

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Peter 3:19

**1 Peter 3:19 - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/2 12:52**

By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison

Questions:

1. What did He preach?
2. Where / What was the prison?
3. Was he forced to go there?
4. Did He suffer when he was in there?

**Re: 1 Peter 3:19 - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/2 12:55**

5. Who were the spirits?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/2 14:31**

This is John Wesley's comment on the verse;

1Pe 3:19 - By which Spirit he preached - Through the ministry of Noah. To the spirits in prison - The unholy men before the flood, who were then reserved by the justice of God, as in a prison, till he executed the sentence upon them all; and are now also reserved to the judgment of the great day.

and this is Gill (Spurgeon's precursor)

1Pe 3:19 - By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison. Various are the senses given of this passage: some say, that Christ, upon his death, went in his human soul to hell; either, as some, to preach to the devils and damned spirits, that they might be saved, if they would; and, as others, to let them know that he was come, and to fill them with dread and terror; but though hell may be meant by the prison, yet the text does not say that he went unto it, or preached in it; only that the spirits were in it, to whom he sometimes went, and preached; nor is his human soul, but his divine nature meant, by the Spirit, by which he went and preached to them: and as for the ends proposed, the former is impracticable and impossible; for after death follows judgment, which is an eternal one; nor is there any salvation, or hope of salvation afterwards; and the latter is absurd, vain, and needless.

I have some ideas of my own, but will give others an opportunity of commenting.

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/3 2:41**

This is what I gather from the text:

The spirits are those that in the days of Noah rejected God.

I have done a quick search on the word preach in the NT and this is a list of what Jesus preached:

The gospel of the Kingdom  
The kingdom of heaven is at hand  
the gospel of the kingdom of God  
the word  
that men should repent  
the acceptable year of the Lord  
the gospel

As Gill says, the dead cannot be saved, therefore I am still wondering what he preached to them.

Some say Victory, but why would He do this?

Some say to fill them with dread and terror, but why would He do this?

It says "By which also he went", therefore He must have gone somewhere, and as the text says - the spirits were in prison, therefore I would assume He went to that prison.

It talks about a prison in Revelation 20:7

And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison

and in the preceeding verses is mentions this prison as the bottomless pit:

1 And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.  
2 And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years,  
3 And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.

Question - are these the same prisons?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/3 3:35**

Hi Mark

These are the kind of questions I would have in my mind.

1. why is this group singled out?
2. what is the thought context of the writer? What association of ideas are to be seen here?
3. Individuals are usually referred to as 'souls' in scripture. Why does Peter call them 'spirits'?

**Re: 1 Peter 3:19, on: 2004/9/7 12:44**

Well we know that Christ suffered when he died on the cross. We know that he endured the pains and torment of hell. So it would be easy to believe, the prison which is spoken of, is the prison where all those who had died prior to Jesus's resurrection had gone. We have to realize that God was with the Jews, those were his people. They knew how to sacrifice and they knew his laws. The Gentiles, did not have the covenant with God, they were not counted in as 'God's People' UNTILL AFTER Jesus raised from the dead.

So Christ would have went and made sure that those who were in prison, were preached to. So that they could come to repentance and have eternal life. For God to have allowed them to die, and then go into eternal torment, would have meant that God created humans, and only cared for a certain group of them untill Christ came. Which brothers and sisters, would make God a respecter of Persons, which he is not.

So to answer the questions better. I believed he preached the same thing he preached while on earth. To repent. The prison, I'm unsure of, perhaps a holding cell of sorts before a person is cast into the Lake of Fire. He wasn't 'forced' to go preach there, we have to remember Christ chose to follow the will of the Father and die for us, the Father did not force him to do it. He said Father if there be any other way remove this cup from me, but nevertheless not MY WILL BUT THINE be done. So he wasn't forced there, he chose to do it. And lastly, if he suffered while preaching, I have no idea. But he did suffer while he was in the grave, there is no doubting that.

Mitch

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/7 14:16**

Quote:

-----Well we know that Christ suffered when he died on the cross. We know that he endured the pains and torment of hell. So it would be easy to believe, the prison which is spoken of, is the prison where all those who had died prior to Jesus's resurrection had gone... And lastly, if he suffered while preaching, I have no idea. But he did suffer while he was in the grave, there is no doubting that...

-----

Hi bornagain

I wonder if we know as much as we think we know?  
Why do you say he 'suffered in hell'?  
Why do you say he suffered 'in the grave'?

**Re:, on: 2004/9/7 15:22**

I used the phrase 'suffered in the grave' to mean that at some point during those three days after his crucifixion until he was resurrected, Jesus was suffering.

The entire point of his life was to die for my sins and pay the penalty of sin. He bore all of my sin, just like he bore all of my sickness. I am redeemed from poverty and sickness just like I am redeemed from sin.

And nobody can take the scriptures and say that if I die a sinner, I don't go to hell. We all know that's where I would end up. Because the penalty of sin, is ultimately hell. Where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

So if sin leads to hell, which in turn means suffering, Jesus had to go through the suffering as well. Because he bore my sin for me.

Mitch

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 16:34**

Quote:  
-----The entire point of his life was to die for my sins and pay the penalty of sin. He bore all of my sin, just like he bore all of my sickness  
. I am redeemed from poverty and sickness just like I am redeemed from sin.  
-----

Just for others who are joining in this conversation this fact that sickness and poverty was taken upon Jesus has already been heavily dealt with in this thread:  
([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id2482&forum36&92](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id2482&forum36&92)) By His Stripes (which is a locked thread).

The majority of the speakers available on this site and my personal conviction as well as most members of SI is that Jesus died on the cross for sins, and sins alone. Not the effects of sin, ie poverty or sickness.

Quote:  
-----And nobody can take the scriptures and say that if I die a sinner, I don't go to hell. We all know that's where I would end up. Because the penalty of sin, is ultimately hell. Where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.  
-----

There is the fact that without the knowledge of law sin is not known. But agreed the chief end of man is hell due to an inclination towards sin and disobedience to God. Knowing God but rather choosing not to obey Him.

As for Jesus going to hell and preaching to the spirits, and for his even suffering in hell?

He did say "it was finished" on the cross..

there is a difference between "prison" and hell.. and aren't "hell" and the "lake of fire" two different things also?

He did descend into the lower regions and he did convey a message to peoples, I would believe it's the people who died in the flood. The apostles' creed formulated in the 3rd century maintained he descended into hell (\*prison?).

Re:, on: 2004/9/7 17:09

Quote:

-----there is a difference between "prison" and hell.. and aren't "hell" and the "lake of fire" two different things also?  
-----

The terms at times, can mean different things. That's where we rely on our Strong's. However, my point, is that if Jesus never suffered in Hell, then Jesus never paid the penalty for sin.

So if you say that he never suffered, and you already claim that Jesus died ONLY for your sins, then you are in fact saying, sin still has a hold of you, because Christ never fully took that away.

The only way he could conquer death, hell and the grave was to go to all three of those. The only way he could ever remove the bondage of sin from our lives, was to pay the penalty of sin. And who denies that the penalty of sin is death and hell?

Mitch

Re:, on: 2004/9/7 17:13

Quote:

-----The majority of the speakers available on this site and my personal conviction as well as most members of SI is that Jesus died on the cross for sins, and sins alone. Not the effects of sin, i.e. poverty or sickness.  
-----

I'm not going to get into a discussion about health and prosperity with you, you lack knowledge on the subject, I learned that the hard way. But I will say, you need to look at your statement. If you claim Jesus did not die for the effects of sin, then you say that you will die. Because death is an effect of sin. But I know that I have everlasting life.

Also, sin leads to damnation in Hell. So if Christ didn't die for the effects of sin, then you are saying that someone who is saved can still enter into Hell.

That doesn't make sense to say Christ died for my sin, but not the effects of it. It makes the preaching of the cross nothing. Sin isn't the only thing that had to go. The effects go with it. If I have no sin, I have no disease, if I have no sin, I have no poverty. The ONLY reason we EVER had sickness and poverty and sin was because of the fall of man in the Garden.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 17:18

Quote:

-----So if you say that he never suffered, and you already claim that Jesus died ONLY for your sins, then you are in fact saying, sin still has a hold of you, because Christ never fully took that away.  
-----

Your reasoning makes no sense? And you are quoting words from my mouth that don't exist. I have stated clearly that Jesus died for SIN and to clarify that ALL SIN the sin of all the individuals of the world past, present and future. Yes Christ HAS fully taken away sin and I am not under the curse of sin because I have died with Christ and through grace have become an heir of God, not having my sins accounted against me.

**Psalm 32:1-2** - Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man unto whom the LORD imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile.

Quote:

-----The only way he could conquer death hell and the grave was to go to all three of those. The only way he could ever remove the bondage of sin from our lives, was to pay the penalty of sin. And who denies that the penalty of sin is death and hell?  
-----

Could you show from scripture exactly how you get this idea? If you take away SIN then you don't have the consequences of SIN. God didn't take away death and hell, they still exist, but he has conquered them by taking SIN upon Himself.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 17:30**

Quote:  
-----I'm not going to get into a discussion about health and prosperity with you, you lack knowledge on the subject, I learned that the hard way. But I will say, you need to look at your statement. If you claim Jesus did not die for the effects of sin, then you say that you will die. Because death is an effect of sin. But I know that I have everlasting life.  
-----

I thought you can to the point of realizing it's not fruitful to discuss these things in this community. Is there a certain reason why you want to re-initiate these things? I am very sorry that you firmly believe in these things, I have an evangelical and puritan library of 3000 books from men of God who through suffering and much anguish of soul served God in such a way that puts us contemporary followers of Christ to shame. Their cloud of witness is overwhelming to me when I ponder on it.. and it's interesting that they all had a proper concept of the cross, poverty, sickness, they the majority of them had to endure all of these in a way that would seem overwhelming to us in our day. Also all of the a bit more contemporary speakers on this site in the downloads section followed the example of these men. Brother you are here to tell me against all these men of God and two thousand years of church history of suffering, pain, and death that they ALL never came to a full realization of the atonement and therefore your knowledge and experience in God is more weighty and supercedes them ALL? I CANNOT EXCEPT THAT!

Brother come and let us reason together.. do not believe every wind of doctrine but test and approve these things. Look back to the spiritual fathers of our faith.. who have suffered much.. we are part of the fellowship of sufferings. Oh how I wish for you to know these things.

Quote:  
-----Also, sin leads to damnation in Hell. So if Christ didn't die for the effects of sin, then you are saying that someone who is saved can still enter into Hell.  
-----

Jesus was an atonement, he wasn't the questionable party. He replaced the lamb on the altar.. who was dying for the one in trespass. You must not confuse pauline theology at this point. Identification with Christ is a totally different spiritual experience than Christ's atonement in my estimation.

Us (sin) -- sacrifice for sin, lamb (Jesus) -- Holy God (no sin)

Jesus died to open the way up to God.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/7 17:35**

Well from what I read, you said that Jesus died for your Sins, not the consequences of sin.

That means that you are saying that even though Christ went upon the cross, Saints can still go to hell. And they have to taste death, because Jesus didn't bother taking away the consequences of sin.

Go back and read the story of the fall of Man. And tell me how that isn't the moment that sin came into this world. And along with the sin came what? Death, sickness, poverty, lack, want, all those things and more came along with sin.

You can't take away the sin, without taking away all of those. It's absurd and shows a lack of knowledge to claim that Jesus did not take away all those things. To say he never suffered for me in Hell, means he never actually bothered to pay the penalty of sin. He took it all, God didn't put SOME handwriting of ordinances on the cross. He put EVERY handwriting of ordinance that was against us up on that cross with Jesus.

Your claims that we still have to suffer the consequences of sin, it's just plain absurd. You have taken the cross and turn

ed it into just a place where he died. Not a place where he began his redemptive work.

Sickness, and hell and poverty, all those things still exist. God didn't take them away, you can still go to hell if you dont believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.

But according to your comments that Christ didn't die for those consequences, you are saying Christ didn't die to keep you from having to be tormented in Hell.

You asked me to show you scriptures, well I dont think I can post the entire Bible in a post. I'm sure there is some sort of character limit. But let me just assure you, Jesus Christ died so that I do not have to be bondage to sin, and therefore, I dont have to die, I have eternal life. I dont have to sin, I can through the spirit mortify the deeds of the body.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/7 17:44**

Quote:  
----- Brother you are here to tell me against all these men of God and two thousand years of church history of suffering, pain, and death that they ALL never came to a full realization of the atonement and therefore your knoweldge and experience in God is more weighty and supercedes them ALL? I CANNOT EXCEPT THAT!  
-----

Yes I can tell you that they never came to a full realization of God. I can tell you that they were totally ignorant when it came to many things in the Bible. I can tell you that they never understood most of everything in the Word of God.

And here is why I can tell you that.. because you among many others today like to sit and say well I can answer your question brother.. its like this.. Tozer said.. or Daniels said...

Let me tell you something, it doesn't matter one hill of beans what Tozer or Daniels or any other scriptural ignorant man said.

You like to talk about your 3000 books you have. Thats wonderful for you. But let me tell you that I have the Word of Almighty God and it outshines any one of those others books you have.

Its time you stop quoting those nuts, if you want to actually be your own man someday, Quote the scriptures.

So yes, if any man you listen to says that Healing and prosperity and sin isn't in the atonement. I can most assuredly tell you that he is ignorant in that area. I know more than he does, because I've taken the time to read it.

The problem is, you get these guys who read about Faith in the Bible, and they get sick, and dont want to keep steady and pray through it, and so they just give up, call God a liar, and say that there is no healing.

They dont want to ever admit how weak they are, and how little knowledge they have. They would rather spend their time saying that guys like me are 'false teachers' and spend all their money on bashing me, instead of just quoting scripture.

And why is this? Its because they have no scriptures in their heart. They have no scripture anywhere that says God kills, steals and destroys.

So before you try to jump all over me, and act as if those guys you listen to are smarter than I am when it comes to this topic, you might want to actually take the time, to blow the dust off your Bible and bring scriptures at me. I am sick and tired of hearing about crazy men like tozer

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/7 17:50

Quote:  
-----So if sin leads to hell, which in turn means suffering, Jesus had to go through the suffering as well. Because he bore my sin for me.  
-----

Hi Mitch

I'm not going to pursue the 'sickness and health' thread. Others are doing that. I want to make the point that it was on the cross that all the suffering was accomplished. It was on the cross that He cried it is finished and dismissed His spirit. It is old error resurrected by unthinking folk in the 20th Century that Christ secured some kind of victory in hell. It is sheer superstition; faith without revelation. It is vital to bible Christianity to understand that the cross 'finished' all that could ever be necessary to accomplish our salvation.

The resurrection was the proof that the sacrifice/suffering had accomplished its object, but it was the cross where 'justice divine was satisfied'.

If by 'hell' you mean separation from God and its consequences, then I agree with you. But that 'hell' was on the cross not during the 3 days that followed.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 17:58

Quote:  
-----So before you try to jump all over me, and act as if those guys you listen to are smarter than I am when it comes to this topic, you might want to actually take the time, to blow the dust off your Bible and bring scriptures at me. I am sick and tired of hearing about crazy men like tozer  
-----

You have clearly shown your ignorance and unreceptive spirit to accepting truth by maligning the witness of many saints who were much closer to God than you. Why should I give your words the time of day.. what makes your words different than theirs? We are hearing a gospel according to Mitch and though you confess it's the truth, so did others before you whose witness was confirmed in the Holy Ghost throughout the ages. Your new doctrine that you believe and has been started by very dubious characters is wrong, it's not of truth though it has a sound of truth. I say this honestly and forthrightly you must know that you are in clear error and you must seek God in prayer over these things and not be ignorant of men from the past.

Please take this as from a Christian who cares for you and for everyone to come into the fulness of truth and bear much fruit for God. I would implore you to read the bible yourself afresh with the help of the Holy Ghost apart from your books and teachers that you adhere to.

Did you believe these things before you sat under men's teachings such as Hagin, etc?

Re: - posted by ZekeO (), on: 2004/9/7 18:24

The 'others' march on:  
Based on your reasoning these scriptures for your perusal.

They called the apostles in and **had them flogged**. Then they ordered them not to speak in the name of Jesus, and let them go.

41The apostles left the Sanhedrin, rejoicing because they had been counted worthy of suffering disgrace for the Name. Acts 5:40

**While they were stoning him**, Stephen prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." 60Then he fell on his knees and cried out, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them." When he had said this, he fell asleep. Acts 7:59,60

He had James, the brother of John, **put to death with the sword**. Acts 12:2

The crowd joined in the attack against Paul and Silas, and the magistrates ordered them to be stripped and beaten. 23**After they had been severely flogged**, they were thrown into prison, Acts 16:22,23

My point is that in the light of your reasoning, these men suffered. Paul suffered. I have worked much harder, been in pri



son more frequently, been flogged more severely, and been exposed to death again and again. 24Five times I received from the Jews the forty lashes minus one. 25Three times I was beaten with rods, once I was stoned, three times I was shipwrecked, I spent a night and a day in the open sea, 26I have been constantly on the move. I have been in danger from rivers, in danger from bandits, in danger from my own countrymen, in danger from Gentiles; in danger in the city, in danger in the country, in danger at sea; and in danger from false brothers. 27I have labored and toiled and have often gone without sleep; I have known hunger and thirst and have often gone without food; I have been cold and naked. 2 Cor 11:23-27

There are many scriptures that say that he will guard a righteous man, no evil shall befall him etc. The Psalms are full of it, but look what happened to these men. Some lost their lives, were they out of the will of God? I don't think so. God promised us three score years and ten so does that mean because he promised it, and I am able to receive it that it is automatic? No, on the basis of what happened here. Stephen I presume was a young man when he was killed, do you think that he was putting the Lord his God to the test? No, certainly wasn't. Was it God's will to take him, seems like it. But I thought that it was God's will to give us a full happy life?

This brings me to the crux of the matter, for as many scriptures there are that tell me that God is for me, there are those that tell me that it was the Lord's will to crush him and cause him to suffer. Isaiah 53:10 Remember God is making us like his son Rom 8:29

I hope these scriptures are what you are looking for.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/7 18:37**

I'm not going to fight with you about who is closer to God. But I can tell you, whoever says Health and wealth is not biblical, failed to read some of what Jesus' said, and they certainly never read Deuteronomy 28. And it's funny you call it 'my new doctrine' seeing as how Paul himself preached it, it's pretty old brother.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 18:58**

**Hebrews 11:32-38** - And what shall I more say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthah; of David also, and Samuel, and of the prophets: Who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions. Quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens. Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection: And others had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword: they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (Of whom the world was not worthy:) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/7 19:18**

Good job quoting a part of that chapter. Now read the rest of it. Read the entire book actually, and if you want, you'll see some truth in it.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/7 19:19**

And also remember, there might come a point and time where I will lay down my life for my savior, where I will be beaten and hated of all men. But when did Christ say that before that time comes I am to be sick and miserable? And when anywhere did God say, I am the God who makes you sick and poor and makes you stay in sin.

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/9/7 19:27**

Quote:

-----But I can tell you, whoever says Health and wealth is not biblical, failed to read some of what Jesus' said  
-----

Jesus said:



Joh 15:20 Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also.

Joh 15:21 But all these things will they do unto you for my name's sake, because they know not him that sent me.

Mat 5:10 Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

Mat 10:21 And the brother shall deliver up the brother to death, and the father the child: and the children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death.

Mat 10:22 And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved.

Mat 10:23 But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another: for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come.

Mat 10:24 The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant above his lord.

Mat 23:33 You snakes, you children of serpents! How can you escape being condemned to hell?

Mat 23:34 "That is why I am sending you prophets, wise men, and scribes. Some of them you will kill and crucify, and some of them you will whip in your synagogues and persecute from town to town.

Luk 21:15 For I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist.

Luk 21:16 And ye shall be betrayed both by parents, and brethren, and kinsfolks, and friends; and some of you shall they cause to be put to death.

Luk 21:17 And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 19:37**

Quote:  
-----And also remember, there might come a point and time where I will lay down my life for my savior, where I will be beaten and hated of all men. But when did Christ say that before that time comes I am to be sick and miserable? And when anywhere did God say, I am the God who makes you sick and poor and makes you stay in sin.  
-----

I think this discussion has been pursued enough on these forums and we are just repeating the other thread I mentioned earlier. Please let us continue the topic of this thread and the main questions raised.

I would ask you refrain from arguing these matters anymore I see it quite unfruitful for all of us to be quoting scriptures to you and you need even taking heed to them but just repeating your same comments.

Yes this is an evangelical Christian website holding to the tenets of the faith and is **not** a word of faith site, we clearly believe it as heresy, as do the majority of Christians who confess Christ, obey God and have the Holy Ghost.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/7 23:38**

"When my eyes first opened to the bright light of the Gospel, it was a critical moment, and I saw nothing but the rage and fury of the wolf against the sheep of the Good shepherd and I now think nothing of the little contradiction I meet with. Nevertheless, I wish not to boast, for if, by the grace of God, I have some strength, I have but little in comparison with other laborers a thousand times more faithful than I am. And besides, I have so many cases for humiliation that I must be worse than a fool to esteem myself on any account.

All I can do is to point to the Giver of every good and perfect gift- to Him, Who when He came to open the kingdom of Heaven to us was far from having His earthly path strewn with roses and met with but little honor and respect...

Do not, I entreat you, talk of "an end of all of this," of "Satan being conquered" etc. Either lay down your arms and submit at once to the enemy, or make up your mind to a life of warfare. If outward peace were to be granted you, I should fear that spiritual life would soon expire... Perfect peace in this world is death to the new man... For our flesh-no peace, no repose, no honour, no esteem."

-Felix Neff (*The Brainerd of the High Alps*)

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/8 4:24**

Let's have another look at our original thread.

There is an assumption that has constantly surfaced in Christian thinking that Christ wreaked havoc in 'hades/hell' at the point of His resurrection. This notion teaches that for the time between His death and His resurrection Christ was a 'prisoner' in Hades/Hell. (We'll look at these terms later .DV)

This theory includes the idea that God 'tricked' Satan. Satan, so the theory goes, demanded the life of Christ in payment for the release of souls in his domain (hades/hell). Having taken his payment back to his domain Satan celebrated with his hordes the death of Christ and his permanent imprisonment. Satan was amazed that on the third day Christ revived and broke out of hades/hell making it possible for Satan's prisoners to follow Him, and so captivity was led captive.

Medieval theology went to town with this idea. In the UK they still have medieval pageants called 'mystery plays' where this whole drama is acted out as a medieval equivalent of street theatre. It is usually called The Harrowing of Hell. C S Lewis who was a medieval scholar included this theory in The Lion, the witch and the wardrobe. In that story the white witch demands the life of Aslan (Christ) in exchange for the life of the traitor. (Edmund?) She takes Aslan's life and his corpse is left on the altar. But Aslan had tricked her with a 'more ancient magic' and rose from the dead, thus setting Edmund at liberty and starting the breakup of the white witch's kingdom.

A modification of this idea even became the basis of one Keith Green's famous songs, sung by him and by Jamie Owens and many another over the last 30 years or so. It is a great tune and has a theme of triumph. Unfortunately it is a re-run of this ancient 'ransom to the devil' theory. The lyrics include this verse...

Swallowed into Earth's dark womb,  
Death has triumphed, that's what they say,  
But try to hold Him in the tomb,  
The Son of Life, rose on the third day.  
Just look, the gates of hell, they're falling,  
Crumbling from the inside out,  
He's bursting through the walls with laughter,  
Listen to the Angels shout!  
It is finished, He has done it,  
Life conquer death, Jesus Christ, has won it!  
His plan of battle, you know, it fooled them all,  
They led Him off to prison to die,  
But as He entered Hades Hall,  
He broke those hellish chains with a cry.  
Just listen to those demons screaming,  
See Him bruise the serpent's head,  
The prisoners of Hell, He's redeeming,  
All the power of death is dead!

It is finished, He has done it,  
Life conquer death, Jesus Christ, has won it!  
Just look, the gates of hell, they're falling,  
Crumbling from the inside out,  
He's bursting through the walls with laughter,  
Listen to the Angels shout!  
It is finished, He has done it,  
Life conquer death, Jesus Christ, has won it!

this is medieval superstition and not biblical revelation. It was not in hades/hell that Christ bruised the serpent's head but upon the cross. NOR was it in hades/hell that Christ 'was redeeming' by His exploits. We were redeemed 'by his blood' that is to say 'by his cross' not by His resurrection. Keith was in serious biblical error here. I am surprised that someone didn't tell him. I am sure he would have seen the dangerous implications of this idea and strangled this song at birth.

These notions have been recycled by the prosperity preachers who routinely teach that Christ gained a victory for us in hades/hell. This removes the cross from its central place where 'justice divine was satisfied' and where full and perfect judicial satisfaction for the sins of the whole world was accomplished. The focus then switches to the imagined events in hades/hell. Thus, according to this theory, our salvation is based on legends rather than the revelation of the Scriptures.

Here is a website that will give you some idea of the areas covered in 'atonement theory'. I don't endorse the site but it may be a good place to start for folk who are unfamiliar with theological language. Atonement Theory

In conclusion, a little thought will show how ridiculous this whole theory is. It stands on the presupposition that Satan has a 'domain' under his control in which he keeps prisoners. The teaching of scripture is that Satan will not be the warder of hades/hell but will be the chief prisoner of Gehenna. That our salvation should depend upon God duping a Creature hardly bears thinking about.

Any questions, before we move on?

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/8 5:17**

Hi Ron, I'll "try" and answer your questions:

1. why is this group singled out?

This group of people were those that lived in Noah's time (while the ark was a preparing). In Gen 6:2 it mentions the Sons of God, who were these? Angels?

2. what is the thought context of the writer? What association of ideas are to be seen here?

In the previous verse, Peter is talking about Christ suffering (once), for sins to bring us to God. He then digresses (i.e. he is led by the spirit to move into another area of revelation) into talking about how by the Spirit he went into prison (did the Spirit go with Him or did He do there in the "power" of the Spirit?), he then explains who the spirits were, he then uses this to link into how the baptism of Noah and his ark is a type of our Baptism (with the Spirit).

3. Individuals are usually referred to as 'souls' in scripture. Why does Peter call them 'spirits'?

I don't know enough about the difference between a soul and a spirit so I would welcome your guidance here (although you may need to start another discussion to do so ;-)

**Re:, on: 2004/9/8 7:21**

Quote:  
-----I would ask you refrain from arguing these matters anymore I see it quite unfruitful for all of us to be quoting scriptures to you and you need even taking heed to them but just repeating your same comments  
-----

Quoting scriptures to me? Lord have mercy on you, are you a liar, or just ignorant of what you have said? You do nothing but quote things which have been said by men who have no idea who Jesus Christ even is. You never quote scripture, when you do, like from Hebrews, you don't even include the scripture in its full context. You just rip it out, and use it how you want to. You act as though you know the Word of God, but you quote men who know less about the Word of God than Satan does.

I don't wish to argue anything with you. Paul wrote that there would be those like you who are weak and that I will not be able to persuade them otherwise. You teach doctrine, I teach the Word. I've seen lots of your kind, I used to go to Baptist churches when I was much younger. I know what it's like to believe in a God who has no power and has no love for his children. It's a shame though, that you believe Jesus Christ had to be sick while he was on this earth, and that he had to beg for money. I never once read any of those verses in the Bible.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/8 7:26**

Crsschk,

I understand the scriptures you have quoted there. I understand exactly what they say. But let me ask you this, do you think to be hated of all men, I have to be poor and sick? If someone kills me because I believe on the Lord Jesus Christ do you think I have to be poor and sick when they kill me? The Scriptures tell us there can be times of trials and tribulations because we are saved, but it never says there will be constant trials and tribulations. All those things you posted are true, very true of course. All of that could very well happen to me. But where in the Scripture does it say exactly that God will make sure I'm miserable until Satan wishes to do away with me?

Mitch

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/8 7:51**

Hi Mark

I'll wait just a little in case any folks have any questions about my posting on the ransom to the devil theory.

I have posted that primarily to try to remove some of the clutter from the discussion. It is plain, biblically, that Christ did not enter hades/hell to accomplish anything pertaining to our (or anyone else's) redemption. That was fully accomplished at Calvary. The question remains 'did he enter hades at all'? In fact the main verse from which the Apostles Creed...

Suffered under Pontius Pilate,  
Was crucified, dead and buried;  
He descended into hell;  
The third day he rose again from the dead;  
He ascended into heaven...

gets its teaching is Acts 2:27 Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. (Act 2:27 KJV) The NASB has a different rendering which may be significant; BECAUSE YOU WILL NOT ABANDON MY SOUL TO HADES, NOR ALLOW YOUR HOLY ONE TO UNDERGO DECAY. (Act 2:27 NASB).

You may notice the change of preposition from 'in' in the KJV to 'to' in the NASB. The preposition is 'eis' which means 'into or towards'. So the actual words of Peter at Pentecost do not say 'he was in hades' but that God would not 'abandon him to hades'; which I think you will see is something quite different. In the NASB version it might be said that this implies preservation 'from' hades rather than deliverance 'out of' hades. All in all it becomes a precarious verse upon which to

base the whole theory of Christ's descent into 'hades'.

In addition the verb translated 'leave' in the KJV and 'abandon' in the NASB is the one used by Christ in the great cry of dereliction; My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me. This makes it plain that although He was 'abandoned' on the cross He certainly was not 'abandoned' to hades.

Added to which 'hades' in Jewish understanding included the physical grave as well as the covering waiting place of disembodied souls. I don't think we can base a descent into 'hades' on this verse.

So I am still trying to clear away the clutter. If Christ did not descend into hades and did not launch a rescue mission from there in delivering souls imprisoned by Satan, what can 1 Peter be referring to? and what prison is this?

back later...

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/8 8:45**

Quote:  
-----Sickness, and hell and poverty, all those things still exist. God didn't take them away, you can still go to hell if you dont believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.  
-----

Hi Mitch

You are confusing different issues here. I have no doubt that all sin and all need (poverty) are the consequence of sin, but this is not a 'one-to-one' relationship but a 'one-to-many' relationship. In other words you can't do a simple connection between a sin and a disease, or between a sin and poverty. They are not, generally, part of the personal consequences to personal sin. There is a connection but it is not the one-to-one relationship that the disciples of Jesus thought it was; And his disciples asked him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. (Joh 9:2-3 KJV)

Personal sin, however, does have a one-to-one relationship as regards future punishment; The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. (Eze 18:20 KJV)

There is an immediately available remedy as regards the effect of my personal sin upon my ultimate destiny. Where there is a simple one-to-one relationship the blood of Christ cleanseth from all iniquity and my destination is changed. But where there is a one-to-many relationship that is not possible. Not, until the wind up of the ages; Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. (Rom 8:21-23 KJV)

**Re:, on: 2004/9/8 9:20**

I understand that sickness can come from something other than sin. Even though sin itself does create sickness and poverty in a person's life. Other things can as well. For example, if a person has trouble paying their bills, or a person lives a long life and they never had hardly any money, it doesn't mean they were sinners necessarily, it can easily just be that they didn't give any measure to the Word of God, and that they refused to hear the Lord when his Word told them they can be free of sickness and poverty as well as sin.

But what I am saying, is that Jesus came because man fell in the Garden. All of us agree to that. So let me ask you this, before man fell in the Garden, do you think Adam was poor or went without? Do you think he suffered from sickness and disease?

**Re:, on: 2004/9/8 9:24**

But speaking about the Topic in which this thread started, let me ask another question. Do you believe that if I were to die today a sinner, would I most likely enter hell? And if I would enter Hell, how come God would send me there? Why a place of torment?

Mitch

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/8 9:30**

I see...

The BBE translates it like this:

For you will not let my soul be in hell and you will not give up your Holy One to destruction.

Question, between what points of time was Christ separated from His Father?

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/8 9:30**

Quote:

-----Quoting scriptrues to me? Lord have mercy on you, are you a liar, or just ignorant of what you have said? You do nothing but quote things which have been said by men who have no idea who Jesus Christ even is. You never quote scripture, when you do, like from Hebrews, you don't even include the scripture in its full context. You just rip it out, and use it how you want to. You act as though you know the Word of God, but you quote men who know less about the Word of God than Satan does.  
-----

I am quite weary of your double-minded character, you speak that you are knowledgeable in the things of God but your words do not display a Christ-like character. You have told me that I am going to hell because I am a liar and 'liars' do not have a place in the kingdom of God. You have said I have no idea who Jesus is therefore you would expect Jesus to say to me on that day "I never knew you." You speak ignorantly like a brute beast without care or concern, I fear for you. **Again I will state the question to you and expect a response: Why are you on this site and forum?** The majority of people are here because of the audio sermon materials in which they are agreement with, and the forums is a way to communicate with others and edify.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/8 9:43**

Let's first state that just because you don't agree with the Word of God which I try to show you, does not mean I don't have a Christ-like nature. My nature is no different than when Jesus had to walk into the Temple and throw the money changers out, why did he do that? Because they were perverting the Word of God and they were being an assault onto all the things of God.

I am allowed to stand up for the Word and say that you are wrong. Paul would do the same thing, Jesus Christ would do the same thing. You sound just like all those people who say things like 'Those Christians are just mean people because they say homosexuality is a sin'

Let me tell you something, Homosexuality is a sin, I can say that, just as well as I can say that Jesus Christ SAID whatever you give expect a hundredfold return in this life and eternal life in that one to come. God has said time and time again in his word that I am healed thanks to Jesus Christ, and that I have been forgiven of my sins, and that I am a JOINT-HEIR with Christ. You think Jesus was poor and sick on this life, ok that's your own deal. It's not Scriptural. You or anyone of those men you put more value on than you put on the Word of God can try to tell me otherwise. You can say people like me or Kenneth Copeland are wrong about prosperity. But let me tell you brother, who has it working in their lives? God said he would PROVE the Word with signs following. He does it in my life, he has certainly done it in Brother Copeland's life.

So as for you saying I don't have a Christ-like character, that's quite your own opinion. I am allowed to proclaim the truth. I think the problem you have is that I don't have a Tozer or Daniels character. And I never will, and the reason I never will is because I chose to believe God's Word fully. NOT just take parts of it, and twist it around until God has no power, and wants me to be miserable in this life.

Secondly, I didn't call you a liar, I asked if you were a liar, or just ignorant. I asked which you were. YOU can answer the question or not. It doesn't matter.

As for you not knowing Jesus, you don't know much about what he said in the Scriptures, that's 100% certain. I can attest to that, because of the fact you deny every single work he ever did, and the fact he said we'd do the same, and greater.

And I am on this forum, because I am sick of tired of Christians today who want to make the Word of God of no effect. You want to act as though Jesus said I have come to kill steal and destroy. You want to act as though Jesus never bothered to take away sin from my life. You want to lead new believers into thinking God hates them.

You people say, come to Jesus, and I look at your life and say why? So he can then say, ok now that you believe on me, let me take away all the money you have, and make you very sick and very miserable. What on Earth kind of God is that? To sit and tell young Christians, now you will have to just not drive a nice car, cause real men of God have beat up cars. Now give all your money to the poor, cause now that you have Jesus you can begin to have a miserable unholy life.

You can't edify any man by saying 'Well Brother, it's just God's will that your wife has cancer, she'll be in huge amounts of pain for about four years, then die on you... but it's ok.. it's God's will for her to be that way'

Come on that is the talk of the Devil. I heard that Keith Daniels guy say that it isn't God's will to prosper everyone. But then why is it, God promised to prosper us in the Covenant he made with Abraham? Why is that then? Daniels obviously is ignorant, if he never wants to wise up, that's a big shame.

But my point here is, you can not sit and say I show no Character of Christ. I believe every single Scripture of the Bible, it is an infallible Word of God. I proclaim the Good News in order to set people free, not to bind them up as you wish to do.

You want to compare my character to Christ, you might want to look again. And tell me what you think Jesus would say to anyone who was going around spreading Satan's doctrine.

Mitch

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/8 9:55**

Quote:

-----And I am on this forum, because I am sick of tired of Christians today who want to make the Word of God of no effect. You want to act as though Jesus said I have come to kill steal and destroy. You want to act as though Jesus never bothered to take away sin from my life. You want to lead new believers into thinking God hates them.  
-----

It plainly appears you are on a somewhat of a crusade to persuade people on this site to your way of thinking. And if that is the only reason why you are here I really don't see your reason to stay. There are sermons on this site which pose a certain view and people come to hear these old men of God, they don't come to hear a WOF 'Word of Faith' teacher, teaching things contrary to the Word of God. If you cannot leave subjects already discussed in prior threads and talk about things less heretical I will have to ask you to leave. For the sake of a comely and edifying discussion for the body of Christ that meets on this site.

Again why have you come back we have been through this before and your mature decision to leave was applauding for we are not going to accept your beliefs and you neither ours.

**Re:, on: 2004/9/8 10:03**

Quote:

-----It plainly appears you are on a somewhat of a crusade to persuade people on this site to your way of thinking. And if that is the only reason why you are here I really don't see your reason to stay. There are sermons on this site which pose a certain view and people come to hear these old men of God, they don't come to hear a WOF 'Word of Faith' teacher, teaching things contrary to the Word of God. If you cannot leave subjects already discussed in prior threads and talk about things less heretical I will have to ask you to leave. For the sake of a comely and edifying discussion for the body of Christ that meets on this site  
-----



Your Words show just how Ignorant you truly are. I plan on being here, and staying here, because anywhere that I come to that people are calling my God a liar, anywhere people like you are doing the works of the devil, anywhere people like you are quoting crazy men such as Daniels.. I will be there.. because I am sick and tired of the Word meaning nothing to most people in the Church today.

Its time you stop fighting about your love for Tozer, and start getting into the scripture. You won't even answer my questions, you won't even tell me why God was lying when he promised prosperity to Abraham. you won't even tell me why Jesus said we can have a hundredfold return. You won't answer any of those.

Instead you want to take the men such as myself, who have no fears about debating scripture, and who can SHOW you with signs and miracles that its true, and act as if we are wrong.

Well let me tell you something, you go around Benny Hinn, you will get healed. You get around TD Jakes you will get loosened.

God spoke of people like you when he said my people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. I am not here to convince you to believe. You have already made a firm stance against Jesus Christ in your mind. But I am here so that those who do not understand much about the Word and have questions and concerns, can see that there are those out there who like to take the ENTIRE Bible and apply it to their lives. Not just bits and pieces.

My decision to leave before, was not a good one. Because you are still out here, speaking on behalf of the god of this world. You are still claiming that God wants you to accept Jesus as Lord, so that he can hurt you. You make no sense any time you speak. Its time you leave, its time you stop polluting young Christians minds. Its time you stop taking a stand for the devil and finally decide no matter what it takes in your life, you will follow after Christ.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/8 14:08**

Quote:  
-----But what I am saying, is that Jesus came because man fell in the Garden. All of us agree to that. So let me ask you this, before man fell in the Garden, do you think Adam was poor or went without? Do you think he suffered from sickness and disease?  
-----

No, but sin entered and death by sin and it spread to all men. The full restoration of Edenic conditions cannot be without a new Eden. It will need a new heaven and a new earth. Until then, there will be consequences of what happened in Eden.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/8 14:10**

He was separated from His Father eternally, in a moment.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/8 14:22**

Quote:  
-----Your Words show just how Ignorant you truly are. I plan on being here, and staying here, because anywhere that I come to that people are calling my God a liar, anywhere people like you are doing the works of the devil, anywhere people like you are quoting crazy men such as Daniels.. I will be there.. because I am sick and tired of the Word meaning nothing to most people in the Church today.  
-----

Greg  
I would formally ask you to consider suspending Mitch's membership of sermonindex until you have an undertaking from him that he will abide by the rules and spirit of the forum.

I don't think we should be drawn into returning railing for railing; Not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing. (1Pe 3:9 KJV) but I don't think other members and visitors to these forums should have to endure it either.

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2004/9/8 14:47**

Mitch wrote:

Quote:

-----  
And I am on this forum, because I am sick...  
-----

Hmm... you must be out of the will of God if you are sick... I thought you were proclaiming the WOF doctrines. How is it that you are sick?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/9/8 15:51**

There are a couple of words I may have missed that I would like to add to this discussion due to their relevance in the original question.

1) Paradeisos (Paradise)

2) Abraam Kolpos (Abraham's Bosom)

The theory I have felt most plausible concerning Christ and the events after the cross, yet before the resurrection is that Christ appeared to those who were in Abraham's Bosom (who were in prison which could be translated as 'hold' or 'watch'). Their dwelling was the non-penal side (as it were) of that 'prison' known as Abraham's Bosom (Paradise). The rich man was in hell as we know it- the torment side of the 'prison'-- which will later be cast into the Lake of Fire.

In the story related by Jesus in Luke 16 we read that Abraham said Lazarus was 'comforted' etc, and the rich man was tormented. We see then that in these scriptures some people were carried to "Abraham's bosom" and others were carried to hell where there was torment and the following verses say that there is a gulf between the two that no one can cross.

Abraham's Bosom and Paradeisos (Paradise) are considered one in the same ('place') based upon renderings and interpretations of various Jewish apocalyptic writings by the Essenes, etc. (See Eardmans) Jesus told the thief beside Him that he would be with Him in PARADISE- that day. This was thought to be located "in the lower parts of the earth" metaphorically (Ephesians- what is it but that He descended first into the lower parts of the earth...). So if Christ descended it was NOT to a place of torment, as Bro. Ron pointed out Christ said "It is finished!" He had fulfilled in that moment His office as the Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the World that taketh away our sins. Death was the penalty for sin and Christ paid that penalty for all, yet it can be applied ONLY to all who believe.

Rather or not Christ in that moment suffered an instantaneous separation from God - I cannot tell- yet I do not believe it at all necessary to add it to the sufferings of Christ in order to make them efficacious for making atonement. And that, because the shed blood of Jesus Christ has an infinite value to pay any penalty for sin, what more price need be paid? Isaiah 53:5 tells us he was wounded and bruised for our transgressions and healing. My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?- is a reference to Psalm 22 and I personally believe was simply done by our Lord to draw attention to that passage as a fulfillment of that Messianic prophecy and to help the confused and sifted Jews regard the Messianic concept of a suffering Messiah. Yet- they wanted a Messiah after the order of David- but that's another topic. I don't believe necessarily we have to make it to mean what we have by tradition- though I am not dogmatic about this.

\*\*\*\*\*

*From a Paradise that is "descended" into- to one that is "caught up" unto.*

\*\*\*\*\*

Yet later we hear the Apostle Paul state that he was "Caught Up" unto Paradise. Thus, Paradise (Abraam Kolpos/ Abraham's Bosom) that was once in a sense separated from God- was now united because of the first fruits of death's destruction (death meaning separation). The separation of Abraham's Bosom was ended at the Cross. And now Paul exclaims t

hat he preferred to rather be absent from the body and present with the Lord. This is a sharp contrast to those who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject unto bondage (Read closely Hebrews 2:9-15). The precious souls who were saved, yet in the "lower parts of the earth" held in their captivity (prison, hold, watch) were liberated from this state by Christ who "led captivity captive" and are now under the altar based upon Revelation. We can REJOICE that we need not be in bondage all our lives to the fear of death- because we too have been delivered from ever even seeing that place that was merely 'afar off'- yet is now as distant as heaven is from hell. This Paradise is the place where Paul desired to depart and to be with Christ which is far better. It is the balcony (as it were) from whence the great cloud of witnesses is looking on. Shall we lay aside every weight and the sin that so easily besets us- that we might take our place among the victorious who are now alive and in the very presence of Christ?

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/8 16:03**

Quote:

-----My decision to leave before, was not a good one. Because you are still out here, speaking on behalf of the god of this world. You are still claiming that God wants you to accept Jesus as Lord, so that he can hurt you. You make no sense anytime you speak. Its time you leave, its time you stop polluting young Christians minds. Its time you stop taking a stand for the devil and finally decide no matter what it takes in your life, you will follow after Christ.

I think after I gave you warning before about abusive comments in the forum where your chances, and you decided to leave which was a good and mature choice. But your returning with this more abusive attitude and words are unacceptable and just bring strife and contention to the forum discussions. Mitch I am banning your account on SermonIndex and I would ask you find another online venue to discuss scripture. You are free and welcome to read (view) the site and download the sermons. So your account membership will be cancelled and you cannot post to the site, please do not try and sign up again or I will have to take further action to ban you from accessing the site period. I hope you understand why this action was taken. I pray and hope that you come to a knowledge of the truth in Jesus Christ and separate yourself from afore mentioned false teachers. I and other have been and will pray for you as the Spirit of God leads.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/9/8 22:42**

Quote:

-----As Gill says, the dead cannot be saved, therefore I am still wondering what he preached to them.

Liberty to the captives (that were justified by faith). Then He led captivity captive.:-) I would say He preached unto them some of the same things He did the Disciples when they walked with Him in the way and their hearts burned within them. It would be almost like the warden walking in and reading off your Pardon! Think of how they would have shouted and rejoiced! Your free to go! Your free to go back into the very presence of God! The penalty has been paid!

For so long they had been shut up under a covenant that could do little more than incite rebellion in the hearts and a 'blood of the covenant' that when it was shed cried from the ground for vengeance. Yet these precious souls did not look to that covenant for salvation- for the Just shall live by faith. They looked forward to the same cross we look back to and its all in faith. Yet, the blood that cried from the ground for revenge has been supplanted by a blood that speaketh better things than that of Abel! A better covenant established upon better promises with the precious blood of Christ back of it crying that our sins and iniquities shall be remembered no more. He gave gifts unto men! Callings and such. And gave also to us exceeding great and precious promises that by them we can become partakers of the Divine Nature have escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. Heirs, joint heirs with Christ, etc.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/9 2:29**

What about when he descended to the right hand of His Father?

Are you saying that now He has a different relationship with His Father after the cross?

Or are you messing about with my mind? :-?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/9 2:44**

Quote:

-----What about when he descended to the right hand of His Father?  
-----

descended to the right hand of His father???

Messing with your mind? Looks like somebody beat me to it. :-?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/9 3:23**

Having removed the clutter of a 'harrowing of hell' perhaps its time to move on.

The context of 1Pet3:19-20 is interesting. Why should Peter identify these spirits in prison; Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. (1Pe 3:19-20 KJV)

and why should he refer to those saved in the flood as 'souls' when he has just referred to the other group, from the same time period, as 'spirits'?

This is problematic ground but the story of the flood would seem to begin with the account of 'rebellious spirits'; That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose. (Gen 6:2 KJV) The OT only ever seems to use this description 'sons of God' to describe angels. It is a very apt description of angels is that they were not 'sons' to anyone else; they were created as an entire species by God Himself. Those who have received their life direct from God, without an intermediary, are justifiably described as 'sons of God'; Which was the son of Enos, which was the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God.(Luk 3:38 KJV)

The letter of Jude includes an interesting verse; And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.(Jud 1:6 KJV) Now who are these? and again why are they singled out from all 'fallen angels'. If it is true that demons are 'fallen angels' we know that a fair number over them are definitely not 'reserved in everlasting chains' but are wreaking destruction worldwide. There seems to be a sub-set of fallen angels here who have received unique punishment; who are they? Could they be the 'rebellious 'sons of God' of Genesis 6 whose offspring are called nephilim (fallen ones)? and if so what happened to them after the Flood?

Were they 'imprisoned' in 'everlasting chains'? Why was their sins so punished? There is a cryptic comment regarding Noah; These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man and perfect in his generations, and Noah walked with God. (Gen 6:9 KJV) whereas God's description of the rest of humanity is; The earth also was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence. And God looked upon the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth. (Gen 6:11-12 KJV). It seems as though Noah and his family may have been the last pure-bred humans on earth. If Noah and his family had become 'corrupted' in their generations there could have been no incarnation. Their rebellion would have blocked the way to Christ being made flesh. Their rebellion was quashed and the wicked spirits that had instigated it were put 'in prison', 'reserved in everlasting chains'.

I think it is these to whom Christ preached 'in prison'. The word 'preach' here is not 'evangelise' but 'proclaim'. The NASB has captured the sense well; in which also He went and made proclamation to the spirits now in prison, (1Pe 3:19 NASB) The purpose of the 'preaching' was not to deliver these 'spirits in prison' but to proclaim the finality of God's plan in Christ. Their wicked plan had been frustrated and Christ declared his triumph to these spirits in prison.

This can only ever be a hypothesis. We don't have enough information to settle it as a biblical doctrine but, to me, it is the best hypothesis I have been able to shape.

WKIP

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/9/9 7:56**

Quote:

-----  
philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----What about when he descended to the right hand of His Father?  
-----

descended to the right hand of His father???

Messing with your mind? Looks like somebody beat me to it. :-?  
-----

Ron, I meant ascended, sorry to give you the wrong stick of the end. ;-)

I'll get back to you on your other comments...

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/9/9 8:10**

Bro. Ron's details are well worth noting. I have long held this view of Genesis 6 in spite of much modern scholarship that rejects it. The angels that sinned were utterly wicked and violent and left their habitat to wreak havoc on the earth. There were perverse and violent. So violent are they that God has many of the permanently bound until judgment. A few others that can be said to be temporarily bound (such as those bound in the great river Euphrates) will be loosed during the Great Tribulation and will again aid in bringing the days upon the Earth "as they were in the days of Noah." The earth will be filled again with violence and perverseness and the people will not repent in spite of compelling preaching and obvious judgment.

I would have no problem at all seeing the Nephthalim as part of those who heard a message of liberty to the captives and the downside of it being the judgment of those in hell, etc. I would only add that I feel within this context a connection with what Peter is saying as a whole about these prisoners was that they needed their conscience purged before they could come into the presence of God.

Hebrews deals with this need extensively. No blood of bulls and goats could make a man perfect as pertains to the conscience. Verse 21 of this passage in 1 Peter deals with this need. This side of the cross we have no conception of what it was like to have a continuous remembrance of our sins made every year. Yet, since the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ the very conscience that caused Adam and Eve to hide themselves has been purged. This would have been true for the Saints who went before also in my estimation.

For the people in question in 1 Peter- they could not be purged any farther by the putting away of the filth of the flesh because their bodies were in the ground. They were stripped of the flesh. BUT, they still to this point did not have the answer of a good conscience towards God- which would be required for them to come into His presence without hearing a continual, "WOE IS ME... for I am undone... I am a man of unclean lips... etc.," What the coal from off the altar did for Isaiah- the blood of Jesus Christ now does for all eternity. If the conscience had not been purged I would suggest that men and women would not have been able to come into the presence of God.

Death was a thing to be feared in the Old Testament- but Paul had a desire to depart and be with Christ which is far better. No hiding from God as did Adam. No fig leaves. No more animal skins. They have their robes now that have been washed in the blood of the Lamb and feel no shame in His presence as they are no longer naked (as it were). The finality of this process will be when the soul is clothed with the tabernacle from heaven- that spiritual body that desires to serve God rather than sin. As for now- (please bare with me) we have a pure conscience because of the blood of Christ and can walk with God as did Adam and Eve- but we still long to be clothed upon with that spiritual body.

As far as Christ "descending" to the Father- no, He 'ascended' up far above all Heavens that He might fulfill all things. Whether His position in regards to the Father is any different I would say no- because He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world and all that He has and is is eternal and immutable.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/9 19:00**

Quote:  
-----As far as Christ "descending" to the Father- no, He 'ascended' up far above all Heavens that He might fulfill all things. Whether His position in regards to the Father is any different I would say no- because He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world and all that He has and is is eternal and immutable.  
-----

Hi Robert

I think it was Mark's fingers that got mixed up rather than his theology.

I don't think His relationship was altered but in a sense He was altered. He sits on the throne now as the 'man' Christ Jesus; having incorporated humanity into deity. Although in an eternal perspective He is slain from the foundation of the earth yet in linear time some events followed others. The throne has now become the throne of God and of the Lamb. He returned to His rightful place as an old-time prince would have returned to his father's side having gained kingdoms. In Ps 24 He returns as the conquering hero. There is now within the Godhead that which has passed through human-ness and separation. There is a sense in which God Himself has changed, not in His character or attributes but in His experience. And as experience changes 'who we are'... in that sense alone some things have changed.

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/9/14 11:47**

Philologos:

Is this essentially what you are saying?

"The Lord was put to death in the body and made alive in the Spirit. After his death, he went by the Spirit to Hades to proclaim the victory of God's plan to those fallen angels who were judged and imprisoned by God during the days of Noah. Then the Lord was resurrected and he ascended to the right hand of God in heaven, thereby given all powers and authority in heaven and on earth."

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/14 11:55**

Sam

yes.

it isn't often you get an answer like that from me. I would frame it, if I were you. :-P

but with this modification (I knew it was too good to last) I would substitute 'prison' for the word Hades in your summary.

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/9/15 14:24**

What and where is this "prison"? Have we discussed this yet?

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/9/15 14:28**

Quote:

-----What and where is this "prison"? Have we discussed this yet?

"He Descended" - Ephesians 3:9-10 would seem to indicate Christ going into the lower regions, would this be the place where 'prison' is?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/9/15 14:46**

Quote:

-----What and where is this "prison"? Have we discussed this yet?

I feel it is most likely that the prison is the place Christ described as being divided by a great gulf with Abraham's Bosom (Paradise) on the one side and hell on the other. In an earlier post I described how it seems to play out based on what I have heard taught by a well respected Greek scholar in our area Dr. George Westlake.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/15 14:57**

Quote:

-----"He Descended" - Ephesians 4:9-10 would seem to indicate Christ going into the lower regions, would this be the place where 'prison' is?

I think we are on the borders of revelation here, hence my reluctance to be more specific.

I imagine mankind's story and the angels' story as two intersecting circles. The bible is really mankind's story and we usually only get information about angels from the small area of intersection where their story touches ours. We do need to be cautious when we extrapolate our tiny store of angel knowledge.

The 2 Pet 2 reference is to Tartarus; For if God did not spare sinning angels, but thrust them down into Tartarus, and delivered them into chains of darkness, being reserved to judgment. (2Pe 2:4 MKJV) But 'eis' (the word translated 'into' Tartarus) can mean 'with a view to'. That is it can mean the intended destination rather than a plain statement of arrival.

William Wordsworth says tartarus does not necessarily signify "casting" then "down to tartarus", which would be "katartarus"; but (like "phlogos" "tephros" (2Pe 2:6 ashes)"keraunos") signifies the element of their punishment; and this statement, so understood, is quite consistent with revelations of scripture concerning the present liberty of evil spirits who carry a hell, Tartarus, about with them.

I think this is possible. In this sense it would mean 'Tartarus-bound' in the way we might use the phrase 'hell-bound'. This is consistent with 2 Pet 2:6 and the reference to Sodom and Gomorrah being turned 'into ashes'. tephros: the sentence was "to ashes" # 2Pe 2:6 whereas the 2 Pet 2:4 has tartarus: the sentence was "to Tartarus"

According to Thayer 'tartarus' is the name of the subterranean region, doleful and dark, regarded by the ancient Greeks as the abode of the wicked dead, where they suffer punishment for their evil deeds; it answers to Gehenna of the Jews.

Peter's thought association immediately connects this statement to a reference to the flood. (see earlier posts) I think it



must be significant that in the two Peter references there is a clear thought association with the flood. The other reference, Jude 1:6, would seem to fit this scenario.

My current thinking on this is:

- 1) some angels sinned at the time of the flood
  - 2) and were cast out of their original habitation
  - 3) they are "chained with/in darkness" and are 'tartarus-bound'. Their punishment has therefore already begun as their liberty is already severely restricted and they can never regain the regions of light
  - 4) a final judgement day awaits them
- # Mt 8:29,25:41

wkip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/15 15:10**

Quote:  
-----I feel it is most likely that the prison is the place Christ described as being divided by a great gulf with Abraham's Bosom (Paradise) on the one side and hell on the other. In an earlier post I described how it seems to play out based on what I have heard taught by a well respected Greek scholar in our area Dr. George Westlake.  
-----

Hi Robert

This view is usually expressed in terms of hades, the covered place which included, Abraham's bosom and a kind of antechamber to hell itself. In that sense hades would become a kind of soul-state departure lounge with separate sections for the good and the bad.

I'm not convinced that we can place the fallen angels of Gen 6 in hades or gehenna. See my earlier post. There may be a separate holding camp for these particular rebels.

wkip

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/9/16 8:37**

Quote:  
-----I'm not convinced that we can place the fallen angels of Gen 6 in hades or gehenna. See my earlier post. There may be a separate holding camp for these particular rebels.  
-----

When I think about the fallen angels I think of the bound and the loosed. Of those that are bound I think (as MacArthur suggests) of the temporarily bound and the permanently bound. I don't know that we could dogmatically say that there is but one holding place for those that are bound due to scripture referring to the 4 angels that are bound in the great river Euphrates and other 'unclean spirits' ascending out of the bottomless pit. Both those that are in the bottomless pit and the river Euphrates will be loosed upon the earth during the great tribulation. We also have the passage:

*And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. (Revelation 18:2)*

I am not sure what the relationship between the bottomless pit and hell (Gehenna GK, Tophet in the O.T.) is. We know for certain that the rich man was in torment(s) in a flame. Yet God seems to prefer putting the Devil or his devils in the 'bottomless pit' (Revelation 9:1-11) or the 'sides of the pit' (Isaiah 14:15). The 'beast' is also said to ascend from this pit (Revelation 11:7, 17:8, etc.). Yet Revelation 18:2 seems to indicate that God will set up a cage (prison) for these vile devils wherever necessary.

I think of Tophet, the land where the children were made to pass through the fire, and the screams were drowned out by drums, which ultimately became what we know as Hinnom or Gehenna as God's type or visual representation of hell- which

h lends me to think of a huge trash dump. Those that are cast there are not just deserving of God's wrath but are a menace to society at large and a detriment to all through their corruptive influence. Therefore I see these places of holding all so as places where wickedness can be contained or quarantined (caged) either permanently (due to the extreme perversion and violence associated with these devils) or temporarily so that they can be loosed "for a season" for God's purpose. Again, the temporarily bound devils will be loosed and the times on earth will become as it was in the days of Noah when they walked the earth before. Yet, God would not allow all these devils to be loosed as it was likely to be unnecessary or He does not want "the sons of God" taking the "daughters of men" again begetting Nephthalim. This I understand as the meaning of the passage stating that they left "their first estate" or habitat going after 'strange' (homo) flesh. They seem to have left their habitat as the sons of God (angels) and transformed themselves into men (no marvel for Satan is transformed as an angel of light or a serpent, etc.). These have made themselves as brute beasts meant to be taken and destroyed just as an animal that 'pushed' or tried to goad people in the Old Testament was to be destroyed. I see these devils as those who had their part in filling the minds of men until every thought of their imagination was only evil continually.

Nevertheless, certain of the warmongering and violent devils, who had their part in filling the world that then was with violence- will likewise have a part to play in gathering together the enemies of God for perhaps one last showdown. Christ will tread the winepress of the fierceness of the wrath of God that will be poured out without mixture (undiluted) upon those who entertain these devils and allied with His enemy to make war with His Saints.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/9/16 8:40**

RobertW:

Your position is essentially the same as what I was taught in the church. This view was held by Watchman Nee, though he would put it slightly differently -- there is a lower region, Hades (Sheol), which is a temporary holding place for disembodied spirits before the final resurrection. It has two sections, one known as *Abraham's bosom* or paradise, and the other a place of torment (Some object because they think this idea is purgatorial, as is often included in criticisms of Nee).

Overall, I think the primary biblical text is Luke 16 where we find the rich man in Hades suffering and Lazarus resting in Abraham's bosom; and the rich man seems to be aware of the differences between Lazarus' and his own conditions. The problem with this approach is that it is not exegetically sound to establish a doctrine based on a parable with a few obscure references alone.

I think there are some extrabiblical Jewish literature that might be used to support the claim that this was one of the first-century Jewish thought -- but obviously, these do not carry the authority of the word of God.

Nevertheless, this is an explanation that makes most sense to me thus far. But I can see Philologos' point, especially since most in this forum agree that the *spirits* refer to angels, not humans.

I suppose this is one of the many mysteries that we could not fully comprehend in this present life...

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/9/17 14:23**

Just a little addition to my thesis!!

I was reading Luke 8 today and was arrested by this verse...

And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve were with him, (Luk 8:1 KJV)

"shewing the glad tidings" is the word 'evangelise' but we must forget all modern notions of method when we say so. It literally means 'to good news'; the method would have to be discovered from the text. I like the phrase 'bringing the good news'; it leaves the way wide open as to method.

'preaching' is *kErussO* which is the word used in 1 Pet 3:19. It means to act as a herald. The ESV has the best rendering I have discovered so far in Luke 8; Soon afterward he went on through cities and villages, proclaiming and bringing the

good news of the kingdom of God. And the twelve were with him, (Luk 8:1 ESV)

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/9/21 11:32**

I remember in N.T. Wright's writings, especially *Jesus and the Victory of God*, he emphasises this point precisely.

The word for "good news" or "gospel" has strong pagan Roman connotations. It is a word used to describe the annunciation of the emperor's military victory, birth, accession to throne, etc.

Thus, those who "preach" the "gospel", are the heralds who proclaim the good news that Jesus is Lord, Jesus is King.

Seen from this perspective, 1 Peter 3:19 could be referring to Jesus' proclamation of the victory of God in the "prison."