly, but the evidence doesn't lead me to. So one man claims they held to it, another man claims that at least Ravenhill didn't. And the evidence suggests that at least they had some definite MGT-leanings in their theology. What's the conclusion? I don't know, and can't say without solid evidence. I dare not speak with presumption. -I just know that I'm going to study hard all day tomorrow, and then preach the Gospel all weekend to the heathen who don't know God in this foreign land, if the Lord be willing. Pray for souls! Time is short! That's what really matters to me right now, the glory of the Lamb of God. He's worthy to be worshipped by all peoples and tongues.

Anyway, thanks for the answers. I really appreciate it. Love in Christ Jesus.

Re: - posted by whyme, on: 2009/6/18 8:41

I am interested in this concept of the descendants of Adam being "victims" of original sin. Where does this come from and what does it mean? It seems to be really important in our view of the condition of mankind and to me reveals a great deal about our personal opinions of man's position in Adam. Any further thoughts or understanding. I can pose a question in this regard. Is the bad fruit of a bad tree a victim? If we are victims, then has God been unjust or unfair in making us subject to the curse against Adam and giving us inarguably at least a strong predisposition to sin? (I am not arguing He has been unfair in this, but rather following the natural conclusion of our conclusion that we are victims of original sin)

Re: - posted by openairboy, on: 2009/6/18 12:37

I haven't spent too much time with Reidhead, aside from loving "Ten Shekels & a Shirt", but, as far as I know, he was involved in the Christian & Missionary Alliance, right? If so, their doctrinal standards clearly teach "original sin" and a "sinful nature", so it would be odd for a man to be in that fellowship and not hold to their standards, especially if there was any sort of inquiry into his understanding of doctrine.

Regarding Ravenhill, from what I can gather, he was all over the map for better or worse. I am not saying he wasn't smart, but he seemed content with contradictions and incoherence in his doctrine. I remember listening to him once and he said something like, "Young men would do well to lock themselves away for the winter and spend their time with Gurnall and Charnock." And these men were Calvinists.

When I was younger, I would read a lot of Finney, but not really piece things together, so I could be stirred by reading some of stuff on the atonement, but not fully grasp what he was saying. It wasn't until I read some other dialectical material that I saw the errors of Charles Finney.

I would put Keith Green in a similar camp as Ravenhill. Orthodox at the end of the day, but arriving there via different routes. Kind of like Lloyd-Jones telling Tozer, "We arrived at the same place. You through the mystics and me through the Puritans." Ravenhill seemed to love the Lord and was "like a moth to a flame whenever he heard his name", even if he did a poor job at "systematic theology".

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/6/18 13:10

Quote:
-----Regarding Ravenhill, from what I can gather, he was all over the map for better or worse. I am not saying he wasn't smart, but he seemed content with contradictions and incoherence in his doctrine. I remember listening to him once and he said something like, "Young men would do well to lock themselves away for the winter and spend their time with Gurnall and Charnock." And these men were Calvinists.

When I was younger, I would read a lot of Finney, but not really piece things together, so I could be stirred by reading some of stuff on the atonement, but not fully grasp what he was saying. It wasn't until I read some other dialectical material that I saw the errors of Charles Finney.

I would put Keith Green in a similar camp as Ravenhill. Orthodox at the end of the day, but arriving there via different routes. Kind of like Lloyd-Jones telling Tozer, "We arrived at the same place. You through the mystics and me through the Puritans." Ravenhill seemed to love the Lord and was "like a moth to a flame whenever he heard his name", even if he did a poor job at "systematic theology".

Excellent post dear brother, I am in full agreement.

"but he seemed content with contradictions and incoherence in his doctrine" :-)

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2009/6/18 13:32

Quote:
-----Excellent post dear brother, I am in full agreement.

Yes, I agree with brother Greg. I find that a healthy diet of both reformed and arminian literature provides a balanced and beneficial "seasoning" to the Word of God. Not being able to pin a man of God down theologically can be downright frustrating (when I say "pin him down" I mean align him exclusively with one doctrinal camp or another), and this is because human nature unceasingly seeks to define, label, categorize and assign. I suppose it started with Adam naming the beasts of the field and fowls of the air; here we see the methodical inclinations of man in its inception, and that under the watchful yet non-intervening eye of God.

I believe Finney has his purpose in the body of Christ, just the same as Gurnall and Spurgeon. Wesley and Whitefield were not teamed together in the same era of history by blind chance; I do believe that the Holy Spirit would teach us that what is impossible and irreconcilable to man is possible and reconciled through the eyes of God. Categorize as we may, I believe (and I speak for myself) the Lord would bring us as individuals to a level of maturity where these concepts would be reconciled in our hearts, even if we are unable to verbalize the mystery.

Brother Paul

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/6/18 13:36

at the end of the day it does not really matter if you hold to finney or calvin, what matters is not how much correct doctrine we have, but how much of Christ is produced in us. That is what we were predestined unto, so that is what matters, many have right doctrine and go to hell. Some have "faulty" views on some doctrines but have the living Christ in them and will be conformed into his image more and more. Not saying doctrine is unimportant, but it fades away in the shining light of the Life of Christ in us, we can stuff our heads with theology, systematic or not, but our hearts can be as hard as the sinner next door.

I been very encouraged by the fact, anyone who says someone elses doctrine is not right or wrong better se to it his life w
ay higher quality then the one he is claiming to be wrong, in love, in holiness, in fervency in prayer, in intamacy with the
Lord, then you can start saying this and that is wrong.

Yea i know apostle Paul did it alot pointing out error in doctrine and practices, but i dare to belive he was more holy then
all of them, and he also said the only thing that really counts is a new creation, Christ in us, this is vital, doctrine is good,
when accompanied by life. So let us focus rightly, maybe Calvin had a faulty doctrine? maybe right, but in the light of his
life what does it tell us? Ravenhill may have had faulty doctrine, but in the light of his life what does it say?

Many said Jesus had a wrong doctrine to, and he did according to those who had a right one in his day, the most knowl
edgeable and accurate theologians of the day didnt even see the life itself when it was infront of them, often times i thin
k we miss the life in finney due to we have our doctrine so thigh and so fool proof we miss Jesus in finney because we fo
cus on the speck in the brothers eye, or his error in a doctrine. And the other way around, so many armnians can not pic
k up spurgeon and be blessed because he was had a faulty understanding about some things in doctrine.

So my burden is so many miss Christ because they focus on the doctrine, he came to his own and his own received him
not.... how many times do we not receive christ in people because they disagree on a small matter of doctrine....?

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/6/18 13:52

Quote:
-----at the end of the day it does not really matter if you hold to finney or calvin, what matters is not how much correct doctrine we have,
but how much of Christ is produced in us.

The church can't afford this kind of doctrine, seriously. It does matter if you hold to what Finney believed or what Calvin
believed. What Finney believed was sub-Christian, period. His teachings have been rejected countless times as very da
ngerous heresy. Yes, it matters if you believe that the imputation of Christ righteousness to sinful men is a false doctrine,
believing that kind of thing will damn you even if you witness to 50 people a day and pray 23 hours a day.

Frankly, the kind of jelly-fish, "it really matter what you believe, what matters is how you live" theology is worldly. That's
what the pagan world believes. And, it's what the church has been drifting towards for over a century and look at where
we are. Many believers are blessed if there is a sound church in the same state as them, much less the same city.

We need to drive for precise orthodoxy and precise orthopraxy. It doesn't matter how much of a "godly" life you live (pray
8 hours a day, pray 23 hours a day), if you reject the Gospel as taught by the Apostles.

This is somewhat of a firm post, but, I think it is needed. When people started attaching their works into the gospel (or co
nfusing law and gospel), as Finney did, Paul told them to go ahead and castrate themselves if they liked their performan
ce so much.

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/6/18 14:11

Hi openairboy...

This is very interesting. When I met Brother Ravenhill in his home shortly before he died, he told me that he was going
to tell me the most important thing that he thought that I needed to know as a young Christian. He told me to "test
everything." He said that the reason that the Church is in the condition that it is in is because the Church continues to
operate, teach and propogate as it has many centuries. He urged me to test everything (including what might be widely
"accepted") and hold only onto what is clearly "good."

Since my meeting with Brother Ravenhill, I've thought long and hard about the various things that he told me during that
time. Since I was a young shy teenager, I spent most of that time simply listening. However, I have often thought about
the things that he did NOT tell me. He didn't cover issues like this (moral government). He didn't mention other divisive
doctrines. It was as if those things just didn't matter to him...that they just weren't very important.

I'm more of the "neither" position myself. Since there is just so much interpretation behind each of these type of doctrinal views, I find that it is better to NOT form an ultimate, concrete view on the matter. Instead, I believe in a "bottom line" approach to this issue by merely standing firm to what is undeniable. Don't die in sin. Don't walk ahead of Christ. Don't depart the faith. Don't get distracted by the lusts of the flesh, lust of the eyes and the pride of life. Whether you are "predestined" or "never truly saved in the first place" doesn't really matter if "whosoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

I find it disappointing that so many people are certain that they know the ultimate extent to what God thinks about such matters...so much so that they create binding doctrines (either way) about such issues. Can we pretend to know the mind of God on every issue like this? I fear that many will stand before God like Job (found in Job chapters 38 through 42). Maybe we shouldn't take positions on things (at least, enough to propagate them as a binding doctrinal truths) if we are forced to "interpret" the Scriptures in order to try and find the answer.

Perhaps it wasn't that Ravenhill was "all over the map" of "full of contradictions and incoherence," but just didn't think enough of either point to choose a binding position on the matter. Just a thought.

*EDIT: Both Finney and Calvin were flawed men. They may have loved the Lord every bit as much as I do, but they were still confined to "seeing through a glass, darkly" and to "know in part" -- just like the rest of us (I Corinthians 13:12).

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/6/18 14:21

I did say doctrine is important, when accompanied with life. I am sad for you if you can not read finney and be blessed by his writings, and I agree some of it is to my understanding "wrong", but so is much of calvin's and Spurgeons and to me have been refuted by scripture and countless times, And the gospel is greater than calvinism or reformed theology. Yes it is important, but orthodox theology goes further than augustinian and the reformation, what the apostles preached was not calvinism or arminianism, both doctrinal camps can find verses to support and refute the other view.

I just say what I say because I see people that claim they have right doctrine but still very unloving and very unchristlike in much conversation, I see many saying Ravenhill had an error in his understanding of scripture yet they can not weep for souls. I see many saying Spurgeon had a faulty understanding of the gospels yet they have not offered their life up for the Lord as he did when reading how he spent his time and life.

To me it is the very essence of Pharisaical spirit and of Satan himself. Satan has a much greater understanding of the atonement and salvation and scripture than all of us, yet he is going to hell.

So you can understand the scripture perfectly, have all things right and yet go to hell, what good is that doctrine without life? without Christ? in that sense, correct doctrine is rubbish, but when life is there, it's not so important. I am not saying the doctrine of God, who He is, who Jesus is, doctrine on salvation on faith and other "cornerstones" of the Christian faith is rubbish, they are vital, but other aspects are not so important.

And yes Paul told them to cut off their limbs from their body, but he said in the same letter also For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. (Gal 6:15 KJV)

That is what matters, he said that to those that had a salvation by works theology, it is false I agree brother, but many Calvinists claim all Arminians believe this, and that is a very subtle and untrue claim, just as it is untrue to say all Calvinists are hyper Calvinists....

anyway, I hope some misunderstand me rightly.

I just fear many of us including myself have our head so deep in our theological box we can't see Christ in Finney or Spurgeon or whoever, If you can't see in some of Finney's writings something that will make Christ more dear to you, provoke you to good works, more love for the Lord, I pity you, and I pity all who can draw gold from Spurgeon.... all such people are in a very sad state and need refreshment from above.

God help us all

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/6/18 14:36

Quote:
-----I find it disappointing that so many people are certain that they know the ultimate extent to what God thinks about such matters...so much so that they create binding doctrines (either way) about such issues. Can we pretend to know the mind of God on every issue like this? I fear that many will stand before God like Job (found in Job chapters 38 through 42). Maybe we shouldn't take positions on things (at least, enough to propagate them as a binding doctrinal truths) if we are forced to "interpret" the Scriptures in order to try and find the answer.

I agree brother, many a times we should do as Job did.

Behold, I am vile; what shall I answer thee? I will lay mine hand upon my mouth. (Job 40:4 KJV)

another thing, we so often study to gain knowledge and have a correct understanding of scripture and truth, this is a very good reason to study, but it is not the reason God gave us the book, the reason is that we should grow up to salvation how we should live, how Christ life can flow through us. Shine as lights in a dark world ect.

When we come to the book with that intention we will discover new things, not only in knowledge but in life, i spent hours studying diverse matters and doctrines, its good and i gained a lot, but without christ in my conversation at home with my wife, how i treat my children, how i walk in my workplace, how i live and move and speak and think, what God is that knowledge? it is as much good as the tree of knowledge was to Adam, thats how good a correct knowledge is without life. So we can have that correct doctrine and yet be banished from Gods presence, and i have come to this for my self, the more i think i come closer to the Lord, the more my doctrines crumble to pieces, God constantly showing me errors in what i help for a perfect doctrine and put me in situations where i can see it. To claim we understand all things concerning Gods ways would make us like Him.

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead, on: 2009/6/18 19:31

This one thing has been a burden on my heart. Namely, there is a great deal of downplaying the importance of doctrine nowadays in the name of uniting all who we perceive to be "men of God" and embracing everyone from every different background. And what's the standard by which we judge these men to be men of God? Is it by their doctrine? Or is it by their practice?

Biblically, it should be BOTH. A man of God has to pass BOTH tests. However, so many are getting into error because they see that someone seems to pass the test of "practice" and seems to have a lot of zeal and good works and so they accept them as being men of God. This is a tragedy! And it leads to all manner of deception!

While I agree that you can have all the right doctrine and still be just as lost as the heathen next door who knows not God, the same truth applies on the other end, you can have all the right "good works" and still go to Hell for believing in doctrines of demons. We have to have both.

Here's a shocking study for those of you caught up in the spirit of ecumenicalism, who claim that it doesn't really matter what doctrine we hold to. Read through the books of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus (the pastoral epistles) and note how many times the word doctrine comes up. I would suggest using a KJV or a NKJV before looking up different versions.

The fact is, if you willfully embrace a preacher that is teaching contrary to sound doctrine on any important point of the Christian faith that is directly related to salvation, then you are in disobedience and sin according to God's word.

And about Finney, reading his systematic theology will clearly reveal that he denied justification by faith in the fact that he denied imputed righteousness. He believed that justification was conditional upon perfect obedience to the moral LAW of God. That is heresy. It doesn't matter how many "revivals" he led, or how fervently he prayed. He preached "another gospel", adding works to the Gospel of grace (Gal 1). Just look at all the people today who embrace and follow Finney as if he was inspired like the Apostle Paul -they are ALL heretics of the most severe kind, many of them having a self-righteousness which would make the Pharisees themselves blush! Common now, brethren! Put your foot down, stand up with a zeal for the TRUTH of the Gospel that Christ shed His blood to purchase, and EXPEL the leaven from your midst! I've seen Finney's doctrine corrupt so many people, and thrust so many real brothers under clouds of satanic

condemnation for a season. It's demonic. And I despise doctrines that make Christ's little ones to stumble! Need I quote Christ Himself to see what He says about those who make His precious sheep stumble?

I'm not intending to debate about Finney here, but just illustrating that IT DOES MATTER WHAT WE BELIEVE. And you better believe that it matters what you believe! Faith and works go together, and works without faith (in solid truth and correct doctrine and the Person of Christ) is deception! It doesn't matter if "Mother Teresa" abolished world hunger, if she believed in salvation through eating the Body of Christ in a mass she was lost. Supposed "holiness" in character means nothing if it's not coupled with a firm belief in sound doctrine according to Scripture, and not vain philosophies of men.

My words are hard, I know that. But my heart is soft and compassionate about the truth of God. Test what I say with Scripture. See how important doctrine is in Scripture. Then compare everything to the doctrine of the Word. I have not gone a centimeter beyond where Scripture goes in emphasizing the importance of sound doctrine.

It MATTERS whether Christ's righteousness can be imputed to me as a free gift of grace. It MATTERS whether sanctification is based on my own state of sinless perfection or on my position in Christ and faith in Him. It MATTERS whether we're under the Law or under Grace. It MATTERS what the Bible teaches! Oh God, save us from the spirit of this age, and that satanic spirit of ecumenicalism and destroying the precious truths of your Word!

To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. (Isaiah 8:20).

Re: , on: 2009/6/18 20:23

Quote:

-----He told me to "test everything."

And by what are we to "test everything"?

Quote:

-----I believe in a "bottom line" approach to this issue by merely standing firm to what is undeniable. Dpn't die in sin. Don't walk ahead of Christ. Don't depart the faith. Don't get distracted by the lusts of the flesh, lust of the eyes and the pride of life. Whether you are "predestined" or "never truly saved in the first place" doesn't really matter if "whosoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."

.....just responding to what you wrote here...

So you believe in beholding yourself and the work you can do, instead of beholding Christ and the Work He has done. At the core of all doctrine is the interpretation of the Person and Work of Christ.

That is why it is so important. If we get that wrong, we have nothing. We have no Gospel, no hope, and we are still dead in our sins.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/6/18 20:32

Hi Mahoney...

Quote:

-----And by what are we to "test everything"?

The Word of God, of course. However, there is a difference between what is CLEAR in the Word of God...and what we must interpret from the Word of God. Most of the debates are not over what is obvious.

Quote:

-----.....just responding to what you wrote here...

So you believe in beholding yourself and the work you can do, instead of beholding Christ and the Work He has done. At the core of all doctrine is the interpretation of the Person and Work of Christ.

That is why it is so important. If we get that wrong, we have nothing. We have no Gospel, no hope, and we are still dead in our sins.

And, yet, if I don't hold to a final position (or even the correct position) about "moral government," am I in danger of Hellfire...if I have given my everything to Christ...continuously love Him...live for Him...walk with Him...and lead others to a relationship with Him? That is what I am trying to say.

I don't know where Leonard Ravenhill stood on every issue...nor do I care to know. I do believe that he loved and knew God. Whether or not he believed in any form of "moral government" (or what his interpretation was for the fourth toe of the beast of Revelation) is irrelevant in my counting him as a "brother." This, I think, is extremely important for the Body of Christ to learn.

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2009/6/19 0:34

I realize this thread was not intended to be a Moral Government argument, but just to make sure we are understanding the OP's concern:

Moral Government theology denies the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which Christ as the Second Adam attained through obedience to the Law, and legally bestows upon all who rest in His finished work. Rather, **Moral Government theology insists that our own personal, perfect obedience to the Law is necessary to our being finally and eternally saved.**

While I have no certainty about Ravenhill or Reidhead holding to these ideas, it seems very sensible that whoever does believe such extreme errors should not be recognized as a Christian, let alone as a teacher. Was it not for this issue that Paul wrote to the Galatians, and said, "I would that they should be cut off!"?

What a grief, when people strive for clear-cut distinctions about music, movies, head coverings, and beverages, but are willing to endorse the confessions and ministries of ones who replace the **gospel of imputed righteousness** with the fatal cyanide of works-righteousness. Anathema marantha to such a false notion.

Lord bless you all in the love of Christ's gospel, and fill you with grateful obedience and fresh consecration for both the greater and lesser concerns of Christ-likeness. To be conformed to Christ is to do as He did, and believe as He does.

PS: Here are some of Finney's statements, taken from his Systematic:

"The doctrine of imputed righteousness, or that Christ's obedience to the law was accounted as our obedience, is founded on a most false and nonsensical assumption." After all, Christ's righteousness "could do no more than justify himself. It can never be imputed to us ... it was naturally impossible, then, for him to obey in our behalf " This "representing of the atonement as the ground of the sinner's justification has been a sad occasion of stumbling to many" (pp.320-2).

"But for sinners to be forensically pronounced just, is impossible and absurd... As we shall see, there are many conditions, while there is but one ground, of the justification of sinners ... As has already been said, there can be no justification in a legal or forensic sense, but upon the ground of universal, perfect, and uninterrupted obedience to law. This is of course denied by those who hold that gospel justification, or the justification of penitent sinners, is of the nature of a forensic or judicial justification. They hold to the legal maxim that what a man does by another he does by himself, and therefore t

he law regards Christ's obedience as ours, on the ground that he obeyed for us."

And finally, to quote Dr. Michael Horton, who has studied Finney on an academic level, "Thus, in Finney's theology, God is not sovereign, man is not a sinner by nature, the atonement is not a true payment for sin, justification by imputation is insulting to reason and morality, the new birth is simply the effect of successful techniques, and revival is a natural result of clever campaigns. In his fresh introduction to the bicentennial edition of Finney's Systematic Theology, Harry Con- n commends Finney's pragmatism: "Many servants of our Lord should be diligently searching for a gospel that 'works', and I am happy to state they can find it in this volume."

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/6/19 0:39

Quote:

theopenlife wrote:

What a grief, when people strive for clear-cut distinctions about music, movies, head coverings, and beverages, but are willing to endorse the confessions and ministries of ones who replace the gospel of imputed righteousness with the fatal cyanide of works-righteousness. Anathema marantha to such a false notion.

the same is true also the other way around, what a grief when people hold and say they have a true doctrine but are into worldly music, movies and clothing. Yet the word says those who are a friend of the world are God's enemies, no matter if they believe right in all aspects concerning faith, works, imputation, etc. So people who endorse the "believe right" but still worldly in their practices are the same grief and guilty just as much as those who argue the other side.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/6/19 0:56

Hi theopenlife...

I don't mean to get into a quarrel about the definition of "moral government" or an argument about whether or not people must live a holy life if they are a believer. However....

Quote:
-----While I have no certainty about Ravenhill or Reidhead holding to these ideas, it seems very sensible that whoever does believe such extreme errors should not be recognized as a Christian, let alone as a teacher. Was it not for this issue that Paul wrote to the Galatians, and said, "I would that they should be cut off!"?

I know quite a few people who believe that "personal sanctification is absolutely essential for salvation." This is actually part of the statement of beliefs of several denominations...and personal ideology of many more individuals. If what you are saying is true, then such people are not even saved...and deserve to be "cut off." That is just silly.

You see, it seems that people have made a convoluted doctrine out of, well, a basic truth. Whether or not you believe you are imputed with "Christ's righteousness" and therefore have no requirement for personal sanctification is NOT a "condition" for salvation. It is just "knowledge" (right or wrong). Some might even call it a doctrinal view. Yet it isn't a requirement to know and walk with Christ. I know many people who believe that one must live a holy life but do not believe for a moment that you can "earn" salvation through good works. They just believe that "faith without works is dead." I guess this is a NEITHER position in the matter. In fact, I know many people who think this way.

It would be silly to dismiss those with whom we disagree as needing to be "cut off" if they are merely believing something with a clear conscience something that is not essential for salvation. That is why such debates are so harsh and unnecessary. Someone feels so adamantly about something that they are willing to dismiss the faith of another...who merely disagrees. The important points are held...the extent of which there is slight disagreement. What I said about a "bottom line" is where I stand. A believer cannot earn salvation. A believer should not continue to walk in the sins of this world.

Yet I don't want to argue about who is right and who is wrong...because, ultimately, I think that we are all flawed. We each see through the glass darkly. We can point the finger at Charles Finney all day, but we don't know if this is something that he REALLY believed...ALWAYS believed...or merely a thought that he entertained for a season. Remember, Finney only authored one real book. The rest were taken from notes that others took from his lectures (if memory serves me). I have read his autobiography...and I have been encouraged by and provoked by much of what is in it. I don't know what specific positions that he taught in lecture halls, auditoriums, or when he was an old man near death. He, like the rest of us, might have matured quite a bit (and struggled too) throughout his life. His life might have been filled with periods

of truth and periods of error and then periods where he rediscovered the truth. We don't know...because we don't know him. The man has been dead for over a century...and all that is left is found in history books, his autobiography, and books that were taken from notes.

I hope this makes a little more sense of what I am trying to say.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/6/19 1:30

I think the ultimate test for all doctrines is if we are free from sin.

For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death. (Rom 8:2 NKJ)

and this verse read in its context show it is speaking of sin.

"And you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (John 8:32 NKJ)

so the test is not do i have orthodox theology according to this system or not? the truth is is the doctrine you hold made you free from sin in all its forms? if not you have a false doctrine.

If your doctrine makes you more and more free from sin and more holy, more free from the world and its lusts, you have Christ, he is the TRUTH the way and the life, you will be free from sin. Is our doctrine doing this every day? if not you are deceived.

If we cling to worldly music styles, worldly clothing, worldly conversations, worldly entertainment and yet have an orthodox reformed faith or finnian theology we are deceived, Christ is salvation, Christ is correct doctrine, having a relationship with him is what matters, i think mother theresa had one, she erred in some doctrines but she knew Jesus Christ much more then i would say Martin Luther. Many of the reformers that i know many hold to have had a "pure" and "true" faith and doctrine still held mass in church after the reformation, they still clinged to state and church union and still held much heresy's in belief and practice.

Why is not that as important to remember as the errors mother theresa might have held? because we have our pet doctrines as idols and not Christ first, yes we may argue as we do here it is important, but we need to recognize one can have an error in their doctrine and still know the living Christ, otherwise not martin luther, john calvin, mother theresa knew Christ. All had serious errors in their doctrine. Some even blasphemous and very heretical.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2009/6/19 20:16

Hi everyone,

"...we need to recognize one can have an error in their doctrine and still know the living Christ,"

Something that has appeared to me for sometime now is that heresy has to do with contending for something to the disunity of believers, more so than having a wrong view.

This seems to be the sense of the word as I've looked at it in Galatians 5 where Strong's greek dictionary defines it as:

G139

ἡρесь; ἡρῆσις; ἡρῆσις; ἡρῆσις; ἡρῆσις; ἡρῆσις; ἡρῆσις; ἡρῆσις;

hairesis

hah'ee-res-is

From G138; properly a choice, that is, (specifically) a party or (abstractly) disunion. (ἡρῆσις "heresy" is the Greek word itself.): - heresy, sect.

The sense of it to me is in contending for something that causes others to make a *choice*, to choose sides in a matter, causing factions and divisions.

This isn't to say that there are not valid and right things to contend for that people will divide over.

Also, about doctrine, I think that the Bible speaks about doctrine in terms of life and living and not only in the sense of true or false statements or beliefs. I think this is something of what Christian is trying to emphasise.

For instance, when Paul writes about **the doctrine of God** in 1 Timothy, it is in the context of servants submitting to masters, and that this is in reference to the life and example of Christ (Mat 20:25-28, Php 2:1-12). Compare also Titus 2:9-12.

At the beginning of the Chapter there is the exhortation to speak the things that become sound doctrine, and what follows are not things to believe, but how to behave.

Wish you all well and wish us all help and grace from God.

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2009/6/20 4:42

Ccchhhrrriiisss said,

I believe you misunderstood what I wrote. Of course we all agree that personal sanctification is an aspect of true regeneration. What is at issue is whether one must be personally, **perfectly** sanctified in order to be finally saved, which Moral Government theology teaches.

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead, on: 2009/8/6 12:37

Here is what I have found on my research:

Leonard Ravenhill believed in the moral government view of the atonement. He highly recommended "The Atonement" by Albert Barnes, published by Bethany. It was his #1 pick out of 40 books. Leonard used to say, "They sing in Church 'Jesus paid it all'. That's a lie!" That is what Leonard's daughter in law told me.

Paris Reidhead also was in the moral government camp. He was good friends with Gordon Olson, who was the top teacher of Moral Government for YWAM. When Gordon Olson died, Paris Reidhead was going to speak at his funeral, but then Paris himself became sick with cancer. Therefore Dean Harvey, another moral government teacher, spoke at Olson's funeral.

Paris Reidhead also wrote the forward to "The Four Trojan Horses of Humanism" which was a book written by Harry Conn, another moral government teacher. Harry Conn was mentored by Gordon Olson. Paris Reidhead particularly wanted to make Harry Conn's book known to the public because it taught free will.

Both Paris Reidhead and Leonard Ravenhill were friends with Winkie Pratney, another proponent of moral government and open theism. Leonard was also friends with Gordon Olson and mentioned him in one of his sermons that is right here on Sermon Index. Leonard said to Last Days, "I am sure Gordon Olson has told you that Finney used to preach 28 nights in a row without ever making an altar call".

Leonard Ravenhill and Paris Reidhead were definitely involved in moral government circles because they used to teach at YWAM and Last Days, which used to also have Gordon Olson, Harry Conn, Winkie Pratney, and George Otis Jr speak. Leonard lived right down the street from these ministries.

David Ravenhill has told me that he believes in Moral Government and Open Theism. He used to work with YWAM and went to Bethany. Winkie Pratney was his best man at his wedding.

"Ten Shekels & a Shirt" was actually preached at Bethany Fellowship, which at the time was heavily promoting moral government theology. It was Bethany that published "The Atonement" by Albert Barnes and "Systematic Theology" by Charles Finney

Keith Green used to heavily promote Finney in his Last Days Magazine. They would republish Finney's sermons. Keith Green was mentored by Winkie Pratney, who taught moral government and open theism.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/8/6 12:56

Thank you for your research, friend. It is a sad report, and it is also saddening that the seriousness of it will go unheeded by most.

For the purity of the gospel,
Taylor

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/6 13:06

Personally I think its sad how people can marginalize brothers who were greatly used of God into a narrowed theology and claim them heretic or wrong.

I can't wait until the judgement seat of Christ where God will set all things straight and those who were contending for a purity of something that was God's. And God will say to them but what did you do, did you obey my voice? and the response will be no Lord I was too busy defending you.

Leonard Ravenhill was not 100% anything. not moral government, not methodist, not pentecostal. He was a believer in Jesus Christ and he saw truths in many different camps.

Man does have a free will and that does not take away from the Cross of Jesus Christ. It is terrible brothers and sisters divided over these things.

Re: - posted by alan4jc (), on: 2009/8/6 17:20

I have an honest question. Galatians 1:6 I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to a different gospel, 7 which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. 8 But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. 9 As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed.

Does this verse apply at all today? We give all this room for Moral Govt., Open theism and whatever else someone wants to teach and we say "but they were such good preachers and taught so well in other areas, and they believe men are sinners and Jesus died on the cross etc....."

How can a man hold to these teachings and be named a brother? It doesn't matter if they preached open air, gave to the poor, or anything else if they preached a message that trampled the blood of Jesus under foot.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/8/6 18:07

I agree, brother Alan.

This idea that accepting these people regardless of how badly they pervert the gospel is somehow spiritual or godly is mistaken, in my opinion. Actually, it is worldly. It is the world who claims it doesn't matter what you believe and views everything from a pragmatic basis.

Godliness is not solely based on actions, it is also based on belief. To determine if someone was "used of God", we must examine their teachings to see if they are in accordance with the things of God. If the Gospel was perverted and cloudy, we should not promote their teachings, because it promotes ungodliness and misrepresentation of our Lord.

May the Lord give us all light to see clearly in these matters.

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Re: - posted by jlosinski, on: 2009/8/6 22:25

So where is the dividing line of truth and error? This is getting confusing, because there are several saints on this thread that seem to have differing points of view, both seemingly defending the orthodoxy and orthopraxy of the gospel. Where is the line drawn?

Joe

Re: - posted by Billy7 (), on: 2009/8/6 22:31

I'm sorry, but I just can't help myself here, I've got to speak up.

Bro. Taylor,

Please consider the fact that those in the Moral Government camp claim to preach the Gospel as do those in whatever camp that you name. And it is very likely that those in both camps could back up what they preached with Scripture. But who are you to say that they are wrong and you are right to such an extent that you say that they are perverting the Gospel?

Do you honestly believe that all God is concerned about with us is our doctrine? What about men like Ravenhill's, Reidhead's, Finney's, Pratney's, and Green's love for God? Can you question their intentions? Whether or not you agree with their theology is not the real issue, the question is: do we all love God and is it our intention to honor Him?

What if you're the one that's wrong in your theology and they are right? Will you even consider the possibility of that?

While we will never all agree on every point of our theology, I know that these men who you slander all agreed upon certain essentials that are central to salvation and right relationship with God, such as the necessity of repentance of all known sin and the necessity of a living, active faith in a resurrected Jesus Christ. Now as I see it, anything beyond this is open to doctrinal discussion and it's obvious that we will not all see everything alike. But wouldn't it be better to just agree to disagree, than to set ourselves up as judge and label those with whom we disagree as false teachers?

Also, whether you agree with men like Ravenhill and Reidhead or not, you cannot question the fact that they were both greatly used of God. Apparently God doesn't have a problem using proponents of Moral Government theology. Go figure.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/8/6 22:48

Brother Billy,

It was not my intention to slander anyone. Forgive me if I have done so. Sure, I have and am still willing to consider if my theology is wrong. I myself must remain committed to the Scriptures alone.

I think we need to be careful that we do not fall into the same error as the Pharisees are described as falling into in Romans 10:4 ... I don't question that those who hold to moral government theology have a sincere love for God, but I do think they view and teach about God incorrectly, which leads others into the same error. Of course, the warnings James gives to teachers should not be taken lightly.

I can simply say this: I would not recommend these teachers or teachings to a fellow Christian. I believe there are better, more Biblical teachers out there that are more in harmony with the Scripture.

I guess everyone is "used of God" in a sense. God uses all things for His own glory and purposes, even wicked men. The fact that any of these teachers have garnered a powerful response from some does not excuse their false teaching in other areas. We have a duty to guide others in the truths that are in accordance with Scripture. Personally, I think anything that starts distorting the Biblical teaching on the propitiation or work of Christ is dangerous ground and needs to be seriously rejected, regardless of how beloved the teacher may be.

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Re: Purify Sermon Index? - posted by mackaymarsh, on: 2009/8/6 23:15

Taylor,

Do you believe God's Kingdom would be best served if Greg, the owner and moderator, were to remove all sermons, etc. by Ravenhill, Readhead, Green, Finney and others from Sermon Index entirely to purify it of error, false teaching?

Seems to be where you are leading.

Wayne

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2009/8/7 5:39

Of course DOCTRINE DOES MATTER, but.....

When we talk about the doctrine of God that covers a huge area (as huge as the immensity and omniscience of God himself!). So what do we mean when we say 'doctrine is important'. Obviously to become saved (redeemed, regenerated, born again) there are fundamental basics we need to understand and accept to enable us to become partakers of this new life. This would be recognising we are all sinners and unable to pay the sin debt; that Jesus Christ paid that sin debt for us, repentance (turning from my sin) and trusting Christ for my new life, living by His power in obedience and faith.

Now how we understand in detail and fullness the working and mechanics of even these basic doctrines will vary greatly depending upon our maturity, experience and influence by others. I'm sure we could spend hours and days debating the right meaning of these points here on SI.

The point of the above is that we have to realise that our understanding is limited and not perfect and we are (or should be) growing in knowledge. It's not that doctrine is unimportant, it is important. However our full understanding of these doctrines is only in part.

I will listen to Ravenhill, Washer, Wilkerson, Wesley, Tozer, Lloyd Jones, Spurgeon, etc and be challenged, encouraged and enlightened. Do I agree with all they say? No. Is that because they are wrong on some things? Possibly, or maybe they are right and I am wrong on an aspect that I think is the right interpretation.

The problem comes when we follow a particular teacher or 'circle' without allowing for differences and imperfection. The 'I'm a Calvinist' or 'I'm an Armenian' line is so clearly wrong according to scripture (see 1 Corinthians 3 v 4). In fact it says that when we do this we are CARNAL and acting as mere men!

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/8/7 7:20

Wayne,

If I had a sermon site, I would only post teachers that preach the gospel clearly and Biblically, my conscience wouldn't allow me to do otherwise.

This isn't my site, I'm just a guest here. Greg and the Mods put in the hard work, and they make the decisions regarding what is beneficial.

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/7 8:43

Quote:
-----I have an honest question. Galatians 1:6 I marvel that you are turning away so soon from Him who called you in the grace of Christ, to a different gospel, 7 which is not another; but there are some who trouble you and want to pervert the gospel of Christ. 8 But even if we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than what we have preached to you, let him be accursed. 9 As we have said before, so now I say again, if anyone preaches any other gospel to you than what you have received, let him be accursed.

Does this verse apply at all today? We give all this room for Moral Govt., Open theism and whatever else someone wants to teach and we say "but they were such good preachers and taught so well in other areas, and they believe men are sinners and Jesus died on the cross etc....."

In the same exact way I could say that "calvinism" is another gospel and not truly the gospel. And I could even say moral government theology is another gospel. And the true gospel is between both of them.

A lot of you brothers are arguing from a 5 point calvinist position of what the true gospel is. Please wake up to realize most Christians in the world do not believe this. I am not against you holding that what you believe but the majority of Born Again Christians are not reformers or Calvinists.

The True gospel is no predestination of God and the utter "whole" depravity of man.

The true gospel is Jesus Christ. The true Gospel is that Christ died for the sins of the entire world. The true gospel is that He became sin for us. The true gospel is that he was our propitiation. The true gospel is that the only way to heaven is by Jesus Christ. The true gospel is that we are saved by grace only.

To be frank Ravenhill, Reidhead and others believed there and were true Christians and they were not believing a false or another gospel. It is outrageous brothers how you can be saying these things. Your love for the letter of law has taken you from the Spirit of the law.

What if your calvinism was wrong? then by your own "JUDGING" you are condemning yourself to believe in another gospel and therefore go to hell. It is so easy to write these things out and judge others. Oh Lord have mercy.

Re: , on: 2009/8/7 9:21

Even Paul Washer said that he would rather have one Leonard Ravenhill than a hundred Reformed Calvinists.

If you are going to condemn Leonard Ravenhill, shouldn't you also condemn Paul Washer for endorsing him? If Leonard Ravenhill should be removed from SI, shouldn't Paul Washer?

I think you could see how extreme this is getting. Has God used Calvinists for Revivals? Yes, he used Edwards and Whitefield. Has God used Arminians for revivals? Yes he used Wesley and Fletcher. Has God used Moral Government theologians for revival? Yes He used Charles Finney. God has clearly used men like Leonard Ravenhill, Paris Reidhead, Keith Green, Winkie Pratney, and others, even though they held to a theology which was not Calvinism.

In fact, even Edwards held to many points about moral government. He is considered one of the fathers of that type of theology. They were called "New School Calvinists" or "New England Theology". You can read the writings of Jonathan Edwards Jr on the governmental view of the atonement. Was he unsaved too? The common view of the atonement during the Great Awakenings, from Edwards to Finney, was the governmental substitution view. What is so heretical with saying that the blood atonement substitutes our eternal punishment, so that our punishment could be withheld? This view still teaches substitution and forgiveness.

The Early Church also were not 5 point Calvinists. Until Augustine, they taught free will.

I would not worry about those who teach we have a free will, or that Jesus died for everyone, or that we must give up our sins. I would worry about those who say that you don't need to repent of your sins, or that you can be a Christian and live an unholy life. That is what the Church today needs to really worry about.

Alan said, "It doesn't matter if they preached open air, gave to the poor, or anything else if they preached a message that trampled the blood of Jesus under foot." Those who teach that you can keep sinning without perishing are trampling the blood of Christ underfoot according to Hebrews 10:26-31. It is not the Moral Government camp that teaches "a message that trampled the blood of Jesus under foot". It is the antinomian camp that teaches "a message that trampled the blood of Jesus under foot"

Make it plain!, on: 2009/8/7 9:29

Brother Greg, you wrote:

Quote:
-----The true gospel is Jesus Christ. The true Gospel is that Christ died for the sins of the entire world. The true gospel is that He became sin for us. The true gospel is that he was our propitiation. The true gospel is that the only way to heaven is by Jesus Christ. The true gospel is that we are saved by grace only.

amen! Yes! That is IT. Hebrews 3:1 again, Heb. 3:1

brethren, stick to the Word, stay with the Bible, and stay off the side paths that are only meant to divide the Body. "doctrine, doctrine, doctrine".....stay in the Word, and the Holy Ghost will reveal "doctrine", and Jesus will cure you of this need to go around and around in useless controversies and debates.

Read Jeremiah chapters 30-33, "the Book of Consolation".....might prophecy right there.

we do less posting and more time on our knees and in the Word of God, we will discharge the calling and ministry of Jesus and Him crucified into a dying world. (I'm looking in a mirror as I type, no pointing fingers, that exhortation is meant for myself as well, unprofitable worm that I am.)

God love and bless you all, neil

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2009/8/7 10:02

Quote:
-----It is outrageous brothers how you can be saying these things. Your love for the letter of law has taken you from the Spirit of the law.

Yes, it is totally outrageous; it's the 20th century plague among brethren. We can see how insidious this sort of thing is. It all begins with an inordinate *swerving* to one side of the road or another...and a remaining on that respective side despite all the warnings and beseechings for balance.

If left to drive on a shoulder long enough, the drivers soon begin to have disdain for those on the "other" shoulder - and even for those who choose to remain in a lawful lane. They are no longer content to endanger their own lives and risk wrecking, but now they call out to distract others seeking to maintain a safe distance. All other drivers soon become heretics; those who fail to read and interpret the road signs exactly as they do are now an anathema and unfit for the roads...when, in reality, *they* are the ones endangering the public with their own reckless and fanatic shoulder racing.

When I am here, on the forum highway, I will remain in a safe driving lane. I will be courteous *to all drivers*, regardless of what type of car they own, or the speed they choose to drive. When I leave the forum highway, I can go off-roading with my buddies. But even then, I refuse to malign other drivers who may not have a liking for that type of off-road driving; indeed, one of the benefits of staying out of the dirt and grass is that your windshield stays clean. It's bad enough visibility already without going off road.

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/8/7 10:49

Myself am grateful for scripture, we see apostle paul speaking of faith, and some in those days just as now did not understand and went with some things he said and we see the apostle james straighten things out, or clarify things, so I see some reformed teachings is misapplied and misunderstood and God sends a ravenhill and straighten out and clarify that those missed. And the other way around.

I just think before anyone says "he has a faulty" or heretical doctrine, better see to it they are closer to God than that man he is accusing is, many will see in the day calling maybe finney, mother theresa heretics will find they knew God better than they did, maybe they knew the bible better but that is second to knowing God. Many will find the "heretics" prayed more, worked more, loved God and men more than they with a correct doctrine, and they will be shamed before all creation and Christ.

God open our eyes

Re: - posted by alan4jc (), on: 2009/8/7 11:10

I am not saying to quit loving but I am saying that scripture must be held up. If we allow scripture to be blurred in any and all directions then we risk losing truth all together. Personally I like R C Chapman and the way he handled things when it came to baptism. You can read about it, but basically he held to the truth of scripture w/o compromising it or the command and to love others. We can certainly hold to the truth of scripture and love at the same time, the issue is when we quit loving.

For me it has nothing to do with Calvinism, or Arminianism it has only to do with scripture. If a man says you must believe the gospel but he believes that gospel includes as Finney, moral govt. then that man's gospel is tainted. We can and should still love the man but we must point out how he errors away from the truth of scripture.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/7 11:25

I just think before anyone says "he has a faulty" or heretical doctrine, better see to it they are closer to God than that man he is accusing is, many will see in the day calling maybe finney, mother theresa heretics will find they knew God better than they did, maybe they knew the bible better but that is second to knowing God. Many will find the "heretics" prayed more, worked more, loved God and men more than they with a correct doctrine, and they will be shamed before all creation and Christ.

God open our eyes

That must be read and mediated on by everyone! We are not called to defend scripture. We are called to be more like Jesus Christ and to know God. The balance is 90-10 of knowing God and the other side is having right theological views and defending them.

Indeed God help us. When we get before God in heaven we will realize our own ideas of what we thought were important were wrong. We will realize that God desired to lead us by the Spirit of God into His plan and burden and not our zealous doctrinal debating and defense.

God help us.

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/8/7 11:29

the most important thing is to know one can have errors in doctrine and still know Jesus, some must be right, who God is, who Jesus is etc. Scripture says if we know Him, not know the doctrine concerning how Christ saved us, I agree it is important to a degree, but some will set their faith carved in stone, some say I am Cal, some say Arm etc, both have serious errors, many forget many reformers baptized infants, to me a very faulty doctrine, and others did also, but I still believe some of them knew God better than I. Can we say that? Can a Cal say maybe Finney knew God better than I? Can the Arminian say perhaps Luther knew God better than me despite all wrong he believed and did?

to say Ravenhill was a heretic one need to be holier, be more earnest in his devotional life, have a greater burden, walked longer, under greater trials, prayed more, then speak of someone's errors. or you would be a very sad man in that day.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/7 11:38

"Never rule the Scripture by your mind; let the Scripture rule your mind."
- Smith Wigglesworth

Re: - posted by alan4jc (), on: 2009/8/7 11:39

1Ti 5:20

Those who are sinning rebuke in the presence of all, that the rest also may fear.

2Ti 4:2

Preach the word! Be ready in season and out of season. Convince, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching.

Tit 1:13

This testimony is true. Therefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith,

Tit 2:15

Speak these things, exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no one despise you

Certainly we need to read these scriptures in context, but the overarching theme is that rebuking is in and of itself defending the truth of scripture for the sake of God and the person being corrected, as well as others looking on. The question is do we do it with love and longsuffering?

Edit: As Paul says truth without love is just a loud noise. :cry:

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/7 12:01

What was scripture even to Timothy? It was the Old Testament.

Re: - posted by rainydaygirl, on: 2009/8/7 12:40

May I ask a question? I am in no way as knowledgeable as those who have posted to this thread so please bare with me. My question is this, Why do we allow for baggage and the understanding that as humans we all fall short the glory of God and are sinners here and now. Even on the SI forum I have read many posts allowing for forgiveness and understanding when it came to someone seeing that they may have erred in understanding at one time or another. Why is it that we take the men and women of God who are no longer with us and hold them up as to be infallible? Isn't it possible that Finney knew and had God given understanding in many areas of the Christian walk but God had not opened his eyes in other areas? Is it not possible that the same could not be said of Reidhard, Ravenhill, and Keith Green. To all those who have posted to this thread, can you boast, can you say right now you have clear, complete understanding of all areas of the Christian walk today? Can you say that over your lifetime of being a Christian you have always held the same view that you do today in all areas of the Christian walk and without a doubt have always been one hundred percent correct? Why is that we call men who are no longer here to speak for themselves heretics when they are just as we are, fellow servants seeking to follow and know Jesus as Lord and Savior?

As I said, I do not have the knowledge that many here have, but it seems to me that its easy enough to read someones

word, seek the Lord in prayer, read the Bible and glean from it what the Lord would have for you. Perhaps some of Finney's understandings were building blocks that God gave him for others to come along after and build upon for the body as a whole. Is this not possible, that he might see and understand what the Lord had for him at that point in his walk and life. Is it not possible that God did not have for Finney to know and understand all because another member of the body was to come later and share what the Lord was doing in that person's life and have for them to share that with others? Finally I wonder if in ten, or twenty years, if we are all still here, how many believers will read over our own written words and call one of us a heretic because of what we shared here on this forum?? Something perhaps to consider?

Ok thanks for letting me throw that out there.
with care in Him
rdg

Re: Purify Sermon Index? - posted by mackaymarsh, on: 2009/8/7 14:05

Quote:

TaylorOtwell wrote:
Wayne,

If I had a sermon site, I would only post teachers that preach the gospel clearly and Biblically, my conscience wouldn't allow me to do otherwise.

This isn't my site, I'm just a guest here. Greg and the Mods put in the hard work, and they make the decisions regarding what is beneficial.

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Taylor,

It is obvious that Greg has built Sermon Index as a forum for revival upon the shoulders of men such as Ravenhill, Reidhead and others. If these saints of the past are so heretical and full of false teaching, then why are you here? How can your conscience allow you to participate in something that you find so offensive?

Do you realize that you have indicted Greg and the moderators as purveyors of false teaching and heresy?

The very people you have called false teachers and heretics have been a true source of God's grace to me. Am I now to disregard the instruction of the Lord I have received from these dear saints?

Is your mission here just to convert us all to 'Calvinism'? God forbid!

One last question, Taylor. Have you received the Holy Ghost since you believed?

Wayne

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2009/8/7 14:10

Quote:

-----As I said, I do not have the knowledge that many here have, but it seems to me that it's easy enough to read someone's word, seek the Lord in prayer, read the Bible and glean from it what the Lord would have for you. Perhaps some of Finney's understandings were building blocks that God gave him for others to come along after and build upon for the body as a whole. Is this not possible, that he might see and understand what the Lord had for him at that point in his walk and life. Is it not possible that God did not have for Finney to know and understand all because another member of the body was to come later and share what the Lord was doing in that person's life and have for them to share that with others?

I think the knowledge you have and share here is worth its weight in gold, Finney wrote much all believers can draw from, so did ravenhill, luther and all the rest, all of them probably had some error somewhere, but as you say, compare it with the word of God and draw out from the main source what God has for us.

What should scare us is if what we believe today, or what we have learned the first three or four years from our conversion should be the exact same beliefs we hold when we are 50 or 60, we may have the same doctrines somewhere, but much will be shaken by the lord to show us mainly our pride, and showing us, all of us who love to study, his word, commentaries and all the rest, all those will God humble because we all have the flesh that like to feed from the tree of good and evil. so God must bring us to the place where we start seeking the tree of life, and if God is successful we will no longer box our self in in a limited understanding, we will lift our hands and fall on our face and say the closer we come to God the less i know what is right and wrong for others, but i know for me and my walk, myself was and still is a lover of theology, i love reading, i can sit with six or seven books, commentaries, interlinear bibles three or four bibles, english, swedish and my desk is packed with books, my wife says i am crazy and have never seen someone read the bible like me, but i love it.... but sadly the most i have done is gaining and eating for my mind, most of my study was wrong, no matter what i found out was right it was based upon the wrong thing, God spoke to me and said that it is not how much and how right ly i know the word, it is how transformed i become into his image that will count on that day, if i am christlike or not in all areas of my life, whether i know theology and right doctrines will not matter as much as how much i loved god and people, how i used my tongue and how pure my thought life where. And when i first was converted, i was in a pentecostal charismatic church that preached the love of god and easy belivism as is rampant today, zealous for the new life i started reading, listening to washer, ravenhill, and found si and started reading the old classic, i read bonar, ryle, matthew henry, i read luther, i read calvin, i read mostly reformed writings, and i held to reformed theology, i did read others to, tozer etc and wesley... but i knew it all, and i was so fed up with easy belivism i went to the other side, as a reaction to the absence of hellfire preaching, repentance, discipleship etc i saw this in the old writings, in the puritans and i said to myself and all others this is the truth! and much of it was, but my heart was not right, my words maybe where, my doctrine maybe was according to some. but my heart was drawing further from the lord every day, i started slowly gleaning less and less from scripture and directly from God, and more and more from other men, from times in prayer and devotion with tears of joy and grief to a just studying what other men written, the tenderness went away from my heart slowly but surely, for a while i thought i was the only one in my surrounding that understood the scriptures, i was blessed God rooted out this pride, i still suffer from this today, but God is good, he showed me when i put away all books, all commentaries, even the bible for a short while and just gave up all i believed as doctrine and etc, after some time i took out the bible and asked i would see what God wanted me to know, not what i wanted to learn, so that i could be like Christ, so that Gods will could be worked out in my life and that i would not have a single regret in that final day. The result was every single doctrine i was super sure of, i think i could have died for my faith and doctrines rather than deny them, but in all of them, i found i had wrong understanding, maybe not the whole doctrine, but some aspect of it, one example is repentance, i was super sure what it was and how it worked out, but when coming with a fresh eye and a humbles spirit i saw new things concerning repentance, that i did not see before, and so i did with all things, predestination, election, heaven, hell but most wonderfully i saw new things of Christ....

if i had continued to feed from the wrong tree i would have missed these views of christ, these lovely marvelous sights of the king of glory for a doctrine, even a right doctrine, just as the pharisees did, they had all doctrines 100% right, yet missed God, this is in scripture for our learning, and i hope, in 50 years if i live and the lord tarries, that i would see much more of him, so i can be transformed into his likeness.

Also i found out that when we have the right view of Jesus, the right view on salvation, on doctrines, when we have the truth...it will set us free from sin, outward and inward, we will be more and more free, if not so, we probably do not have the true doctrine of Christ.

this must be our private litmus test, this doctrine i believe is the truth and the only gospel, is it freeing me from sin daily? is it making me more and more like Christ? more loving, more humble in my speech, more thoughtful before saying something, less self centered and more giving etc etc....

whether you or i am a calvinist or an arminian or whatever, if you find your doctrine have this effect, please continue to hold it, if not, if you find no change, no victory over sin given by God, you find unclean thoughts, evil thoughts towards others, attitudes and mood swings, lusting after money etc... you are in error somewhere most likely.

anyway, allowing God to humble us is not always a feel good thing, but it is worth it.

Lift up your heads, O you gates! And be lifted up, you everlasting doors! And the King of glory shall come in. (Psa 24:7)

Â NKJ)

God bless you all

Re: - posted by andres (), on: 2009/8/7 15:41

...As far as Pastor Reidhead, he did a wonderful job expounding Galatians 3:13. He said that Christ took our curse, so we didn't have to be cursed any longer..I was under the impression that he meant Jesus stood in our place and took the curse and penalty of God's wrath.. I hope that's what he meant. (sermon was called Redeemed from the curse of the Law)

Don't forget what camp you come from but every person who wants salvation needs to ask yourself this question

1. How do I obtain the righteousness of God? because if you don't have this, you are not going to see and worship Christ.

a. Does it come from my actions and works?

b. Does it come from Christ imputed to me?

If you choose (a) then you don't understand the full work of Christ on the cross. and you're in a dangerous position.

If you choose (b) you still don't understand the full work of Christ, but you know that you have no righteousness of your own that can save you and you need it from someone else..you need a declarative righteousness and an imputed righteousness...

(a) is moral government view

(b) is the substitutionary atonement view

Look I hold Pastor Ravenhill and Pastor Reidhead in the highest regards, and if they were here on earth I would hug them ... but we need to hold scripture higher than Calvin, Luther, Finney, Edwards, Washer Reidhead, Ravenhill and especially ourselves...

in all humbleness and humility

andy

Re: - posted by tjservant (), on: 2009/8/7 15:59

Quote:
-----What if your Calvinism was wrong? then by your own "JUDGING" you are condemning yourself to believe in another gospel and therefore go to hell.

What if your view is wrong?

You boldly state that you are correct and others are wrong just like they are doing.

Quote:
-----It is so easy to write these things out and judge others.

Quote:

-----Oh Lord have mercy.

I agree.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/8/7 16:11

Brother Wayne,

I participate in these forums for the purpose of pointing others towards Christ as He is revealed in the Scriptures. If other s disagree, I make an effort to respond graciously and kindly even though my response may be firm.

Yes, I realize that I believe and imply that false teaching is distributed in some of the sermons here. The moderators the mselves probably don't agree with every word of every sermon, but I can't speak for them.

Whether God has used Leonard Ravenhill in your life or not isn't really the issue here. This is a discussion of what he an d others taught concerning moral government theology, and the validity of that belief. I myself have read four of Ravenhil l's books and I appreciate the zeal he had. However, I also watched his type of teaching lead several people I personally know into deep spiritual depression because it distorted their view of the gospel. Their whole life became an effort to sav e themselves. If we are all honest, I would expect to see many people on these forums going through such struggles.

I will say this: whoever does not rest in the imputed righteousness of Christ to save them will go to hell.

Yes, I have received the Holy Spirit since I believed.

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Re: - posted by alan4jc (), on: 2009/8/7 16:20

I agrre with you 100% Taylor. At least on this issue ;-)

Re: , on: 2009/8/7 17:42

Quote:

-----whoever does not rest in the imputed righteousness of Christ to save them will go to hell.

I thought that we were supposed to trust in the grace and mercy of God made available by the cross?

Are we saved by the obedience Christ gave to the law or are we saved by the the cross of Christ? Isn't the atonement en ough? Do we need to add obedience to the law to the atonement? If God justifies us because the obedience of Christ is transfered to our account, isn't this legal justification? But if we are pardoned by God because of the atonement, isn't this gracious justification?

Either way, I would say that anyone who is not trusting in the grace and mercy of God, made available by the atonement and given to those who repent and believe, will go to hell. Certainly Finney, Reidhead, and Ravenhill believed that the at onement made God's grace and mercy available to those who repent of their sins and believe in Christ.

Quote:

-----1. How do I obtain the righteousness of God?

a. Does it come from my actions and works?

(a) is moral government view

I have done some research and I haven't found this to be true. Let's be fair to our brethren and represent them accurately.

The moral government camp seems to teach that the righteousness of God means that God forgives us by His grace and mercy (when we repent and believe) and thus treats us as if we were righteous. I don't see any problem with the view of imputed righteousness that the moral government camp teaches:

“God imputeth righteousness. Whom God treats as righteous... forgiven, and whose sins are not charged on him, but who is freed from the punishment due to his sins. Being thus pardoned, he is treated as a righteous man. And it is evidently in this sense that the apostle uses the expression ‘imputed righteousness’ i.e. he does not impute, or charge on the man his sins; he reckons and treats him as a pardoned and righteous man.” Albert Barnes (Commentary on the Romans, p. 105)

“This passage deserves special attention, as it explains all those texts that seem to favor, and have been construed to support the theory of the imputation of Christ’s active and passive righteousness to the sinner. Here it is manifest that justification, imputation of righteousness, forgiving iniquities, covering sins, and the non-imputation of sin, are phrases substantially of the same import, and decide positively that the Scripture view of the great doctrine under consideration, is an actual deliverance from the guilt and penalty of sin: from which it follows, that the phrases so often occurring in the writings of Paul – the righteousness of God and of Christ – must mean God’s righteous method of justifying the ungodly, through the atonement and by the instrumentality of faith – a method that upholds the rectitude of the Divine character, at the same time that it offers a full and free pardon to the sinner.” Asbury Lowrey, (Positive Theology, Published by R. P. Thompson, 1854, pg. 211-212)

Source: <http://www.libraryoftheology.com/imputedrighteousnesswritings.html>

Re: - posted by yoadam (), on: 2009/8/7 18:26

Quote:

whyme wrote:
I am interested in this concept of the descendants of Adam being "victims" of original sin. Where does this come from and what does it mean? It seems to be really important in our view of the condition of mankind and to me reveals a great deal about our personal opinions of man's position in Adam. Any further thoughts or understanding. I can pose a question in this regard. Is the bad fruit of a bad tree a victim? If we are victims, then has God been unjust or unfair in making us subject to the curse against Adam and giving us inarguably at least a strong predisposition to sin? (I am not arguing He has been unfair in this, but rather following the natural conclusion of our conclusion that we are victims of original sin)

I don't like the term, "victim" very much, but original sin certainly is inherited to all of us from Adam. I blogged about this yesterday actually.

<http://www.yoadam.com/2009/08/on-sinfulness-of-sin-total-depravity.html>
(click above and scroll down if you want to read it.)

God bless.
Adam

Re: - posted by elected (), on: 2009/8/7 20:15

I will leave to armchair professional theologians debates about theories about the atonement. I for sure don't agree with all Edwards, Wesley, Finney, Spurgeon, Ravenhill have said or written. They all believed in the incarnation, and passion, suffering and death and resurrection of Christ the 3rd day. They believed that by Christ blood shed on the cross our sins are washed away. That he carried our sins on the cross and that we are justified and saved by believing on the finished work of Jesus Christ our Savior and Redeemer.

They all preached the true gospel with unction and power, in truth and in deed, with words and life.

Re: Moral Government Theology and Ravenhill, Reidhead - posted by jimp, on: 2009/8/8 7:28

hi, i spent lots of time with bro len and he never preached calvin or armenian doctrines but he did emphasize his beliefs on conversion. he preached that altars are were one goes to die... also repent... in sincere sorrow for sin and espec. rebellion. he also said often that if your salvation does not produce personal righteousness as the result of Christ being in you then you are probably not His. jimp

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2009/8/8 9:53

The Letter and the Spirit
By Ed Ross on June 7, 2009

Forasmuch as you are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.
2 Corinthians 3:3

Â...Who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the Spirit: for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.
2 Corinthians 3:6

I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness comes by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.
Galatians 2:21

I almost lost the wonder
Of Your love in the delusion
That stoning men with rocks of truth
Was really pleasing You.
I traded new-born innocence
For the pride of being right;
A warrior on the holy road
To wield the sword with might,
Though every word I spoke was true,
Your Spirit gave no life;
The letter kills completely,
Even when completely right.
We've captured Living Water
In a box all painted gold,
Convincing men that they might live
If our box they will behold.
The Altogether-Lovely-One's
Been traded for a price-
A piece or two of silver
To make our box look nice.
We've traded wings of eagles
For a tombstone in the light;
The letter kills completely
Even when it's purest white.
O Holy One, let it be done,
Destroy this box that's dead,
And pour it's costly ointment out
Upon Your own sweet head.
May You, alone, be all our joy,
Our wisdom and our strength;
Restore that innocence for which

You died and rose again.
O now may torn and broken ones
Find refuge in Your sight-
Your Spirit heals completely
In the presence of Your light...
And the letter breathed upon by You
Becomes... the Word of Life.
- Ed Ross

Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, the great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, Make you perfect in every good work to do His will, working in you that which is well pleasing in His sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. Hebrews 13:21-22

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2009/8/8 10:00

Brother Michael wrote:

Quote:
-----Moral Government theology denies the imputation of Christ's righteousness, which Christ as the Second Adam attained through obedience to the Law, and legally bestows upon all who rest in His finished work.

Christ fulfilled the requirements of the Law of Moses through obediently following the Holy Spirit. The Law of Moses is spiritual. In the flesh no one can fulfill the Law of Moses. Only through the power of the working of the Holy Spirit is one enabled to fulfill the law of Moses. Christ the second Adam demonstrated to us the means by which we too are saved.

Heb. 9:14 how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?

Luke 4:18 "The Spirit of the LORD is upon Me,
Because He has anointed Me
To preach the gospel to the poor;
He has sent Me to heal the brokenhearted,
To proclaim liberty to the captives
And recovery of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty those who are oppressed;

John 5:19 Then Jesus answered and said to them, "Most assuredly, I say to you, the Son can do nothing of Himself, but what He sees the Father do; for whatever He does, the Son also does in like manner. 20 For the Father loves the Son, and shows Him all things that He Himself does; and He will show Him greater works than these, that you may marvel.

For those who follow the law of the Spirit, these will come to know the righteousness that is from God...

Gal: 5 For we through the Spirit eagerly wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

Faith that saves comes by hearing and then doing what the Spirit says, it is the Light of Life who works in us to reveal the truth.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: , on: 2009/8/8 10:18

"I almost lost the wonder
Of Your love in the delusion
That stoning men with rocks of truth
Was really pleasing You.
I traded new-born innocence
For the pride of being right;
A warrior on the holy road
To wield the sword with might,
Though every word I spoke was true,
Your Spirit gave no life;
The letter kills completely,
Even when completely right.
We've captured Living Water
In a box all painted gold,
Convincing men that they might live
If our box they will behold.
The Altogether-Lovely-One's
Been traded for a price-
A piece or two of silver
To make our box look nice.
We've traded wings of eagles
For a tombstone in the light;
The letter kills completely
Even when it's purest white.
O Holy One, let it be done,
Destroy this box that's dead,
And pour its costly ointment out
Upon Your own sweet head.
May You, alone, be all our joy,
Our wisdom and our strength;
Restore that innocence for which
You died and rose again.
O now may torn and broken ones
Find refuge in Your sight-
Your Spirit heals completely
In the presence of Your light...
And the letter breathed upon by You
Becomes... the Word of Life."

...

Restore that innocence for which
You died and rose again.
O now may torn and broken ones
Find refuge in Your sight-
Your Spirit heals completely
In the presence of Your light...
And the letter breathed upon by You
Becomes... the Word of Life."

What a poem. Thank you, AbideInHim, for posting this on here~ I, for one, was blessed by it. What a God, who so lovingly and patiently draws us back to His truth and grace!

Re: - posted by mackaymarsh, on: 2009/8/8 14:26

Quote:
-----Restore that innocence for which You died and rose again.
O now may torn and broken ones Find refuge in Your sight-
Your Spirit heals completely In the presence of Your lightÂ...
And the letter breathed upon by You BecomesÂ... the Word of Life."

Amen to the whole poem. It is so appropriate and it surely blesses me.

Thanks so much, 'AbideInHim' for showing a better way...

Oh, the beauty of the Lord.

Wayne

Re: - posted by HeartSong, on: 2009/8/8 15:26

I also was greatly blessed by the poem that Mike posted.

Quote:
-----mackaymarsh wrote: Oh, the beauty of the Lord.

Amen!

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/8/8 18:14

Questions:

What are the dangers of Moral Government Theology?
What is the logical conclusion to Moral Government Theology?

Or is this a whole different subject for a new thread?

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2009/8/8 19:05

Saints,

I was blessed by some of the last posts in this thread.

"But if you bit and devour one another, beware lest you be consumed by one another!" - Galatians 5:15

rather;

"through love serve one another." - Galatians 5:13b

I am not saying we should not discuss any theology at all but the danger is making blanket judgements and extreme stances. Really this is another way to debate Calvinism / Arminianism and I don't think the sermonindex forums is a beneficial place for this.

Let us not just seek to be correct. But let our lives be correct. Let us use of our lives for God be right.

God did not die on the cross so we could study and argue theology.

This thread is being **locked**.

