

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Peter remain saved during his denial??

Did Peter remain saved during his denial??, on: 2007/7/14 3:23

A friend of mine shared on a different board a view which I thought was interesting.

Quote:
 -----I believe a man can be regenerated. I don't believe you can be regenerated, then be degenerated, and then be regenerated again.
 In other words, you can't be born again, leave salvation, and come back.

I know this is not an uncommon view. Some on these forums may share with my friends opinion. My question though, how does this fit into the denial of Christ the Apostle Peter repeatedly did?

Consider this facts of this very interesting situation:

1. The Father gave Peter a revelation of Jesus being the Christ: Matt 16:16-17, Mark 8:29-10, Luke 9:20
2. Jesus commissioned Peter (along with Judas and the others) to preach the gospel, heal the sick, and cast out demons: Luke 10:1-16
 He called them his sheep (vs 3), affirmed that they were a part of the Kingdom of God (vs 11), and that those who reject them reject Christ (vs 16)
3. Jesus told Peter his name was written in the book of life: Luke 10:20
4. Those who deny Christ before men cannot be presently in a state of salvation and face possible condemnation in the future: Matt 10:33
5. Peter denied Christ before men: Matt 26:34, Luke 22:34
6. Peter needed to be converted after this incident: Luke 22:32

Considering these facts, there are only three options:

1. Peter was not saved before denying Christ, not while denying Christ, but was saved for the first time after that.
 If this is true, why would Jesus assure Peter that His name was written in the book of life, before Peter denied Christ?
 Also, it would mean that Christ sent out an unsaved man to preach the gospel, heal the sick, and cast out demons. And that Christ said an unsaved person was a sheep, apart of the Kingdom of God, and His representative. If Peter was of the devil when he did all that, did Satan cast out Satan?
2. Peter was saved the entire time, during his mission to preach the gospel - cast out demons - and heal the sick, during his denial of Christ, and after his denial of Christ.

Problems with this is that it means a saved person can utterly lie three times about Christ, which Christ said denying Him has eternal consequences, and Revelations 21:8 says all liars without exception face eternal hell.

It also doesn't explain Christ telling people to strengthen the brethren "when thou art converted". How can a man in the state of conversion be converted? Only the unconverted can be converted.

3. Peter was saved before denying Christ, fell into temporary backslidings - in which he must have been in a condemned condition, and then later was converted again unto Christ.

I believe this last one makes the most scriptural sense. It means that even a genuine Christian can fall into backsliding, during which he is in a state of condemnation, but can be restored to the faith, and thereby his his spiritual soul saved from eternal death.

James 5:19-20: I believe explains this case with Peter.

“Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that ye which converts the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.”

While some sin is not unto death, in which a sinner or backslider can repent from and be either converted for the first time or restored to the faith, there is also a sin unto death in which there is no more return, a state of probation when no more enlightenment is possible, and therefore no more repentance can occur.

This sin unto death, in which restoration is impossible, a state of no return, or total apostacy, because no further enlightenment is possible, is what I believe this scripture speaks of:

Heb 6:4-6: For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, If they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.

Anyways, the only answer to the question is one of the 3 I listed, unless anyone else sees a 4th option which I failed to think of?

Re: Did Peter remain saved during his denial??, on: 2007/7/14 7:23

Peter was saved, because of God's foreknowledge of what Peter 'would do'.

Jesus said to him, Satan has desired to sift you as wheat, but I have prayed for you, and when you are 'recovered', strengthen the brethren.

He knows those which are His.

He knows those who will be faithful unto the end, even if they stumble.

Foreknowledge of what each human being will do from the day they're born until the day they die is how GOD determines Election.

He knew before the foundations of the world what each of us would do and how we would wind up in the end, by our own choices.

Otherwise, freewill is out the window completely.

Re: Did Peter remain saved during his denial??, on: 2007/7/14 9:26

If our perspective on the salvation of God is simply to remain saved (sin confess..sin confess), then I can see where we might not have any more answers, but...

According to the scripture, God told Israel that He brought them out of Egypt in order to bring them into their inheritance.

Quote:
-----8And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites.

He brought them out, to bring them in...

This too, is God's plan for every believer. God brought us out of our sin, to bring us into our inheritance..which is Christ. His life. He is our inheritance. The purpose of God is that we might be conformed into the image of His Son.

And failure, coming face to face with the reality of who we are, apart from Christ, is a major part of that process.

When Jacob wrestled with God, he had to confess who he really was. He was Jacob...a deceiver. And then God gave Him a new name.

This is why getting Justification right is so important. If we are not confident in our standing with God, then there is no way that He can begin to show us all of our sin nature, our flesh, our weakness. We will never have rest. We will always think we are condemned.

And so Peter...strong, self-confident, Peter, The one who said he would never forsake Jesus. Peter.

He was brought to a place where his own strength failed. He wanted to be strong. He wanted to stand with Jesus, but he could not find the strength to do it (sound familiar...Romans 7 maybe...) And so He denied Jesus. He failed. He sinned. And it was all the purpose, plan, and the will of God.

Peter's strength had to fail because the kingdom of God does not move forward by the strength of man, or the will of man...."It's not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord.

Re:, on: 2007/7/14 9:33

Quote:

-----by Mahoney

This too, is God's plan for every believer. God brought us out of our sin, to bring us into our inheritance..which is Christ. His life. He is our inheritance. The purpose of God is that we might be conformed into the image of His Son.

And failure, coming face to face with the reality of who we are, apart from Christ, is a major part of that process.

Amen Mahoney,

Rom 8:28, 29 And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. **For** whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren.

Re: Did Peter remain saved during his denial?? - posted by Logic, on: 2007/7/14 10:36

Quote:

-----Lazarus1719 wrote:

3. Peter was saved before denying Christ, fell into temporary backslidings - in which he must have been in a condemned condition, and then later was converted again unto Christ.

I believe this last one makes the most scriptural sense. It means that even a genuine Christian can fall into backsliding, during which he is in a state of condemnation, but can be restored to the faith, and thereby his his spiritual soul saved from eternal death.

I don't think all backslidings put one in a state of condemnation.

Salvation is a concept of faith, knowledge, hope and placement, not of initial acts.

Example; if one bears a false witness, is one in a state of condemnation during that lie?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/7/14 12:20

I hope these responses have sufficiently answered your question Jesse.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/7/14 13:00

Another point to ponder as well as when in time did this happen. What I mean is was Peter sealed with the Holy Spirit as we read in the Epistles, or was this prior to that being possible?

If we would look at Scripture we would see the following-

Joh 20:22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:

This happens after the denial of course, and we also understand that the day of Pentecost was after the denial as well, but at this time had not happened yet. Pentecost opened the door to the universal indwelling of God's people by His Spirit, whereas prior to this it was certain individuals that were sealed, or empowered by the Spirit of the Lord.

Now though the Spirit is the earnest of Heaven, and is in all those who are regenerated.

As siter Annie brought up these verses, I think they answer the question pretty clearly-

Luk 22:32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and **when thou art converted**, strengthen thy brethren.

Luk 22:33 And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death.

Peter was very quick to show the Lord how willing his flesh was, but we know that in the heat of the moment the fleshly boldness wilted, and denied the very One whom Peter said he loved. Thus Jesus makes the point, "when you are converted" or when you are made a different man, strengthen your brethren.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2007/7/14 13:25

Quote:

-----roaringlamb wrote:

Another point to ponder as well as when in time did this happen. What I mean is was Peter sealed with the Holy Spirit as we read in the Epistles, or was this prior to that being possible?

If we would look at Scripture we would see the following-

Joh 20:22 And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:

This happens after the denial of course, and we also understand that the day of Pentecost was after the denial as well, but at this time had not happened yet. Pentecost opened the door to the universal indwelling of God's people by His Spirit, whereas prior to this it was certain individuals that were sealed, or empowered by the Spirit of the Lord.

Now though the Spirit is the earnest of Heaven, and is in all those who are regenerated.

As siter Annie brought up these verses, I think they answer the question pretty clearly-

Luk 22:32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and **when thou art converted**, strengthen thy brethren.

Luk 22:33 And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death.

Peter was very quick to show the Lord how willing his flesh was, but we know that in the heat of the moment the fleshly boldness wilted, and denied the very One whom Peter said he loved. Thus Jesus makes the point, "when you are converted" or when you are made a different man, strengthen your brethren.

Joh 17:3 "Now this is eternal life: that they shall be knowing You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You sent.

Peter had eternal life by the relationship he had with Him. While Jesus was on Earth, He was that "earnest of Heaven"

John 15:3 **Now** you are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you.

This was said in relation to being in the Vine.

Abide in me, and I in you As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can you, except you abide in me. **John 15:4**

This was said also before Peter's denial in Chapt. 18.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/7/14 13:54

Quote:

-----A friend of mine shared on a different board a view which I thought was interesting.

Glad to see I'm a friend! :-)

Here is my response on the other board.

Quote:

-----Anyways brother Josh, I was wondering your perspective of the Apostle Peter. Did you affirm one of those 3 options I listed, or is there a 4th option I failed to think of??

My whole system of thinking is probably different than yours...

First, I would say Peter was never regenerated until Pentecost. In my mind regeneration is a new covenant phenomena. How can you be baptized into His death and raised in newness of life before Christ died and resurrected? The new covenant wasn't into effect until Christ blood was shed. If those things aren't true, then what is the difference of the covenants? I can find scriptures in the OT that even use the same language as "receiving a new heart" but if it means the exact same thing then there really isn't any difference between the covenants, maybe you can say there are "new laws" but that's about the extent of it. Since theology is systematic and you reject a few things I embrace, we are going to have obvious differences in this topic.

Regeneration is when the old man has been made inoperable ie dead and you now have a new man- something only He alone can do. Conversion is when you turn to God. I'm not wanting to debate this with a Calvinist, but my view is the exact opposite of a Calvinist. I believe conversion precedes regeneration. You turn to God, He changes your heart.

So, in my thinking you could never be a true "partaker of the divine nature" until the new covenant, Peter was never regenerated, unregenerated before the Cross and then regenerated after it. But rather was converted, unconverted before the cross and was both converted and regenerated after the cross. I hope I don't sound like I'm making up things as I go, because I'm really not!

Quote:

-----James 5:19-20: I believe explains this case with Peter.

“Brethren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that ye which converts the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.”

(I know you said the James was written to a synagogue, but it must have been a synagogue that was in the faith, because James assumed their faith 1:2-3; 2:1)

And if James was written to believers, and not to unbelievers, 5:12 declares that believers can actually "fall into condemnation". Besides, none can "err from the truth" but those who are walking in the truth, and none walk in the truth but believers.

I see that admonition in the book of James no different than if I were to write a letter to a church about their faith and at the end I think there may be some that are not really turned to Christ and say "if one of you are away from the faith and another of you convert him, let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."

Re:, on: 2007/7/14 14:19

I believe everyone covered this subject very well. At what point he was saved I don't believe I could make the call. I would say it is hard to tell. He was following to a degree when he said "Lord we have fished all night and have not caught anything, but he cast out into the deep anyway". Afterwards he seemed to understand he was sinful in doubting Jesus' instruction to cast out into the deep. He said something along the lines of get away from me for I am a sinful man, after the big catch. He seemed to show some doubt when he said, "Lord if it is you tells me to come to you on the water". He grew in knowledge when he took his eyes off Jesus and began to sink. He really was crushed when he realized what he had done when he denied Jesus three times and cursed one of those times alluding to convince them he was not a follower of Jesus. He went to sleep while Jesus was praying in the garden but afterwards defended Jesus and cut off the soldier's ear. I believe it is a picture for all of us who follow and fail. After all that, he followed instructions and waited in the upper room until the winds blew and the tongues of fire fell and filled the room and they were filled with the Spirit and he was one of those who wrote the New Testament under the inspiration of that Spirit for a light unto our feet and a lamp unto our pathway today. It requires the same Spirit to understand the scriptures as it did for the Apostles to write them. On the Day of Pentecost that Spirit was made manifest in Peter when he preached Jesus in the same place Jesus was crucified. Just as Peter, we all can look back at some things we had rather forget about we have done and said, but the main thing is after we believed in our heart and confessed with our mouth have we seen the Holy Spirit's power manifested in our life and we can look back and see we have not quit following HIM. The question we should ask ourselves as believers. Do we see any change in our life? Do we see any change that can only be explained by HIS Spirit and HIS POWER? As the Word says examine ourselves to see if we are of the faith.

edit:

Luke 22:31-34

31 "Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat. 32 But I have prayed for you, Simon, that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers."

33 But he replied, "Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death."

34 Jesus answered, "I tell you, Peter, before the rooster crows today, you will deny three times that you know me."

Acts 2:38-41

38 Peter replied, "**Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins.** And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.39 The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off—for all whom the Lord our God will call.

40 With many other words he warned them; and he pleaded with them, "**Save yourselves from this corrupt generation.**" 41 **Those who accepted his message were baptized**, and about three thousand were added to their number that day.

(from New International Version)

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/7/14 14:49

I think too that it is important to note how we throw out the term "saved" to mean many things.

But the thrust of our question should be when was Peter justified? That is the issue. He may have been justified before Pentecost simply because he understood who Christ was-

Mat 16:16 And Simon Peter answered and said, **Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.**

In the Jewish mind, this was saying, "you are the sin bearer, the deliverer, you are the one who is to free Israel." In the OT the faith in the One to come was counted as righteousness.

Ultimately Peter was "saved" when he was hung on the cross, and entered into glory.

Re:, on: 2007/7/14 23:39

Quote:

-----I don't think all backsliddings put one in a state of condemnation.

Salvation is a concept of faith, knowledge, hope and placement, not of initial acts.

Example; if one bears a false witness, is one in a state of condemnation during that lie?

Yes, lying in particular always puts one in a state of condemnation because, since lying is the intention to deceive, and therefore must always be willful.

Revelations 21:8 says ALL liars will have their part in the lake of fire. It's such a serious sin (as all sin is), because truth is so valuable, and lying is open rebellion against God, and so God makes no exceptions regarding liars (or any rebels/sinners) - they all must repent or perish.

Mistakes and accidents do not put someone automatically in a state of condemnation. For example, genuinely thinking something is true -spreading that truth - only later to find out you were mistaken. That is not lying, ie the intent to deceive, but it was a mistake and accident, in which you cannot be blamed because you acted in accordance with the best of your knowledge, and with a pure intention.

But Heb 10:26-31 in particular says all willful sins put's someone in a state of condemnation, and they can only be restored through repentance (turning from sin and turning back to Jesus).

I suppose the only alternative is to say that sins cannot harm a Christian, and they can commit countless willful sins and still have no condemnation. In which case, Christians are lawless and yet without judgment.

But this is so contradictory to the words of Christ who said "not everyone who says Lord Lord will enter the Kingdom of Heaven. But he that DOETH the will of my Father". And also "depart from me, you worker of iniquity (worker of lawlessness) I never knew you."

So Christians are not lawless, and are still in a state of probation; the law must condemn all who willfully break it.

Re:, on: 2007/7/14 23:58

Quote:

-----Mistakes and accidents do not put someone automatically in a state of condemnation. For example, genuinely thinking something is true -spreading that truth - only later to find out you were mistaken. That is not lying, ie the intent to deceive, but it was a mistake and accident, in which you cannot be blamed because you acted in accordance with the best of your knowledge, and with a pure intention.

Jesse, sin is sin. Those two places in Revelation about lying is the continual practice and the Liars are in with all those 'other' sins that are ingrained in the person, habitual or continuous practice - making them "Liars" rather than one who makes a mistake, as you said about "other sins" and the other verse says, "whosoever LOVETH and maketh a lie" --- that's continual practice and Loving the sin.

Same with the 1John verses. That is when someone is in a "life-style" of sin, not just a fumbling in our Love for Him by committing an act against His will one time.

Even fierce struggling cannot be compared to habitual/continuous/willful/lifestyle sin.

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 0:18

If it takes a lifestyle of sin to be condemned, why did it only take one for Adam? And why did only one lie kill Ananias and Safira in the book of Acts?

And what would qualify as a "lifestyle of sin"? Would "sinning every day in word, thought, and deed" be a "lifestyle" or "continual" sin that condemns you?

And if sinning every day isn't a lifestyle of sin, what is? Does it take sinning every hour, or every second, before you have a "lifestyle of sin", before you are "continually sinning"??

And if so, do you agree with me that sinning every minute, every hour, every day most certainly condemns the one who does it? Because such is continuance in sin, a lifestyle of sin?

"The wages of sin is death" ???

And if one lie doesn't merit condemnation, what about three in a row?

If three in a row is continual lying, then was Peter condemned when he lied three times when he denied knowing Christ?

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 0:27

Jesse, have you ever been afraid or have your faith shaken so that you felt that you weren't believing God for as much as you should ?

Then compare those two things with this ...

Rev 21:8 But the fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death.

Brother, Adam ate from The Tree of Good & Evil.

That was never to be seen again, because God closed off Eden from thence forth.

His sin cursed the earth and all mankind.

You cannot compare his "sin" to ours. He was born perfect ... and he embodied all mankind and affected all of mankind forever. You don't.

GOD in HIS Foreknowledge, knew (fortunately) what you will do tomorrow.

Either His blood has covered that when He placed His seal of ownership on you, or you are in and out of Christ with each thought that doesn't Come directly from Him.

We are to come into His Image, not our Image of what we think He's trying to make us.

Each time you do not follow His Voice and leading, you are sinning.

If that's true, then your theory would have us all in continual condemnation.

Missing the mark is the definition for sin.

HE or HIS IMAGE is the Mark.

Wherever you walk or think in your own strength and not by His Leading - you're out of His Will, which is called sinning.

Every thought Jesse. Every thought.

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 0:29

And why did only one lie kill Ananias and Safira in the book of Acts?

And what qualifies as a "lifestyle of sin"??

What qualifies as "continuing in sin"?

It's very important that you share that with me. If the wages of continual sin is death, I need to know what continual sin is .

If the blood of Christ does not cover a lifestyle of sin, what is a lifestyle of sin?

Does a lifestyle of sin, and continual sin, consist in sinning every day?

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 0:47

Jesus said, they do not come to the Light because they Love the darkness.

Like cockroaches. They love their sin.

God is Love --- Satan is Hate.

God is Light --- Satan is darkness.

Those who "walk in the darkness and love it" are an abomination unto the Lord.

There are sinners, who hate their sin, but don't know "how" to come out of it, because they've either not been taught about Jesus at all or they have been taught to save themselves by the letter of the law, rather than the spirit of the law.

He asks for our "will" -- which is "our heart".

HE KNOWS whose heart He has ... but their are those who have hardened their heart to such an extent, they will never come to the light.

They love unrighteousness. And that is far different from someone who is struggling.

One need not sin everyday to be spiritually dead.

It's the condition of the heart.

GOD looks at the heart of men. Look at King David.

I for one had a hard time understanding why GOD would say that "David was a man after God's own heart". Hoy Vey a murderer/adulter/bigomist/liar and so on ?

Ha, I had to really stretch on that one, yet Jesus calls Himself the Son of David ... again Hoy Vey ... but that is what H E said.

Go figure.

He looks at the heart ... we can but we don't.

The LORD said, all that HE did, we can do.

We just don't believe Him. (which is sin btw).

The first Church had many things happen that needed to be recorded for our admonition.

Ananias and Saphira were HYPOCRITS not just LIARS.

They were phonies. You could probably call those two TARES.

God demonstrated His power through-out the book of ACTS and if we're not living a life as they did, we're sinning.

We're not believing GOD still works that way.

Many "drop-dead" today under the power of a Holy GOD.

As long as we are STRIVING for righteousness, which means ---- TO BE JUST LIKE HIM BY HIS POWER ONLY ---- He knows our hearts in that.

We should always have in us, that Holy fear or reverence that we are Not Like Him.

Walking in the Spirit is His command.

Working for God in the flesh is disgusting to Him. A lifetime of working, thinking, acting in our own strength or flesh or power even FOR GOD is continual sin.

I think inside you already know what "continual/lifestyle sin" is.

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 1:13

Quote:

-----He asks for our "will" -- which is "our heart".

I completely agree. And it is a daily choice to deny yourself (your will) and pick up your cross and follow Christ (God's will).

My point is that if someone is not carrying their cross and following Jesus, they cannot be presently in a state of salvation, but must be in a state of condemnation, because they are sinning instead of following Jesus.

Those who seek to save their life will lose it. When Peter denied Christ, he was seeking to save his life, and was not wanting to pick up his cross. He was not presently following Jesus, but later choice to do so and eventually was crucified.

Only those who are presently following Jesus can have the salvation offered in Jesus. But those who leave Jesus for sin, cannot have the salvation offered in Jesus.

Quote:

-----GOD looks at the heart of men

That was my point exactly when I distinguished between a mistake and a sin.

God looks at your heart, and judges you by what you knew, by what you were capable of, and by your intention.

There is no occasion for guilt, blame, or fault, when a person's intention is benevolent, when their heart is pure; in other words, if they "mean well" what can they be blamed for? Their heart, or intention, is right. Even though they are imperfect in knowledge, they are pure in heart.

Quote:

-----I think inside you already know what "continual/lifestyle sin" is.

Yes I do. It consists in sinning daily instead of dying daily.

Continual/lifestyle of sin would be giving into temptation everytime your tempted, which is daily.

But Christianity starts when a person dies to self when they are tempted, which is daily.

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 1:38

Quote:

-----Re:
by Lazarus1719

Quote:

He asks for our "will" -- which is "our heart".

I completely agree. And it is a daily choice to deny yourself (your will) and pick up your cross and follow Christ (God's will).

My point is that if someone is not carrying their cross and following Jesus, they cannot be presently in a state of salvation, but must be in a state of condemnation, because they are sinning instead of following Jesus.

Those who seek to save their life will lose it. When Peter denied Christ, he was seeking to save his life, and was not wanting to pick up his cross. He was not presently following Jesus, but later choice to do so and eventually was crucified.

Only those who are presently following Jesus can have the salvation offered in Jesus. But those who leave Jesus for sin, cannot have the salvation offered in Jesus.

Hia Jesse, I don't know what I'm doing up this late tonite. Ha.

I have some problem with you using that term "a state of condemnation" ... that means, if someone botches and dies in car crash, let's say the crash was because he got angry for a moment, then if he dies, he'll go to hell.

That's what "state of condemnation" means to me.

Is that what you mean ? Consigned to hell at that point that they are not perfect ?

What you said above is ... that if we do anything outside of his will we are condemned ?

I think in your good intentions, you have been taught about the letter of the law rather than the spirit of the law, but that is the whole problem in the whole Church.

IF, we understood what "hearing His voice & following Him" was or "walking in the Spirit" as He did ... **completely** Dependent on GOD for every word, thought and deed Nothing of ourselves and all of HIM, then how many of us could say we are "like HIM in this world" ?

WE don't just "imitate" HIM, we must allow Him to conform us into His Image.

Death to self doesn't normally happen over nite.

That is what "take up your cross" represents.

Not all can say "nevertheless, it is no longer I that live but Christ that liveth in me and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

Some few folks pick up on this "walking in His Spirit" more easily. They can come as a little child and have no "knowledge" of thier "own" and read the book of Acts lets say, and just say, WOW, I want to walk as they did and I know that only Jesus can speak to me His very thoughts and power. And then they wait and listen for Him every waking minute of the day.

Some folks mock those type people and ask, "Did GOD tell you what to have for dinner tonight ?"

YES - He did as a matter of fact. And HE can and will if we let HIM. I'm not ashamed to answer those type folks. If they want to walk autonomously for the rest of their days, well, they may still be saved, but their works will be burnt up, because they didn't originate from the Him/His Spirit.

So, if becoming like a little child, totally aware of our own ignorance and dependent on Him for every thought and what proceeds those thoughts, then if we step outside of His thoughts, yes, we are sinning, even if the thoughts are not what Church folks call "sinful thoughts".

GOD is calling this last generation to full dependence on HIM, so that they can get through what's coming and be as those who Daniel and John spoke of ... but they can't do it with the letter of the law.

That's why this drawing of the fine line in this conversation is so very important.

If we walk in the Spirit, He will even tell us things to come.

Walking in the Spirit, is losing our own thoughts completely to dependence that HE will direct completely. His sheep will continuously hear His Voice and continuously follow Him.

That's nothing of us and all of Him.

But if you say, that one who is not quite there yet is in a state of condemnation ... then you don't understand GOD's Foreknowledge of those that are His and who will be saved in the end.

Could you just rethink what "condemnation" is ?

God does not condemn His Elect. His Elect will make mistakes, but they are His Elect because He Foreknew what their end would be. So they cannot be in a "state of condemnation" ever.

Condemnation means HELL bound.

Hope we can talk more some other time. Church day today.

Thanks brother.
Annie

Edit: Something still going through my mind.

We're going to HAVE to learn to walk in complete trusting dependence on Him now, or else we'll be fearful & possibly unbelieving when the rubber meets the road soon.
Can't shake that thought and had to spill it out.

Thanks again.
HIS LOVE!

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 1:47

Quote:
-----I have some problem with you using that term "a state of condemnation" ... that means, if someone botches and dies in car crash, let's say the crash was because he got angry for a moment, then if he dies, he'll go to hell.

That's what "state of condemnation" means to me.

By "state of condemnation" I mean that if they die in their willful/intentional sin, they will go to hell.

Eze 18:24 - But when the **righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity**, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? **All his righteousness that he hath done shall not be remembered**: in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, **in them shall he die**.

If Peter died, while he was in his denial of the Lord, Jesus would deny Peter before the angels of Heaven. Those who deny Christ will be denied by Christ, unless they repent.

Anyone who is in willfull sin must be, for the time being, in a state of condemnation. Only those who have repented (turned from sin) and are in a state of love for God and Jesus (and thus keep His commandments) are in a state of salvation, since God offers grace to all repented sins, but condemns eternally *all* willfull sins.

God grants people "time to repent" (Rev 2:21) but there is also a point when a person "sins away their day of grace" and God may kill them on the spot, when all their time to repent is over, and God allows them to die in their willfull sin and go to hell. This is proven by the fact that some do die in impenitence and sin.

And if someone is in sin when Jesus comes back, they must perish. The bride must make herself ready, to be spotless and without fault or blemish. The master of the house will destroy those servants who are in sin when he returns, but will reward those whom he finds watching. Mt 24:46, Lu 12:43

Quote:
-----Condemnation means HELL bound.

I agree. They are hell bound unless they repent.

Quote:
-----Hope we can talk more some other time. Church day today.

Thanks brother.
Annie

Good night sister.

:)

Re:, on: 2007/7/15 9:41

Hi Brother, I woke up with an urgency to just post this while rushing now to Church.

BY FAITH

All that I wrote above - By Faith.

Childlike - big eyed - expecting everything and anything FROM GOD.

Heb. 11 etc. Without faith, it is impossible to please GOD.

He asks, "When I return - will I find Faith on the earth ?"

BY FAITH!

Thank you. TTYL

Jesus Cares !!!

Re: Did Peter remain saved during his denial?? - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2007/7/17 22:13

Laz,

I am going to respond to your original post, at this point it is the only one I have read. Let me remind you of my respect for you as this may be the only area I ever remember disagreeing with you. The more I think it over, though, I think we may have common ground as well as a fourth option.

I rely on Scripture first, which obviously you do, as well. But, I have always tried to put my personal experience secondary, which I think is good. In my case, I think I often have gone with what I have heard preached as doctrine, as long as I don't find contradictions in the Word. In my early Christian experience, I questioned both apostasy and the impossibility of apostasy. The eternal security side is obviously more outspoken in the argument (at least in my experience), so there was obviously influence there.

While I lean heavily toward the perseverance of the saints side, I must remind everyone that what I hear preached along with the modern eternal security doctrine most of the time is not biblical (telling everyone 'you are saved', never doubt your salvation, look at that date in your Bible, don't let the enemy put second thoughts in your head, etc).

The only other option that I could think of, and this is from personal experience, is that there could be a period for some (or all) that come to the Lord for salvation, where they have genuinely repented of their sins and turned to the Lord, but the work is not completed IN THEM. Make no mistake (as I know many at this point some are already loading cannons at me), I am not saying Christ's work is not done, as I believe all work to cleanse sin was done at the cross, ie: it is finished. What I am saying is that as a brand new believer, I was absolutely scared stiff that my salvation had not taken, that something was undone.

As a result of this, I dug deep into God's Word, prayed many times that if I had not been born again that God would reveal all this to me (to be honest I still pray that every once in a while), listened to many sermons, read many commentaries/opinions, went through my life and cut major sins out one by one, etc, etc. When I came out the other side, to my surprise, I was a spiritual leader.

Like I said, I lean heavily toward eternal security, but there are some Scriptures that are hard to answer (but this is the case if you go with either side of the debate). In light of all this and my personal experience, the only concession I make right now is that during the early life of one who is being drawn by the Father, there may be a period where God will allow someone to walk away from His salvation. This could be picture-illustrated as an adoption process or a baby being formed in the womb. God may let this person taste of His heavenly grace, and give them the option to put their hand to the plow or turn and face Sodom. He may:

- call you by name: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem"
- reveal Himself to you "how often would I have gathered thy children together"
- but give us the ability to walk away after He does so "and ye would not"

But I believe that one who is genuinely born again won't fall into non-salvation. I believe that you can deny Christ as a believer, but God will reprove you and change you, if you have been genuinely born-again, just as I surely have told a lie since I was born-again, but I will not be cast into the lake of fire for doing so. I will be reproved.

All this said, I look at modern Christianity and it just seems like a big joke. No praying, no firm doctrine, no fire, etc, etc. So while I line up with many of the mainstream guys on security of the believer, don't let me fool you into thinking I approve of the present state of the church. We are in dire need of revival.

It is hard to say about this matter as it seems you can never put God in a box. Every time I heard a great preacher make some blanket statement about how God saves, if I dug hard enough I found an equally great preacher contradict the first about how people experience God when they are saved. Honestly, at this point, I have made a habit of looking for fruit before I judge a person's salvation. I don't stand in judgment for the sake of doing so, but in order to know how I should pray for this person.

Furthermore, I am a believer in election, but also freewill. Like my friend at church said, just because we see freewill and election as two rails on a track and they don't meet as far as the eye can see, we cannot not be sure that they never do

as both are clearly in Scripture, they may just meet in Heaven.

In the case of Peter, I think that he was either in this adoption state process, or he was not yet converted. When one might say that Peter would not have been sent out as 'not yet regenerated', I must remind you that John 6 has Jesus stating that Judas "is a devil", but whatever Judas did or did not do, it must have been everything that the others were doing. With Judas being "a devil" he was commissioned and so forth with all the others, but was still labeled as such by the Lord. "For the gifts and CALLING of God are without repentance" (emphasis added). Remember also the experience of John Wesley prior to his conversion.

All comments are welcome

Re:, on: 2007/7/19 4:40

Quote:

-----Let me remind you of my respect for you as this may be the only area I ever remember disagreeing with you

I respect you to and think that there can totally be disagreement among brethren, so long as we maintain Christain love no doubt.

Quote:

-----In the case of Peter, I think that he was either in this adoption state process, or he was not yet converted. When one might say that Peter would not have been sent out as 'not yet regenerated', I must remind you that John 6 has Jesus stating that Judas "is a devil", but whatever Judas did or did not do, it must have been everything that the others were doing. With Judas being "a devil" he was commissioned and so forth with all the others, but was still labeled as such by the Lord.

Here's my two cents:

Respecting the disciples that were sent out we are told that

Jesus commissioned Peter and Judas to preach the gospel, heal the sick, and cast out demons: Luke 10:1-16

He called Peter and Judas his sheep (vs 3), affirmed that Peter and Judas were a part of the Kingdom of God (vs 11) which is only for those who are born again (John 3:3), and that those who reject Peter and Judas reject Christ (vs 16)

Jesus told Peter and Judas that their names were written in the book of life: Luke 10:20

In fact, it was for this very purpose that the 12 (including Peter and Judas) was chosen:

Mark 3:13-15 "And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him. And he ordained twelve, **that** they should be with him, and **that** he might send them forth to preach, And to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils"

Therefore I don't believe Judas was a devil at the time Jesus chose Him, nor that Peter was not saved when Jesus picked him. All the 12 disciples were devoted followers at the time of their selection, but Judas fell from it and became a devil and then a betrayer, just as Peter fell from it and became a liar by denying the Lord.

The only other option is that Jesus chose to send out unsaved people to preach the gospel (which is absurd), and even sent out "a devil" to cast out devils (which is unscriptural). Jesus said that Satan cannot cast out Satan, for a house divided cannot stand.

But Judas had worldly sorrow that led to his death, while Peter had godly sorrow that led to repentance. Both of them were saved when Jesus chose them, both of them fell into rebellion and terrible sin, but one truly repented and was restored while the other was not.

Re: Did Peter remain saved during his denial?? - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/7/19 8:49

Quote:

-----Did Peter remain saved during his denial??

3. Peter was saved before denying Christ, fell into temporary backslidings - in which he must have been in a condemned condition, and then later was converted again unto Christ.

I believe this last one makes the most scriptural sense. It means that even a genuine Christian can fall into backsliding, during which he is in a state of condemnation, but can be restored to the faith, and thereby his his spiritual soul saved from eternal death.

Anyways, the only answer to the question is one of the 3 I listed, unless anyone else sees a 4th option which I failed to think of?

Col 2:18 ... intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind,

Not to be unduly harsh or careless with that verse but am finding this whole premise, from the question on very presumptuous. It is largely an argument from silence and less a question than an opportunity for statement. The fourth option is flatly, we do not know one way or the other emphatically and the wonder is of this as a premise being used to support another argument, on it's own worth discussing, but this manner here, what kind of notions is it putting into peoples heads? Speculation? And that as ground for proving?

Consider;

Luk 22:31 And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat:

Luk 22:32 But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

Luk 22:33 And he said unto him, Lord, I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death.

Luk 22:34 And he said, I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me.

When thou art converted - The word "converted" means turned, changed, recovered. The meaning is, when thou art turned from this sin, when thou art recovered from this heinous offence, then use "your" experience to warn and strengthen those who are in danger of like sins. A man may be "converted or turned" from any sin, or any evil course. He is "regenerated" but once - at the beginning of his Christian life; he may be "converted" as often as he falls into sin. ~ Barnes

Mar 14:27 And Jesus saith unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.

Mar 14:50 And they all forsook him, and fled.

Joh 6:70 Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

The problem here is one of again trying to peer into the foreknowledge of the Lord and then make conclusionary statements based on "what if" scenarios, why I ask do we feel so inclined to do these things? The point of the matter is that one ends up having to rewrite the scriptures by inserting speculative things to that which is linear and ongoing and, as far as we are concerned, already has it is conclusions stated by the time you walk through to the end. In other words, it is the wrong question and premise to be basing things on in the first place.

Quote:

-----If Peter died, while he was in his denial of the Lord, Jesus would deny Peter before the angels of Heaven. Those who deny Christ will be denied by Christ, unless they repent.

That is a miscarriage of assumption and tying a denial wrongly. Have you the mind and state of that mind of Peter in that hour at your disposal? Is this not very much a great problem that we find even more broadly, that of *I know what you are thinking\ know your type?* have we forgotten;

1Co 2:11 For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

Quote:
-----My point is that if someone is not carrying their cross and following Jesus, they cannot be presently in a state of salvation, but must be in a state of condemnation, because they are sinning instead of following Jesus.

Those who seek to save their life will lose it. When Peter denied Christ, he was seeking to save his life, and was not wanting to pick up his cross. He was not presently following Jesus, but later choice to do so and eventually was crucified.

"A state of salvation" and "A state of condemnation"

This is a stretch of credulity and certainly can see both the OSAS abuse and the presumption upon grace eking in as argument, but there is something that doesn't sit right in assumption that is even more bothersome. That is the pride of dicing up things and in effect playing God and playing with scripture to try and make it say something *other*. Think about it. 3 years is not a long time over the course of a lifetime but it is still a long time and what we have of the disciples is only but a small snapshot. I take a great deal of umbrage at the things bandied about flippantly with, for instance "Doubting Thomas" as if an incident characterizes the whole of a man's character, heart, soul and spirit beyond even the great overlooking of what also was stated of him. It is still speculative assumption and insinuation, a great deal of us get all up in arms over far less slights upon our persons. No different is it with Peter or the rest, we have only that which is stated in its ongoing progression. I find far too much pride in our speculative reasonings that can put emphatic "answers" to things already past especially when one is in the middle of a progression and worse assumed into the future. Being on guard, looking at example, warnings ... 'situational ethics' of a spiritual sort are not without merit at all, just when the bounds of *knowing* are broken. We end up taking out both the mystery and the *impossibility* that is ...

Luk 1:37 For with God nothing shall be impossible.

... by date stamping out into the future, ends and conclusions that come from our fleshy thinking and just as well by backdating incidents and moments in time that have already expired. I cannot help twinge at the unbelief that this fosters.

2Co 6:1 We then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain.

2Co 6:2 (For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)

Is not the emphasis on *now, today*, this moment, presently ... ?

Wrong constitution - posted by crsschk (), on: 2007/7/21 9:43

Jesse,

... *puffed up by his fleshly mind*

This applies to myself. I owe you an apology for the spirit this was spoken in and a confession of an usurping that I knew at the time was one of silence, but I disobeyed and went ahead anyway.

Forgive me.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2007/7/22 1:56

Bro Laz,

I want to go through this with you point by point whether or not we change each other's mind; for if nothing else we are digging deeper into God's Word.

First, the statements in Luke 10 are not made to the 12, but the 70. I had always thought these were two separate groups, and after a little digging, that seems to be the bend of the scholars, too:

"The account of the designation and mission of these is found only in Luke 10. Some have therefore sought to maintain that we have here only a confused variant of the appointment of the Twelve; but this is impossible in the light of Luke's account of the Twelve in chapter 9."

-The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia

"the instructions here given them are much the same with those given to the twelve"

-Matthew Henry's Commentary

So the statements made in Luke 10 are not, as far as I can tell, made to the 12. But rather, the 70 others:

Luke 10:1-2:

KJV: After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also...therefore said he unto them

NAS: Now after this the Lord appointed seventy others...And He was saying to them

As far as Judas' state when he was chosen, I know that the Scripture doesn't state whether Judas was born again, but rather that Jesus knew who would betray him from the beginning. I read the following verses, though, and lean heavily toward Judas being called and never being saved:

John 6:

But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.

Jesus answered them, Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve.

I know that it does seem absurd to send out an unsaved betrayer, but I believe this parallels what we see today. God uses false prophets as pawns, I believe. From looking at a (http://www.urbanseminary.org/pdf/ASBC_Harmony_of_the_Gospels_chart.pdf) Gospel Harmony, you can see that Judas was named "a devil" very soon after the Commission was given. So if Judas did fall, he was not saved very long. But, though I suppose we could debate this all day, I don't think that is the case from reading over the text.

As far as Satan casting out Satan, I am certainly not an expert of exorcism (in fact, I am not even sure if I spelled that right), but I believe that demons 1) can only do what God commissions them to do 2) will depart / pretend to depart from someone if there is deception to be done. I believe that sometimes they do so (depart or pretend to depart) to restore a false faith or a false sense of security. I have heard of many exorcisms and read up on some where they were not done biblically, and not done by someone I felt was born-again, but yet there seemed to be a point where the demon departed. I think this was the case with Judas.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2007/7/22 2:13

Bro crsschk,

I am not posting to try to pull anyone onto my side, or recruit a Calvinist/Arminian, or anything like that, and I don't think that Jessie is, either. I am not standing on the issue we are discussing, and I don't think we are speaking about it in a way that is destructive to one another.

I welcome your comments and opinions, and I am sure you probably get tired of moderating this age-old argument. I think that a Bible student who takes the theologies of the saints gone by, and sees if they do or do not parallel the Word of God is not doing himself a disservice. I think where we go wrong is when we either make enemies of our brothers who h

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Did Peter remain saved during his denial??

ave accepted another reasonable doctrine, or where we replace our relationship with the Lord with argument. I don't feel that we have done either here.

But who knows, maybe I will look back at this discussion and realize that it was a waste. But for now, as best I can tell, am am doing my best to rightly divide the Word of God. I think I will cut off here and spend some time in prayer and study so as not to fall into what I have just said.

Re:, on: 2007/7/22 2:20

I appreciate everyones thoughts on this.

I just wanted to share this one scripture, which states Jesus' purpose in selecting the 12 disciples, including Peter and Judas, which is why I believe *all 12* were saved *when* Jesus choose them, because Jesus would not send unsaved men to preach the gospel, nor can devils cast out devils:

Mark 3:13-19: And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him. And he ordained twelve, **that** they should be with him, and **that** he might send them forth to preach, And **to** have power to heal sicknesses, and **to** cast out devils:

And Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder: and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him: and they went into an house.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2007/7/25 14:43

Laz,

I read over these Scriptures again and while there seems to be room for either of our bends, I still think that it leans the way I am saying, and you probably still the way you are saying.

I guess I am putting emphasis on one Scripture while you are putting it more on another. I don't have any issue with Jesus ordaining one of the twelve to go out without the Holy Ghost, as I believe he calls people regardless of whether they respond. Just as it doesn't make human sense for John to be filled with the Holy Ghost from the womb, it doesn't make sense for Judas to be sent out. But I believe everyone has a call to serve God regardless of whether or not they repent, believe, and serve:

Jer 1:5 Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.

So I don't believe the Scripture about "ordaining twelve" is not an accountability of salvation for each, but rather the call placed on their lives. The same word translated to "ordained" is also used to say "brought forth". I just get the idea that Jesus was calling them out and giving them a job to do, with Judas being a devil from the beginning.

God bless. More later.

Re:, on: 2007/8/25 0:28

Quote:

Lazarus1719 wrote:

I appreciate everyones thoughts on this.

I just wanted to share this one scripture, which states Jesus' purpose in selecting the 12 disciples, including Peter and Judas, which is why I believe *all 12* were saved *when* Jesus choose them, because Jesus would not send unsaved men to preach the gospel, nor can devils cast out devils:

Mark 3:13-19: And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would: and they came unto him. And he ordained twelve, **that** they should be with him, and **that** he might send them forth to preach, And **to** have power to heal sicknesses, and **to** cast out devils:

And Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The son

s of thunder: and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, and Simon the Canaanite, **and Judas Iscariot** also betrayed him: and they went into an house.

John 17:12

12 While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition ; that the scripture might be fulfilled.

KJV

John 6:70-71

70 Jesus answered them, "Did I not choose you, the twelve, and one of you is a devil?" 71 He spoke of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for it was he who would betray Him, being one of the twelve.

NKJV

Judge for yourself!!!!

There is more info to tell who was the son of perdition.

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2007/8/25 4:16

hi, i know only one way to be saved... faith in the finished work of the cross. what can wash away my sins? nothing but t he blood of jesus... abraham was saved by faith in the cross. only.. jimp

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2007/8/25 4:16

hi, i know only one way to be saved... faith in the finished work of the cross. what can wash away my sins? nothing but t he blood of jesus... abraham was saved by faith in the cross. only.. jimp

Peter's denial - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/25 4:27

This is a big question because the martyrs under the persecutions would'nt deny Jesus, considering rather to be burn at the stake than to experience the eternal hell-fire.

Peter's denial was before he was regenerated i.e. he had not received the Holy Spirit. Therefore he had the opportunity t o metanoia.

Peter who most likely died as a martyr (crucified upside down) later had his chans to stand for his saviour - and he did (p raise to God).

Judas on the other hand was not predestinated to salvation but did share in the plan of salvation (this a truly mystery).

Magnus :-D

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/25 5:04

John 14:28-29 Ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and come again unto you. If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father: for my Father is greater than I. And now I have told you before it come to pass, t hat, when it is come to pass, ye might believe.

Peter and the Apostles were saved as all men were saved before the Cross, by the Mercy of God. There is a difference in Mercy and Grace. Mercy is as someone is doing the works even if they do it wrong, God's Mercy attends to the Law a nd works. Grace attends to no works or Mercy even though that are together in our Faith Salvation. Mercy is of earthly t hings forgiven by the the blood of animal sacrifice. Grace by the Blood of Christ the Person, heavenly, with no works. Ephesians 2:7-9 That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us th rough Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works , lest any man should boast.

Peter was saved but not as we are for He had neither Christ or the Holy Spirit in him until Pentecost. Peter did not even know it until Paul came on the scene and preached Christ in you. Peter came to know this by the characterising of Incor ruptable Seed of God being the blue print in 1 Peter 1:23 for being born again.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/25 5:46

Phillip! Hmm, I'm not sure I follow. The differentiation of Mercy and Grace I never heard of before (interesting!!) However, in the Gospel of John 20:21 after Peter's denial; he receives the Holy Spirit. In Acts, it is in the upper room experience, where he receives the Spirit.

I would not say that Peter is saved (rather called, or under the Grace of God, or in God's foreknowledge at best) before he actually experiences the regeneration (whether or not he really understands it or not). The Twelve Apostles are models for us Christians and we have to pass through the same experiences as them. We have to be called, to repent, be baptized, experience the fellowship with Jesus and to see our Lord be risen in our lives and finally be regenerated (just like Peter and the others).

The thing is: Peter could and did deny Jesus when he was ungenerated but he didn't and wouldn't after he had received the Holy Spirit.

This question is as crucial for us as it was for the early church and the martyrs. To deny Jesus after you have been regenerated is to apostatize. To do it before you are saved it is forgivable as with Peter. Or as the author of Hebrews puts it:

It is impossible for those who once been enlightened, who have tasted the heavenly gift, who have shared in the Holy Spirit, who have tasted the goodness of the word of God and the powers of the coming age, if they fall away, to be brought back to repentance, because to their loss they are crucifying the Son of God all over again and subjecting him to public disgrace (Hebr 6:4-6).

Best wishes

Magnus ;-)

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/25 12:01

Gal 2:14 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

Like it is said, Peter was saved like all the rest of us. Even though at Pentecost is when he was regenerated, saved if you will. If Christ is with you you are saved. Christ being with Peter in the flesh was an earthly salvation. The Holy Spirit putting the Spirit of Christ in him was a heavenly salvation. That is how he could deny Christ. Peter was in Christ and did not know it, even though the Holy Spirit sealed the Spirit of Christ in him. It took Paul to bring this revelation to Peter that He might say, "Born again not of corruptible Seed but incorruptible". Gal 2:14 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? Paul's only message was "Christ in you the Hope of Glory", and He bid us to live as he lives and follow him in his Gospel.

Mercy earthly, Grace heavenly.

In Christ: Phillip

Re:, on: 2007/8/25 12:21

Conversion and salvation are two different things.

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/25 13:02

Salvation and Conversion are interconnected!

To Phillip: Ok now I understand what you mean ...

Is there an earthly salvation as well? ;-). I thought the salvation of Jesus Christ held the two realms together (as Romans 8 suggest) i.e. one earthly and heavenly salvation (it should be more accurate according to Scripture wouldn't it?).

Ok, what it all boils down to is the question whether a man is truly saved (i.e. bound for the new heaven and the new earth) if he is not regenerated.

My answer is still that: No-one can enter the kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit. You must be born again (or from above) to see the kingdom of God.

Peter saw the Kingdom of God in its initial form: "the risen Christ" and through the workings of the Holy Spirit's power and might (as Acts of the Apostles shows).

Before Jesus had risen all the Apostles were ignorant and misunderstood Jesus pretty much at every occasion (except when God spoke through him: you are the Christ).

So I state again: Peter's denial could only come from a person who was in the process of being saved (i.e. from a time-perspective; not from God's perspective in which all saved people have always been saved).

However the regenerated Peter (in my mind the heaven-bound Peter) could still misunderstand the deep teaching of Saint Paul such as "Christ in me" and therefore lean towards his Judaistic background which Christianity always been eager to do (Law contra evangelion).

But making a mistake or fail to understand the depths of the new covenant is not the same as denying Jesus Christ which the regenerated Peter never did (only the ungenerated one).

Sincerely Magnus :-D

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/25 17:49

Quote:

"

""But making a mistake or fail to understand the depths of the new covenant is not the same as denying Jesus Christ which the regenerated Peter never did (only the ungenerated one)."" But still converted, waiting for regeneration at Pentecost, knowing it through Paul's Gospel.

By Job, I think he's got it. Amen.

In Christ, converted, regenerated, headed for the Father's Heavenly House, because of the "Christ in me the Hope of Glory".

Phillip

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/25 19:19

Quote: "But still converted, waiting for regeneration at Pentecost, knowing it through Paul's Gospel".

Yes Peter was regenerated at the Pentecost and got to know the power of the Holy Spirit in his preaching and through his acts (see Acts chap 2ff) The deeper meanings and implications of being born anew he might have learned from Paul (however we can not be too sure though; Peter seems to have known a lot of the workings of the Holy Spirit as witnessed in Acts).

The episode of Peter in Galatians however is about the Judaistic legalistic inconsequences of Peter which Paul rightly is rebuking him for: namely "hypocrisy". This is clearly not a question concerning Peter's regeneration or understanding of it rather it indicates Peter's double standard conduct in putting up the wall of Jew contra gentile which according to Paul is against the truth of the gospel (which Peter knew but had acted out of fear= typical Peter!!!). Again, this is the regenerated Peter who sins (as Christians often do, and must be rebuked for). But to deny Christ in a regenerated status is to crucify Christ anew (and unpardonable apostasy) which Peter never did.

Lastly: In Gal. 2:15ff most scholars agree that Paul now begins to address the Galatians and the issue that troubles Paul. In this he is bringing out the headlines of Christian teaching which were in accordance with the views of the other apostles.

les (Peter included).

Magnus :-x

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/25 20:42

Quote:

"Yes Peter was regenerated at the Pentecost and got to know the power of the Holy Spirit in his preaching and through his acts (see Acts chap 2ff) The deeper meanings and implications of being born anew he might have learned from Paul (however we can not be too sure though; Peter seems to have known a lot of the workings of the Holy Spirit as witnessed in Acts"

Peter was filled with the Spirit at Pentecost, this is understandable, He heard Christ say that the Holy Spirit was with them and soon would be in them. Peter did not know that the Person of Jesus Christ was birthed in Him at that time, Sealed by the Holy Spirit. Paul was the only one that got this revelation, the only one in the whole world. That is why God allow Paul to call it his gospel. This is what Peter is speaking of in the last epistle he wrote, "hard thing to understand" The mystery Paul speaks about abundantly, even hid from all previous knowledge offered by God. Paul was the only one that received it, "that is Christ in you the Hope of Glory.

2 Peter 3:15-18 And account that the longsuffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness. But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him be glory both now and for ever. Amen.

If like Paul, Peter knew full well who this Christ was that was birthed in Him, would it not be your final words as with Paul, "to Know Him", as in all of Paul's writing the most important impression he wanted to leave in all his writing was "Christ in you" and "you in Christ", new birth, new life, Rom 5:17 For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

Rom 5:21 That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

Rom 6:4 Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

The statement "in Christ" is mentioned 224 times, all from Paul. Not once for Peter.

The statement "Christ in" you" Christ in: 224 times, all from Paul. Not once for Peter.

In Christ and Christ are the same, and all mentioned by Paul.

God used Peter mightly to the Jew, but God used Paul singularly to preach this new life in Christ being our only life.

And still with all the revelation to Paul, Paul said all the wanted was "to know Him More".

I am not trying to take away from Peter, for God used him mightly. But, I see Paul's admonition of follow me and do as I do in Christ being much the greater life of Christ in the believer in his offering.

1Cr 11:1 Be ye followers of me, even as I also of Christ.

The powerful speaking of Paul of the revelation he received is the greatest single tone of the New testament. "In Christ"

Gal 1:12 For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Rom 16:25 Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began,

Eph 1:17 That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him:

Eph 3:3 How that by revelation he made known unto me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words,

1Pe 1:13 Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ; NOW, not future, but future also.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/26 7:03

Ok, Im with you in part.

Sure Paul had his unique and mystical experience that resulted in his plenty use of the word Christ in you. No one disputes that Paul is the theologian par excellens of the early church. But as Paul admits:

"I had been entrusted with the task of preaching the gospel to the Gentiles, just as Peter had been to the Jews. For God who was at work in the ministry of Peter as an apostle to the Jews was also at work in my ministry as an apostle."

Summa: Different callings but working for the same God in the same Spirit!

Peter being a fisherman (and if written by him 1 Peter, does not have the same elegance and deepness as the epistles of Paul; 2 Peter, is most likely not written by Peter at all i.e. a late epistle probably around 150-160 AD) and Paul being an ex-Pharisee might explain some of the differences.

We do not know too much about Peter; but we know that he was born again at the pentecost and was filled by the Spirit time and time again; and did mighty deeds through the power of the Holy Spirit (which Acts tells us about).

Just because we have no explicit (except from 1 Peter 3:16 but again we are not sure that this letter stems from him; if so probably dictated) evidence that Peter had an In-Christ-experience does not mean that he didn't.

On the contrary he was regenerated and was operating in the power of the Holy Spirit; a Spirit which in fellowship with, draws you nearer and nearer to Christ.

We must assume even though not articulated that Peter had Christ in him even if he never (or just once) used that expression.

The question that started these conversations was: Peter's denial.

1. the saved/regenerated Peter would (probably even could not) not have denied Jesus Christ which he didn't;
2. the unsaved and ungenerated Peter did and could deny Jesus Christ and because of this conditions he also could repent after Christ had risen.

Magnus
:-D

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/26 17:39

Act 10:25 And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped .

Act 10:26 But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man.

Act 10:32 Send therefore to Joppa, and call hither Simon, whose surname is Peter; he is lodged in the house of Simon a tanner by the sea side: who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee.

Act 10:34 Then Peter opened mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons:

Act 10:44 While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.

Act 10:45 And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Act 10:46 For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter,

Act 11:2 And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him,

Act 11:4 But Peter rehearsed from the beginning, and expounded by order unto them, saying,

Act 11:7 And I heard a voice saying unto me, Arise, Peter; slay and eat.

Act 11:13 And he shewed us how he had seen an angel in his house, which stood and said unto him, Send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter;

Act 12:3 And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread.)

Act 12:5 Peter therefore was kept in prison: but prayer was made without ceasing of the church unto God for him.

Act 12:6 And when Herod would have brought him forth, the same night Peter was sleeping between two soldiers, bound with two chains: and the keepers before the door kept the prison.

Act 12:7 And, behold, the angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shined in the prison: and he smote Peter on the side, and raised him up, saying, Arise up quickly. And his chains fell off from his hands.

Act 12:11 And when Peter was come to himself, he said, Now I know of a surety, that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and all the expectation of the people of the Jews.

Act 12:13 And as Peter knocked at the door of the gate, a damsel came to hearken, named Rhoda.

Act 12:14 And when she knew Peter's voice, she opened not the gate for gladness, but ran in, and told how Peter stood before the gate.

Act 12:16 But Peter continued knocking: and when they had opened the door, and saw him, they were astonished.

Act 12:18 Now as soon as it was day, there was no small stir among the soldiers, what was become of Peter.

Act 15:7 And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.

Gal 1:18 Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.

Gal 2:7 But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as of the circumcision unto Peter;

Gal 2:8 (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)

Gal 2:11 But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

This is just a small overview of what Peter contended with from the circumcision. Peter mistakenly saying he was to go to the Gentiles when Paul met with him Paul got it straight. Paul wanted to go to his brethren also but he finally gave up and gave the revelation of Jesus Christ to the Gentile nations, even in Rome. Check out Paul's trip through The Acts of the Apostles also and you will see when Paul gave up.

Acts 28:25-28 And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word, Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers, Saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive: For the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them. Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.

Then Paul only preached to those that were sent to Him, for two years.

Acts 28:30-31 And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

What was Peter preaching? Repent and be baptized and you will be saved. What was Paul preaching? Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and you will be saved and The Christ that would be birthed in them.

Do you see the difference? I don't want to be contentious but Peter did not preach "Christ in you the Hope of Glory". Approaching it, Yes, but not fully understanding it or preaching it like Paul to the Gentiles.

Peter's understanding and coming close: 1 Peter 1:22-25 Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently: Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

Paul: Colossians 1:27-28 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

Colossians 3:1-4 If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.

Paul making it plain to Peter, he was wrong and needed to speak the same Gospel which later Peter said, "which some things are hard to understand."

Galatians 2:12-14 For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

This was the bus from Jerusalem which was the circumcision, being James, John and others to spy out the freedom that the Gentiles had in Christ and Peter defected back to them for fear of them, that is why Paul confronted him bring him back to the task at hand, Preaching the final Gospel of Paul that fulfilled the word of God. Colossians 1:22-25 In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight: If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister; Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you

u, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church: Whereof I am made a minister, according to the dispensation of God which is given to me for you, to fulfil the word of God;

That is "Christ in you the Hope of Glory". This is the Gospel. Amen

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/26 19:41

Brother, youre killing me with the amount of words! :-P. However I should make a go of it myself, so hold on, here it comes:

Im not sure that there are any substantial differences between Paul and Peter (just different use of words about the same reality), rather an accordance except for a dispute concerning Peter's hypocrisy concerning table-fellowship.

What was Peter's calling according to the Lord Jesus, let us see:

i. Lk. 24:46-49. He (i.e. Jesus) told them: "This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance and forgiveness for sins will be preached in his name to all nations (i.e. Jews and Gentiles), beginning at Jerusalem. You are witness of these things. I am going to send you what my Father has promised: but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high".

ii. The Apostolic Council of Jerusalem (Chap 15).

vv.7-12. After much discussion, Peter got up and addressed them: Brothers, you know that some time ago God made a choice among you that the Gentiles might hear from my lips the message of the gospel and believe. God who knows the heart, showed that he accepted them by giving the Holy Spirit to them, just as he did to us. He made no distinction between us and them, for he purified their hearts by faith. Now then, why do you try to test God by putting on the necks of the disciples a yoke that neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear? No! We believe it is through the grace of our Lord Jesus that we are saved, just as they are.

iii. Paul writes in Roman 8:9 that: if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Christ.

Peter and the Jews and Gentile that resulted from Peter's missions was both repented, baptized and regenerated and would in Paul's vocabulary be partakers in/of the Spirit of Christ (do you see??)

iv. Again the dispute in Galatians is between the Apostolic Church and the Galatians; not between Peter and Paul they are in accordance after a minor dispute. The dispute and agreement between Paul and Peter which Paul is talking about in Galatians is

a. not about the Apostolic Council, and

b. must be of a later agreement between the parties that Paul should be the apostle of the Gentiles and Peter (and the other apostles) equivalent to the Jews.

If above is not the case either Luke is wrong or Paul. But this is the word of God so we have to harmonize these contradictions.

v. Acts is the only example we have of Paul's preaching to the gentiles (and hold fast your seatbelt) and is lacking his teaching of "Christ in you" because that teaching developed in his letters written to the congregations which he addressed (i.e. teaching to already Christians: Jews and Gentiles).

vi. Peter on the other hand, probably didn't write any letter personally. He was no theologian but he had the Spirit of God with him and in him and in that case the Spirit of Christ.

We can be most sure that Peter had an intimate relation with the Lord Jesus Christ even if he does not give any such statement in paulinic words.

Magnus :-D

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/27 2:58

What do we do with this? Gal 1:12 For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Expanded: Galatians 1:11-18 But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it: And profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers. But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, To reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: Neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days.

Why did he see Peter? Reveal the revelation to him? If so did Peter understand? It is clear that in the short space of two weeks Paul could not have very extensively taught Peter the nature of the Christian religion that had been revealed to him and probably the time is mentioned here to show that he had not been under the teaching of the apostles which he clearly states, it was not revealed to him by man, but only by revelation by Jesus Christ.

Yes God had a very close relationship with Peter, saving him from being sifted by Satan and showing him forgiveness, "Peter do you love me?"

Feed my sheep, who were the Lords sheep? "The lost sheep of the House of Israel.

John 21:15-17 So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than the se? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

Three times for the roosters crow. Forgiveness?
Complete.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/27 5:01

i. "Why did he see Peter? Reveal the revelation to him?"

*Answer: Yes! The revelation which the Lord Jesus Christ gave to him i.e. about the Gentiles as partakers in the faith and the new covenant.

ii. If so did Peter understand?

*Answer: Yes! we can see that he did that in Acts Chap 15.

iii. It is clear that in the short space of two weeks Paul could not have very extensively taught Peter the nature of the Christian religion that had been revealed to him and probably the time is mentioned here to show that he had not been under the teaching of the apostles which he clearly states, it was not revealed to him by man, but only by revelation by Jesus Christ".

*Answer:

Yes Paul's revelation was a true encounter with the risen Christ to/or in him (depending how you interpret the greek preposition). Yes, Paul's calling and gospel did not come from any human being (just as the Apostles calling was not from a human being but from the risen Lord to preach the gospel to the world: there is only one gospel which is the same for Jews as well as Gentiles). Paul did not get this revelation (i.e. the same revelation as Peter and the rest of the Apostles) from any human encounter, which gives him the authority and status as an apostle (which all have met with the risen Christ

).

What did happen the two weeks in Jerusalem. Probably, that Paul shared his message with the twelve and they gave him the authority to carry on with his mission. Paul states in Gal. 1:9:

"James, Peter and John those reputed to be the pillars, gave me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, when they recognised the grace given to me".

* The keywords: "they recognised the grace given to me" is significant. I.e. There was no difference in what Paul had experienced in content from what Peter and the rest had experienced with the Holy Spirit and the risen Christ.

*Again I state: the teaching of Paul about the nature of the new birth is a later development and only in his letters to already Christians.

In that, it is possible that Peter later took part in the depths of the pauline thoughts on the matter; however we can not be too sure (1 and 2 Peter is not consider to stem from the hand of the apostle himself).

Pax et bonum
Magnus ;-)

Re: Did Peter remain saved during his denial?? - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/8/27 16:08

This is another example of Finney/Morrell reductionism. It also presumes that there is no difference between 'being saved' whatever that means and 'regeneration'.

Quote:

-----Peter needed to be converted after this incident: Luke 22:32

Here is a list of times that the NT uses the word

(<http://cf.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?Strongsg1994&Versionkjv>) **epistrepho** which is translated 'converted' in Luke 22:32...

If you follow the reductionism of Jesse you will make the astonishing discovery that Jesus had to be 'converted', demons could be 'converted' and that Paul was 'converted' just before he cast the demon out of the clairvoyant woman in Philippi. The point is that although the word can mean convert in our usual evangelical sense it is the usual word for 'turning around'. To build an argument that Peter was not yet 'converted' on this simple word is a serious error.

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/27 18:31

Which one are you addressing? Me or someone else?

Quote: To build an argument that Peter was not yet 'converted' on this simple word is a serious error.

Who builds what on what? The question is not the greek verb which always should be interpret according to its context (such as you described it). However the verb seems from viewpoint of the context in Luke to imply a meaning close to metanoia.

Rather the question is: Could Peter deny Jesus Christ after his regeneration?

My view is that he could'nt or would'nt. But before he was regenerated he could and did!

The next question is of immense importance:

Is it even possible to call an ungenerated man saved?

Why is the question of Peter's denial so important in connection to his salvation? Well, if he was saved during his denying of Christ, then all the martyrs in the history of the Church died in vain (or atleast throwed away their life) for their Lord while Peter's denial was somehow ok because he was already saved!

These following words must be taken into consideration concerning this topic:

*Lk. 12:4-5. "I tell you, my friends, do not be afraid of those who kill the body and after that can do no more. But I will show you whom you should fear: Fear him who, after the killing of the body has power to throw you into hell, Yes I tell you, fear him.

*Lk. 12:8. I tell you, whoever acknowledges me before men, the Son of Man will also acknowledge him before the angels of God. But he who disowns me before men will be disowned before the angels of God.

Denying Jesus Christ (if you know anything of the history of the early martyrs) meant for the martyrs - apostasy and resulted in hellfire.

The regenerated Peter had according to the tradition a chance to prove this later on by choosing rather to die as martyr than to deny his saviour. We should therefore follow his example.

Lastly: It is wrong to say that Peter was unsaved (from God's perspective of time) when he denied Jesus the first time. However it is right to say from the perspective of the storyline that he was not yet bound for heaven because Jesus had not yet died and risen and Peter had not yet received the Holy Spirit. But again, from God's perspective Peter was saved; from our perspective Peter was in the process of reaching it.

Magnus :-(

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/28 2:59

Quote:

Magnus wrote,

"The regenerated Peter had according to the tradition a chance to prove this later on by choosing rather to die as martyr than to deny his saviour. We should therefore follow his example."

"Lastly: It is wrong to say that Peter was unsaved (from God's perspective of time) when he denied Jesus the first time. However it is right to say from the perspective of the storyline that he was not yet bound for heaven because Jesus had not yet died and risen and Peter had not yet received the Holy Spirit. But again, from God's perspective Peter was saved; from our perspective Peter was in the process of reaching it."

This pretty much shows where Peter was even before God the Father gave them to Jesus and Jesus "Kept them", Jesus said, "I have kept them that thou has given me," in thy name. Peter was already given to Jesus, even in the mind of God before it was manifest in the world.

Ephesians 1:4 According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love:

This is Peter's legacy, Matthew 16:17-18 And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

Not that Peter is the Rock but that the revelation of Father is what Jesus will build his church upon. The gates of hell will not and are not prevailing against His church, we are living proof.

Was Peter saved before or after he denied the Lord three times. It really does not matter. But, in the words of Christ and Pentecost, He was and also it was revealed to Peter that Christ was his life and Paul revealed the mystery to him that even Christ was in Him, birthed by the Father, kept by the Holy Spirit's seal and the truth of the Incorruptable Seed of the Father Peter speaks of. 1 Peter 1:23

Text proof;

John 17:11-26 And now I am no more in the world, but these are in the world, and I come to thee. Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are. While I was with them in the world, I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the son of perdition; that the scripture might be fulfilled. And now come I to thee; and these things I speak in the world, that they might have my joy

oy fulfilled in themselves. I have given them thy word; and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil. They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth. As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, I will that they also, whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am; that they may behold my glory, which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world hath not known thee: but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. And I have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it: that the love wherewith thou hast loved me may be in them, and I in them.

"I in them", greatest Word I have ever heard. Who is the Word? John 1:1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/28 5:10

Quote: Was Peter save before or after he denied the Lord three times. It really does not matter. But, in the words of Christ and Pentecost, He was and also it was revealed to Peter that Christ was his life and Paul revealed the mystery to him that even Christ was in Him, birthed by the Father, kept by the Holy Spirit's seal and the truth of the Incorruptable Seed of the Father Peter speaks of. 1 Peter 1:23

Yes I pretty much agree with you, except that

a. To deny Christ is to be denied at the judgement day before the angels (look at my last contribution). As ungenerated Peter could, and did deny Christ; as regenerated Peter would'nt and did'nt deny Christ (just like all the martyrs in history - who rather choose to be burned at the stake than to suffer eternal hellfire)

b. It was only Paul who had a revelation of Jesus Christ in him and has left a written account for it. We don't know whether Peter had been taught the theology of Saint Paul (2 Peter is a late account written in his name 150-160 ad), or if he had a similar experience by his own (though the biblical material is on your side, no doubt about it).

However it seems to me, that it is impossible to be a Christian without having Christ in you; given the fact that the function of the Holy Spirit is to reveal the presence of Jesus inside of us - and so likewise with Peter. With or without Paul's teaching about Christ in you Peter would surely had an similiar experience.

Magnus ;-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/8/28 6:18

Quote:
-----Which one are you addressing? Me or someone else?

I was addressing Jesse.

Quote:
-----Who builds what on what? The question is not the greek verb which always should be interpret according to its context (such as you described it). However the verb seems from viewpoint of the context in Luke to imply a meaning close to metanoia.

Rather the question is: Could Peter deny Jesus Christ after his regeneration?
My view is that he could'nt or would'nt. But before he was regenerated he could and did!

epitrepheo is certainly not a synonym for metanoia. The simplest understanding is that Christ is saying to Peter 'this is what you are going to do, when you have turned from that strengthen your brethren.'

Quote:

-----Rather the question is: Could Peter deny Jesus Christ after his regeneration?

My view is that he could not or would not. But before he was regenerated he could and did!

The next question is of immense importance:

Is it even possible to call an ungenerated man saved?

A man is capable of doing, after his regeneration, anything that he did prior to his regeneration. A regenerate man cannot continue in sin.

My problem with the simple assertion is that I don't actually believe anyone was 'regenerated' until the Spirit came in Acts 2. Regeneration is a verb which has God as its owner. Conversion and repentance both have man as the agent. Anything that man can do he can undo. The question is can man undo what God has done? I think the warnings of Hebrews show that he can but I think we need to read the Hebrews warnings in very clear context. And the indication there is that if a truly regenerate man rejects Christ and turns against him he puts himself in an irretrievable position.

I think there is another indication that Peter was unable to act as Christ in the John 21 incident where Peter cannot bring himself to use the word 'agape' of his own state. He, with all the honesty of the kind of man he was, knows he cannot say 'agape' having seen what the word really means in the cross of Christ. Such 'agape' is only possible when the love of God has been poured out in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/29 20:50

Oh Im sorry, I thought you were addressing me!

Quote i. : "epitrepheo is certainly not a synonym for metanoia".

Hmm! Im not sure about your account.

"Epitrepheo" in a moral sense designates primarily the fulfillment of religious conversion; thus the vb. used in a way similar to that of the LXX. Yet the usage is limited, for the vocabulary of conversion is often represented by metanoeo and metanoia, although in Lukan material epitrepheo (14 occurrences) predominates over metanoeo (11 times); Exegetical Dictionary of The New Testament Volume 2 page 40.

However I was taught by my greek professor that youve always have to consider the context for any word in NT (a meaning of word is always interconnected with a context). It is right to say that epitrepheo and metanoia have different lexical meanings i.e. they are not substantially synonymous - and Ive never said that. However a greek verb can imply given the context a different meaning from its lexical definition and so in the lukan account. So therefore Im bent to see the use of epitrepheo (in this case) as equivalent to metanoia.

Quote ii. "The simplest understanding is that Christ is saying to Peter 'this is what you are going to do, when you have turned from that strengthen your brethren.'"

Turned from what? literally/physical (to walk in another direction) or emotional spiritual as most translations imply (converted)?

iii. The rest of your views I am inclined to agree on. I do agree that the regeneration took part in Acts. I did write about the un- and regenerated Peter that he could/would or could not/would not deny Jesus Christ, just in case there were any Calvinists around (he he:-P)

Sincerely Magnus :-D

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/8/30 17:20

My Greek teacher would have taught me the same, so take a look at Luke's usage of epistrepho...

Luke 1:16-17; 2:20; 8:55; 17:4, 31; 22:32; Acts 3:19; 9:35, 40; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19, 36; 16:18; 26:18, 20; 28:27

and you will find that the honours are shared fairly evenly between a natural sense of 'return' and the moral sense of 'convert'. Which brings us back to Luke's use in this context. I maintain that this is too tenuous a statement to use as a basis for the notion that Peter was not converted at this time or that he had been and was about to be not converted and then subsequently reconverted. How many times can this process take place. Did he have to be reconverted after his 'hypocrisy' over not eating with the Gentiles (Galatians)?

Quote:
-----Turned from what? literally/physical (to walk in another direction) or emotional spiritual as most translations imply (converted)?

The point I am making is that there are times when we may well find ourselves heading in the wrong direction. To turn a round and obey the light is not tantamount to a 'new conversion', and Christ's words to Peter were not indicative that at t his point in time (or tomorrow) Peter was an unconverted man.

Re: - posted by Servant2U, on: 2007/8/30 19:15

Let's keep it simple brethren. One simple question... Were you saved when you denied Jesus before the clerk at the 7 el even when an opportunity presented itself to witness Him? Were you saved when you sat quietly during lunch while your co-workers debated their humanistic Oprah topic of the week?

While we debate and flex our academic and scholarly muscles the world is perishing because we don't speak up.

Just a thought...

Kevin

Re: - posted by Mangan (), on: 2007/8/31 12:22

Thank's for the clarifications. I do not think that Peter was unconverted when he denied Jesus the first time. However, he was not regenerated. I state that in this given context in Luke the meaning of the epistrepho is towards metaneo/metan oia. In that case it should be understood as repentance.

The salvation concerning Peter was anyway perfected with the sealing of the Holy Spirit and in the belief that Christ was risen from the dead.

With the indwelling of the Spirit, Peter did'nt deny Christ the second time he had the chance to stand before the authoriti es of the Roman Empire.

He choose rather to be burned at the stake than be burned at the hellfire.

Magnus

:D

Re: edit, on: 2007/8/31 12:53

Quote:

moe_mac wrote:

I believe everyone covered this subject very well. At what point he was saved I don't believe I could make the call. I would say it is hard to tell. He was following to a degree when he said " Lord we have fished all night and have not caught anything, but he cast out into the deep anyway". Afterwards he seemed to understand he was sinful in doubting Jesus's instruction to cast out into the deep. He said something along the lines of get away from me f or I am a sinful man, after the big catch. He seemed to show some doubt when he said, "Lord if it is you tells me to come to you on the water". He g rew in knowledge when he took his eyes off Jesus and began to sink. He really was crushed when he realized what he had done when he denied Jesu s three times and cussed one of those times alluding to convince them he was not a follower of Jesus. He went to sleep while Jesus was praying in the garden but afterwards defended Jesus and cut off the soldier's ear. I believe it is a picture for all of us who follow and fail. After all that, he followed in structions and waited in the upper room until the winds blew and the tongues of fire fell and filled the room and they were filled with the Spirit and he w as one of those who wrote the New Testament under the inspiration of that Spirit for a light unto our feet and a lamp unto our pathway today. It require

s the same Spirit to understand the scriptures as it did for the Apostles to write them. On the Day of Pentecost that Spirit was made manifest in Peter when he preached Jesus in the same place Jesus was crucified. Just as Peter, we all can look back at some things we had rather forget about we have done and said, but the main thing is after we believed in our heart and confessed with our mouth have we seen the Holy Spirit's power manifested in our life and we can look back and see we have not quit following HIM. The question we should ask ourselves as believers. Do we see any change in our life? Do we see any change that can only be explained by HIS Spirit and HIS POWER? As the Word says examine ourselves to see if we are of the faith.

edit:

Luke 22:31-34

31 "Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat. 32 But I have prayed for you, Simon, that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers."

33 But he replied, "Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death."

34 Jesus answered, "I tell you, Peter, before the rooster crows today, you will deny three times that you know me."

Acts 2:38-41

38 Peter replied, "**Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins.** And you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. **39 The promise is for you and your children and for all who are far off—for all whom the Lord our God will call.**

40 With many other words he warned them; and he pleaded with them, "**Save yourselves from this corrupt generation.**" 41 **Those who accepted his message were baptized,** and about three thousand were added to their number that day.

(from New International Version)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/8/31 17:17

Quote:

-----I do not think that Peter was unconverted when he denied Jesus the first time. However, he was not regenerated.

I'm with you on this one.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2007/8/31 17:49

I agree also,

Also, Quote:

However it seems to me, that it is impossible to be a Christian without having Christ in you; given the fact that the function of the Holy Spirit is to reveal the presence of Jesus inside of us - and so likewise with Peter. With or without Paul's teaching about Christ in you Peter would surely have had a similar experience.

I am sure Peter was drawn and in his saying thou art the Christ the Son of the living God, He was converted from Israel to Christ, but not regenerated until Pentecost. I don't think that Peter had to repeat himself, to receive the Holy Spirit and the birth of Jesus Christ in Him. For Christ said, "upon this rock I will build my Church," not Peter but the revelation from the Father,

Matthew 16:16-18 And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona: for flesh and blood hath not (((revealed))) it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this (((rock))) I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

In Christ: Phillip