



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

Is Limited Atonement heresy? - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/16 13:37

Jerry Falwell's Friday the 13th declaration: Limited atonement is heresy

See this (<http://wwwFOUNDERS.org/blog/2007/04/jerry-falwells-friday-13th-declaration.html>) link to the video of Jerry Falwell's comments on Limited Atonement:

Quote:

-----"We are not into particular love or limited atonement. As a matter of fact we consider it heresy."

I ask the members of SI, do you believe that the doctrine of (<http://www.aomin.org/Was%20Anyone%20Saved.html>) Limited Atonement is heresy?

Re: Is Limited Atonement heresy? - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/4/16 13:56

Quote:

-----I ask the members of SI, do you believe that the doctrine of Limited Atonement is heresy?

I am very reluctant to call something heresy, because those that teach such will not inherit the kingdom of God. So no, I don't think it is heresy although I disagree with the doctrine.

Gal 5:20-21 ...heresies....of the which I tell you before, as I have also told in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/4/16 14:35

Hi everyone.

This issue of *heresy* is something that I have thought about from time to time.

According to Strong's the word which is translated heresies in Galatians 5:20 is

G139

haireisis

hah'ee-res-is

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

...a choice

Now, someone with more knowledge of the greek language may point out my error here(and please do if I am in error here), but my impression of this matter of heresy is this:

That something or other becomes a heresy when a person or group of persons insist on a particular doctrine or teaching on a particular subject or fact to the disunion of the body of believers, when this subject or fact is not otherwise so self-e

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

vident and or plainly and unmistakeably laid out in the scriptures as to make the holding of teachings or doctrines that are contrary to it, the same as rejecting revealed truth.

If that is an acceptable definition of heresy, then perhaps the question of this thread could be phrased this way:

Is the doctrine of *Limited Atonement* true?

Or perhaps it may also be asked:

If I contend for the doctrine of *Limited Atonement* to the disunion of the body of believers, is that heresy?

Peace be with you all in Messiah Jesus

EDIT: I should rephrase the question *Is the doctrine of Limited Atonement true?* to say, is it true, and **unmistakeably and plainly so**.

Re: definition of heresy - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/4/16 15:28

Have been thinking about this some more and would consider adding another qualifier to the definition of heresy that I gave before, and that would be this:

I would ask, above and beyond if something is unmistakeably and plainly true, if there is **also** some **necessity** in contending for it.

I think of how the Lord Jesus told the Jews

I have many things to say and to judge of you

Yet it is not apparent, at least to me, that He ever did, at least while He was with them. And then too, how He told His own disciples,

I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now.

He said they could not bear them *now*. So it seems He did not tell them, *then*.

So it should be with us?

A man hath joy by the answer of his mouth: and a word spoken in due season, how good is it! -Proverbs 15:23

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/4/16 16:13

Chris's definition of heresy is correct. Biblically speaking, "to be a heretic" is simply to be an individual who causes division within the church, so as to create factions and parties. The word heresy later came to simply be associated with any body who taught some different points in regard to doctrine that was considered contrary to established orthodoxy.

Biblically speaking, the word heresy never refers to a doctrine per say, but a person and their actions.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 16:32

Interesting! Thanks for the definition Chris.

So is Jerry Falwell a heretic for saying that Limited Atonement is heresy? Or is Jay a heretic if he believes in Limited Atonement and thinks everyone else is a heretic if they don't? ;-)

Just being a bit silly there...:-P

Jeannette

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/16 16:41

Quote:

-----Biblically speaking, the word heresy never refers to a doctrine per say, but a person and their actions.

If I tell you that I disagree with your definition, am I a heretic? ;-)

1Co 11:19,

For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.

Ga 5:20

Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

2Pe 2:1

But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.

Heresy in these instances refers to false doctrine.

So, let's get back to the main point a second. Do you believe Limited Atonement is a heresy?

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2007/4/16 16:42

Quote:

-----So is Jerry Falwell a heretic for saying that Limited Atonement is heresy? Or is Jay a heretic if he believes in Limited Atonement and thinks everyone else is a heretic if they don't?

Hey, sister, now *you're* being a heretic too for even entertaining such a heretical thought!

:-o

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 16:58

Quote:

PaulWest wrote:

Quote:

-----So is Jerry Falwell a heretic for saying that Limited Atonement is heresy? Or is Jay a heretic if he believes in Limited Atonement and thinks everyone else is a heretic if they don't?

Hey, sister, now *you're* being a heretic too for even entertaining such a heretical thought!

:~o

LOL Paul

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 17:16

I read a post by Evan Schaible on another board. In it he says:

"Jesus' life, death, burial and resurrection procure salvation for any and all who repent and believe. The only thing limited in the extent of the atonement are the benefits - full present salvation based on the finished work of Christ - as only those who repent and believe reap those benefits. The death of Christ is sufficient for all, but efficient only for those who repent and believe.

-- Evan"

If this is what you mean by limited atonement then I would not call it heresy.

Re: - posted by saltlicker20 (), on: 2007/4/16 17:46

My head is still swimming on all of this...mainly because of this:

George Whitefield (my personal hero): Calvinist
John Wesley: Arminian
Charles Finney: In between as a Semi-Pelagianist

Two things they all have in common:

- 1.) Used by God to shake the world
- 2.) Called out as heretics in their time and even still today

Heck...even Wesley called Whitefield a heretic...what's the deal?

Obviously the Holy Spirit must not have received the message...

-DO
I Pet 4:2

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 18:07

Quote:
-----George Whitefield (my personal hero): Calvinist
John Wesley: Arminian
Charles Finney: In between as a Semi-Pelagianist

Two things they all have in common:

- 1.) Used by God to shake the world
-

very true....

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/4/16 18:12

I would say, from an Arminian point of view, that while I don't believe in limited atonement (and find it amazing that anybody does), that such persons do not preach heresy. For my Calvinist brethren and I both acknowledge and have experienced the atoning work of Christ on the cross. All that is simply in dispute is the exact scope and effects that atoning work provided.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/4/16 18:16

Just a note: What I would consider more close to heresy is the easy-believism and watered down Calvinism that Jerry Falwell preaches.

Such I am very tempted to say is a damnable heresy, for it suggests to folks that things such as holiness of life, commitment to discipleship, and daily following the Lord Jesus Christ are mere options a Christian has, but need not seriously consider should they choose not to. This is something Calvin never taught.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/4/16 20:47

Both sides limit the atonement
The Arminian limits its ability to save
The Calvinist limits the amount who are saved.

Jesus Himself limited the atonement
Matthew 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, **which is shed for many** for the remission of sins.

Mark 14:24 And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, **which is shed for many**.

Matthew 20:28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and **to give his life a ransom for many**.

In speaking of the New Covenant the writer of Hebrews has written
Hebrews 9:28 So **Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many**; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation.

Even Isaiah the prophet in speaking of the Messiah wrote
Isaiah 53:8 He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: **for the transgression of my people was he stricken**.
Isaiah 53:12 Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and **he bare the sin of many**, and made intercession for the transgressors.

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/4/16 20:50

isn't all, many?

you can find just as many verses that say "all", cant you?

Lets declare the whole counsel of God brother!

Acts 20:26 Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men.
27 For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.

~vico

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/4/16 21:05

But even the "all" statements do not always mean all in totality. For example in Luke Luke 2:1 And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that **all the world should be taxed.**

So how much did Mexico pay in this? Or China? We must understand that in this context "all the world" means the Roman world.

Many of the passages that refer to Christ being the Saviour of the world, are written to Jews who thought the Messiah was only for the Jewish race, and not for the World or nations like the Romans and Greeks.

Paul Washer has a very good message on Particular Redemption and Missions and it can be found here (<http://www.sermonaudio.com/sermoninfo.asp?currSection=sermonsspeaker&sermonID=22007141746>) Particular Redemption And Missions

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 21:09

"Heresy" has such a bad connotation to it. I would rather say that Limited Atonement is a false teaching, which misrepresents the work of Christ and misrepresents the loving heart of God.

Many sincere and God loving Christians have been deceived by this doctrine, along with the other 5 points of Calvinism, but I wouldn't call them heretics as though they were not saved. I would rather say that they were gravely and terribly mistaken.

Limited atonement, like Universalism, is derived from the payment or punishment view of the atonement. If Christ was punished for all, then none would be punished. Since some will end up in hell, it shows that Christ did not pay their debt, since they are paying their own.

My take is that there is no partiality with God. The bible says that what Christ did, He did for everyone. The death of Christ was not the payment of anyone's debt, but Christ made it possible for the debt of all sinners to be forgiven, if they repent and believe. God required the severity of blood shed if He was going to forgive us our debts. The benefit of this wonderful offer is now extended to all people of all nations, which they can receive if they repent and believe.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/4/16 21:22

How many councils have declared Pelagianism, Semi-Pelagianism, and their not too distant relative Arminianism as heresy already? Not that they (the Councils) supercede Scripture, but when a view that was already cast aside as unbiblical comes back in another form, or even the same it does not change it.

I wonder how many of you have honestly read the beliefs of Reformed/Calvinist Theology before commenting? I once was Arminian, so what I say is based upon that background.

May I suggest reading "The Death of Death in the Death of Christ" by John Owen, or "A Display of Arminianism" by John Owen.

I started out once to disprove the Five points, but instead ended up seeing the Scriptural truth and validity of them, and have been moved to that belief.

Jesse I guess I am blessed to be "deceived"

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 21:25

I have read parts of the works of Augustine and parts of the work of Calvin. While I scripturally disagree with both of them, there is still advantage in reading their works in order to fully understand their views. It is my intention to complete their works within a year.

My favorite theologian however is Gordon Olson. I am reading a lot of his stuff along with reading Jonathon Edwards (who I do not agree with either) and others. One of the greatest theologians since the Apostle Paul seems to have been Charles Finney. I cherish his writings. They are life while so much theology is a dry and dusty rotten corpse.

If I was predestined to be a Calvinist, I will inevitably become one. Until then, I will exercise my free will and remain an Armenian. :)

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/16 22:02

Jesse,

What you are saying is that when Jesus died He did not actually secure anyone's salvation. You say that Christ's work of atonement was designed by God to atone for the sins of everyone in the world. It made possible the salvation of everyone, but made certain the salvation of no one. By your understanding the design is therefore unlimited and indefinite. The Reformed view holds that Christ's atonement was designed and intended only for the elect. Christ laid down His life for His sheep and only for His sheep. Furthermore, the Atonement insured salvation for all the elect. The Atonement was an actual, not merely potential, work of redemption. In this view there is no possibility that God's design and intent for the Atonement could be frustrated. God's purpose in salvation is sure.

(R.C. Sproul)

Re:, on: 2007/4/16 22:04

Quote:

-----If I was predestined to be a Calvinist, I will inevitably become one. Until then, I will exercise my free will and remain an Armenian. :)

:-) :-) :-)

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/4/16 22:47

Quote:

-----JaySaved wrote:

Jesse,
What you are saying is that when Jesus died He did not actually secure anyone's salvation. You say that Christ's work of atonement was designed by God to atone for the sins of everyone in the world. It made possible the salvation of everyone, but made certain the salvation of no one. By your understanding the design is therefore unlimited and indefinite.

Amen!

Quote:

-----JaySaved wrote:

The Reformed view holds that Christ's atonement was designed and intended only for the elect. Christ laid down His life for His sheep and only for His sheep. Furthermore, the Atonement insured salvation for all the elect.

This would make a finite atonement, And you would have to get passed:

1John 2:2 And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only(the elect), but also for the sins of the whole world

.

Quote:

-----JaySaved wrote:

The Atonement was an actual, not merely potential, work of redemption.

unlimited and indefinite Atonement is an actual work of God.

Quote:

-----JaySaved wrote:

In this view there is no possibility that God's design and intent for the Atonement could be frustrated. God's purpose in salvation is sure.

To frustrate the Atonement would make it worthless, however, It is for even the ones who don't take the opportunity to apply it to their own lives; doing that does not take the value away nor does it take the effectiveness away. Therefore, God's purpose in salvation is sure!

It is still sure for all mankind.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/4/16 23:02

Hi everyone.

This just came up in the random article after viewing this thread...

Selective Scripture Screening by A.W. Tozer

Heresy is not so much rejecting as selecting. The heretic simply selects the parts of the Scripture he wants to emphasize and lets the rest go.

This is shown by the etymology of the word heresy and by the practice of the heretic. "Beware," an editorial scribe of the fourteenth century warned his readers in the preface to a book. "Beware thou take not one thing after thy affection and liking, and leave another: for that is the condition of an heretique. But take everything with other." The old scribe knew well how prone we are to take to ourselves those parts of the truth that please us and ignore the other parts. And that is heresy.

Almost every cult with which we have any acquaintance practices this art of selecting and ignoring. The no-hell cults, for example, habitually stress everything in the Bible that seems to support their position and play down or explain away all the passages that deal with eternal punishment.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/17 8:40

Quote:

-----If I was predestined to be a Calvinist, I will inevitably become one. Until then, I will exercise my free will and remain an Armenian. :)

This is a cute sound bite, but sadly it exposes your lack of knowledge of Reformed Theology.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/4/17 9:02

“World” is a difficult word to properly define. The Greek word is Kosmos. World can mean earth, all people in the earth, certain people in the earth, Gentiles, society, creation, etc. World is a word that many Arminians sometimes define as “every single person”.

So how is John using world in 1 John 2:2? Take a look at Romans 11:11-13:

"11 I say then, have they stumbled that they should fall? Certainly not! But through their fall, to provoke them to jealousy, salvation has come to the Gentiles. 12 Now if their fall is riches for the world, and their failure riches for the Gentiles, how much more their fullness!

13 For I speak to you Gentiles; inasmuch as I am an apostle to the Gentiles, I magnify my ministry,"

Did you catch how Paul uses world and Gentiles interchangeably in that passage? This is the context that John uses 1 John 2:2. We must remember that the early church struggled with accepting Gentiles into the fellowship (See Galatians and Acts) John makes it perfectly clear that the Messiah is not just for Jews but is for Gentiles (the world) as well.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/4/17 10:05

Quote:
-----If I was predestined to be a Calvinist, I will inevitably become one. Until then, I will exercise my free will and remain an Armenian. :)

Jesse you may use whatever free will you think you have but ultimately the government of Armenia will have to decide if you will be Armenian or not. :-D

Re: - posted by vico, on: 2007/4/18 16:47

In deciding between Calvinism and Arminianism, you must first divide the Word of God in three parts, choose one of them, and throw the others away.

Re: Kosmos - posted by mamaluk, on: 2007/4/20 0:24

Quote:
-----World” is a difficult word to properly define. The Greek word is Kosmos. World can mean earth, all people in the earth, certain people in the earth, Gentiles, society, creation, etc. World is a word that many Arminians sometimes define as “every single person”.

Brother Jay,

I just came across this by A.Pink,

It may appear to some of our readers that the exposition we have given of John 3:16 in the chapter on "Difficulties and Objections" is a forced and unnatural one, inasmuch as our definition of the term "world" seems to be out of harmony with the meaning and scope of this word in other passages, where, to supply the world of believers (God's elect) as a definition of "world" would make no sense. Many have said to us, "Surely, 'world' means world, that is, you, me, and everybody." In reply we would say: We know from experience how difficult it is to set aside the "traditions of men" and come to a passage which we have heard explained in a certain way scores of times, and study it carefully for ourselves without bias. Nevertheless, this is essential if we would learn the mind of God.

Many people suppose they already know the simple meaning of John 3:16, and therefore they conclude that no diligent study is required of them to discover the precise teaching of this verse. Needless to say, such an attitude shuts out any further light which they otherwise might obtain on the passage. Yet, if anyone will take a Concordance and read carefully the various passages in which the term "world" (as a translation of "kosmos") occurs, he will quickly perceive that to ascertain the precise meaning of the word "world" in any given passage is not nearly so easy as is popularly supposed. The word "kosmos," and its English equivalent "world," is not used with a uniform significance in the New Testament. Very fa

r from it. It is used in quite a number of different ways. Below we will refer to a few passages where this term occurs, suggesting a tentative definition in each case:

"Kosmos" is used of the Universe as a whole: Acts 17:24 - "God that made the world and all things therein seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth."

"Kosmos" is used of the earth: John 13:1; Ephesians 1:4, etc., etc.- "When Jesus knew that his hour was come that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world He loved them unto the end." "Depart out of this world" signifies, leave this earth. "According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world." This expression signifies, before the earth was founded—compare Job 38:4 etc.

"Kosmos" is used of the world-system: John 12:31 etc. "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the Prince of this world be cast out"—compare Matthew 4:8 and 1 John 5:19, R. V.

"Kosmos" is used of the whole human race: Romans 3:19, etc.—"Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God."

"Kosmos" is used of humanity minus believers: John 15:18; Romans 3:6 "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated Me before it hated you." Believers do not "hate" Christ, so that "the world" here must signify the world of unbelievers in contrast from believers who love Christ. "God forbid: for then how shall God judge the world." Here is another passage where "the world" cannot mean "you, me, and everybody," for believers will not be "judged" by God, see John 5:24. So that here, too, it must be the world of unbelievers which is in view.

"Kosmos" is used of Gentiles in contrast from Jews: Romans 11:12 etc. "Now if the fall of them (Israel) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them (Israel) the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their (Israel's) fulness." Note how the first clause in italics is defined by the latter clause placed in italics. Here, again, "the world" cannot signify all humanity for it excludes Israel!

"Kosmos" is used of believers only: John 1:29; 3:16, 17; 6:33; 12:47; 1 Corinthians 4:9; 2 Corinthians 5:19. We leave our readers to turn to these passages, asking them to note, carefully, exactly what is said and predicated of "the world" in each place.

Thus it will be seen that "kosmos" has at least seven clearly defined different meanings in the New Testament. It may be asked, Has then God used a word thus to confuse and confound those who read the Scriptures? We answer, No! nor has He written His Word for lazy people who are too dilatory, or too busy with the things of this world, or, like Martha, so much occupied with "serving," they have no time and no heart to "search" and "study" Holy Writ! Should it be asked further, But how is a searcher of the Scriptures to know which of the above meanings the term "world" has in any given passage? The answer is: This may be ascertained by a careful study of the context, by diligently noting what is predicated of "the world" in each passage, and by prayerfully consulting other parallel passages to the one being studied. The principal subject of John 3:16 is Christ as the Gift of God. The first clause tells us what moved God to "give" His only begotten Son, and that was His great "love;" the second clause informs us for whom God "gave" His Son, and that is for, "whosoever (or, better, "every one") believeth;" while the last clause makes known why God "gave" His Son (His purpose), and that is, that everyone that believeth "should not perish but have everlasting life." That "the world" in John 3:16 refers to the world of believers (God's elect), in contradistinction from "the world of the ungodly" (2 Pet. 2:5), is established, unequivocally established, by a comparison of the other passages which speak of God's "love." "God commendeth His love toward us—the saints, Romans 5:8. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth"—every son, Hebrews 12:6. "We love Him, because He first loved us"—believers, 1 John 4:19. The wicked God "pities" (see Matt. 18:33). Unto the unthankful and evil God is "kind" (see Luke 6:35). The vessels of wrath He endures "with much long-suffering" (see Rom. 9:22). But "His own" God "loves"!!!

I have been reading The Sovereignty of God, by A.Pink, thoroughly enjoying and encouraged by it, praise God..

Brother Roaringlamb,

Quote:

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is Limited Atonement heresy?

-----Many of the passages that refer to Christ being the Saviour of the world, are written to Jews who thought the Messiah was only for the Jewish race, and not for the World or nations like the Romans and Greeks.

Yeah, that's my understanding as well, praise God, the more I learn of Sovereign grace, the more grateful I become, and the more solemn I reckon my responsibility before God..

Living in such evil time, I simply can't live without knowing God is Sovereign..not we, not satan..but God supreme! Praise Him so very much!

In Christ

Re: - posted by saltlicker20 (), on: 2007/4/23 11:50

Isn't modern day Calvinism and Arminianism the equivalent to the Corinthian "I am of Apollos", "I am of Paul" division??