

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill

Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill, on: 2009/9/7 1:30

"I've heard people say "Jesus died for you sins past, present and future." Imagine a judge tell a thief "you are forgiven of all the purses you stole in the past, the ones you stole today, and the all of the ones you'll ...steal in the future." If that's insane in real life is just as insane in so called doctrine."- Leonard Ravenhill

The way I see it, only repentant sins are forgiven sins. God only pardons us of our sins after we forsake our sins. If a believer sins, they are not already forgiven, they need to repent and ask for forgiveness. Forgiveness in advance would be a license to sin.

Re: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill - posted by Jimotheus, on: 2009/9/7 4:58

Greetings truefaithsav:

Amen!! I most definitely agree. This is a most unfortunate teaching among most who embrace the teaching of eternal security, or better know as, once saved, always saved; once in grace, always in grace, etc. Not only this belief that all of our sins past, present, and future are already forgiven is a license for sin, but any kind of teaching on grace that allows individuals to continue in sin, or go back into sinful living with the promise of eternal life is also making the grace of God a license for immorality.

The Lord Jesus did not teach that all of our sins past, present, and future are automatically forgiven. Remember the Lord's teaching concerning the condition upon which our future sins would be forgiven? Jesus gave the parable of the wicked servant who was forgiven so much debt, because he cast himself on the mercy of his Lord, and his Lord had compassion on him and forgave him. Later on that day, he found a fellow servant who did not own him near as much as he was indebted to his Lord, but instead of forgiving his fellow servant, he took by the throat and had him cast into jail. The point of this parable Jesus gave was to teach us that if we forgive not those who are indebted to us, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you. Now if all of our future sins are already forgiven, this teaching by our Lord could not be eternal truth.

Secondly, in first John chapter one it tells us that IF WE CONFESS OUR SINS, he is faithful and just to forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. It is obvious that the apostle was referring to the Saints and not to unbelievers with the use of the plural pronoun, "us" including himself. Also "IF" is a condition and in this case represents the condition upon which we are to receive forgiveness of our sins. If you do not confess your sins, you will not be forgiven. If you are not forgiven, you will not be able to take your sins to heaven in the presents of a Holy God. If you will have not admitted into heaven because of unconfessed sin, there is only one place for you after you have died in your sins, and that is the lake of fire burning with brimstone which is the second death.

Re: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/9/7 10:06

Friends,

The forgiveness exhibited in the propitiation made by Christ is indeed a full satisfaction for the sins of his people (past, present and future). The cross of Christ is a historical event, not a hypothetical spiritual allegory. The propitiation was made 2000 years ago - it cannot be undone. It exists outside of us. It is an objective, historical atonement for the sin of Christ's sheep.

The Scriptures also declare that God gives us a new heart, and Paul states that "God has poured out his love into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, whom he has given us" (Romans 5:5). Our Lord taught us that he who is forgiven much loves much. So far is this amazing grace a license for sin, it is actually the only way to true holiness! Once we have tasted of this living water, we cannot return to muddy pools. The fact that we are fully forgiven of our sins by Christ's death and resurrection is the motivation to our righteous living. Those who have been justified and sanctified by our Lord will live lives of repentance, and will walk in His ways.

We believe that this true faith, being wrought in man by the hearing of the Word of God and the operation of the Holy Spirit, sanctifies him and makes him a new man, causing him to live a new life, and freeing him from the bondage of sin. Therefore it is so far from being true that this justifying faith makes men remiss in a pious and holy life, that on the contrary without it they would never do anything out of love to God, but only out of self-love or fear of damnation. Therefore it is i

impossible that this holy faith can be unfruitful in man; for we do not speak of a vain faith, but of such a faith which is called in Scripture a "faith working through love", which excites man to the practice of those works which God has commanded in His Word.

We must ask ourselves: is the gospel I preach able to be charged with the same accusation that Paul's gospel was? *"What shall we say, then? Shall we go on sinning so that grace may increase?"* The fact that Paul was even anticipating this argument shows the greatness of the grace he preached. If there is no way anyone could charge us with the same thing, are we really preaching the gospel?

With care in Christ,
Taylor

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2009/9/7 13:19

Hi Taylor...

Personally, I agree with what Brother Ravenhill is saying. While I do believe that the sacrifice of Christ was more than enough to handle all of the sins of this world (past, present and future), I also think that it is something of a stretch to say that it can and will be applied to people who choose to follow God and then turn back and live in sin.

Taylor, you quoted Romans 6:1 and asked whether people could charge the same thing against us. Yet the very next verse (the answer to the question) is GOD FORBID (Romans 6:2). It says that we are dead in sin. To apply forgiveness to those who may have come to Christ and are yet LIVING IN SIN just doesn't seem plausible. In fact, this passage continues with yet another question: *"What then? Shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace?"* (Romans 6:15 NIV). Again, this is a question about whether or not we should continue to sin. The answer is obvious: *"By no means! Don't you know that when you offer yourselves to someone to obey him as slaves, you are slaves to the one whom you obey—whether you are slaves to sin, which leads to death, or to obedience, which leads to righteousness?"*

The Word of God is clear that those who are living in sin will not be go unpunished. I think that we should always look at this issue through a different set of questions. Maybe we shouldn't be asking whether or not someone can possibly "lose their salvation," but whether it is possible to walk away from God after having truly sought Him, given your life to Him and Known Him. Regardless of whatever doctrinal defense you might have for those who fit this category (like *"well, they were never truly saved in the first place"*), the Word of God seems quite clear about the end of a man who is living for self and sin.

I have spoken of one of my sisters in the past. One of my older sisters was a very dedicated believer for most of her life. She appeared to have walked with God from her childhood. I lived around her, and I can testify that her faith was quite sincere. In fact, when I was an agnostic teenager, she used to plead with me (in tears) to come to Christ. She even would quietly come into my room when I was supposed to be sleeping and pray for me with tears. She led many people from school to Christ (including the guy that should would eventually marry several years later). She knew and testified firsthand of the supernatural ways in which God would take care of her and her husband. She has a little boy that she named Elijah -- because the name means "My God is the Lord!" My sister was the picture of a good and godly home for believers.

My sister's husband is a good Christian man. He sought the Lord, prayed with his family, and provided well for them (spiritually and physically). In fact, they recently bought a nice home in the suburbs (near where he works at the Director of Admission at a local university). My sister used to use her life story to encourage many young girls about finding a godly young man and the benefits of Christian courtship and propriety. We always had a lot of fun at my sister's house!

Last year, my sister suddenly changed. This change was quite sudden (over a period of a couple of months). Within months of us realizing something might be wrong, she left her godly Christian husband...to run away with a very disturbed young man. This young man is obsessed with vampires. My sister won't even listen to reason. Every time that I tried to talk with her, she would change the subject saying, "I don't want to talk about it." She admitted that this was her decision...and that she knew that she was walking away from God...but she didn't want to discuss it. She demanded a divorce, but her husband continued to resist her attempts. Her husband longed to take her back -- long after she had already left him. He waited for her...called out to her daily...yet she continued to ignore him. However, as time went on, my brother-in-law realized that she was not going to come back. As my sister continued to live in sin, he eventually consented to a divorce. This is heartbreaking to our family, my brother-in-law, my young nephew and his family.

Why am I saying this? My sister is an example of a person who gave her heart to Jesus in honesty and sincerity...but walked away. She knows that I have people praying for her (even online). Oddly, she admitted that she knows that she is "lost." I agree. It would be unrealistic and unScriptural to suggest that she is saved while living in sin.

I believe that it is difficult for a person who has met the Lord to walk away. They are, of course, led astray by their own lusts. However, I have known men of God (even pastors and evangelists) who went astray. Sometimes, it was due to major sins (like sexual sins), but I have even met men who slowly walked away too.

"Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." - II John 1:9

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/9/7 14:15

Chris,

Thank you for your gracious response. I think we are talking past each other a little bit. I agree with you, we can not proclaim forgiveness to those who are living in sin.

Since we may disagree on the nature of election and atonement, I may be approaching the issue a little different. I was simply saying for one of the regenerated, elect of God, all of their sins were atoned for on the cross.

With care in Christ,
taylor

Re: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill - posted by elharris, on: 2009/9/7 14:53

Quote:
-----"I've heard people say "Jesus died for you sins past, present and future." Imagine a judge tell a thief "you are forgiven of all the purses you stole in the past, the ones you stole today, and the all of the ones you'll ...steal in the future." If that's insane in real life is just as insane in so called doctrine."- Leonard Ravenhill

The way I see it, only repentant sins are forgiven sins. God only pardons us of our sins after we forsake our sins. If a believer sins, they are not already forgiven, they need to repent and ask for forgiveness. Forgiveness in advance would be a license to sin.

As I read all of this, this scripture popped into my mind.

John 3:12 If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe, if I tell you of heavenly things?

and then;

Rom 1:20 For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:

So I guess you could also say, "Hear what the unjust judge sayeth? We know an earthly unrighteous judge would not do that, God does not do that either.

We know that Jude says that certain men crept in and through the good words and fair speeches they deceived the hearts of the unlearned and unestablished in the truth by turning the original gospel of Christ, also called the gospel of grace, the gospel of the kingdom, the gospel of God, into lasciviousness, or a license to sin.

What God's people need to fully understand is HOW they did that, and HOW it continues to be done today. HOW are the scriptures perverted.

We tend to think the Jews had the law and kept the law, and the works of the law. But this is not the case at all. Did they keep some of the outward ordinances? Yes, like circumcision and the washing of cups and platters et. But they never actually did or taught the righteous requirements of the Law, in the ordinances on how you should treat your neighbor.

Rather they reinterpreted all of those things, so that you could still be righteous just by doing their external rituals, regardless of how you treated your neighbor. They in effect turned the law also into a license to sin, by what they taught about Abraham.

Whether it was the Jews twisting of the Law, of Christians twisting of the NT, one thing is the same, they both think that because they are "children" (of Abraham) be it physical or spiritual, they are special and chosen and will not come into condemnation. And the Jews, believed as much in "predestination", as some sects of Christians do today.

You see I was taught all of this false doctrine when I first became a Christian, and was also fully indoctrinated into the systematic hermeneutic and theology that supports it. I was fully persuaded of, and a champion for this lie.

It is a VERY LONG story, 10 year of being fully deceived, and another 10 years, of how I came out of this lie. But this I will tell you, that when I came to the realization of the fact that I was or had been deceived by many great teachers, I then wanted to know, where it started and HOW they were able to do this to me.

Being deceived was bad enough, but watch out what you ask for. Learning the HOW, of how they deceived me was even, by far much, much worse. **Until God's children learn the tools that are used on them to deceive them into such a damnable lie, they will continue to be deceived and to deceive, and for the most part unintentionally.**

I will try and give you a short synopsis of verses which led me to find out the HOW of deception within the Church.

Paul said this about himself.

1 Tim 1:12 And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry;

1 Tim 1:13 Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.

1 Tim 1:16 Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might shew forth all longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting.

Paul was in fact "a believer". He just did not believe in Jesus Christ. He is set forth as an example not only of Jews that don't believe in Christ, but even more importantly Christians who believe in a false Christ, or another Jesus, a false gospel.

Phil 3:5 Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, **a Pharisee;**

Phil 3:6 Concerning zeal, persecuting the church; touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless.

Paul was one of these people.

John 16:2 They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.

Paul, as a Pharisee, was "educated", in Hebrew and read the scriptures, all the time. How could he be so deceived knowing the scriptures, when people who were uneducated could hear and see the truth that Jesus taught. How is it that people can read, and still not see the truth?

Paul said he had to do this;

2 Cor 4:2 But have renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully; but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

Paul had to renounce something. Something that did three things, something he learned to do, in the school he attended. He called it;

1. the hidden things of dishonesty,
2. walking in craftiness,
3. handling the word of God deceitfully.

As a Pharisee, you were educated to "handle" the word, or "interpret" the law. But what they taught was really how to handle the Word of God deceitfully, and the truth of this was HIDDEN from those they taught. That is why it is called "The hidden things of dishonesty".

When a person wants to be a minister where do they go today? They go to a seminary or Bible school. This is basically what Paul did. But what he was taught there was how to handle the word of God deceitfully, while at the same time, being led to believe, that he was doing the right thing, and in the truth. This is why he could kill people, and think he was doing god a service. And much of this has also taken place in Christianity among Christians. Christians killing other Christians, thinking they are doing god a service.

It happens today too, and even in this country, though thank God they have not the power to actually take your life literally. It happens when they do not like what a person is thinking, or the questions they ask. It happens when they kill God's people off spiritually, by hate, anger and intimidation, by shutting them up, and forbidding questions, by not loving them. By offending many who then leave god. It is called "spiritual abuse". Only our laws protect us from physical abuse.

Paul was an example of how people get deceived, by those in authority, and by the best education. At that time the Hebrew language was not the common language. The common language was Aramaic and Greek. Hebrew was the language of the Torah and the school. No self respecting Pharisee, would even learn Greek, as it was considered, "unclean".

Hebrew in which the Torah was written, was a language only the very educated truly understood. Just as Greek became in later centuries.

2 Cor 10:10 For his letters, say they, are weighty and powerful; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible.

Jesus called Paul to preach to the Gentiles, who all spoke Greek, when Paul did not know Greek. He never did master the language to become a great orator. Did you know, that Paul, did not write most of his own letters? Paul had to have professional Greek speaking and writing scribes who were also believers, write most of his letters.

Rom 16:22 I Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord.

1 Cor 16:20 All the brethren greet you. Greet ye one another with an holy kiss.

1 Cor 16:21 The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand.

And then what you can only read in the Greek text or in an Interlinear translation, and which they do not include in the English translations, it states the following.

1 Cor

To the Corinthians first written from Philippi, by Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus and Timotheus.

The same at the end of 2 Cor.

To the Corinthians second written from Philippi of Macedonia by Titus and Lucas (Luke)

And again in Ephesians.

To Ephesians written from Rome, by Tychicus.

And again to the Philippians.

To the Philippians written from Rome by Epaphroditus.

And again to the Colossians.

To the Colossians written from Rome, by Tychicus and Onesimus.

Also 1st and 2nd Thessalonians, was only signed by Paul in the salutation, being written by Silvanus and Timotheus.

1 Thes 1:1 Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus, to the assembly of Thessalonians,

2 Thes 2:1 Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus, to the assembly of Thessalonians,

2 Thes 3:17 The salutation by my own hand of Paul, which is the sign in every epistle, so I write.

You see there are all kinds of little endings in these epistles that they do not usually put in the regular English translations. WHY NOT? Is it perhaps that they don't want us to know, that Paul was lacking in Greek speaking and writing abilities? For it is Paul's letters that they laud and pervert into a false confession of faith to begin with. (i.e. false gospel of grace).

And here is a really "funny" one. I will have supposed that you have heard of the "debate" on who wrote Hebrews. They try and say it was not written by Paul, and they don't know who wrote it. Yet they also do not include the last line of the Greek text in the English translation which states:

Here is the "salutation" as Paul always does. And then look at the last line, the left out.

Heb 13:23

Know ye that brother Timotheus has been released; with whom if sooner he should come, I will see you. Salute all your leaders, and all the saints, salute you, they from Italy. Grace be with you all. Amen

To the Hebrews written from Italy, by Timotheus.

We know from reading, that the letter was not "from" Timothy, since the author is speaking about Timothy. And we know Timothy wrote the epistle because it says so. And also because he had previously written some of Paul's epistles.

To the Corinthians first written from Philippi, by Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus and **Timotheus**.

Paul, was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a Pharisee. The Pharisees were a religious and political party that had its origin in the second century before Christ. **During a time when it seemed as if the whole world was embracing the Greek culture, language and writing, the Jewish group known as the Hasidim arose to combat this influence and to preserve Jewish ways.**

Eventually, one branch of the Hasidim broke off and formed their own community. Others however, who remained a part of regular Jewish life, formed the group that later became known as the Pharisees ("separate ones").

To the Pharisee's anything Greek was anathema, including the language. In fact any language that was not Hebrew was thought by them to be defiled and unclean. Paul was educated in Hebrew and spoke the common dialect of Aramaic, but not Greek. Greek was the lingua franca (any of various languages used as common or commercial tongues among peoples of diverse speech) in the Roman Empire.

Paul, highly educated in Hebrew, but never did fully pick up the great Greek rhetoric and oratory skills that were so highly prized in that day and time. This is why his critics said his bodily presence was weak, and his speech contemptible. But when he wrote letters, he had highly educated men do the writing, so his letters seemed more weighty, in that they were written perfectly. Perfect grammar, perfect syntax. The Greek language and its grammar was very advanced and very scientific.

God knew that he was going to send Paul to the Greek speaking Gentiles. Why didn't God pick someone who was as a great orator like Apolos or a writer like Luke? I believe it is for a very similar reason for why many people "home school", their children today.

Were you to be educated in the Greek language, you were not "just" educated in Greek. You were also indoctrinated

ated into Greek Philosophy. Just as today, children in school are not just educated but politically indoctrinated, especially into environmentalism. In fact "recycling", has become the new character trait, taught in the schools.

When Paul writes about the "wisdom of this world", he is specifically speaking about Greek Philosophy.

Col 2:8 Beware lest any man spoil you (lead you off as prey) through philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.

We, in this day and time, do not fully realize what Greek philosophy primarily consisted of. At the outset, philosophy included the whole field of higher learning, everything beyond reading, writing, and arithmetic. But as a time honored saying has it, "philosophy is the mother of the sciences": as men have gradually acquired more extended and better assured knowledge of any classification of phenomena and systematic relations among these have been sufficiently made out, a special branch of learning has become consolidated and has separated itself from the general body of thought called philosophy.

In general, it is the physical sciences which were the first to undergo this separation. Then things like psychology, anthropology, sociology, economics and government, became their own special studies.

Originally the actual word "philosophy" was coined by Socrates, a little over 400 years before Christ, to describe he and his followers, as "lovers of wisdom". Plato was his disciple, and Aristotle was the disciple of Plato.

The main subject and aspect of the Philosophy of Socrates, concerned religion, and the stories that were told about the gods. This was directly tied to his beliefs and teachings on government.

Socrates did not like what the Greek states taught and believed about the gods. He also did not like the ancient writings of the Greek prophets (also called poets) like Homer. These writings were considered like scripture, to the Greeks.

But because government was directly tied to the worship of the gods, Socrates could not just come out and say, "All these writings are a bunch of lies, and we should throw them in the trash heap, the gods are not really like this."

He could not say this, because he would have been dragged into the street and stoned. As it was eventually he was tried for corrupting the youth, and what is called "impiety", disrespecting the gods.

So since he could not just come out and say the revered writings (also called graphes or scripture) were hogwash, he instead comes up with a METHOD or what you would call a SYSTEM, on how to pervert the understanding of these writings, and change everyone's beliefs, through TEACHING.

According to Socrates, if you prescribed principles and laws, that people must apply when reading any stories about the gods, then you could control what people thought about the gods, and about what they read. All writings must conform to these laws. He called this method of interpretation THEOLOGY.

In other words, where as we think, when we read the bible, that we should try and understand exactly what it says, and conform what we believe and say about it, to what the book says: IN CONTRAST Socrates developed a type of teaching in which the writing conformed to you, not you to the writing. So if you wanted to believe such and such, you could then apply his method of interpretation on what you read, and make it look like it really said that. Hence you CONFORMED the writing to you, not you to the writing.

When Paul was warning about philosophy, he was really warning about what we know as THEOLOGY. But theology like the other sciences broke away from philosophy general, and became it's own separate branch of learning, when the Christian Church adopted it, and began using it's methods of interpretation on the Word of God.

In the west down to the time of Abelard 1079-1142 Christianity considered the term "theology" to be totally associated with heathenism. In other words they paid heed to Paul's warning to the Colossians.

But Abelard, changed the application of the word. Where as previously the system was only associated with writing

things outside the NT. Abelard said that for him theology was as much the study of the Christian doctrine of God displayed in the Holy Scriptures and the church fathers as of the doctrines of gods found outside the NT.

Not that theology had not been adopted and applied before this, even from the beginning, hence why Paul warned about it.

Theology was considered by Aristotle to be one of the three speculative sciences. Paul called it a science falsely so called.

1 Tim 6:20 O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called:

1 Tim 6:21 Which some professing have erred concerning the faith. Grace be with thee. Amen.

These methods of study were originally created to corrupt the understanding of what people read. Therefore when used on the scriptures would do the same.

As I said the word theology was first coined by Socrates. However Socrates left no writings, but his disciple Plato wrote dialogues of what Socrates taught. It's much the same as Jesus. Jesus left no writings himself, but his disciples wrote down what he taught.

Remember in Daniel, where the angel tells Daniel that after he departs the prince of Greece will come. Plato was not just a philosopher, he was also the last known legitimate king of Greece, a prince that never actually came to the throne. His genealogy can be traced back for about 1700 years. And his writings have been the most influential writings in the world next to the Bible.

Our whole educational and political system is founded on what he wrote. But not the "good" part of those systems. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle showed up about 100 years after the book of Daniel was written. Greek philosophy was spread through the conquests of Alexander the Great, who by the way was not GREEK, but Macedonian. The true prince of Greece was a demonic spirit, the earthly king of Greece was Plato.

Plato's writings, on Socrates' teachings, teach how to seduce and deceive a generation and control the minds of men, and form a one world government. This is what Plato taught, in his writing *The Republic*, where the word "theology" is used for the first time in history. It is a system comprised of relatively simple laws on HOW written documents should be taught, and how to control information through education, if you want to control what people believe about them. (Read *The Republic*)

This is why Paul warned against using these methods on the scriptures. The system itself was called theology, the laws, principles and rules became known as Hermeneutics. See here what Baker's Theological Dictionary states as much.

pg 100 But recent studies in hermeneutics indicate that hermeneutical principles are distilled from the activity of exegesis itself. Therefore any division between exegesis and hermeneutics is somewhat artificial. Scholars did not develop a theory of hermeneutics from abstract considerations, but the practical issue of exegesis (as well as controversy over interpretation) drove them to the formulation of hermeneutical theory.

In other words, you would think that FIRST you would have the hermeneutic, or the principles which you should apply to the text to come up with the correct interpretation. Then as you read the text you would apply the principles to make sure you accurately understood it.

But that is not what they do. FIRST they come up with a doctrine or belief, THEN they form their system of interpretive rules and principles around the belief.

That is first you come up with a lie, then you form a whole theology and hermeneutic around it to make the lie seem like it is true.

For instance, let's say you list "context" as one of your principles. Well the ONLY place you actually use that principle is if the context will not interfere with the lie. If the context does not matter. But anywhere, where the context, even the next verse and sometimes even a whole verse would interfere with the lie you are propounding, you don't read or mention that.

t part.

Or say for instance a word study. If all the words seem to agree with what you are trying to convey, then you will use those verses and expound on that word. But if there is a word or verse with that word, that would contradict your lie, then you either omit it, or do not use word study in that particular case.

Then there is the historical perspective. This again is only used on that bit of scripture, where whatever is taught will not interfere with the lie. You mix and match these so called scientific rules of study to suit whatever you are trying to "prove"

This type of deception was around at the time of Paul, being taught in all the Greek schools, in philosophy, which ultimately was founded on theology. The literal translation of Eph 4:14 gives us quite a different perspective on what Paul meant, and how it referred to this very thing.

Eph 4:14 that no longer we may be infants, being tossed and carried about by every wind of the teaching in the sleight of men in craftiness **with a view to the systematizing of error.**

This is the exact same thing Baker's Dictionary of theology stated, and is the exact same thing that Paul said he RENOUNCED, and called a "science falsely so called".

Here they apply this stuff and do not even realize what they are doing. As Bakers said: Recent studies in hermeneutics indicate that hermeneutical principles are distilled from the activity of exegesis (preaching) itself....Scholars did not develop a theory of hermeneutics from abstract considerations, but the practical issue of "preaching" (as well as controversy in interpretation) drove them to it."

See they had to develop a "system" to systemize their error. That was why there was controversy, because they Preach something that is not true, and then people can READ, and controversy arises when people see that there are other verses of scripture that state something contrary to what they are teaching. So they developed a system of theology and hermeneutics around the error to make it look true.

And so an unsuspecting man, who even loves God, and feels the call to preach etc. what does he do? He does what the Church says you should do, he goes to school, and what do they teach him in that school? They just teach him HOW to study. They just teach him HOW he should read and look at the bible, through these man made SYSTEMS.

So they indoctrinate and brainwash him into thinking that he knows the truth, after all after they gave him the "system", every time he uses that system of how to study on the Word, he come up with the same answer they do. Teach anyone your system on anything and they get the same results you do. So men are innocently blinded by these systems of theology and hermeneutics, and it's HIDDEN from them. It's in the darkness, and they apply this to God's word, and wind up HANDLING THE WORD OF GOD DECEITFULLY.

It really is almost identical to computer program. A computer is programmed with a certain system, and must use that system to compute its information. Once that "system" of interpretation is in your brain, the word will always be filtered and computed through that system.

But again they are led to think they are doing the right thing. After all it's so respectable, so accepted. And again it's "just a way to study. You do not even think you are actually being taught doctrine, or indoctrinated, just learning how to study scripture.

This is exactly what happened to Paul in his training in Pharisee school. The Pharisees were the worst of hypocrites. While they called themselves "Pharisees" "separated ones", and looked down on everything Greek, including the language, in truth, they were founded on the principles of Greek Philosophy and theology itself.

They just took all the teachings, and gave it all Hebrew names, hiding the fact that they were in reality plagiarists. So after Paul's conversion, and after he learned to speak Greek and understand it, he learned that they all used the same "THEOLOGY".

Theology can so convince sincere men that a lie is the truth, that they will kill you and think that they are doing God a service.

When men say and believe that "Jesus died for you sins past, present and future." They are sincere and truly believe this because they cannot SEE the truth in the written word of God, due to what they have been taught in their systems of "theology", which was as Paul warned "philosophy". There is a whole system built around these doctrines that blinds men's minds. I know because I was fully indoctrinated into it.

Until God's people understand that danger of theology ALL OF IT, for it is the leaven of the Pharisees, their teaching, that Jesus meant to beware of. Until God's people come away from that stuff, from ALL of it, they will continually be led back into error and falsehood.

Like Paul, I at one time had no idea whatsoever that the principles of biblical interpretation, which I had been taught were in reality the very philosophy he warned of.

Also similar to Paul, I was lied to and told that the principles of Biblical interpretation I was taught and which I applied to the Word of God, were not even THEOLOGY. The actual word itself was never used in my indoctrination. Rather only the principles taught. In fact I was taught that theology had no answers and was used to corrupt the Word of God, while at the same time being taught the very hermeneutic from that same theology. But see, when you don't know the "language" how would you know. And if you've separated yourself from those other "deceived" people, how would you know, you were actually all believing and applying the same thing.

It was in one day many years ago, reading that verse in Col, where Paul warned of philosophy, that I thought, "Well if I'm supposed to BEWARE of it, I better understand a little about what it is. This led me to discover the Church has adopted it, and only kept the name THEOLOGY.

I totally renounced it, and from that point on just primarily read the scriptures, and studied history and languages, and the word opened up to me like never before.

When you think about it, when you read the writings of these men, you could have read the scriptures a thousand times over and really actually learned something. WHO ARE THEY? To tell us how to interpret God's word, and what to think about it.

God's people are deceived into thinking that these "systems" are merely a means to study the scripture. In reality, they were developed to mislead and get you to handle the word of God deceitfully. Only when we understand their true origins, and renounce them, will we then be able to quit being blown around by every wind of doctrine and grow up into the truth, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

One more historical fact to note here. Socrates, received visions and revelations from a daimon, translated "devil" in the New Testament. Even though the deception of theology came from a man, it came to that man from a demonic spirit. This is why these same teachings are also called doctrines of devils.

Regards,
El Harris

Re: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill - posted by BlazedbyGod, on: 2009/9/7 15:25

Rom 3:22-25 22 Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference: 23 For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; 24 Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: 25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that **ARE PAST**, through the forbearance of God;

Re: - posted by ccchhrrriiisss (), on: 2009/9/7 15:49

Thanks Taylor...

Good point, and you are probably right. I think that most of us agree...even in regard to the underlying context for which the various camps defend their views. I must admit that I tend to approach it almost in a third person perspective. I don't care to dabble in the discussion very often, because it gets extraordinarily heated.

Quote:

-----"I've heard people say "Jesus died for you sins past, present and future." Imagine a judge tell a thief "you are forgiven of all the purses you stole in the past, the ones you stole today, and the all of the ones you'll ...steal in the future." If that's insane in real life is just as insane in so called doctrine." - Leonard Ravenhill

I think that the major apprehension amongst some people is the idea that "eternal security" (if it existed in any sort of form) might be viewed as license to sin by some...because they think that their future sins are already forgiven due to an encounter that someone once had with God (or the fact that they sincerely surrendered themselves back to the Lord at that time). That is why I brought up this heartbreaking anecdote surrounding my sister. She has actually had people tell her that she is still "saved" -- even though she is living in sin. In fact, I know several people who have heard similar stories.

One of my best friends came to Christ while he was a child. He continued walking with the Lord throughout his youth. However, he eventually became engrossed in heavy sexual sin. The love of this sort of pleasure led him away from his love for God. He said that he always loved the Lord, but slowly, his sinful exploits became a way of life while he was in his 20s. In fact, he was one of the student teachers in my high school. Some of the girls in my class would party with the guy during that time of spiritual ambiguity. He once admitted that he was sleeping with nearly 75 girls a year -- because he kept count! He was the president of his fraternity...and his nickname became "Animal." Yet there were people from Church that he respected who told him that he was "still saved" and "only struggling." Yet God had become a faint, distant memory. He grew to the point where he even questioned God's existence.

To make a long story short, this guy went through a few things...which made him fearful that he had "blasphemed the Holy Spirit" in his life...because he was encouraging people to not put their faith in a God that may or may not exist. This fear of being doomed led him to seek a God that he once knew and fellowshiped with. I can't help but wonder how many people had a false sense of "assurance" while living in sin?

I think that this is what Leonard Ravenhill is speaking of in this particular quote.

That "third person perspective" that I was speaking of is sort of akin to an "eternal" perspective. God is eternal and sits in Eternity. He knows the end from the beginning, the Omega from the Alpha. He knew us before we were born because He seated in the past, present and future at the same time. This is how John can have a vision of the future...and even in the future as seen from Heaven. I sort of approach the entire idea of predestination, atonement and election with this in mind. Is it possible that God knows those who are His simply because God is not confined to time? Perhaps Eternity is already settled in the timelessness of Heaven?

Regardless, I think that Brother Ravenhill was expressing the danger of encouraging a false sense of security. The expression that "Jesus died for your sins -- past, present and future" seems to indicate a belief that it is IMPOSSIBLE for a person who has come to Christ (who has had the sacrifice of Christ applied to his sins) from ever falling away or falling back into sin. As a person who is tempted daily, I think that it is safe to say that the temptation is ever present -- even to those of us who have certainly walked with God.

Re: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/9/7 16:20

Quote:

-----only repentant sins are forgiven sins

I want to be very practical here, and not just simply theological.

In all honesty, are there sins in your life that you have recently repented of?

If so, what would have happened to you had you died *before* you repented? Would you have gone to Hell as one of Christ's sheep? as one who had faith in His death for them?

Scripturally, I find this impossible.

Re: Forgiven Past, Present, Future Leonard Ravenhill - posted by twayneb (), on: 2009/9/7 16:40

Quote:

-----"I've heard people say "Jesus died for you sins past, present and future." Imagine a judge tell a thief "you are forgiven of all the purses you stole in the past, the ones you stole today, and the all of the ones you'll ...steal in the future." If that's insane in real life is just as insane in so called doctrine."- Leonard Ravenhill The way I see it, only repentant sins are forgiven sins. God only pardons us of our sins after we forsake our sins. If a believer sins, they are not already forgiven, they need to repent and ask for forgiveness. Forgiveness in advance would be a license to sin.

I have great respect for Ravenhill and have received great blessing from his teaching, but, if this is not a quote out of context, I think he missed it on this one. If we are to take this line of thinking, that we must first of all recall and second repent of every sin we commit, then we are most miserable and hopeless.

Forgiveness in advance is definitely NOT license to sin. I contend that a man or woman who is supposedly born again but has the attitude that, "now that my sins are taken care of, I can live a life of licentiousness and enjoy it", is a man or woman who was never born again. The grace of God does not give us license to sin, it teaches us not to sin. Titus 2:12.

Yes, when we were born again, we did receive forgiveness of sins past. Romans 3:25. We must also realize that forgiveness of past acts of sin are not all that salvation is about. It is a total transformation, regeneration, and bringing to life a spirit that was dead in trespasses and sin. It is an exchanged life. It is placing faith on Him who became sin for us so that we might become the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus.

If past actions of sin were all salvation were about then Ravenhill's analogy would certainly hold true. But, like most analogy, it misses some important aspects of the salvation experience. Having listened to many of Ravenhill's teachings, I would guess that he has not missed this fact except in this particular teaching. I contend that the particular sins of my past, such as the time I lied to my parents, are not the primary focus of salvation, although Christ did atone for those individual sins as well. The primary focus is dealing with the nature of sin within my, dealing with my spirit man, so that I can enter into right relationship with God through Christ. The high priest had to endure extensive cleansing rituals before entering the holiest of holies. Now I can come boldly into God's presence having been cleansed by the blood of the lamb.

In fact, I am reminded of a discourse on this very topic in the book of Hebrews. Hebrews 10:1-19

- (1) For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.
- (2) For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins.
- (3) But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year.
- (4) For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.
- (5) Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me:
- (6) In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure.
- (7) Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me,) to do thy will, O God.

- (8) Above when he said, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; which are offered by the law;
- (9) Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.
- (10) By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.
- (11) And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins:
- (12) But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God;
- (13) From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.
- (14) For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.
- (15) Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before,
- (16) This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them;
- (17) And their sins and iniquities will I remember no more.
- (18) Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.
- (19) Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus,

I am not sure more has to be said. When he says once for all, he does not mean for all men, he means for all time. Praise God there is security in my salvation. If I do fail or come short of doing that which I know I should do, if I act in fear and not in faith (This is a sin. Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.) I have not lost my salvation or contaminated my spirit man. Paul dealt with this topic so strongly in the first few chapters of Romans that he finally had to counter the voice of the critics by saying, "What am I saying then, shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?...GOD FORBID!" I am born again and am dead to sin. I live no longer therein. The life I now live I live by the faith of Christ. I am not my own. I am bought with a price. I want nothing to do with sin in my life anymore for I have been born again.

I know there is another thread recently about this topic, and I would say that we CAN lose our salvation, but not by one action of sin.

Sin is deadly. Persisting in a sin will cause a born again man to shipwreck his faith due to a defiled conscience. 1 Tim. 1:19. We do need to repent of and turn from any sin that God reveals in our life, but not out of fear that we may have lost our salvation.

Chris, I appreciate how well you put what you said in your last post. Well said.

Re: - posted by PulpitFict, on: 2020/9/12 19:12

God is able to forgive the sins of those that are faithful, but God also knows if we harden our hearts and refuse to repent of our sins. The heart makes all the difference.

Re: - posted by PulpitFict, on: 2020/9/12 19:15

We can lose our salvation but again it is not one sin. It is a general hardening of heart that turns away from the living God. This hardening results in a callousness to sin, refusal to repent, loss of love, etc. It is a pattern of behavior. Even David, with the seriousness of some of his sins, repented and did not let his heart remain hard. Even Calvin (whose theology I generally disagree with) did not believe future sins were forgiven. Future sins were not forgiven in advance or necessarily automatically forgiven when they occur. The difference is in paid for and forgiven.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2020/9/12 20:11

A saved person's future sins are forgiven. An unsaved person's are not.

A person who does not care if they are sinning is not saved.

Re: they never actually did or taught the righteous requirements of the Law, - posted by BeYeHoly1611, on: 2021/9/6 1

What you said here is not true, and only half true. You really need to research what the Pharisees actually believed. Read Michael Hoffmann's Judaism Discovered. Actually they did not turn the Law into a "license to sin" they did preach its righteous requirements but missed the heart of the Law. Because no human on this earth can keep the law perfectly.

Luke Chapter 18

9 And he spake this parable unto certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others:

10 Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican.

11 The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.

12 I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.

13 And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.

14 I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

Re: - posted by James777, on: 2021/10/7 13:15

The better way of looking at this is the Lord has made provision for your future sin to be washed away, but that provision is not automatically applied to you...

Proverbs 28:13

He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy

James 4:6

But he giveth more grace. Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble

Ezekiel 18:20

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

Re: Sin and power. - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2021/11/5 22:57

"Because no human on this earth can keep the law perfectly."

This is not how Scripture presents the reality of our common sin, including the sins that can easily beset us, and the sins that fall into that category of inadvertence. Actually, there is no law of God that we are not equipped to obey. Deuteronomy 30:11 says, "This law that I command you this day is not too hard for you, you can do it."

Paul references this verse in Romans 10, so he knew it well. We don't sin because we can't help it, we sin because we want things forbidden to us. We sin with both moral light shining against us, and the power at hand to choose righteousness. That is what makes it sin, and removes any excuse we might throw at the Righteous Judge!

But here is the big sin problem- one sin can crush a tall tower of righteousness! God does not work with Karma or some moral balance scale- as the world seems to think fits our God. No, righteousness cannot abide any single sin- the sin is the justification for death. God never says, "Well you are doing pretty good, I will just overlook those two sins you committed last week." That is not how He works- indeed He cannot operate like that or His whole moral governance of the universe would implode! No sin- of any man- can ever be overlooked, or forgiven without repentance!

Our sin must be submitted to the atoning work of Jesus on the cross, all of it, there is no other solution to the sin problem of man. That is why Jesus calls us to repentance, to confess and turn from our wicked ways, believing in Him for salvation.

ation. And this repentance? It must become a fixture in your character, as the likelihood of further rebellion is within you !

Alas, too many Christians take the sin in their lives to be of little account, and they actually believe they can sin because they have a sinful nature inherited genetically. Ezekiel 18 is the most complete exposition of this lie, and a wise man of God will meditate fully on that chapter. There are no excuses for sin before God, there is only His Son's blood- covering you that you receive with full and genuine repentance joined to your faith.

As in James, "The effectual and fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" If you would be that man- and God would have you be that man- you will be in a place where God can safely use you to wield great and supernatural power!

Is it any surprise that Satan would wish to keep you deceived in sin and away from that power? I should think not!

Re: The real core issue - posted by beloved-vern, on: 2021/11/7 6:55

True salvation is NOT a result of practicing prescribed principles and laws or doctrine. Christianity is the living Person and activity of Christ indwells the spirit of the Christian. This fundamental reality of Christ's actual and spiritual presence within the Christian individual is so well-attested by direct New Testament references that those who "search the Scriptures" and are receptive to spiritual reality invariably recognize the indwelling presence of the living Christ.

"That which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3:6). Being "born again" or "born from above", in "new birth" necessarily implies that the personified life of the Spirit of Christ comes to dwell in the spirit of an individual who is thus constituted as a Christian.

When a person is regenerated a spiritual exchange takes place. The "spirit that works in the sons of disobedience", "the spirit of error", "the spirit of this world", is exchanged for the "Spirit of truth", the "Spirit of God", the personified presence of the Spirit of Christ who works in the Christian.

No law, principle, doctrine can give LIFE. Jesus Christ is the PERSON who is the life giving Spirit. Even the scriptures cannot give life.

It is simple "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5:12

Lets not forget that just being forgiven is totally insufficient in overcoming sin.

Read this post

https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=64121&forum=36&start=0&viewmode=flat&order=0