

Party Doctrines - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/30 14:42

I'm not referring to the doctrine of Birthday or Christmas Parties! But party doctrines coming out of a party spirit, i.e. sectarianism.

It occurred to me as I viewed current topics under discussion here that it becomes easy to predict what certain people will say about such things as salvation issues, end times, etc. This is because as one becomes aware of a person's allegiance to a particular 'party' of the church, their doctrine will fall in line with that party. This is particularly true when seen in the terms Reformed/Calvanism on one end and fundamentalist at the other end. However we can all be guilty of this to some degree.

So the question we should be asking when we see this in any degree in ourselves is, "Do I hold to this doctrine because it is what my church or group believes, or have I really found this position from my own study and conviction". Maybe if we are honest we might say "I am really not sure about the full understanding of this particular issue, but Ah LORD, thou knowest!"

Re: Party Doctrines - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/30 14:54

It's a great question. Personally I was both in the reformed camp and dispensational camp for years until I took the time to listen to alternative teachings and actually took a closer look at scriptures myself. However this did not come quickly and occurred over a course of a few years. I am now decidedly non-reformed but I would not say I am Armenian either. I am decidedly non-dispensational now.

These are two areas that are very difficult to discuss because there really seems to be no common ground- it's all or nothing.

However, I am willing to admit that my end times view may be wrong.

But, I cannot accept that Calvinism might be right because that goes to the very character of God, at least for me.

Re: Party Doctrines - posted by savannah, on: 2016/11/30 15:16

Please read below.

But first, consider that;

These are men who searched the Scriptures diligently. Just as with George Mueller's testimony, all the others were students of the Scriptures as well.

Consider the time and effort of all these men who met together in 1618-1619 to come to the knowledge of the truth.

Hardly are they party or pet doctrines.

The Decision of the Synod of Dort on the Five Main Points of Doctrine in Dispute in the Netherlands is popularly known as the Canons of Dort (or the Five Articles Against the Remonstrants). It consists of statements of doctrine adopted by the great Synod of Dort which met in the city of Dordrecht in 1618-1619. Although this was a national Synod of the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands, it had an international character, since it was composed not only of sixty-two Dutch delegates, but also of twenty-seven foreign delegates representing eight countries.

The Synod of Dort was held in order to settle a serious controversy in the Dutch churches initiated by the rise of Arminianism. Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), a theological professor at Leiden University, departed from the Reformed faith on a number of important points. After Arminius's death, forty-three of his ministerial followers drafted and presented their heretical views to the States General of the Netherlands on five of these points in the Remonstrance of 1610. In this document and even more explicitly in later writings, the Arminians, who came to be called "Remonstrants," taught:

1. Election based on foreseen faith
2. the universal merits of Christ
3. the free will of man due to only partial depravity
4. the resistability of grace, and
5. the possibility of a lapse from grace.

They desired the Reformed church's doctrinal standards to be revised and their own minority views to be protected by the government. The Arminian-Calvinism conflict became so severe that it led the Netherlands to the brink of civil war. Finally in 1617 the States General voted four to three to call a national Synod to address Arminianism.

The Synod held 154 formal sessions over a period of seven months (November 1618 to May 1619). Thirteen Remonstrant theologians, led by Simon Episcopius, used various tactics to delay the work of Synod and to divide the delegates tactics which proved to be unsuccessful. Under the leadership of Johannes Bogerman, the Remonstrants were dismissed. The Synod then developed the Canons which thoroughly rejected the Remonstrance of 1610 and scripturally set forth the Reformed doctrine on these debated points, now popularly called "the five points of Calvinism": unconditional election, limited atonement, total depravity, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of saints.

Though these points do not embrace the full scope of Calvinism and are better regarded as Calvinism's five answers to the five errors of Arminianism, they certainly lie at the heart of the Reformed faith, particularly Reformed soteriology, for they flow out of the principle of absolute divine sovereignty.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/11/30 16:12

Savannah,

You have proved my point well!

Doctrines formed by one sect in response to disagreement against another sect's doctrines. Most probably both wrong in parts due to a wrong intent in seeking to establish doctrinal dogma.

Re: , on: 2016/11/30 16:16

Brothers Sermonindex's Guiding principles state that members of this forum are not to initiate discussions which can cause division. Specifically Calvinism vs Arminianism.

So I humbly ask why are we going against the directives of the Sermonindex's guide lines and having these discussions?

-bbs-

Re: Dispensationalism - posted by jochbaptist (), on: 2016/11/30 17:37

Hi Todd

I have been looking at discussions on Dispensationalism in older posts. Trying to figure out what exactly differentiates a Dispensationalist from a Non-Dispensationalist. I am starting to lean towards the latter. Might share my reasons later if time allows. Was wondering what you see as the main differences?

Blessings.

;))

Edited to add:

Or anyone else's thoughts on the matter.

Re: Dispensationalism - posted by dolfan (), on: 2016/11/30 17:57

I think distillations such as creeds, substantive articles of faith, and the like can be helpful IF they are merely guard rails for the scripturally inexperienced. We all know they invariably become way more than that. But, I say they are helpful to an extent because I would not want a novice believer or even a lazy one to be left with no polestar by which to redirect them from grave error.

As we mature in the faith and as students of Christ, we should expect to find ourselves adrift from even the most trusted statements even if only in a small degree. Why? Because those statements, even by holy men whose hearts were His, were broken men plagued by the limitations of the flesh and their utterances and writing do not enjoy the imprimatur nor authority of scripture.

That distance between the island of creed or doctrinal distillation and the shoreline on which the Truth walks alive is choppy water. We travellers across that channel may feel like captains or captives at times, sometimes certain and sometimes hanging on to knowledge for dear life in fear of letting go of what we think we know. Patience and love and frequent assembly are the means by which that choppy water breaks and smooths.. Our togetherness in Him, His presence with us as we meet, the accounting to one another in love and mutual submission all serve to roll us onto the safety of that shore.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/11/30 18:19

Tim- I think you should have put that a little more beautifully.

Re: , on: 2016/11/30 19:43

Quote:
-----Savannah, You have proved my point well!
Doctrines formed by one sect in response to disagreement against another sect's doctrines. Most probably both wrong in parts due to a wrong intent in seeking to establish doctrinal dogma.

If you really can't decide which sect has it together just make your judgement on the one who doesn't torture, imprison and burn at the stake those who disagree with them:-)

Re: decisions...decisions - posted by savannah, on: 2016/11/30 20:02

awakened,

I believe those same doctrinal truths as those men I listed in the other thread. And neither I nor they, torture, imprison or burn at the stake those who disagree.

George Mueller, George Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, John Bunyan, JC Ryle, Charles Spurgeon and Matthew Henry, to name a few, have blessed me and many others. They are all of the same mind regarding the truth. If some want to label us as belonging to a sect, I take no offense. You must remember what I claim to believe. The truth has set me free. Free from the fear and calumny of men as well.

All praise and glory to His Name forevermore! Amen.

Re: Party Doctrines - posted by docs (), on: 2016/11/30 20:29

Love is the perfect doctrine.

Re: David Winter - posted by JFW (), on: 2016/11/30 20:42

Amen!!!

That, my dear brother, is golden!

Synod of Dort - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/11/30 22:15

The Synod rejected the teachings of the Remonstrants on the controverted points as falling outside the bounds of the Reformed confessions. There followed the political condemnation of the statesman Johan van Oldenbarnevelt who had been the protector of the Remonstrants. For the crime of general perturbation in the state of the nation, both in Church and State (treason), he was beheaded on 13 May 1619, only four days after the final meeting of the Synod. As consequence of the Arminian defeat the jurist Hugo Grotius was given a life sentence in prison; but he escaped with the help of his wife. Both Van Oldenbarnevelt and Grotius had in fact been imprisoned since 29 August 1618.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Synod_of_Dort