

General Topics :: New Calvinistic song

New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 9:29

I wrote new lyrics for an old Doris Day song for all of you who are Calvinistic.

When I was a child
I asked my mother
Were I would spend eternity
Will I be in heaven
Will I be in hell
Here's what she said to me

Que sera, sera
Whatever will be, will be
The future's not ours to see
only God determines your destiny
What will be, will be

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 9:43

Quote:

-----only God determines your destiny What will be, will be

Truth of the Day. Thanks for sharing that!

Re: New Calvinistic song - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 9:46

It's a good thing that a balanced reading of the bible will yield both calvanistic and arminian interpretations of salvation.

I've been reading a lot of DL Moody recently, and he was very much an Arminian, during one of his sermons he talked a bout people's doubts that they cannot accept Christ because they are not pre-destined. His answer to that was, paraphrased 'Jesus stands at the door and knocks, if you open the door He will have a meal with you... do not tell me that Christ is not knocking at the door of your heart, *knocking his hand on the podium as if a door* if you have heard this sound, you have heard His knocking, to refuse Him entry is the primary selfish act that will deny you your salvation.'

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 9:52

Hi Steve,

I see you're occupying yourself manfully during your convalescence... (laughing)...

Like the words enormously.

Ian,

Thanks for the quote from DL Moody. I saw someone had posted somewhere (maybe you) something he had said which I would like help to recall accurately... along the lines that 'God did not save us because we are valuable, but we are valuable because God saved us...' Do you recognise that (or anyone else reading who remembers where it was recently posted on SI)?

Thanks.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 9:55

Quote:
----- His answer to that was, paraphrased 'Jesus stands at the door and knocks, if you open the door He will have a meal with you..

Would you liken D.L. Moody's statement to this verse?

Quote:
----- John 6:65 And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.

No one can open that door except it were given from the Father.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 10:20

Compliments,

In response to John 6:65 I counter with 2 Peter 3:9 *The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, **not willing that any should perish**, but that all should come to repentance.*

God has by this verse predestined everyone, it is our own free will to deny this relationship.

The bible can be read and understood to be correct by either a Calvinist or a Arminian, but in doing so, both parties deny clearly contradictory verses.

In regard to the trinity, the decision was made during the early ecumenical councils to adopt an approach of 'mystery.' I. E. no amount of human speculation or formulation can fully understand all the workings of God with regards to his persons.

The same balanced approach needs to be taken in regard to predestination, we could quote verses to each other all day supporting one party over another, but the truth of the matter is that these verses are all in the bible -so how should they be read? They should be read in light of each other, and the conclusion is: we just can't know.

And if we just can't know, how should we respond? We shouldn't separate ourselves by parties in regards to a doctrine that we cannot be sure of. I think it was AW Tozer that said 'I'd rather be an Arminian than a dead Calvinist' and Paul Washer said something to the effect of 'If I was going to start a church and had to decide between 10 Arminians and 100 Calvinists, I would choose the 10 Arminians.' I also heard someone once say that 'In the closet when I am on my face before God, I am a Calvinist because I cannot deny the omnipotence of God, but when I am preaching the Gospel I am an Arminian, because that is the way that Jesus introduced Himself to man.'

AW Tozer in his book 'Knowledge of the Holy' works in one of the chapters to reconcile Calvinism with Arminianism in an illustration. We are all traveling on a boat in one direction, towards God, and our decision to stay on that boat or jump off into the water is our own free will, Arminianism.

When the bible apparently contradicts itself there is usually more to the story than 'these verses are right and these verses are wrong.' I challenge anyone who is a Arminian to read the bible as a Calvinist, and anyone who is a Calvinist to read the bible as an Arminian. Without knowledge of both sides of the coin of salvation we are unprepared for what the world may bring at us.

Calvanistic churches tend to die slow painful deaths because they do not have strong evangelical principles to keep them growing. Arminian churches flirt with heresy because they often put too much within man's power in regards to his salvation and sanctification... there is a balance in between.

Apostle Paul wrote Romans, so he must have been an Calvinist, but he was also a great missionary taking the word to all manner of people, so he must have been an Arminian. Whatever you're looking to find you will find... if you look at Paul through the lenses of an Arminian you will see an Arminian zealous missionary, if you look at him through the eyes of a Calvinist you will see a staunch Calvinist. But we would be denying Paul his true identity, which is somewhere in between.

We need to stop reading our bibles with party glasses on.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 10:33

I am neither Calvinistic or Arminian, I just wanted your input. I have never read what Calvin believes or what the Arminians believed.

Re: New Calvinistic song - posted by ginnyrose (), on: 2007/12/27 10:45

Do I detect a note of sarcasm? Actually, this is very good - if you have a sense of humor. The point is very well taken. I love it!

ginnyrose

PS: Writing any more songs, or poetry? Give us more - and be sure to include satire or sarcasm! (Remember God used these approaches to challenge people - can be found in Isaiah.)

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/27 11:00

Hi everyone.

Ginnyrose,

"Remember God used these approaches to challenge people - can be found in Isaiah"

...but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2007/12/27 11:22

Quote:

-----by iansmith on 2007/12/27 9:20:50

We need to stop reading our bibles with party glasses on.

thank you ian for your very balanced and insightful response to this issue. it would be nice to learn from one another instead of taking sides and debating one another many times.

i like the quote (can't remember it that great) that says something like:

pray like a calvinist and preach like an arminian.

we would do well to be balanced in this issue.

phil

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 12:31

Ok, so here's an Arminian song-

And now, the end is here
And so I face the final curtain
My friend, I'll say it clear
I'll state my case, of which I'm certain
I've lived a life that's full
I traveled each and ev'ry highway
And more, much more than this, I did it my way

Regrets, I've had a few
But then again, too few to mention
I did what I had to do and saw it through without exemption
I planned each charted course, each careful step along the byway
And more, much more than this, I did it my way

Yes, there were times, I'm sure you knew
When I bit off more than I could chew
But through it all, when there was doubt
I ate it up and spit it out
I faced it all and I stood tall and did it my way

I've loved, I've laughed and cried
I've had my fill, my share of losing
And now, as tears subside, I find it all so amusing
To think I did all that
And may I say, not in a shy way,
"Oh, no, oh, no, not me, I did it my way"

For what is a man, what has he got?
If not himself, then he has naught
To say the things he truly feels and not the words of one who kneels
The record shows I took the blows and did it my way!

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 12:49

While I'm here, allow me to ask you all a question. When the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea, was it against their "free will"?

I mean they probably wanted to continue living and harming the Israelites right? But their will was never allowed to decide their fate, and God never checked with them to make sure He could drown them first.

How about the Pharisees? Didn't they want Jesus to remain dead? Did God run it by them first and get their permission to raise Christ?

No? How dare He inflict His will upon them!!

Seriously, I am shocked by the lack of any Biblical exegesis used to disprove Calvinism, and not simply quoting 2 Peter 3:9 does not clear up anything. Anyone can take a verse out of context and make it say anything. This verse in its context is written to "the elect", and Peter is letting them know, that none of the elect shall perish, but will come to repentance.

To make it mean that God wills for every human that has ever lived to come to repentance is not the logical or Scriptural conclusion. If so, then we see God as a deranged fool who thought he wanted Pharaoh to come to repentance then goes on to say, "I created you for this very purpose." (Which was not salvation)

We also have Judas Iscariot who Jesus said was "the son of perdition", and that he (Judas) was fulfilling Scripture by being just that.

Seems God does what He wants with whom He wants, when He wants. Why? Because all things are created by Him, for Him, and for His glory, He is God, we are not.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/27 12:53

Why is it none of you can keep from adding your log to the fire.

So long as you do don't claim you're burning something for the Lord.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 13:43

Hi Patrick,

I don't know why you want so much to be known as a Calvinist? except I keep hearing everyone has to be one or the other over in the US. Why not just hold to scripture? You would find a greater measure of agreement that way and you would not be relinquishing the sovereignty of God.

You said

Quote:
-----I mean they probably wanted to continue living and harming the Israelites right? But their will was never allowed to decide their fate, and God never checked with them to make sure He could drown them first.

One of the marks of proper wrestling for truth, is that neither side need mockery (or ridicule) to show forth a valid understanding of the written word. I don't think that's a very good example, as God was preparing to speak to *His* people in great detail first. It was to be about fifteen centuries before Egyptians could be evangelised. Okay... you were only joking? Or you want your point to be taken seriously....? Sorry if I sound jaded by these controversies. I am. That's my fault, not yours. But let me know if you're particularly offended, and I'll apologise unreservedly... It's not often something like this *gets to me*. :-?

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 14:11

Quote:
-----I don't know why you want so much to be known as a Calvinist?

Sister I could care less about being known as a Calvinist.

What upsets me is the condescending, and oft times humiliating way in which men who hold to Reformed, Lutheran, or Calvinist ideas are treated here.

It's as if only those who agree with Finney and Wesley are allowed to say anything, and anyone speaking to the contrary are shunned or poo-pooed into thinking they are the "heretics", when in truth, 500 or so years ago the men that are so heralded by many here would have been branded as heretics.

There is no common ground between Calvinism and Arminianism, nor does Scripture teach this. Sadly we all use the same terms with different meanings. For example when I speak of grace, I mean God's regenerating, and sustaining work in a person's heart.

The Arminian has more of a Roman Catholic view of grace, that being something a person must cooperate with in order for it to be effective.

When we speak of justification, we speak of two different ideas. I say justification is a once for all declaration of innocence which is made real by faith. Whereas the Arminian would say justification is only as good as the person's sanctification. Again this is more inline with Roman Catholic doctrine than Scripture.

The blatant disregard for serious exegesis(taking out from the text), and the heralding of isogesis(reading into, or putting into the text) is absolutely mind boggling.

Maybe it's time I go, I don't know. I have and do enjoy many of the brethren here. But I see a very dangerous trend developing here that was common in the times of Luther and Calvin.

The idea that no one needs to be taught, and that God can speak to individuals, and they can be the sole interpreter of what is being said without any regard for Biblical truth, or being consistent with the Bible's teaching is dangerous. Sadly I in the past followed such ways, and have realized that it led me to more rebellion than anything else. I became one who "got it", while others did not.

People filled my ears with garbage about me being a prophet, and blah, blah, blah....

And I failed miserably at everything my hand touched. All praise to Him who caused this failure, for had He not, I surely would have been lost because I was trusting in my works, and not His work alone.

He has saved me! Not because I am good, or because I made a decision for Him. But because He fore-loved me while I was yet a sinner. All I brought to the equation was my sin, and damnation.

Blessings and grace to you.

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/12/27 14:48

I prefer this Calvinistic song by Cowper...

"There is a fountain filled with blood"

There is a fountain filled with blood drawn from Emmanuel's veins;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood lose all their guilty stains.
Lose all their guilty stains, lose all their guilty stains;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood lose all their guilty stains.

The dying thief rejoiced to see that fountain in his day;
And there have I, though vile as he, washed all my sins away.
Washed all my sins away, washed all my sins away;
And there have I, though vile as he, washed all my sins away.

Dear dying Lamb, Thy precious blood shall never lose its power
Till all the ransomed church of God be saved, to sin no more.
Be saved, to sin no more, be saved, to sin no more;
Till all the ransomed church of God be saved, to sin no more.

Ever since, by faith, I saw the stream Thy flowing wounds supply,
Redeeming love has been my theme, and shall be till I die.
And shall be till I die, and shall be till I die;
Redeeming love has been my theme, and shall be till I die.

Then in a nobler, sweeter song, I'll sing Thy power to save,
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue lies silent in the grave.
Lies silent in the grave, lies silent in the grave;
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue lies silent in the grave.

Lord, I believe Thou hast prepared, unworthy though I be,
For me a blood bought free reward, a golden harp for me!
'Tis strung and tuned for endless years, and formed by power divine,
To sound in God the Father's ears no other name but Thine.

Re: - posted by LoveHim, on: 2007/12/27 14:53

Quote:

-----I prefer this Calvinistic song by Cowper...

"There is a fountain filled with blood"

brother mike, what an excellent selection for a song. one of my favorite hymns, it blesses me to just read the lyrics, much less sing them as well.

ps can we please just call it a christian's song? do we have to put a label on it? oh, i hope not.

thanks again mike,
phil

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 16:05

Roaringlamb,

This got my sympathy: 'What upsets me is the condescending, and oft times humiliating way in which men who hold to Reformed, Lutheran, or Calvinist ideas are treated here.'

Then this lost it: 'The Arminian has more of a Roman Catholic view of grace, that being something a person must cooperate with in order for it be effective.'

Paul Washer said that in his prayer he was a Calvinist and in his preaching he was an Arminian, I have to agree that I feel the same way. I'm not going to deny either one, but there is a balance to both. You're so quick to plead for sympathy, then rashly you trash talk the other party.

'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you,' I think that's a primary teaching of our Lord. If you want the respect of others, give them more respect, maybe more than they deserve. **Until you can show respect to others, don't complain that you don't receive any.**

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 16:10

Quote:

-----Do unto others as you would have them do unto you, I think that's a primary teaching of our Lord. If you want the respect of others, give them more respect, maybe more than they deserve. Until you can do that, don't complain.

Brother Ian, if it walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it would be a lie to call it any thing other than a duck.

The truth is the truth, Arminians as well as Roman Catholics subscribe to Prevenient grace which must be cooperated with in order for a man to begin his salvation. Then, he must be sanctified in order to be justified.

Sad, but we have lost a lot of ground in the last 500 years, and in the wrong direction.

Grace and peace to you

Re: A Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 16:12

D
ear Patrick,

Well, this is a long post... it got a little more philosophical as it went along. Please take from it what you can, and don't think I'm trying to move you off your hard-won safety in God.

Thank you for your gracious reply to my groanings. Perhaps American Arminianism is genuinely off the rails. You see, in my simple way of understanding the difference, it is only - and I mean only - a matter of emphasis. It should not be possible - especially after having someone as studied as philologos explaining terms of reference (though he hasn't been around much lately) - to pin down each word within its scriptural context, and let scripture be the standard. Of course each person is different and the way God's dealings with them appears to each one may differ greatly.

But in the end, whoever assents to the call of God on their life, finds that the provision for their needs is identical - Jesus Christ, crucified, risen, ascended and the gift of the Holy Spirit for sonship and service. Am I overstating the case for faith? I have recently begun to think of 'faith' as *my* faith, but until then (I mean for many years) I could only lay hold of it as His faith - I held onto His faith-fullness.

I think one only has to look at the many different ways God won battles for His people in the Old Testament, to see how many different ways the death and resurrection of Jesus may be communicated to the understanding of one hearing the gospel to their own heart.

Really, I had no intention of pushing you away from SI. I opened the thread again fully expecting to have to apologise. I really am sorry you are feeling in such a minority.... but... does that matter? As long as you are open to keep adjusting your perspective according to God's revelation to your heart and mind, you will find yourself more and more comfortable even with those who think they are 'Arminians'. I confess that to me this is not the way for a person to present themselves any more than as a Calvinist.

Quote:
-----There is no common ground between Calvinism and Arminianism, nor does Scripture teach this. Sadly we all use the same terms with different meanings.

Objectively though, this cannot be God's fault, although it may be a problem to Him. It is certainly a problem to us, and I would strongly suggest it is the people who need to change their view of scriptural terminology, rather than God to change His, who arranged for His revelation to be recorded for us.

Quote:
-----For example when I speak of grace, I mean God's regenerating, and sustaining work in a person's heart.

This perplexes me, as I remember hearing it described by a seasoned preacher as being like the air in its abundance and life-supporting properties. But grace itself is not what we eat or drink or receive.... rather, it supplies the medium within which we eat the word, drink of the water of life and receive the Spirit of Truth. (I realise there are many other tags I could have mentioned, but these are readily identifiable in scripture.) Attributing more to grace than scripture does... is problematic for me also.

Quote:
-----The idea that no one needs to be taught, and that God can speak to individuals, and they can be the sole interpreter of what is being said without any regard for Biblical truth, or being consistent with the Bible's teaching is dangerous.

Of course. But only certain people are called to be mechanics with doctrine. Others simply climb into the vehicle and let the driver take them where they need to go. Still others walk. They benefit from the existence of such vehicles in other ways.

Quote:
-----I surely would have been lost because I was trusting in my works, and not His work alone.

We all need the security of being able to give our testimony in reasonably recognisable terms. The most important part

of it though, must be the way looking to Christ has opened the way to the Father.

I think I'm beginning to understand something about those who settle on *calling themselves 'Calvinists'*... It seems they are people who have a large measure of natural ability, - go-getters, doers, never-say-diers, triers and try againers - and by the time God has separated them from their efforts, they have lost all consciousness of ever having invited Him or *begged* Him to come to them and sort them out, and they are convinced they have been so much trouble to Him, it's a miracle He has stuck with them all this time... This convinces them they have been more especially chosen than some who don't give themselves the same degree of trouble on certain points about coming to God - or over believing He has come to them.

This battle for assurance, threatens both a person's capabilities and vulnerabilities. All the while God is gently coaxing the fighter onto His ground, in such a way that he never feels threatened and ends up thinking he's been selected specially - which brings its own problems. While there are others, whom if God were not to present Himself in such a way as those people thought they were *choosing Him*, they would never put themselves through the ignominy of being unable to explain why they believed - right from the start of making a commitment.

Maybe I'm misunderstanding the whole thing here.... but God takes a different route to coax *them* off their ground and onto His. In both cases, it is an elaborate wooing procedure - entirely at God's orchestration - which catches some people more unaware than others. But it matters **to Him** to win each one - whatever it takes - that His Bride may be brought closer to completion. How these two different kinds of people perceive His work is what causes discussion His work is not in question.... only how to define it. Perhaps the lingering question over total assurance, commonly felt by an 'Arminian' is the way God deals with their variety of self-assurance? Trying to codify these perceptions into theologies just leads to a lot of hot air and unnecessary suspicion... while all the time God is the same, knows what He's doing and usually gets what He wants. Amen.

Well, I don't know how much sense that made, but I hope you'll tell me... :-)

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 16:14

I was raised Catholic and have been involved in both Arminian and Reformed Evangelical communities as a protestant... from what I know of my 'faith' as a child and what is practiced in the Arminian branch of the protestant church, there are no such similarities as you have described.

You are slandering hundreds of thousands of Christians with your words.

You talk about everyone interpreting the scripture as they see fit, well what are you doing? Who made you the expert that we should all turn to? Who made you the Holy Spirit?

You are too bold, you are out of line.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 16:29

Quote:

-----You are too bold, you are out of line.

Brother can you tell me then the difference between the idea of grace in the Catholic and Arminian views?

Both start with man alive and able to do all that God has commanded, and he only needs some help to get on the path, but man must keep himself there. I don't think I have misrepresented anything here have I?

Re: A Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 16:33

Quote:
-----I was raised Catholic and have been involved in both Arminian and Reformed Evangelical communities as a protestant... from what I know of my 'faith' as a child and what is practiced in the Arminian branch of the protestant church, there are no such similarities as you have described.

I can't make any of these claims, but I would never have put Arminians in the same camp as Catholics.

Probably I'm too hazy on the American Arminian mindset to have ventured as I did in my last post (two minutes before yours). Let no-one imagine I think I'm an expert... ;-)

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 16:33

Quote:
-----I think I'm beginning to understand something about those who settle on calling themselves 'Calvinists'... It seems they are people who have a large measure of natural ability, - go-getters, doers, never-say-diers, triers and try againers - and by the time God has separated them from their efforts,

Yes but this is everyone of us. We think we can do what God requires, we are not poor in Spirit but rather haughty and proud. we want to be our own gods, our own rulers.

It is in His great mercy that God then out of the rebellious race of man chooses out people for Himself, and changes them to see their great and moment by moment need of Him.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 16:39

Roaring,

Do you actually know what Arminians believe, or do you just repeat what you've heard?

Can I save or sanctify myself? No, it's only by the Blood of Jesus! Why do I follow the commands of God, why do I obey, because I love my savior!

John 14:23 Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.

There is an action on the part of all parties involved in this verse. 'If a man love me.' Jesus first loved me, but I must reciprocate my love for him... how? Through obedience to his words. And both Jesus and the Father will love me, and they will live with me. Action on behalf of Jesus, God and the Holy Spirit.

But somewhere in the mixed up jumble there is an action on behalf of man. I just cannot see any other way for that verse to make sense.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 16:39

Hi Patrick

Quote:
-----Yes but this is everyone of us.

I don't think I disputed that. What I suggested is that God brings the same result by different routes with different people depending on how He knows they deal with life. He respects those differences. Only trouble for us here is, way back, h

ow to define two of the broadest differences got tangled up with the systematisation of doctrine... when really in both broad groupings, God was creating the response He wanted from either kind of person. It is how that person perceives God's dealings with them, which has become the subject of so much fruitless discussion.... not the dealings themselves (which I am utterly convinced we would find are very similar when viewed from within the person).

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 16:46

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

Ok, so here's an Arminian song-

And now, the end is here
And so I face the final curtain
My friend, I'll say it clear
I'll state my case, of which I'm certain
I've lived a life that's full
I traveled each and ev'ry highway
And more, much more than this, I did it my way

Regrets, I've had a few
But then again, too few to mention
I did what I had to do and saw it through without exemption
I planned each charted course, each careful step along the byway
And more, much more than this, I did it my way

Yes, there were times, I'm sure you knew
When I bit off more than I could chew
But through it all, when there was doubt
I ate it up and spit it out
I faced it all and I stood tall and did it my way

I've loved, I've laughed and cried
I've had my fill, my share of losing
And now, as tears subside, I find it all so amusing
To think I did all that
And may I say, not in a shy way,
"Oh, no, oh, no, not me, I did it my way"

For what is a man, what has he got?
If not himself, then he has naught
To say the things he truly feels and not the words of one who kneels
The record shows I took the blows and did it my way!

That's not an Arminian song, but a secular song. I don't know any Armenians, as such, well enough to be 100% certain, but surely no Armenian, if he was truly born again, would accept the thoughts expressed in it any more than you or I do!

By no stretch of the imagination is that the opposite to the "Calvinist song" - even as a joke!

Why (as Dorcas said) this insistence on people being one or the other, Calvinist or Arminian anyway? Aren't we allowed to be "none of the above"?

These aren't the only two doctrines between which one has to make a choice, so why talk as if they are?

I don't get it - why do some folks seem to think you can't believe in the sovereign Grace and power of God without having a Calvinist-type theology :-?

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 16:47

Brother Ian,

here are two Canons from the Council of Trent. Of course the Roman Catholic Church still regards this as their standard of doctrine, so that is why I post it.

Canon XXIV. If any one saith, that the justice received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of Justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof: let him be anathema.

Canon XXXII. If any one saith, that the good works of one that is justified...does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life— if so be, however, that he depart in grace,—and also an increase of glory: let him be anathema.

In their estimation, grace is something that must be increased in order to earn justification. the way to increase grace is to do works, or cooperate with grace. In the end, a man is the one who determines if he will be justified or not.

The Arminians are not much different than this. Consider this rejection of the Arminian teachings from the Canons of Dort-

IX

We reject those who teach that grace and free choice are concurrent partial causes which cooperate to initiate conversion, and that grace does not precede--in the order of causality--the effective influence of the will; that is to say, that God does not effectively help man's will to come to conversion before man's will itself motivates and determines itself.

For the early church already condemned this doctrine long ago in the Pelagians, on the basis of the words of the apostle : It does not depend on man's willing or running but on God's mercy (Rom. 9:16); also: Who makes you different from anyone else? and What do you have that you did not receive? (1 Cor. 4:7); likewise: It is God who works in you to will and act according to his good pleasure (Phil. 2:13).

They are similar, because they have a similar root- the denial of man being dead in sin, and capable of doing what God requires in his natural state.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 16:51

Quote:

theopenlife wrote:

I prefer this Calvinistic song by Cowper...

"There is a fountain filled with blood"

There is a fountain filled with blood drawn from Emmanuel's veins;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood lose all their guilty stains.
Lose all their guilty stains, lose all their guilty stains;
And sinners plunged beneath that flood lose all their guilty stains.

The dying thief rejoiced to see that fountain in his day;
And there have I, though vile as he, washed all my sins away.
Washed all my sins away, washed all my sins away;
And there have I, though vile as he, washed all my sins away.

Dear dying Lamb, Thy precious blood shall never lose its power
Till all the ransomed church of God be saved, to sin no more.
Be saved, to sin no more, be saved, to sin no more;
Till all the ransomed church of God be saved, to sin no more.

E'er since, by faith, I saw the stream Thy flowing wounds supply,
Redeeming love has been my theme, and shall be till I die.
And shall be till I die, and shall be till I die;
Redeeming love has been my theme, and shall be till I die.

Then in a nobler, sweeter song, I'll sing Thy power to save,
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue lies silent in the grave.
Lies silent in the grave, lies silent in the grave;
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue lies silent in the grave.

Lord, I believe Thou hast prepared, unworthy though I be,
For me a blood bought free reward, a golden harp for me!
'Tis strung and tuned for endless years, and formed by power divine,
To sound in God the Father's ears no other name but Thine.

I love that hymn.

But what's "Calvinist" about it? :-?

Jeannette

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 16:51

It's funny because I could have come on here, and continued the mud flinging upon Calvinists and no one would have cared.

Why is that? Why are there no admonitions against the one who started the thread, but rather "atta boys", and a seeming acceptance of the put down?

Re: - posted by broclint (), on: 2007/12/27 16:52

This thread reminds me of the discussions between the Pharisees and the Sadducees...

I believe it was old Vance Havner who said, "why don't we just be Christians".

Any time we start hyperventilating over the doctrines of ANY man we get our attention drawn away from Christ. Labels or advocations to certain doctrines is not what is going to get us to heaven, but obedience to Christ. Otherwise there is a whole lot of folk that would be considered terribly ignorant and "roared" away into hell that do not know the difference between

Arminian and Calvinism but have certainly fallen in love with Christ enough hear HIS voice.

Peace,

Clint

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/12/27 16:57

I ate at Taco Bell last night.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 16:58

Wait a minute, you're trying to define modern Arminians by what was written against them by Calvinists 388 years ago. Certainly you must maintain that there might have been a bias on behalf of the Synod of Dort.

Define an Arminian by how he defines himself, not by how a Calvinistic group defined them hundreds of years ago.

I was saved by grace through faith, upon accepting Christ I was filled with the Holy Spirit, any good works that have been done on my behalf are fruits of the Spirit's work within me.

That is why they are called 'fruits of the Spirit.' Fruits do not grow without a tree.

Without being grafted onto the true vine I cannot bear any good fruit. In John 15 it says that apart from Jesus I can do nothing.

But there are also verses, as the ones that have been listed that show that there is an element of choice on my behalf as

to whether or not I accept God's free gift of Grace. That is the difference between an Arminian and a Calvinist, I chose to accept His grace, or God chose that I should choose to accept His grace.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 16:59

Miccah,

I just had tacos from a taco-truck here in Seattle with some of my coworkers, 4 tacos and a drink for \$5 even. Such a great deal. They put a slice of avocado on each taco.

It was a little cold today, since the only seating is at picnic tables, and it's snowing.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 17:00

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

...Yes but this is everyone of us. We think we can do what God requires, we are not poor in Spirit but rather haughty and proud. we want to be our own gods, our own rulers.

It is in His great mercy that God then out of the rebellious race of man chooses out people for Himself, and changes them to see their great and moment by moment need of Him.

AMEN, but how is that particularly Calvinist as opposed to Armenian?

Although, Like Dorcas, I only have a hazy idea of what Armenianism means to you.

In its simplest form my understanding of the difference between Calvinism and Armenianism is that Calvinists believe "Once saved always saved" and Armenians believe there is a possibility (however slight) of someone, who was once saved, completely and deliberately turning his back on God.

There is scriptural support for both views, so why the need to debate on it?

in Him

Jeannette

Re: tacos - posted by broclint (), on: 2007/12/27 17:04

And I thank him for food in Louisiana too! :-)

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 17:12

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

It's funny because I could have come on here, and continued the mud flinging upon Calvinists and no one would have cared.

Why is that? Why are there no admonitions against the one who started the thread, but rather "atta boys", and a seeming acceptance of the put down?

Hi Bro Lamb

Maybe one reason is that you are poking your head above the parapet and *asking* to be shot at?

Another reason could be that some of those who espouse Calvinism on this Forum make a point of debating it at every opportunity?

Holiness is another one that's endlessly debated, (can we become perfect in this life? Which is actually missing the point)

...Come on Bro. I'm on your side really (though neither a Calvinist nor Armenian). I just wish you would lighten up a little, and not take this "pet doctrine" so very, very, very seriously. It only makes those who disagree more determined to knock you off your doctrinal pinnacle!

Do you play the children's game "king of the castle" in America? That's what it reminds me of. And it can get nastily personal if we don't watch out.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 17:13

Quote:

broclint wrote:

This thread reminds me of the discussions between the Pharisees and the Saducees...

I believe it was old Vance Havner who said, "why don't we just be Christians".

Any time we start hyperventilating over the doctrines of ANY man we get our attention drawn away from Christ. Labels or advocations to certain doctrines is not what is going to get us to heaven, but obedience to Christ. Otherwise there is a whole lot of folk that would be considered terribly ignorant and "roared" away into hell that do not know the difference between Arminian and Calvinism but have certainly fallen in love with Christ enough hear HIS voice.

Peace,

Clint

AMEN

Thank you

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 17:14

LittleGift,

The most contentious argument between Arminians and Calvinists is about the nature of predestination.

There's a t-shirt that you can buy online that I think explains it pretty well. On the front it says 'Arminianism: I Chose this T-shirt' and on the back it says 'Calvinism: This T-shirt Chose me.' I hate to simplify it that much, but since some of you folks don't know, it might make more sense to break it down to its most basics.

Arminians believe in the free will of man to make a decision for salvation. Ultimately without free will, we would all be robots incapable of love, simple cogs in a galactic machine -whether or not we are saved is purely the will of God. There are many verses that support man's free will to believe and follow God in the bible.

Calvinists believe that God is Almighty, something that Arminians believe also, but Calvinists take it the next step and say, 'since God is all knowing, He has always known who would accept him and who wouldn't. And since he is allpowerful, He picked those that would accept him and those would reject him, because nothing can be outside of the will of God.' Most Arminians would find fault with this because it would mean that some people are destined to go to Hell from birth, that there was never hope for their souls. This goes in complete opposition with many bible verses, although there are plenty of bible verses that do support God's allpowerfulness etc.

So do we choose or does He choose...

Revelation 3:20 **Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.**

2 Peter 3:9 The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

John 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

Any man, any, whosoever... doesn't sound like God picks favorites.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 17:18

That's more or less what I thought, Ian. Thanks for putting it so clearly

Jeannette

Re: - posted by hmmhmm (), on: 2007/12/27 17:23

There's a t-shirt that you can buy online that I think explains it pretty well. On the front it says 'Arminianism: I Chose this T-shirt' and on the back it says 'Calvanism: This T-shirt Chose me.'

that made me laugh

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 17:37

Quote:
-----Wait a minute, you're trying to define modern Arminians by what was written against them by Calvinists 388 years ago. Certainly you must maintain that there might have been a bias on behalf of the Synod of Dort.

This is what has defined Arminian thought for the last few hundred years, and is the first time they put forth their beliefs, so why not start at the source?

And no there was no bias, the Synod was held at the request of the Arminians as an avenue to put forth their ideas. Many hours, and many months later, all of their ideas were found contrary to Scripture, and declared as heresy.

Quote:
-----But there are also verses, as the ones that have been listed that show that there is an element of choice on my behalf as to whether or not I accept God's free gift of Grace. That is the difference between an Arminian and a Calvinist, I chose to accept His grace, or God chose that I should choose to accept His grace.

Even the remotest urge to seek God comes from Him working in us. Left to our own devices, we would rather sin and hide from the light. That is why God saves men in spite of themselves by changing their hearts.

For instance, I can tell my cat, "if you open the food container, you may eat."

My cat cannot open it as it is an airtight container, and he would need thumbs to do so. But the truth of the matter is that if he could open it, he could eat.

Because I love him, I open it and scoop out food for him, because he cannot do it himself.

Another example would be if a man desired to carry a baby. No matter how much his will sought after it, he is by nature unable to perform that which he desires. Of course if his nature were changed(not by surgery ;-))he could do it.

God calls us to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, but man cannot do that on his own, because it is contrary to the nature of man to do so.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 17:49

Quote:
-----Any man, any, whosoever... doesn't sound like God picks favorites.

Do we negate the rest of the bible when it says:
Quote:
-----John 6:44 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.

The part must agree with whole, you can't just pick and choose the verses to fit an argument. We must include it all to make it work effectively.

Certainly it's "Whomsoever will" but look at the rest of the verse, "Let him drink of the water of life freely" not just any man in his present condition of not being born again can even partake of this drinking. He can't even SEE let alone ENTER the Kingdom of God unless it were given by the Father for him to see and that would mean that he would have to be born again first to even believe the things of the Spirit.

You can't just say "Whosoever will" or "Any man" and say, "There, see I told ya". That's not enough, we are to rightly divide the word, and not be biased towards the others.

Come on man! sheesh

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 17:58

Compliments,

If you go back and read earlier verses I have been arguing for balance since the beginning. I would say that I'm 50/50 on the Arminian/Calvinistic thing, both models work, and each one works better in some settings than others. All scripture is profitable, we just need to know what setting to use it in.

I do not dismiss the verse you have brought up, and I think I said earlier that it is a mystery how apparently contradictory verses work together. I'm just saying that RoaringLamb's accusations that Arminians are simply re-packaged catholics is wrong, misguided and uninformed. He's the one who picked the side, I was happy walking the narrow road between the sides.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 17:58

Hi Patrick... still trying to see how you can said this:

Quote:
-----God calls us to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, but man cannot do that on his own, because it is contrary to the nature of man to do so.

The reason I question it is John's explanation here:

Chapter 3

16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

17 For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.

18 He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.

19 And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.

20 For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.

21 But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God.

According to Hebrews 11:6, to start to please God, a person must believe that He is. It seems to me that these verses present the reality of God, and face the person looking at Jesus with a choice - to believe, or not to believe.

According to John, v 19, it is possible to know the light is there, but as you said, to stay in the darkness. This is a choice . God does not force a person to stay in the darkness.

In fact, we know that the light extinguishes the darkness, so for men to stay in the dark, they must actively retreat from the light... it's not a matter of simply staying where they are.

Again... that retreat is a choice which is made in the face of the full knowledge of God's existence. Faith is not a work.

Rather, to not exercise that faith by coming to the light - *that's a 'work'* - because coming to the light is easier in the presence of Jesus Christ.

No wonder men are condemned. But they are condemned by their actions, not by God's inaction or by God's actively choosing to reject them.

Can you see this?

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 18:05

Roaring,

BTW:

*Episcopius was chosen as the spokesman of the thirteen representatives of the Remonstrants before the synod; **but he was refused a hearing when he would not submit to the Synod's order of discussion** -- which was for him to first present scriptural arguments for the Remonstrants' opinions. At the end of the Synod's sittings in 1619, Episcopius and the other twelve Arminian representatives were deprived of their offices and expelled from the country.*

Doesn't sound like the Arminians were given a fair chance at the Synod of Dort... their appearance there was merely for show. They were not given a chance to defend themselves, which is why it was so easy for them to be labeled as heretics , which you have already so aptly pointed out.

Re: - posted by iansmith (), on: 2007/12/27 18:08

Quote:

-----And no there was no bias, the Synod was held at the request of the Arminians as an avenue to put forth their ideas. Many hours, and many months later, all of their ideas were found contrary to Scripture, and declared as heresy. -Roaringlamb.

*The synod was to be composed of supporters both of the Calvinistic views and the Arminian views. **However, the Arminian representatives were detained and were not allowed to sit on the synod. Thus the judges were comprised entirely of individuals who had already rejected the Arminian view. As one has observed, the Remonstrants were predestined to fail.***

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

History is written by the winners huh...

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 18:17

from wikipedia

Quote:

-----... As one has observed, the Remonstrants were predestined to fail.

This would be funny if it was not just exactly the reason many people don't trust those in charge of 'religion'.

It reminds me of a trial which took place in London later that century, in which every member of the jury of twelve was in

agreement politically with the defendant. He should have been executed, but was condemned to exile instead - which only lasted about three years.

We really need to be willing to break the mould, then people will *listen*...

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 18:22

Ian I do agree with you there needs to be a balance.

I do agree with Calvinism to a degree, and I can't ignore the warnings that Paul gives to the elect that they should make dead the deeds of the flesh by the assistance of the Spirit, otherwise we will not live.

The warnings are real even to those who sin "Wilfully". That is, those who have denied the faith and rejected the atonement and counted the blood of Jesus as nothing, to these it says there is no sacrifice for sins. I know of a man who was once enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift and was made partaker of the holy Ghost and has gone down this path. Today He rejects Jesus Christ as His LORD. His testimony of his salvation and deliverance is on record, and to say that he was never saved is downright stupid. He has joined the JW's and is an advocate for them.

He was once saved, no doubt about that. This is where John Calvin and myself split hairs.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 18:47

Quote:

-----History is written by the winners huh...

If you want to let wikipedia be the source for your Church History that is fine by me, but it would probably be better to find some more credible resources.

I mean there are some who say Luther died of syphilis, and simply propagate the lie so that people will remain enslaved to the Roman Church.

The fact of the Synod of Dordt is that the Remonstrants were put forth by the Arminians, who were in the minority as they were resurrecting Pelagianism. One must understand that in the minds of many in the Synod, this was a "here we go a gain" situation, so they saw it as it was.

The simple fact that the Synod lasted seven months and held 154 formal sessions in which both Episcopius and the other leader Johannes Bogerman were asked to leave as they were using various tactics to delay, and divide the Synod.

But in the end, we must settle upon which view lines up with Scripture, and represents God as He truly is, and man as he truly is.

See ya in Geneva ;-)

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 18:56

Quote:

-----Again... that retreat is a choice which is made in the face of the full knowledge of God's existence. Faith is not a work.

The retreat is the default reaction of our natural birth. We like Adam and Eve would rather hide and accuse others than admit to our sin.

We cannot even understand that we have sinned against God until a new nature is instilled within us.

Faith is a result of the new birth and not the cause of it. Repentance also is a fruit of the new birth and not what ushers it in. I believe this is where you and I will have the most separation(maybe not, who knows :))

So men will not come to the light because they are blind, and don't even want their eyes opened. That is why it is so amazing that God gives us all He requires, and Christ has perfectly fulfilled the Law and its demands for us as well.

Men are condemned because they will not come, but they also cannot come unless God gives them the ability to come. Whosoever will may come, but only those whom God enables will come.

The Biblical description of men is that they are dead, blind, deaf, slaves to Satan, enemies of God. They cannot change this as they are this by birth. Thus they must be re-born and receive a new nature, they must have their eyes opened, their ears opened, the chains removed etc. But only God can do that.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 18:57

Years ago, attending a Calvinist Church, (this would be during the 80's) and there was a horrible famine going on in Africa. Remember, no water, and people were dying.

Our Pastor got up one Sunday and stated, that they deserved to die because they had rejected God many many moons ago....reading from the beginning of Romans.

I tell you, I was in shock and cut to the heart when I heard that.

This may not be all Calvinists, but how dare anyone say things like this.

Dorcas, Yes, in America it is a problem, because America is smug and self righteous anyway. The American Calvinists that is. Just by that statement above will tell you so. Stating How God has Blessed America, placing ourselves a somewhat better more righteous deserving sinner than those other horrible sinners from other countries. Yet if smug American Calvinists want to trace their roots back to the beginning of Romans, they might have something to ponder.

Actually, I did privately ask my Pastor that very thing.

I cut a picture out of the news paper of dying people, with these words:

Added/ Edited

Not sure who the author of this song is, but was popular at this same time. Some say there is controversy about the author being gay or something. Lets not go there, but put the words with the situation, as I did with the picture of the people in Africa.

Jesus said, Come to the water,
Stand by my side,
I know you are thirsty,
You won't be denied,
I felt every tear drop,
Where in darkness you hide,
and I came to remind you,
That for those tears I died.

Something happened to him that day. He opened his church to widows, orphans, divorced people, single mothers etc. And to this day has never regretted it.....also gives an invitation at the end of his sermons.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 19:10

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

Even the remotest urge to seek God comes from Him working in us. Left to our own devices, we would rather sin and hide from the light. That is why God saves men in spite of themselves by changing their hearts.

For instance, I can tell my cat, "if you open the food container, you may eat."

My cat cannot open it as it is an airtight container, and he would need thumbs to do so. But the truth of the matter is that if he could open it, he could eat.

Because I love him, I open it and scoop out food for him, because he cannot do it himself.

I know that examples have their limitations and aren't supposed to be exact illustrations of all aspects of what they illustrate, but in a way you have given a very wide loophole for the dreaded Arminians here.

Calvinism, taken to its logical conclusion, would say that the cat cannot even eat of its own volition, so you will have to eat the food for him!.

Quote:

-----God calls us to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, but man cannot do that on his own, because it is contrary to the nature of man to do so.

True, I agree.

But that doesn't make me a Calvinist :-P

Still trying to tease you out of that over serious attachment to a mere doctrinal system.

The Words that JESUS speaks to us are spirit and life, not our attempts to explain His written Word in terms of our human understanding!

in Him

Jeannette

Re: - posted by partofaplan, on: 2007/12/27 19:12

I think that this was a horrible thing for the pastor to say that they deserved to die. It is true that we all deserve hell. The true tragedy is that those in Africa who die everyday without the knowledge of Christ and his loving sacrifice to mankind. They will be going to hell, but how much more accountable are we for not taking the time to love them and tell them of Christ's sacrifice? That is what we should be remembering.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 19:18

Quote:

-----Calvinism, taken to its logical conclusion, would say that the cat cannot even eat of its own volition, so you will have to eat the food for him!.

That would be a misrepresentation of Calvinism though. To be more precise and true to Calvinism, I would change my cat's nature and enable him to feed himself.

Sister, it is funny because I am the last person to want the name Calvinist thrust upon me, and rather I would rather be called a Biblical Christian. But, I have put myself into this discussion as one, and for the continuation and ease of marking the parties involved, I will use the nick name.

Christ is our life, and He alone moment by moment sustains us and works in us that which is pleasing to our Father in Heaven.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/27 19:27

Hi everyone.

Katy-Did,

It may be small consolation but I wanted to say I'm sorry that happened to you, what the pastor said and how it felt.

Chris

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/12/27 20:02

Quote:

-----To be more precise and true to Calvinism, I would change my cat's nature and enable him to feed himself.

Well said.

Christ didn't actively choose for me. I was chosen in Him before the foundation of the world to receive a new nature, without which I would never have wanted anything besides my sin and self-righteousness. This new nature is like that of a newborn babe, which hungers after the milk of its mother. The new nature I received, in that same moment freed me to hunger and thirst after righteousness by faith.

All who are set free are free indeed!

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/12/27 20:11

Compliments wrote:

Quote:

-----He was once saved, no doubt about that.

Brother, what do you do with 1 John 2:19?

"They went out from us, but they **were not of us**; for if they had been of us, they would **no doubt** have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be **made manifest that they were not all of us.**"

I do not deny that your JW friend may have at one time experienced the external workings and strivings of the Holy Spirit, to the extent of making him aware of the truth of the gospel in Christ, but I can be almost certain that he did not receive adoption into the family of God, or else he would continue in the light. May God grant mercy to his soul.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 20:21

Quote:

-----The Words that JESUS speaks to us are spirit and life, not our attempts to explain His written Word in terms of our human understanding!

AMEN!!!

I know when Adam and Eve sinned, we lost our relationship with God, but we didn't lose our minds too.

(Well, maybe some did)

I think we forget that the Law is the Schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. The law Shows us our Sin and also shows us God's perfect Righteousness and Holiness.

God, knowing NO ONE could keep the law, as He proved through Israel, could ****now**** say...ALL have sinned and fallen short of the Glory of God.

And where sin abounded GRACE much more abounds.

Paul carefully clarifies that Grace does not mean you can sin and Grace will abound....it means rather UNlimited atonement, and whosoever will.

Interesting too, when we read the Gospels, they are written when Jesus spoke to Jews ..so the whosoever will was that Gentiles were to also be saved as well, as Paul so wonderfully brought the Gospel to the Gentiles, for the obedience of faith to ALL ****nations**** which is Gentiles, as Israel would be referred to as Tribes.

I have a dog, a blond Lab, and she is sooooo smart. She's not allowed to get on the sofa, and she knows it. When I leave the house, she gets up on the sofa, and when I come in the door, she slithers off hoping I won't see, and pretends she's sleeping on the floor. I don't even have to say a word...she knows. Must be her **conscience** bothering her to slither off that way.

Are we more than a dog or cat...gee I hope so!

Dogs and cats have a conscience, and emotions, but no soul. They are not created after the image of God. We are, and our lost relationship did not make us animals (well most of us anyway!) Added, however the fall of man affected all of creation , even dogs and cats.

The WHOLE council of God please. Many think God gave the Law to the Jews just so He could stick it to them in the end....not so! The Law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ BY FAITH, not by law.

Dr. Law diagnosis the illness (ONLY) and Dr. Grace applies the scalpel dealing with the Illness.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

;-)

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/12/27 20:24

Hebrews 6:4-6

For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, if they fall away to renew them again to repentance, since they crucify again for themselves the Son of God, and put Him to an open shame.

I am wondering because I do not know. How does Calvinism work with this verse? The writer says that it is impossible to renew once again after accepting, then falling away (paraphrase).

How can one fall away if they are predestined to be saved?

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 20:37

Brother,

This will be long, and I apologize for copying and pasting but I believe that this from A.W. Pink shades much light upon this text.

The whole of his Commentary on Hebrews may be found here-

(<http://www.pbministries.org/books/pink/Hebrews/hebrews.htm>) An Exposition of Hebrews

"For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened" etc. (verse 4). Here the apostle continues the digression which he began at Hebrews 5:11. The parenthesis has two divisions: the first, Hebrews 5:11-14 is reprehensible; the second, Hebrews 6:1-20 is hortatory. In chapter 6 he exhorts the Hebrews unto two duties: to progress in the Christian course (verses 1-11); to persevere therein (verses 12-20). The first exhortation is proposed in verses 1,2 and qualified in verse 3. The motive to obedience is drawn from the danger of apostasy (verses 4-6). The opening "For" of verse 4 intimates the close connection of our present passage with that which immediately precedes. It draws a conclusion from what the apostle had been saying in Hebrews 5:11-14. It amplifies the "if" in verse 3. It points a most solemn warning against their continuance in their present sloth. It draws a terrible contrast from the possibility of verse 3. "The apostle regards the retrogression of the Hebrews with dismay. He sees in it the danger of an entire, confirmed, wilful, and irrecoverable apostasy from the truth. He beholds them on the brink of a precipice, and he therefore lifts up his voice, and with vehement yet loving earnestness he warns them against so fearful an evil" (Adolph Saphir).

Three things claim our careful attention in coming closer to our passage: the persons here spoken of, the sin they committed, the doom pronounced upon them. In considering the persons spoken of it is of first importance to note that the apostle does not say, "us who were once enlightened", nor even "you", instead, he says "those". In sharp contrast from them, he says to the Hebrews, "Beloved, we are persuaded better things of you".

"Afterwards, when the apostle comes to declare his hope and persuasion concerning these Hebrews that they were not such as those whom he had before described, nor such as would fall away unto perdition, he doth it upon three grounds whereon they were differenced from them as: 1. That they had such things as did 'accompany salvation'; that is, such as salvation is inseparable from. None of these things therefore had he ascribed unto those whom he describeth in this place (verses 4-6); for if he had so done, they would not have been unto him an argument and evidence of a contrary end, that these should not fall away and perish as well as those. Wherefore he ascribes nothing to these here in the text that doth peculiarly 'accompany salvation'. 2. He describes them by their duties of obedience and fruits of faith. This was their 'work and labor of love' towards the name of God, verse 10. And hereby, also, doth he differentiate them from those in the text, concerning whom he supposeth that they may perish eternally, which these fruits of saving faith and sincere love cannot do. 3. He adds, that, in the preservation of those there mentioned, the faithfulness of God was concerned: 'God is not unrighteous to forget'. For they were such he intended as were interested in the covenant of grace, with respect whereunto alone there is any engagement on the faithfulness or righteousness of God to preserve men from apostasy and ruin; and there is so with an equal respect unto all who are so taken into the covenant. But of those in the text he supposeth no such thing; and thereupon doth not intimate that either the righteousness or faithfulness of God was anyway engaged for their preservation, but rather the contrary" (Dr. John Owen).

It is scarcely accurate to designate as "mere professors" those described in verses 4,5. They were a class who had enjoyed great privileges, beyond any such as now accompany the preaching of the Gospel. Those here portrayed are said to have had five advantages, which is in contrast from the six things enumerated in verses 1, 2, which things belong to man in the flesh, under Judaism. Five is the number of grace, and the blessings here mentioned pertain to the Christian dispensation. Yet were they not true Christians. This is evident from what is not said. Observe, they were not spoken of as God's elect, as those for whom Christ died, as those who were born of the Spirit. They are not said to be justified, forgiven, accepted in the Beloved. Nor is anything said of their faith, love, or obedience. Yet these are the very things which distinguish a real child of God. First, they had been "enlightened". The Sun of righteousness had shone with healing in His wings, and, as Matthew 4:16 says, "The people which sat in darkness saw great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up". Unlike the heathen, whom Christ, in the days of His flesh, visited not, those who came under the sound of His voice were wondrously and gloriously illumined.

The Greek word for "enlightened" here signifies "to give light or knowledge by teaching". It is so rendered by the Septuagint in Judges 13:8, 2 Kings 12:2, 17:27. The apostle Paul uses it for "to make manifest", or "bring to light" in 1 Corinthians 4:5, 2 Timothy 1:10. Satan blinds the minds of those who believe not, lest "the light of the gospel should shine unto them" (2 Cor. 4:4), that is, give the knowledge of it. Thus, "enlightened" here means to be instructed in the doctrine of the gospel, so as to have a clear apprehension of it. In the parallel passage in Hebrews 10:26 the same people are said to have

ave "received the knowledge of the truth", cf. also 2 Peter 2:20, 21. It is, however, only a natural knowledge of spiritual things, such as is acquired by outward hearing or reading; just as one may be enlightened by taking up the special study of one of the sciences. It falls far short of that spiritual enlightenment which transforms (2 Cor. 3:18). An illustration of an unregenerate person being "enlightened", as here, is found in the case of Balaam; Numbers 24:4.

Second, they had "tasted" of the heavenly gift. To "taste" is to have a personal experience of, in contrast from mere report. "Tasting does not include eating, much less digesting and turning into nourishment what is so tasted; for its nature being only thereby discerned it may be refused, yea, though we like its relish and savor, on some other consideration. The persons here described, then, are those who have to a certain degree understood and relished the revelation of mercy; like the stony-ground hearers they have received the Word with a transcendent joy" (John Owen). The "tasting" is in contrast from the "eating" of John 6:50-56.

Opinion is divided as to whether the "heavenly gift" refers to the Lord Jesus or the person of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps it is not possible for us to be dogmatic on the point. Really, the difference is without a distinction, for the Spirit is here to glorify Christ, as He came from the Father by Christ as His ascension "Gift" to His people. If the reference be to the Lord Jesus, John 3:16, 4:10, etc., would be pertinent references: if to the Holy Spirit, Acts 2:38, 8:20, 10:45, 11:17. Personally, we rather incline to the latter. This Divine Gift is here said to be "heavenly" because from Heaven, and leading to Heaven, in contrast from Judaism—cf. Acts 2:2, 1 Peter 1:12. Of this "Gift" these apostates had "tasted", or had an experience of: compare Matthew 27:34 where "tasting" is opposed to actual drinking. Those here in view had had an acquaintance with the Gospel, as to gain such a measure of its blessedness as to greatly aggravate their sin and doom. An illustration of this is found in Matthew 13:20, 21.

Third, they were "made partakers of the Holy Spirit". First, it should be pointed out that the Greek word for "partakers" here is a different one from that used in Colossians 1:12 and 2 Peter 1:4, where real Christians are in view. The word here simply means "companions", referring to what is external rather than internal. It is to be observed that this item is placed in the center of the five, and this because it describes the animating principle of the other four, which are all effects. These apostates had never been "born of the Spirit" (John 3:6), still less were their bodies His "temples" (1 Cor. 6:19). Nor do we believe this verse teaches that the Holy Spirit had, at any time, wrought within them, otherwise Philippians 1:6 would be contravened. It means that they had shared in the benefit of His supernatural operations and manifestations: "The place was shaken" (Acts 4:31) illustrates. We quote below from Dr. J. Brown:

"It is highly probable that the inspired writer refers primarily to the miraculous gifts and operations of the Holy Spirit by which the primitive dispensation of Christianity was administered. These gifts were by no means confined to those who were 'transformed by the renewing of their minds'. The words of our Lord in Matthew 7:22, 23 and of Paul in 1 Corinthians 13:1, 2 seem to intimate, that the possession of these unregenerate men was not very uncommon in that age; at any rate they plainly show that their possession and an unregenerate state were by no means incompatible".

Fourth, "And have tasted the good Word of God". "I understand by this expression the promise of God respecting the Messiah, the sum and substance of all. It deserves notice that this promise is by way of eminence termed by Jeremiah 'the good word' (Jer. 33:14). To 'taste', then, this 'good Word of God', is to experience that God has been faithful to His promise—to enjoy, so far as an unconverted man can enjoy the blessings and advantages which flow from that promise being fulfilled. To 'taste the good Word of God', seems, just to enjoy the advantages of the new dispensation" (Dr. J. Brown). Further confirmation that the apostle is here referring to that which these apostates had witnessed of the fulfillment of God's promise is obtained by comparing Jeremiah 29:10, "After seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform My good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place".

Observe how studiously the apostle still keeps to the word "taste", the better to enable us to identify them. They could not say with Jeremiah, "Thy words were found and I did eat them" (Jer. 15:16). "It is as though he said, I speak not of those who have received nourishment; but of such as have so far tasted it, as that they ought to have desired it as 'sincere milk' and grown thereby" (Dr. John Owen). A solemn example of one who merely "tasted" the good Word of God is found in Mark 6:20: "for Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly".

Fifth, "And the powers of the world to come," or "age to come." The reference here is to the new dispensation which was to be ushered in by Israel's Messiah according to Old Testament predictions. It corresponds with "these last days" of Hebrews 1:2, and is in contrast from the "time past" or Mosaic economy. Their Messiah was none other than the "mighty God" (Isa. 9), and wondrous and glorious, stupendous and unique, were His miraculous works. These "powers" of the new Age are mentioned in Hebrews 2:4, to our comments on which we would refer the reader. Of these mighty "powers" t

these apostates had "tasted", or had an experience of. They had been personal witnesses of the miracles of Christ, and also of the wonders that followed His ascension, when such glorious manifestations of the Spirit were given. Thus they were "without excuse". Convincing and conclusive evidence had been set before them, but there had been no answering faith in their hearts. A solemn example of this is found in John 11:47, 48.

"If they shall fall away". The Greek word here is very strong and emphatic, even stronger than the one used in Matthew 7:27, where it is said of the house built on the sand, "and great was the fall thereof". It is a complete falling away, a total abandonment of Christianity which is here in view. It is a wilful turning of the back on God's revealed truth, an utter repudiation of the Gospel. It is making "shipwreck of the faith" (1 Tim. 1:19). This terrible sin is not committed by a mere nominal professor, for he has nothing really to fall away from, save an empty name. The class here described are such as had had their minds enlightened, their consciences stirred, their affections moved to a considerable degree, and yet who were never brought from death unto life. Nor is it backsliding Christians who are in view. It is not simply "fall into sin", this or that sin. The greatest "sin" which a regenerated man can possibly commit is the personal denial of Christ: Peter was guilty of this, yet was he "renewed again unto repentance". It is the total renunciation of all the distinguishing truths and principles of Christianity, and this not secretly, but openly, which constitutes apostasy.

"If they shall fall away". "This is scarcely a fair translation. It has been said that the apostle did not here assert that such persons did or do 'fall away'; but that if they did—a supposition which, however, could never be realized—then the consequence would be they could not be 'renewed again unto repentance'. The words literally rendered are, 'And have fallen away', or, 'yet have fallen'. The apostle obviously intimates that such persons might, and that such persons did, 'fall away'. By 'falling away', we are plainly to understand what is commonly called apostasy. This does not consist in an occasional falling into actual sin, however gross and aggravated; nor in the renunciation of some of the principles of Christianity, even though those should be of considerable importance; but in an open, total, determined renunciation of all the constituent principles of Christianity, and a return to a false religion, such as that of unbelieving Jews or heathens, or to open infidelity and open godlessness" (Dr. J. Brown).

"It is impossible . . . if they fall away, to renew them again unto repentance". Four questions here call for answer. What is meant by "renewed unto repentance"? What is signified by "renewed again unto repentance"? Why is such an experience "impossible"? To whom is this "impossible"? Repentance signifies a change of mind: Matthew 21:29, Romans 11:29 establish this. It is more than a mental act, the conscience also being active, leading to contrition and self-condemnation (Job 42:6). In the unregenerate, it is simply the workings of nature; in the children of God it is wrought by the Holy Spirit. The latter is evangelical, being one of the things which "accompany salvation". The former is not so, being the "sorrow of the world", which "worketh death" (2 Cor. 7:10). This kind of "repentance" or remorse receives most solemn exemplification in the case of Judas: Matthew 27:3, 5. Such was the repentance of these apostates. The Greek verb for "renew" here occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. Probably "restore" had been better, for the same word is used in the Sept., and a Hebrews verb meaning to renew in the sense of restore: Psalm 103:5; 104:30; Lamentations 5:21. Josephus applies it to the renovation of the Temple!

But what is meant by "renewing unto repentance"? "To be 'renewed' is a figurative expression for denoting a change, a great change, and a change for the better. To be 'renewed' so as to change a person's mind is expressive of an important and advantageous alteration of opinion, and character and service. And such an alteration the persons referred to had undergone at a former period. They were once in a state of ignorance respecting the doctrines and evidences of Christianity, and they had been 'enlightened'. They had once known not of the excellency and beauty of Christian truth, and they had been made to 'taste of the heavenly gift'. They once misunderstood the prophecies respecting the Messiah, and were unaware of their fulfillment, and, of course, were strangers to that energetic influence which the New Testament revelation puts forth; and they had been made to see that that 'good word' was fulfilled, and had been made partakers of the external privileges and been subjected to the peculiar energies of the new order of things. Their view, and feelings, and circumstances, were materially changed. How great the difference between an ignorant, bigoted Jew, and the person described in the preceding passage! He had become as it were a different man. He had not, indeed, become, in the sense of the apostle, a 'new creature', His mind had not been so changed as unfeignedly to believe 'the truth as it is in Jesus'; but still, a great and so far as it went, a thorough change had taken place" (Dr. J. Brown).

Now it is impossible to "renew again unto repentance" those who have totally abandoned the Christian revelation. Some things are "impossible" with respect unto the nature of God, as that He cannot lie, or pardon sin without satisfaction to His justice. Other things which are possible to God's nature are rendered "impossible" by His decrees or purpose: see 1 Samuel 15:28, 29. Still other things are "possible" or "impossible" with respect to the rule or order of all things God has appointed. For example, there cannot be faith apart from hearing the Word (Rom. 10:13-17). "When in things of duty God hath neither expressed command thereon, nor appointed means for the performance of them, they are to be looked upon

n then as impossible ; and then, with respect unto us, they are so absolutely, and so to be esteemed. And this is the 'impossibility' here principally intended. It is a thing that God hath neither commanded us to endeavor, nor appointed means to attain it, nor promise to assist us in it. It is therefore that which we have no reason to look after, attempt, or expect, as being not possible by any law, rule, or constitution of God.

"The apostle instructs us no further in the nature of future events but as our own duty is concerned in them. It is not for us either to look or hope, or pray for, or endeavor the restoration of such persons unto repentance. God gives a law unto us in these things, not unto Himself. It may be possible with God, for aught we know, if there be not a contradiction in it unto any of the holy properties of His nature; only He will not have us to expect any such thing from Him, nor hath He appointed any means for us to endeavor it. What He shall do we ought trustfully to accept; but our own duty toward such persons is absolutely at an end. And indeed, they put themselves wholly out of our reach" (Dr. John Owen).

It needs to be carefully observed that in the whole of this passage from Hebrews 5:11 onwards the apostle is speaking of his own ministry. In God's hands, His servants are instruments by which He works and through whom He accomplishes His evangelical purpose. Thus Paul could properly say "I have begotten you through the gospel" (1 Cor. 4:15). And again, "My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you" (Gal. 4:19). So the servants of God had, through the preaching of the Gospel, "renewed unto repentance" those spoken of in Hebrews 6:4. But they had apostatised; they had totally repudiated the Gospel. It was therefore "impossible" for the servants of God to "renew them again unto repentance", for the all-sufficient reason that they had no other message to proclaim to them. They had no other Gospel in reserve, no further motives to present. Christ crucified had been set before them. Him they now denounced as an Imposter. There was "none other name" whereby they could be saved. Their public renunciation of Christ rendered their case hopeless so far as God's servants were concerned. "Let them alone" (Matthew 15:19) was now their order: compare Jude 22. Whether or not it was possible for God, consistently with His holiness, to shame them, our passage does not decide.

"Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh" (verse 6). This is brought in to show the aggravation of their awful crime and the impossibility of their being renewed again unto repentance. By renouncing their Christian profession they declared Christ to be an Imposter. Thus they were irreclaimable. To attempt any further reasoning with them, would only be casting pearls before swine. With this verse should be carefully compared the parallel passage in Hebrews 10:26-29. These apostates had "received the knowledge of the truth", though not a saving knowledge of it. Afterward they sinned "wilfully": there was a deliberate and open disavowal of the truth. The nature of their particular sin is termed a "treading under foot the Son of God (something which no real Christian ever does) and counting (esteeming) the blood of the covenant an unholy thing", that is, looking upon the One who hung on the Cross as a common malefactor. For such there "remaineth no more sacrifice for sins". Their case is hopeless so far as man is concerned; and the writer believes, such are abandoned by God also.

"Seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame". "They thus identify themselves with His crucifiers—they entertained and avowed sentiments which were He on earth and in their power, would induce them to crucify Him. They exposed Him to infamy, made a public example of Him. They did more to dishonor Jesus Christ than His murderers did. They never professed to acknowledge His divine mission; but these apostates had made such a profession—they had made a kind of trial of Christianity, and, after trial, had rejected it" (Dr. J. Brown).

Such a warning was needed and well calculated to stir up the slothful Hebrews. Under the Old Testament economy, by means of types and prophecies, they had obtained glimmerings of truth as to Christ, called "the word of the beginning of Christ". Under those shadows and glimmerings they had been reared, not knowing their full import till they had been blessed with the full light of the Gospel, here called "perfection". The danger to which they were exposed was that of receding from the ground where Christianity placed them, and relaxing to Judaism. To do so meant to re-enter that House which Christ had left "desolate" (Matthew 23:38), and would be to join forces with His murderers, and thus "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh", and by their apostasy "put Him to an open (public) shame". We may add that the Greek word here for "crucify" is a stronger one than is generally used: it means to "crucify up". Attention is thus directed to the erection of the cross on which the Savior was held up to public scorn.

Taking the passage as a whole, it needs to be remembered that all who had professed to receive the Gospel were not born of God: the parable of the Sower shows that. Intelligence might be informed, conscience searched, natural affections stirred, and yet there be "no root" in them. All is not gold that glitters. There has always been a "mixt multitude" (Ex. 12:38) who accompany the people of God. Moreover, there is in the real Christian the old heart, which is "deceitful above all things and desperately wicked", and therefore is he in constant need of faithful warning. Such, God has given in every dispensation: Genesis 2:17; Leviticus 26:15, 16; Matthew 3:8; Romans 11:21; 1 Corinthians 10:12.

Finally, let it be said that while Scripture speaks plainly and positively of the perseverance of the saints, yet it is a perseverance of saints, not unregenerate professors. Divine preservation is not only in a safe state, but also in a holy course of disposition and conduct. We are "kept by the power of God through faith". We are kept by the Spirit working in us a spirit of entire dependency, renouncing our own wisdom and strength. The only place from which we cannot fall is one down in the dust. It is there the Lord brings His own people, weaning them from all confidence in the flesh, and giving them to experience that it is when they are weak they are strong. Such, and such only, are saved and safe forever.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 20:42

Quote:

-----How can one fall away if they are predestined to be saved?

Well, the way I see this is there is no such thing as getting saved and lost and saved and lost like some people claim they got Saved Again after they lost their salvation years ago. Hum!

It says you can't get re-saved period.

However it does bring up a very good point. Who is doing the convicting? The Holy Spirit Correct. So, first comes the Holy Spirit, who convicts of sin, then REPENTANCE comes NEXT.

I do remember the story of John Mark. He started with Paul and Barnabas, and went back into the world....repented and returned, of which caused a division in the friendship of Paul and Barnabas. In the end John Mark was highly praised by Paul and was with him to nearly his time of death.

And don't forget the Prodigal son.

So we need to be very careful about these verses. You either are saved or you are not, and that evidence will show.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/12/27 20:47

To my sister, LittleGift, and all who will discuss these things for edification and love of the truth...

Great hymn, eh? I love it, too.

You have to put into perspective that Cowper was thoroughly "Calvinist", or as he might put it, a 'believer in free grace', which affected his writing significantly.

"And sinners plunged beneath that flood lose all their guilty stains."

Cowper saw the divine act of regeneration as one of irresistible power. God's grace sweeps upon the soul turning beast into man, freeing him not only to choose Christ, but from that which would prevent his from choosing Christ. The man is then willing to lay hands upon the Lamb for forgiveness. In this sense the sinner does not plunge himself, but is rather plunged beneath the flood of Christ's healing fountain.

"Till all the ransomed church of God be saved, to sin no more."

Again, Cowper was writing from his view of the atonement. The death of Jesus made a real and effective atonement for all of God's chosen people, purchasing by a real ransom all that would be reclaimed throughout the age to come. This is the doctrine sometimes called "limited atonement", but better phrased, "effective redemption." It is the belief that like the pascal lamb which was slain once a year for the sins of Israel alone, so Christ was once offered for the sins of many, even so many as will believe in Him.

Again, who are those who were ransomed? Those who will believe. But who believes? Only those who come. Who com

es? No man comes to Christ, except the Father draws him, and Christ shall raise him up again on the last day. All who come were called AND justified AND glorified, so far as the sovereign decree of God is concerned. These are not things that may happen if a man fulfills certain conditions, but will without doubt happen. God's sovereign act is our only hope of fulfilling the means appointed to the end.

Romans 8:29-30

"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. 30 Moreover **whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.**"

"Lord, I believe Thou hast prepared, unworthy though I be, For me a blood bought free reward, a golden harp for me!"

Once again, Cowper sees salvation as a gift purchased on the cross for a people chosen according to grace in Christ. The gift was bought by Christ's blood. It is freely given, that is, it is given to whom God has chosen to give it too, without regard for their person.

My dear sister, and all others reading, I do not hold to these doctrines out of thirst for contention. How can I receive a spirit of strife from the things which give me peace? These doctrines assure me that God is indeed God. His will is free, and ours is ever contingent. The only free will is one not bound in time or finitude.

I see these doctrines on every page of scripture, and you will say the same of yours.

These are not light issues. If that were so, we must call many of our heroes fools for drawing lines on these points. We do better to listen, pray, and bear one another with goodwill.

May His grace be upon you, as I too desperately need it.

Your brother, Mike:.

Re: - posted by Miccah (), on: 2007/12/27 20:55

Thank you for the link Roaringlamb, I will look it over tonight when I have more time.

Katy-did wrote:

Quote:

-----So we need to be very careful about these verses. You either are saved or you are not, and that evidence will show.

Thanks for replying. As always, I appreciate your passion.

I agree 100% that one is either saved or not, no question. But what is this verse about then? What do you feel it is about? Again, I do not know how this would relate to Calvinism, thus the questions.

I wish to be careful when speaking and studying scripture, but scripture is hard to contradict, and this scripture seems pretty straight forward to me. I take it as a warning to those on the fence of flesh and spirit, like all of us.

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2007/12/27 20:59

Brother Mike,

Cowper is one of my favorite hymn writers(along with Augustus Toplady). He also suffered from horrible depression which is probably why he could pen such wondrous words.

Here are a couple of my favorites-

1.O for a closer walk with God,
A calm and heavenly frame;
A light to shine upon the road Â–
That leads me to the Lamb!

2.What peaceful hours I once enjoyed!
How sweet their memory still!
But they have left an aching void Â–
The world can never fill.

3.Return, O Holy Dove, return
Sweet messenger of rest;
I hate the sins that made thee mourn,
And drove Thee from my breast.

4.The dearest idol I have known,
What eÂ’re that idol be,
Help me to tear it from Thy Throne,
And worship only Thee.

5.So shall my walk be close with God,
Calm and serene my frame;
So purer light shall mark the road Â–
That leads me to the lamb.
-William Cowper

Light shining out of Darkness

God moves in a mysterious way,
His wonders to perform;
He plants his footsteps in the sea,
And rides upon the storm.

Deep in unfathomable mines
Of never-failing skill,
He treasures up his bright designs,
And works his sov’reign will.

Ye fearful saints, fresh courage take,
The clouds ye so much dread
Are big with mercy, and shall break
In blessings on your head.

Judge not the Lord by feeble sense,
But trust him for his grace;
Behind a frowning providence
He hides a smiling face.

His purposes will ripen fast,
Unfolding ev’ry hour;
The bud may have a bitter taste,

But sweet will be the flow'r.

Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan his work in vain;
God is his own interpreter,
And he will make it plain.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/27 21:01

Hi Patrick :-)

Quote:
-----there are some who say Luther died of syphilis, and simply propagate the lie so that people will remain enslaved to the Roman Church.

This is not impossible. :-o It was not always a sexually transmitted disease and it was endemic - like we always have c
olds and other infections being transmitted by droplet inhalation.

Quote:
-----The retreat is the default reaction of our natural birth. We like Adam and Eve would rather hide and accuse others than admit to our sin.

In this statement, you are effectively rejecting John's declaration that simply by believing, we show ourselves accepting of the light.

Quote:
-----We cannot even understand that we have sinned against God until a new nature is instilled within us.

I've heard you say this before, but... again, it is unscriptural.

Paul says the goodness of God leads people to repentance... that the homosexual (that is, one who has made a lifestyle choice to embrace sin, the lie and darkness, whose mind has been given over by God to strong delusion, whose conscience has been seared as with a hot iron) is without excuse - whether Jewish or Greek. Now we know that not everyone is approaching God from this disadvantageous stance, but Paul clearly says the goodness of God leads these men (women implied) to repentance.

By 'default', this gives the ordinary sinner a better-than-reasonable-hope-of-faith when presented with Jesus Christ Himself.

Think of the prodigal son, who was far away from his father when he determined that he would return with the words on his lips 'I have sinned against God'. I know you're going to tell me he'd had a change of heart... but he had not been forgiven at this point and he certainly was not about to be born again even when he reached home. His change of heart had been based on his realisation of having sinned against his father and God, and his action to return was based on the hope of being accepted as a servant.

I don't know how you can keep hanging on to this idea about faith being dependent on new birth, when all the patriarchs had their faith counted for righteousness, and are *never* going to be born again.

Quote:
-----Faith is a result of the new birth and not the cause of it. Repentance also is a fruit of the new birth and not what ushers it in. I believe this is where you and I will have the most separation(maybe not, who knows :))

You are correct in your assessment. Not because you claim your beliefs are 'Calvinism' but because they are unsupported from the breadth of scripture - particularly the typology and examples under the Old Covenant era (including the prodigal son).

I agree that repentance follows upon faith - or there is no coming to God at all. But it cannot be dependent upon new birth, as setting oneself aside unto God is a result of recognising one's sinfulness. And God endorses that recognition by accepting the repentance (which followed faith) and upon confession of Jesus Christ come in the flesh, His death and resurrection, the Father can send the Holy Spirit to bring the believer into sonship by adoption, whereby now he cries 'Abba'. There is no way God can give the spirit of adoption first, before the person has believed.

You appear to have made up your own definition of new birth (or a whole section of the church has made a bid for its own private interpretation) and you (all) are ignoring the mountains of information in the Old Testament about faith (which never led to new birth), repentance (which never led to new birth), forgiveness (apart from new birth), obedience (without the indwelling spirit), and worship (which was available apart from new birth) - long before Christ appeared.

This wealth of examples wherein God's blessing was experienced by many, completely undermines your thesis. Faith is one commodity which has never changed, which existed from eternity. You cannot hijack it like this, and expect to retain intellectual credibility.

Going back to Paul's thesis in Romans for a second, I fully accept that when he was writing, the final Atonement had been made, and God had already committed the ministry of reconciliation to the apostles. But that is where they began.

Look at the end of 2 Cor 5. Their invitation is to the people to be reconciled to God, because He has not held their sin against them, having laid it on Jesus *already*. He is telling them to turn to God. Acts 17 'but now commands all men everywhere to repent'. These guys had not quite heard about the resurrection, but they were about to, and that the first person back from the dead (Jesus) would judge their response when they died.

This raises another interesting exhortation from Jesus during His story of Lazarus and the rich man. He said: They have Moses and the prophets; let them believe them. If one rise from the dead they will not suddenly start believing because of it.

Now you may feel this last point plays into your hands, but all Jesus is saying is that there is so much evidence of God in their history, and word of God in their writings, that they are without excuse if they do not believe already. So.... here was another entire family who Jesus Himself said had enough information about God and righteousness, to be prevented from going to hell, again.... long before the first 'new birth'.

Quote:

-----So men will not come to the light because they are blind, and don't even want their eyes opened.

So how do you account for the blind men that don't fit this category, who were still blind when they encountered Jesus and received sight from Him? They weren't born again either ;-)

Quote:

-----That is why it is so amazing that God gives us all He requires, and Christ has perfectly fulfilled the Law and its demands for us as well.

Lets take this in two parts. Why would it be amazing that God gives us all He requires. This is not in doubt. What you are claiming for your faith, is a string of events placed in a perverse order (by someone), bearing no resemblance to ... yard upon yard of scripture which is at variance to that *order* of events. I am familiar with *waterfalls* - like a line of dominoes falling one onto the next and so on. The order you offer doesn't connect effectively.

'and Christ has perfectly fulfilled the Law and its demands for us as well.' I know. This is awesome and it blows our minds. :-D Amen. I know God is bringing you through to an even greater knowledge of Himself. God knows what He's done for you, and what He's doing, and I hope you will continue to look for the parallels in scripture, and see where your experience agrees with scripture - rather than taking terms like 'faith' and 'new birth' and redefining them beyond anything which is in the Book.

Quote:

-----but they also cannot come unless God gives them the ability to come.

Again I refer to John's gospel, and his statement about the Light which lights every man who comes into the world. It sounds as if you dispute this verse as well (1:9) by making it sound as if God picks and chooses between who will get the Light or not. But John says 'every man'.

'Whosoever will may come, but only those whom God enables will come.' Isn't this an oxymoron? Doesn't it make your head *hurt*? (I'm absolutely serious! :-?)

Quote:
-----Thus they must be re-born and receive a new nature, they must have their eyes opened, their ears opened, the chains removed etc.
. But only God can do that.

Yes I can agree in a general way with this statement. But, a baby can hear from within the womb - can learn to recognise voices. True, it cannot see anything because of the dark and not much but shadows after it is born, but the light is working to enable the brain to develop the ability to tune into better visual focus as soon as possible.

Coming out of the womb is like coming out of prison, or having chains removed. But once you move the picture from the natural to the spiritual, God is free to work in any order He chooses. And if He says a person must believe as a prerequisite for approaching Him, no-one can alter that decree to 'must be born again' first. Can you see what I'm getting at here?

Quote:
-----The Biblical description of men is that they are dead, blind, deaf, slaves to Satan, enemies of God. They cannot change this as they are this by birth.

OK. But, all babies go through a period of gestation, prior to birth, and this is where your theology stops making sense - mostly by the claim that the birth must precede the work which would go on *in the metaphorical womb*. Even God cannot do. This is how He fixed things, because it tells us about Himself, and the pattern is littered around creation like confetti. Our most intelligent attention should be given to catch up with Him, and try to tune our understanding into what He can show us through nature.

The more I consider it, nature is His grand statement of 'I AM' in bold capitals 24/7 which we can use in many different ways to establish both for ourselves, and in the hearing of others, His sovereignty. But then we have to accept what the New Testament teaches us - that man makes conscious choices many times in respect of accepting His revelation of Himself, or rejecting it, without His 'doing' anything more than simply 'being'.

Well, that's more ramblings for you, but they are all in real earnest. Sorry, you probably feel as if you've read a book today, and I guess you've heard all these arguments already, also...

Re: New Calvinist song, on: 2007/12/27 21:07

theopenlife said

Quote:
-----This new nature is like that of a newborn babe, which hungers after the milk of its mother. The new nature I received, in that same moment freed me to hunger and thirst after righteousness by faith.

All who are set free are free indeed!

The fact of the effect of new birth is not under discussion really. No-one is 'born' without warning. In spiritual terms the process may be speeded up to the length of a short conversation before delivery, but to imply that the birth comes before everything else, doesn't make sense. And I believe the preparation may well be unconscious to the person who turns to Christ; but I don't believe there was no process.

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 21:22

Quote:

-----Again, I do not know how this would relate to Calvinism, thus the questions.

Micah, in understanding Hebrews, it is a well thought out foundation of truth. Chapter comes after chapters 3&4, and there is where you will find your answer.

Keeping the author of Hebrews in mind, and what is being said, not jumping from one scatterbrained thought to another, but very very excellently (The Holy Spirit is So Great here) places this whole teaching in order of truth. These were Jews still sitting on the fence, not sure if they could abandon the old way of the faith for Grace + nothing.

The Children of Israel who didn't go into the Promise land.. Why? Didn't they taste of the Holy Spirit? Manna..was a miracle...the Shekinah Glory over the Camp. The Serpent lifted and anyone looking would be healed of Leprosy. Moses struck a rock and water came out....the Red Sea parted ...all of this....they certainly did taste of the Holy Spirit....yet God did not let them go into the Promise land. Read Chapters 3 & 4 again and go back to Exodus too. Was not the Holy Spirit there as well????

These verses do not say indwelt with the Holy Spirit and that is where we need to understand this is connected to all of what the Author of Hebrews is teaching.

To us today....

The Jordan represents the Cross, and the Promise land Jesus Christ Himself in the Church age..it is parallel to Ephesians, our Heavenly Promise Land is Jesus Christ.

Many can be drawn to the Lord and just flat out refuse to cross that Jordan...they come right to the cross, and just gaze up at it, and never identify with it. or say like they did,,,oh we can't go over, there are giants in the land. They didn't have faith in God that what He promised them...this Promise Land...He was going to see it through.

But read verse 9 of Hebrews 6....see the word **Better** there...something that ***better accompanies salvation***....that is the New Covenant of the indwelling Holy Spirit..."I will put my Spirit in you and cause you to walk in my statutes etc".

Chapter 10 goes even deeper....our identification with Jesus Christ in death and resurrection life....the New and Living way, through the veil, that is to say His flesh...I am Crucified WITH Christ. This is the Gospel!

Hope that helps.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re:, on: 2007/12/27 21:40

Quote:

-----Again, I do not know how this would relate to Calvinism, thus the questions.

Oh I forgot to end this.....now a Calvinist would say God just drop-kicked you over the Jordan whether you wanted to be there or not.

Hebrews teaches quite a different Gospel.

Also note ALL came out of Egypt under the Blood, however ALL did not go into the Promise Land who came out.

Jesus died for the sin of the whole world, however again, the whole world will not receive the Free Gift of salvation. The Promise land was a Gift...all they had to do is receive it and take it.

No one is saved and still in the desert. Exodus says, they died IN THEIR SINS in the desert.

Must get some sleep now.
God Bless
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2007/12/28 2:46

hi, for the most part these over simplified points sound like two children on each side of a door looking up at a sign arguing if its an entrance or an exit. its a doorway. jimp

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 6:20

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:

Years ago, attending a Calvinist Church, (this would be during the 80's) and there was a horrible famine going on in Africa. Remember, no water, and people were dying.

Our Pastor got up one Sunday and stated, that they deserved to die because they had rejected God many many moons ago...reading from the beginning of Romans.

I tell you, I was in shock and cut to the heart when I heard that.

This may not be all Calvinists, but how dare anyone say things like this.

Dorcas, Yes, in America it is a problem, because America is smug and self righteous anyway. The American Calvinists that is. Just by that statement above will tell you so. Stating How God has Blessed America, placing ourselves a somewhat better more righteous deserving sinner than those other horrible sinners from other countries. Yet if smug American Calvinists want to trace their roots back to the beginning of Romans, they might have something to ponder.

Actually, I did privately ask my Pastor that very thing.

I cut a picture out of the news paper of dying people, with these words:

Added/ Edited

Not sure who the author of this song is, but was popular at this same time. Some say there is controversy about the author being gay or something. Lets not go there, but put the words with the situation, as I did with the picture of the people in Africa.

Jesus said, Come to the water,
Stand by my side,
I know you are thirsty,
You won't be denied,
I felt every tear drop,
Where in darkness you hide,
and I came to remind you,
That for those tears I died.

Something happened to him that day. He opened his church to widows, orphans, divorced people, single mothers etc. And to this day has never regretted it.....also gives an invitation at the end of his sermons.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Hi Katy

That was such a terrible thing! Really shows the harm in taking any doctrine to its extreme logical conclusion. The truth of doctrines becomes false if misused in this way, as we must all agree. Extreme Armenianism would be the same, with no possibility of assurance of salvation, and endless striving to please God, instead of trusting in Christ's finished work.

..

Islam also teaches that everyone is predestined to heaven or hell from birth. Of course there is no assurance of salvation either, so it is a doubly false and barren belief. Hinduism, with its concept of *karma*, is even worse, because it actively condones neglect of those who suffer, because it's seen as the result of sin in a previous life.

But Katy, surely it was worth the shock and pain on that occasion, to see the pastor repent and begin to live and preach more nearly according to Truth! Wow! All because you had the courage to approach him on the matter, and he the humility to listen!

In the end it is our *actions*, not our doctrines, that confirm if we really believe. As the Epistle of James shows.

Again, I'm sure all would agree...

in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 6:34

Quote:

roaringlamb wrote:

Quote:
-----Calvinism, taken to its logical conclusion, would say that the cat cannot even eat of its own volition, so you will have to eat the food for him!

That would be a misrepresentation of Calvinism though. To be more precise and true to Calvinism, I would change my cat's nature and enable him to feed himself.

Touche, you got me there!!! :-D

You are right, but there still has to be an element of free will, however small. God wouldn't be a just God if He condemned us for something that we couldn't help, like being unable to receive His saving grace.

Quote:
-----Sister, it is funny because I am the last person to want the name Calvinist thrust upon me, and rather I would rather be called a Biblical Christian. But, I have put myself into this discussion as one, and for the continuation and ease of marking the parties involved, I will use the nickname.

I suppose it's a convenient handle, as long as we all understand what the label means. But this discussion is mainly about whether, or to what extent, Calvinism *is* Biblical. Which means that your claim to be a Biblical Christian is not yet proven :-P

Quote:
-----Christ is our life, and He alone moment by moment sustains us and works in us that which is pleasing to our Father in Heaven.

AMEN! Again we agree. But that still doesn't disprove we have some free will in *receiving* this grace. Otherwise how could it ever be possible to "fail of the grace of God" (Heb 12:15) - even temporarily?

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 6:42

Quote:

theopenlife wrote:

Quote:

-----To be more precise and true to Calvinism, I would change my cat's nature and enable him to feed himself.

Well said.

Christ didn't actively choose for me. I was chosen in Him before the foundation of the world to receive a new nature, without which I would never have wanted anything besides my sin and self-righteousness. This new nature is like that of a newborn babe, which hungers after the milk of it's mother. The new nature I received, in that same moment freed me to hunger and thirst after righteousness by faith.

All who are set free are free indeed!

AMEN!!!

Michael, you have a way of putting things that makes me think you aren't that much of a Calvinist after all - or at least far from hard-line! :-P

Soon after coming to the Lord (while in college) I was plunged into the fellowship of an almost 100% hard-line Calvinist Christian Union. Anyone expressing even slightly "Armenian" views would have been verbally squashed at once!

It took a few years to come to realise that there are other possible interpretations of Scripture besides the Calvinist one.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 6:44

Quote:

hmmhmm wrote:

There's a t-shirt that you can buy online that I think explains it pretty well. On the front it says 'Arminianism: I Chose this T-shirt' and on the back it says 'Calvanism: This T-shirt Chose me.'

that made me laugh

:lol:

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 6:58

Quote:

iansmith wrote:

Compliments,

If you go back and read earlier verses I have been arguing for balance since the beginning. I would say that I'm 50/50 on the Arminian/Calvanistic thing, both models work, and each one works better in some settings than others. All scripture is profitable, we just need to know what setting to use it in.

I do not dismiss the verse you have brought up, and I think I said earlier that it is a mystery how apparently contradictory verses work together. I'm just saying that RoaringLamb's accusations that Arminians are simply re-packaged catholics is wrong, misguided and uninformed. He's the one who picked the side, I was happy walking the narrow road between the sides.

Amen, Ian! Although I would prefer to say that I'm neither Armenian nor Calvinist, *nor* 50% of both...

Why don't folks get it? You can't put Biblical doctrines into neat little pigeon-holes - they keep spilling out and overflowing into each other. Simply because the written Word of God speaks of truths that our minds can only hold part of.

The well-known illustration of the Flatlanders has been mentioned before. The spiritual and eternal are another dime

nasion, that our minds can't fully grasp. We grasp just enough to enable us to hold to the basic facts, such as in 1Corinthians 15, so as to recognise gross heresy.

3 For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

4 And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures:

The rest is spiritually discerned...

1Cor 2:

14 But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 7:05

Quote:

Micah wrote:

Hebrews 6:4-6

For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and have become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, if they fall away to renew them again to repentance, since they crucify again for themselves the Son of God, and put Him to an open shame.

I am wondering because I do not know. How does Calvinism work with this verse? The writer says that it is impossible to renew once again after accepting, then falling away (paraphrase).

How can one fall away if they are predestined to be saved?

I know, Christiaan, that is one of the verses that show that Calvinism isn't a watertight doctrine, but that there are "exceptions to the rule".

But you won't convince anyone: Scriptures can always be interpreted in a different way which doesn't disturb a fixed belief...

Blessings

Jeannette

Re: Another good Calvinist hymn, on: 2007/12/28 7:18

Thanks for the exposition of "There is a fountain filled with blood" Michael.

...This to me is a more typical "Calvinist" hymn, we used to sing it a lot in College, and I love this one too!

*A debtor to mercy alone, of covenant mercy I sing;
Nor fear, with Thy righteousness on, my person and off'ring to bring.
The terrors of law and of God with me can have nothing to do;
My Savior's obedience and blood hide all my transgressions from view.*

*The work which His goodness began, the arm of His strength will complete;
His promise is Yea and Amen, and never was forfeited yet.
Things future, nor things that are now, nor all things below or above,
Can make Him His purpose forgo, or sever my soul from His love.*

My name from the palms of His hands eternity will not erase;

General Topics :: New Calvinistic song

*Impressed on His heart it remains, in marks of indelible grace.
Yes, I to the end shall endure, as sure as the earnest is giv'g;
More happy, but not more secure, the glorified spirits in Heav'n.*

AMEN and AMEN!!

The only thing I don't like about it is :

Quote:

-----My Savior's obedience and blood hide all my transgressions from view.

His blood does far, far more than merely *hide* our transgressions!

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 7:23

Quote:

jimp wrote:

hi, for the most part these over simplified points sound like two children on each side of a door looking up at a sign arguing if its an entrance or an exit. its a doorway. jimp

HAHAHA :lol: Good one Jimp

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/28 7:31

For any of those of you who do not know, my name freecd has absolutely NOTHING to do with any of my beliefs.

I named myself freecd because of the free revival and holiness files I give away at www.freerevivalcd.com

I hope this clears things up.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/28 8:21

Hi Jeannete,

I saw something mentioned about God's justice a bit back. It seems to be something that comes up in these discussions.

In my own meditations on this subject, two things which I've thought upon are these:

what it is that man lost from the garden

and what we became liable to **as a result**.

Take care for now,

Chris

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 11:26

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Hi Jeannete,

I saw something mentioned about God's justice a bit back. It seems to be something that comes up in these discussions.

In my own meditations on this subject, two things which I've thought upon are these:

what it is that man lost from the garden

and what we became liable to **as a result**.

Interesting!

Have to go soon, have spent hours here today, but this deserves thinking about!

Quote:

-----"what it is that man lost from the garden?"

His free will and right of choice; the freedom to choose to trust and obey God, and walk with Him. Except he didn't lose it, he gave it away!

Quote:

-----and what we became liable to **as a result**

We no longer have power to obey God, and are liable to sin and the effects of sin, and separation from God. Therefore we are under condemnation and subject to His wrath...

Is this more or less the answer you were expecting? Only a few thoughts that came as a result of your questions, no doubt there's more to it than that.

So that means that salvation restores the *ability* to choose good, to obey God?
Which must mean that we can still *choose* to subject ourselves afresh to Satan?

But more than that, salvation/= the new birth gives the actual nature of Christ, so we don't want to disobey God any more. His life in us gives both the desire and the power to resist temptation, as Adam couldn't, or wouldn't, do...

in Him

Jeannette

Re: paradise lost, responsibility gained? - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/28 13:57

Hi again Jeannette and thank you for the response :-)

I hope it will be alright if I do not respond directly to the things you suggested, at least not right away. The reason is I had something specific in mind and was hoping to look at that in particular.

I was thinking of all of this in regards to our asking how can God hold us accountable to do things that we cannot perform, and this be just.

So I was thinking of these things in that context.

What do you think, is there anything that we may have lost that would have made us accountable to do things we cannot render or attain?

Let me know what you think,

Chris

Re:, on: 2007/12/28 14:50

As I said before I am Calvinistic to a degree. I was telling my Mother yesterday saying, "One thing that I hope that I will begin to know and that is that I am saved".

It would be great to know that with full assurance of faith, but when you sin, you don't sense that belonging.

Though I agree with Calvinism or I should say I agree with the Bible when it speaks of predestination, but to say that I am saved, your guess is as good as mine. My problem is not the bible, my problem is a matter of believing that He has cleansed me from all unrighteousness. When I think of past sins I think of the foolish decisions that I have made, even though the LORD has forgiven me, I am having a hard time forgiving myself. The people that I have wronged and the wickedness of my actions towards them, I literally hang my head in shame. When I see them, I go thru the same ritual I did the last time I saw them, "Will you forgive me". Their answer is always, "I have forgiven you, don't let it bother you".

When Calvinist sin, do they still believe that they are saved no matter what? If you died in a backslidden condition, the wages of sin is death, is heaven awaiting for him or is hell?

Re: wha it is that man lost - posted by broclint (), on: 2007/12/28 15:20

This thread is truly amazing!!

It demonstrates the utter futility and foolishness to which people can go to defend a "position" rather than to merely take what the Word of God says and be done with it.

Why all this conjecture about what was lost? Instead of simply taking what God said they lost?

Instead you have come to an impossible "position" here: Quote:

"what it is that man lost from the garden?"

His free will and right of choice; the freedom to choose to trust and obey God, and walk with Him. Except he didn't lose it, he gave it away!

And now we have Moses, Joshua, Elijah and all the prophets calling men to choose to trust and obey God and they "lost this in the Garden"... So they were calling for impossibilities?

What an awful accusation against the Holy and Righteous God who commanded these men to call men to a choice that was impossible to make!

Why not just take what God says period rather than all these pulling scripture from here there and everywhere to defend what?!!

This thread like so many more, (like dear Annie said in another thread regarding the things that will divide folks on this site) that goes on and on ad infinitum between free will and predestination is one of those arguments, and I do mean arguments, that will never be settled in this life, so what my dear folks is the point? It does not unite, it does not edify, it only DIVIDES.

If you are one of the ELECT, then thank God. If you can make choices, CHOOSE you this day to serve the LORD Jesus Christ with all your soul, body, mind and strength...

Job 6:25 - 26 (KJV) 25How forcible are right words! but what doth your arguing reprove? 26Do ye imagine to reprove words, and the speeches of one that is desperate, which are as wind?

For those seeking to be saved, or to be encouraged or to find fellowship, or who are desperately seeking to find God, will they find it in endless discussions of this sort?

God bless all of you and each of you...

As I said in an earlier post, quoting the late Vance Havner, "let's just be Christians".

We can, and I certainly include myself in the number, "yes but..." till it doesn't matter anymore, because the cry of midnight will have gone out, and it is all over.-o

In and for the Love of Christ and His Church,

Clint

Edit:

Sorry after posting this that I did... sounds far too preachy... I know that there is plenty of good humor and plenty of openness in this thread... my response, I suppose, is just that over and over again in thread after thread for all these months of reading them before I ever posted the first time... this one has been stated and restated... It would be a tragedy to take any of the idiosyncrasies of some of these great men of God in the past that accomplished being used of God to bring souls into the kingdom and throw away their labor because it does not all fit into our mould... and I believe that has already been stated :-)

Surely hope no one tries to pigeonhole me because I don't agree on every point of their doctrine... He is able to make His servant stand... He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him... He is able to complete that which is started...

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/28 19:19

Hi brother Clint,

I don't normally like these discussions either but I think there could be something fruitfull in the question that Jeanette and I were looking at. I don't want to promote conjecture either, or promote debate, or defend either of these sides.

But I do think there is something profitable for us in this question, by itself.

Thanks,

Chris

Re: New Calvinist song, on: 2007/12/29 1:11

Hi ChrisJD,

I want to use a broader brush than Jeannette. She mentioned various freedoms.

I would say simply, Adam lost fellowship with God (and the freedoms which pertain to that relationship) and therefore man had to be restrained some other way... hence, work and certain bondages for both him and his wife which directly reflect the errors into which they had fallen in the Garden.

(Later, after the near destruction of the human race, this is narrowed down to a closer obedience to His word through Abraham, and later still, a whole regime of laws through Moses.

By this time, God is using these devices to leave a clear message in the psyche of mankind of both His existence and will.)

Now, I said Adam lost fellowship with God. It is clear he did not lose all communication... but, he lost *communion*.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/29 3:13

Dorcas, just in case you missed this also, am thinking of this question of what was lost in the context of why God might require things of us that we cannot render.

Anything else come to mind?

Re: - posted by theopenlife, on: 2007/12/29 3:45

To everyone:

Thank you for an engaging and good-spirited thread on such a difficult and important subject. For those who do not see the importance, I can only say that I once did not either. Let us continue to speak in love, this thread has been useful to me and I thank you all.

Compliments wrote:

Quote:

-----When Calvinist sin, do they still believe that they are saved no matter what?

Well, I am a so-called Calvinist, and while I cannot speak for all of us, I will tell you my view on this subject.

Whenever I sin, I am certain that all of God's elect shall persevere in faith by His grace until the end. Whenever I sin, I am confident that He who began the work in His elect shall finish it in one-hundred percent of them. Whenever I sin, I know that none of His children are ever lost, if first they were brought to salvation in Him.

What none of this knowledge can do is assure me that I am personally a part of the elect.

This is the difference between the doctrines of perseverance and assurance. While I am certain that all of the elect will be saved, I must derive my confidence of personal involvement through another means, namely through continuance in faith which works through love.

So long as my faith in Christ continues to act as a conduit of grace, through which sanctification flows; so long as I continue to measurably love the Lord and kick against temptations in general, I *sense* my involvement in His kingdom.

Ultimately, I believe one may only take confidence in one thing... that he has trusted himself to the mercy of God in Christ, and not in works. If after doing this, he continues to strive after holiness, then he may be encouraged that he seeks what is already his.

Have you considered the words, "slave of righteousness"? It occurred to me, suddenly and powerfully, to ask myself, "why do you keep coming back to the Lord, after so many failures and embarrassing faults? Why do you keep reading your bible and praying, when at times you hit a brick wall of doubt and ignorance? Why do you keep looking for ways to improve your obedience, when for a season you look for ease in vain things and find none? Because YOU'RE A SLAVE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/29 8:05

Good morning all,

In case anyone else is considering this question also, to narrow the consideration, I'm looking at Genesis chapter 3 and verse 7. This may be compared with chapter 2 verse 25.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/29 8:31

"As a bird that wandereth from her nest, so is a man that wandereth from his place."

- Proverbs chapter 27 verse 8(KJV)

Think this is appropriate also.

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 9:06

Hi Jeannette,

Quote:
-----But Katy, surely it was worth the shock and pain on that occasion, to see the pastor repent and begin to live and preach more nearly according to Truth! Wow! All because you had the courage to approach him on the matter, and he the humility to listen!

Yes, many things are worth the shock and pain, and even persecution one may receive in speaking out.

The hard core Calvinists left and started their own church. So I would say even the Pastor went through some serious so

ul searching....yet what I have come across is:

Many who do believe in their eternal security are many times (I hate to use this word, but I will).. *Brainwashed* by certain doctrines of men, not realizing how hurtful many of those doctrines are in the end to souls. I know this Pastor was truly saved, and the Lord did a mighty work in him, (not over night...it never is).

He now has a Church that is so rich in the LOVE of God, and God blessed his obedience.

That's what I call AMAZING GRACE!!!

Never be afraid to speak out, especially when the Lord puts something on your heart (obedience)to do so. You won't be popular for doing so, but the Lord will show you now and again the fruit of that obedience that far outweighs the pain.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by davyman, on: 2007/12/29 10:03

I think there is a huge misconception by Arminians on this thread that Calvinist ascribe to the doctrine of saying the "sinner's prayer" is a ticket to heaven. This is not what the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints teaches. Rather, Perseverance of the saints teaches that once God has renewed the heart of a sinner through the application of the redemption wrought by Christ upon the cross, He will continue to be saved and show forth the fruits of that salvation. The sinner perseveres because of Christ, but he continually shows himself as one who has been changed by Christ. God has saved the individual and will sanctify him until the end when he is ultimately glorified, and in heaven. It does not mean man has a license to sin. 1 Peter 1:23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." In other words when God changes a heart of stone to a heart of flesh, cannot be revoked. It is a deposit of an incorruptible seed that cannot be taken away. Romans 11:29, says, "For the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable." If the promises of God cannot be revoked, then perseverance is a biblical and logical necessity. "I am surely convinced that neither angels, nor powers, nor principalities, nor death, nor life, nor things present, nor things to come...will separate us from the love by which the Lord embraces us in Christ".

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/29 10:33

Here is what one Pastor actually experienced, in regards to **brainwashing**.

(<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid582&commentViewItemComments>) Communist brainwashing techniques (Video) by Richard Wurmbbrand

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 16:37

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Hi again Jeannette and thank you for the response :-)

I hope it will be alright if I do not respond directly to the things you suggested, at least not right away. The reason is I had something specific in mind and was hoping to look at that in particular.

I was thinking of all of this in regards to our asking how can God hold us accountable to do things that we cannot perform, and this be just.

So I was thinking of these things in that context.

What do you think, is there anything that we may have lost that would have made us accountable to do things we cannot render or attain?

Hi again Chris

The only Scriptural clue I can think of at the moment is that the OT sacrifices included one for sins a person didn't know

he'd done! So it seems we are liable for unintentional sins too!

But that's because there is a Sacrifice for sin provided.

As Adam should have known when God made them garments of skin (from a slain animal).

Quote:
-----is there anything that we may have lost that would have made us accountable to do things we cannot render or attain?

We *are* accountable if we refuse His provision for forgiveness and removal of sin. Which is probably why God refused Cain's offering.

But something lost??? When man sinned first he gave himself over to Satan's control, so he was unable to regain that simple innocent trust in God, to walk with Him as before.

So maybe we can say that the thing lost was childlike faith?

But are we liable because of its lack?

I don't think this is the answer you were looking for, but found it good to meditate on all the same...

in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 16:52

Quote:

Compliments wrote:
As I said before I am Calvinistic to a degree. I was telling my Mother yesterday saying, "One thing that I hope that I will begin to know and that is that I am saved".

Brother, I had those same agonies of doubt of salvation at first. That's why I'm mostly grateful for starting my Christian life under Calvinist teaching. Being chronically lacking in confidence and full of doubts about myself, there was a *need* of that assurance that a strongly Calvinistic outlook gives.

Just as there is *need* for someone who lives carelessly to be warned that he might be lost in the end if he doesn't repent.

Quote:
-----It would be great to know that with full assurance of faith, but when you sin, you don't sense that belonging.

If I, as a child, wilfully disobey my father is he any less my father? If I fall down in the mud and get filthy as a result of my disobedience, so he has to pick me up and clean me up, is he any less my father?

Quote:
-----Though I agree with Calvinism or I should say I agree with the Bible when it speaks of predestination, but to say that I am saved, your guess is as good as mine. My problem is not the bible, my problem is a matter of believing that He has cleansed me from all unrighteousness. When I think of past sins I think of the foolish decisions that I have made, even though the LORD has forgiven me, I am having a hard time forgiving myself. The people that I have wronged and the wickedness of my actions towards them, I literally hang my head in shame. When I see them, I go thru the same ritual I did the last time I saw them, "Will you forgive me". Their answer is always, "I have forgiven you, don't let it bother you".

But the fact that you have these doubts, and are so very distressed when you fail, shows you *are* indeed saved. If you weren't it wouldn't worry you so much!

John Bunyan went through two years of such torment, even imagining he'd committed the unforgivable sin (as he writes in "Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners"). But the Lord brought him through it in the end.

What was your experience in first coming to Christ? Maybe it would help to make things certain...

It honestly sounds as if the real problem is guilt, not sin!

Please, Brother, stop beating yourself up!

Been there, done that, have the T-shirt!

Quote:
-----When Calvinist sin, do they still believe that they are saved no matter what? If you died in a backslidden condition, the wages of sin is death, is heaven awaiting for him or is hell?

Good question. As long as you don't imagine *you* are backslidden, because it's obviously not true!

Love in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 16:57

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

In case anyone else is considering this question also, to narrow the consideration, I'm looking at Genesis chapter 3 and verse 7. This may be compared with chapter 2 verse 25.

Only just seen this, Chris. Commentators usually seem to think that what they lost there was the glory of God, in which they were previously "clothed". Of course they must have instantly lost this when they sinned.

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 17:06

Quote:

broclint wrote:

This thread is truly amazing!!

It demonstrates the utter futility and foolishness to which people can go to defend a "position" rather than to merely take what the Word of God says and be done with it.

So what does the Word of God say? Isn't that what some of us are seeking to know in more depth?

What amazes me about this thread is that it is, as Michael said, wonderfully good natured.

Which isn't always the case with this topic! I too have been weary of the ding-dong arguments on "predestination" etc, but this thread seems different.

Another thing I find amazing is that new thoughts, blessed insights into the Word, keep cropping up when discussing a subject that has been debated over and over again.

As long as we are willing to listen to each other, rather than use the Bible to beat each other with, that will always be true.

As Paul says, when speaking of another subject:
Romans 11:

33 ¶ O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!

34 For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?
35 Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?
36 For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen.

Amen

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 17:15

Quote:

theopenlife wrote:
...Ultimately, I believe one may only take confidence in one thing... that he has trusted himself to the mercy of God in Christ, and not in works...

"Not in works" - that says it all. That is why both pride in our own righteousness and despair at our lack of it are *both* sins!

Quote:

Have you considered the words, "slave of righteousness"? It occurred to me, suddenly and powerfully, to ask myself, "why do you keep coming back to the Lord, after so many failures and embarrassing faults? Why do you keep reading your bible and praying, when at times you hit a brick wall of doubt and ignorance? Why do you keep looking for ways to improve your obedience, when for a season you look for ease in vain things and find none? Because YOU'RE A SLAVE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS."

Exodus 21:

5 And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master...I will not go out free:
6 Then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul; **and he shall serve him for ever.** There comes a point when we have "pierced ears", and are no longer free to stray from our Master!

Amen!

Praise Him!

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 17:31

Quote:

davyman wrote:
I think there is a huge misconception by Arminians on this thread that Calvinist ascribe to the doctrine of saying the "sinner's prayer" is a ticket to heaven.

While there are several partial or non-Calvinists, (such as myself), I'm not sure who the Armenians are on this thread! Could you point them out? :-P

And did anyone say or suggest that Calvinism teaches that "the sinner's prayer is a ticket to heaven"? If so I haven't noticed.

Quote:

This is not what the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints teaches. Rather, Perseverance of the saints teaches that once God has renewed the heart of a sinner through the application of the redemption wrought by Christ upon the cross, He will continue to be saved and show forth the fruits of that salvation. The sinner perseveres because of Christ, but he continually shows himself as one who has been changed by Christ. God has saved the individual and will sanctify him until the end when he is ultimately glorified, and in heaven.

I don't know if anyone disagrees with this. So does that mean we are all Calvinists after all?

Quote:

-----It does not mean man has a license to sin. 1 Peter 1:23,

No indeed!

Quote:

-----"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." In other words when God changes a heart of stone to a heart of flesh, cannot be revoked. It is a deposit of an incorruptible seed that cannot be taken away. Romans 11:29, says, "For the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable."

This quote is often used, but it is actually out of context. It originally speaks of the Jews' place in God's plan, that even though they were become, for the most part, enemies of the Gospel, yet they are still His "beloved for the fathers' sakes". In other words it is talking about those who are not saved, yet have received the Scriptures, and the promises and from whom Christ came.

Quote:

-----If the promises of God cannot be revoked, then perseverance is a biblical and logical necessity. "I am surely convinced that neither angels, nor powers, nor principalities, nor death, nor life, nor things present, nor things to come...will separate us from the love by which the Lord embraces us in Christ" .

In essence I agree with you. But other Scripture does allow for the *possibility* of someone who, having been truly born again, yet still in the end turns his back on the Lord. As I think has already been shown.

Blessings

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 17:36

Quote:

Katy-did wrote:
Hi Jeannette,

Quote:

-----But Katy, surely it was worth the shock and pain on that occasion, to see the pastor repent and begin to live and preach more nearly according to Truth! Wow! All because you had the courage to approach him on the matter, and he the humility to listen!

Yes, many things are worth the shock and pain, and even persecution one may receive in speaking out.

The hard core Calvinists left and started their own church. So I would say even the Pastor went through some serious soul searching....yet what I have come across is:

Many who do believe in their eternal security are many times (I hate to use this word, but I will).. *Brainwashed* by certain doctrines of men, not realizing how hurtful many of those doctrines are in the end to souls. I know this Pastor was truly saved, and the Lord did a mighty work in him, (not over night...it never is).

He now has a Church that is so rich in the LOVE of God, and God blessed his obedience.

That's what I call AMAZING GRACE!!!

Never be afraid to speak out, especially when the Lord puts something on your heart (obedience)to do so. You won't be popular for doing so, but the Lord will show you now and again the fruit of that obedience that far outweighs the pain.

Thank you Katy, this really spoke to my heart personally...

Blessings

J

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/29 17:39

Hi Jeannette :)

Am going out for a few hours but wanted to check in here...

You mentioned innocent trust.

Am thinking something close to that.

What is it that they now saw that they didn't before...

Am considering Genesis 3:22 also.

Thanks for sharing thus far,

Chris

Re:, on: 2007/12/29 17:56

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Hi Jeannette :)

Am going out for a few hours but wanted to check in here...

You mentioned innocent trust.

Am thinking something close to that.

What is it that they now saw that they didn't before...

Am considering Genesis 3:22 also.

22 ¶ And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Man knew the difference between good and evil, but lost the power to do good.

In *that* sense too, he saw his nakedness...

I'm going to bed soon, it's almost 11pm here

Goodnight all

Jeannette

Re: what we became... - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 0:53

Hi Jeannette,

In regards to our question before:

I think we lost our innocence, our eyes were opened, **and we became like God**, to know good and evil.

This is **not** how God made us at first.

I think once our eyes were opened, we became liable to live as God, without the divine nature.

Imagine calling a man that is a farmer to be an astronaut, without any training or equipment. In and of himself, he just doesn't have **the right stuff**.

That's why I think it is possible that God could require of us things which we could not render. We stepped out of our domain, **where He put us to begin with**, and into His, so to speak.

It would seem that our whole human history has proven how inadequate we were.

Here are some scriptures that I draw this from, and like I said at the beginning, these are only my impressions from meditating on the subject:

Gen 2:25, 3:7-10,22, Rev 3:18, Prov 27:8, Acts 17:28-29, John 10:34, Psalm 82:6, 2Peter 1:3-4

"And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil..."

EDIT: would add Genesis 1:27 to the verse list above.

Re: the glory of God - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 7:52

I was still thinking about all of this this morning and thought about this book I bought for my wife that has all of these pictures from outer-space along with descriptions.

This Cosmos that we live in is supposed to be so incredibly vast that it is probably beyond all our comprehension! Astonishingly vast!

David said the Heavens declare the glory of God and also that He has set His glory above them.

Paul said we have all sinned, and fallen short of God's glory.

But still, how can we grasp this?

John writes of the Lord Jesus

"And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth."

- John chapter 1 verse 14(KJV)

And in Hebrews it says He is the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person(Heb 1:3).

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 7:57

John says they beheld Him and His glory, and He **was full** of grace and truth.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/30 8:09

EDIT: on posting discovered you have added points which I have not addressed. I will wait for some feedback from you. end edit.

Hi ChrisJD, you said

Quote:

-----It would seem that our whole human history has proven how inadequate we were.

I would analyse this situation differently, without disagreeing that man is inadequate.

If I could put it this way... we were already like God. That's how we'd been created and there was a whole world of understanding which I believe man had been given, which enabled man and God to walk in peace, friendship and fellowship every day.

Knowing good and evil, though, was one function God had withheld from His creation of Adam - or it wouldn't have been such a big deal when he acquired it. This change in Adam's make-up was so profound, that there was nothing he could do to fix himself back into the state of not 'knowing good and evil', or, to get rid of 'the knowledge of good and evil' (at that time).

I would disagree that God has asked things of man which man is unable to render. The problem is more that man doesn't want to render them because every man born has an instinct about himself which is contrary to pleasing God. (Within this statement, I moot that God only asked of man within man's capability to comply. This might be a lot less than He originally commissioned Adam before his demise. In other words, God adjusted His expectations.)

We have to come to an understanding within ourselves, that the onus is still on us (through Christ), to show God that we have become trustworthy again, and that we seriously desire fellowship with Him. And all this starts *after* we have had our perspective wrenched round to understand God's (perspective) enough to accept that only He could 'fix' us. Our return to fellowship with Him is dependent on our acceptance of His grace - on our abandonment (in other words) of our instinctive misbelief in our self-sufficiency.

The fact is, Adam was never meant to 'do' anything which was not well within his capability. This would have included a n awful (or should I say *awesome*) amount of pure rest and recreation, and simply commanding things to be as he saw fit - and those things would have obeyed him. But, he disenfranchised himself of his God-given authority, when he showed himself personally unable to abide under authority.

That's why the connection between pride and rebellion remain two of the most important issues for any person to get over. God understands how difficult we find them, and He puts up with a huge amount of failure from us, but, He doesn't stop seeing us as His children.

However, He cannot ignore our disobedience or our unbelief, and certain spiritual laws take over spontaneously, when we allow ourselves to be dominated by unbelief or disobedience after we have begun to fellowship with Him again.

I can find scriptures if you need them, but I suspect your knowledge of the word is better than mine. I don't have scriptures in mind, but I think I've said nothing which is incompatible with God's revelation of His mind and will.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 8:35

Good morning Dorcas. It is morning here :)

Again...

"And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us..."

If you have time, take a look at some of those verses I mentioned in the list also.

The Lord Jesus said He could do nothing of Himself. And He said of us that we could do nothing without Him.

He is the glory of God.

What do you think?

Re:, on: 2007/12/30 11:55

Quote:

-----I think we lost our innocence, our eyes were opened, and we became like God, to know good and evil.

ChrisJD,

Genesis 3:22&23 does not say that Adam and Eve became LIKE God, but says become as one of us to know both good and evil. Had they eaten of the Tree of Life which they did not, but were forced out of the garden, or they certainly would have been LIKE GOD.

What I find interesting here is that man never lost his ability to know GOOD, but had an added demention of knowing evil as well.

Total depravity teaches man only knows evil...yet God says otherwise in Genesis.

Man's conscience did not die... Romans 1&2 clearly state this fact, (LOST) humanity after the fall had the law of God written in their conscience. This again is what the Bible teaches.

Satan, still wanting to corrupt humanity corrupted mankind, except for Noah and his family.

Enoch had a personal relationship with God. We may be extremely surprised at how many of those before the flood are in heaven now.

We know Abel is, and we also know God gave Cain a second chance to do what was right....confessing himself a sinner, and acknowledging it by offering a sacrifice as did Abel.

Immediately after Adam and Eve sinned God promised a redeemer...Genesis 3:15. This was no secret.....even Job made a sacrifice and said, I know that my redeemer liveth, and I will see Him in the last days. Job was not from any tribe of Israel that we can see, and most likely long before. No mention of him keeping the law or the sabbath or anything like that..but he did know about sacrifice, and KNEW about a promised REDEEMER.

Please re-read Romans 1&2 and what GOD says about the beginning of man.....nothing about total depravity.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 12:50

Hi everyone.

Katy-Did,

"Genesis 3:22&23 does not say that Adam and Eve became LIKE God..."

You're right. I think I may even have used it without consideration, thinking it was interchangeable with the expression "one of us". Or even confusing it with what the adversary had said. Thank you for the correction.

I looked at Strong's and it says the word translated 'as one' is

H259

אחד
'echâd
ekh-awd'

A numeral from H258; properly united, that is, one; or (as an ordinal) first: - a, alike, alone, altogether, and, any (-thing),
apiece, a certain ly, each (one), + eleven, every, few, first, + highway, a man, once, one, only, other, some, together.

We were already made in His image.

I think the point remains the same.

Which by they way, what does this have to do with total depravity?

Who said anything about that?

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/30 16:51

Dear Chris,

You seem to have changed the question. You hadn't mentioned Jesus before... you were asking about Adam and Eve,
and Jeannette had said nothing to be disagreed with.

Quote:

-----The Lord Jesus said He could do nothing of Himself. And He said of us that we could do nothing without Him.

He is the glory of God.

What do you think?

I believe I have looked at the Bible verses you quoted.

'He is the glory of God' is an understatement I believe.

To discuss Adam before the fall, Adam after the fall, fallen mankind in general and then to bring Jesus in to the equation,
is to keep moving the goalposts!

Originally you asked two questions. Here is a question for you in return... Was there a reciprocity between your first and
your second question? By this I mean, had you embedded the assumption that before the fall Adam and Eve would hav
e been able to render to God that that you implied they could not render afterwards? Or, were the two questions compl
etely separate, such as 'Please could you bring the milk from the fridge?' and 'Do you know when dad will be home from
work?'...

;-)

So... what does Jesus have to do with the answer to either of the first two questions? (I could have asked a more compli
cated question, but trying to keep this simple.)

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 17:21

Hi Dorcas,

I mentioned what the Lord Jesus said about Himself and us in regards to what you said here

"I would disagree that God has asked things of man which man is unable to render."

I think His life demonstrates what God required.

Also, about this

"...had you embedded the assumption that before the fall Adam and Eve would have been able to render to God that that you implied they could not render afterwards?"

No, not at all. It's just the opposite. It seems that nearly all of the requirements for man came **after**. Which is what I think this change in us left us exposed to.

Does this all make sense?

Thanks :-)

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/30 17:41

Hi ChrisJD

Quote:

-----I think His life demonstrates what God required.

No contest. But the requirements which He fulfilled, in a measurable sense, had changed tremendously since Adam had to till the ground to get food for his family. That's why I commented upon your introduction of Jesus to the discussion... because it wouldn't have mattered when Jesus came, He would always have been able to do what His Father required of Him, because they had an agreement about that.

Quote:

-----No, not at all. It's just the opposite.

Does this mean you believe Adam and Eve didn't please God before the fall either?

Quote:

-----It seems that nearly all of the requirements for man came after. Which is what I think this change in us left us exposed to.

The thing you are trying to say here is that man could not keep the law, (I think), but that is what I'm disputing. The Man (Jews) who did have the law *did* keep it perfectly and God imputed that to them for righteousness.

It is completely different to say that Jesus kept the law, because He fulfilled it without breaking it.

That's the amazing thing I'd not realised till recently, is that ***even if a person broke the law*** in itself it was the way to keep fellowship with God.

My turn: does this all make sense?

:-)

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 17:51

Hi Dorcas,

What law are we talking about here?

"That's the amazing thing I'd not realised till recently, is that even if a person broke the law in itself it was the way to keep fellowship with God."

Any of the laws that required the death penalty?

Ezekiel said the soul that sins would die.

What do you mean?

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 17:56

Dorcas, I think we need to draw a distinction here between provisions God made for man to continue with Him, and what was required for life.

See Leviticus 18:5 and Galatians 3:10.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 18:01

Sorry for the multiple posts, but my thoughts are trailing along....

What I'm looking for is what would gain man the right to the tree of life again.

Re:, on: 2007/12/30 18:32

Quote:

ChrisJD wrote:

Hi Dorcas,

What law are we talking about here?

"That's the amazing thing I'd not realised till recently, is that even if a person broke the law in itself it was the way to keep fellowship with God."

Any of the laws that required the death penalty?

Ezekiel said the soul that sins would die.

What do you mean?

Hi Chris,

You are right. What I mean is not that people never broke the law - and I'd forgotten about the death penalty - but that the law was capable of keeping them from sin - for instance, the deterrent of the death penalty - or, buying them forgiveness.

Don't worry about the multiple posts... That was a fair question. I am so used to thinking of the law in terms of the time of Jesus, I'd forgotten how much it had been diluted by both the Romans and the rabbis in recent decades.

Galatians 3:10

For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, "Cursed is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the law, to do them."

I didn't mean that the law dealt with the fall, but that it kept communication open with God.

Leviticus 18:5

'You shall therefore keep My statutes and My judgments, which if a man does, he shall live by them: I am the LORD.

You said

Quote:

----- I think we need to draw a distinction here between provisions God made for man to continue with Him, and what was required for life.

Do you mean you don't think the law provided for life? (Sorry if I'm driving you mad with these questions. I'm asking because of this that you said, which I realise the law could not give them.)

Quote:

-----What I'm looking for is what would gain man the right to the tree of life again.

So, another question: do you mean the tree of life in the midst of Eden or, Christ, or, a tree like that on the banks of the river in Ezekiel 47, or, the one in Revelation 22 (which may be the same tree). I'm asking how literally to take the phrase 'tree of life'. Also, you might mean the cross...

Re:, on: 2007/12/30 18:36

Love in Christ

Katy-

Quote:

-----Which by the way, what does this have to do with total depravity?

Hi Chris,

You do know one of the premises of Calvinism is based on total depravity, that after the fall, man became so evil in fact that God had to Regenerate man first (Born Again) in order to have an implanted spirit that could have faith to believe in Jesus to begin with.

When you do something wrong, does your conscience bother you? Is that only true for Born Again Christians?

To say that lost man has no conscience at all is to say all men are Psychopaths...raping killing/murder etc, without any conscience of knowing it was wrong.

Now occasionally we will see someone on the news who display these characteristics...those Jeffery Dommer types...you know, and guess what...society All of society is appalled.

One has to be aware of good and evil before one has a conscience to distinguish between the two.

When man fell, he knew both good and evil.....activating his conscience.

When Adam and Eve fell, they hid themselves in the Garden, not wanting God to see them....because their CONSCIEN
CE was bothering them.....they were at that time in sin, and painfully aware they had disobeyed God and were in sin at t
he same time.

Gnostics are who taught total depravityÂ...this is Gnosticism, and this teaching came from Augustine who was a Gnostic
, and influenced Calvin in this Gnostic thinking.

For their own good and for all of mankind they were banished from the Garden, not to eat of the Tree of Life. Had they d
one so, no need for a redeemer....if they had become immortal sinners, they would be just like the fallen angels in the se
nse of eternal, and fallen. There is no redemption for those angels. Many now are reserved in chains waiting for judgme
nt (Jude) and the rest are awaiting judgment period.

Love in Christ
Katy-Did ;-)

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 18:49

Dorcas,

"Do you mean you don't think the law provided for life?"

Well, consider Galatians 3:21 for instance.

By life here I'm thinking of everlasting life. Which it seems to me we lost access to from the garden.

Thanks for sharing thus far Dorcas,

Chris

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 18:52

Hi Katy-Did,

I'm not sure about all of those things, but thank you still.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/30 19:07

Hi Katy,

That was interesting. I appreciate how you think things through more than the average bear...

;-)

ChrisJD... hello and thank you also for engaging. It does seem rather a pedestrian pace but we can be sure of no
misunderstandings so far. Thank you for all the Bible verses.

You had said something about 'what was required for life' and it wasn't immediately obvious to me you were meaning
'everlasting life'.

Galatians 3:21

Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.

You raise an interesting point about everlasting life being lost in the Garden, because ... I put it to you ... that is not really true, if Jesus could refer to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as 'living'.

The question is, was that Jesus speaking prophetically, or, were they actually alive in heaven already, because of their faith?

Another question might be, were they in as good a position as Adam had been before the fall, or, were they in a better position because they had been obedient?

Lastly, are you thinking of Adam as 'the son of God' (Luke 3:38)?

What I'm trying to establish is also whether you think of Adam and Jesus as being the same (which they were not) and if not, how in your mind do you define the differences?

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 20:29

Dorcas,

I want to say again I'm only offering my own understanding here.

"The question is, was that Jesus speaking prophetically, or, were they actually alive in heaven already, because of their faith?"

I think it was lost, and now God would give it to whoever He would choose to, as a gift (Romans 6:23).

So regarding Abraham, Paul writes

"Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."

and...

"But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

And also he says

"So then *it is* not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy."

What do you think?

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/30 21:34

Hi Chris,

"So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy."

And this mercy He showed, in that while we were all under death, since Adam, Christ died for us - and the waters of Jordan were piled up all the way back to 'Adam'.

I believe this is how God is able to justify by faith all those who were obedient after the fall, even though those before Christ cannot become sons, as the Holy Ghost was not yet given.

Nevertheless, Isaac Watts wrote:

Where He displays His healing power,
Death and the curse are known no more:
In Him the tribes of Adam boast
More blessings than their father lost.

What do you think?

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2007/12/30 21:58

Hi Dorcas,

I don't know really.

Chris

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2007/12/31 5:54

Quote:
-----I don't know really.

Hi Chris,

Well, I hope you have more food for thought in your melting pot, even if you are not able to bring forth answers that satisfy your quest.

If I may add... I believe the tree of life is very special, and we need to actually eat of it to be sure of eternal life. Simply knowing that the way is not barred any more, and gaining the right to eat of it, is not good enough.

Re: New Calvinistic song, on: 2008/1/1 17:31

To ChrisJD,

I suddenly found myself musing over my own question about who has access to the tree of life, and it struck me that all who believe, have access. All who meditated according to God's revelation of Himself, showed they had understood something of its existence. And it is not of mankind - as you pointed out - but of God - that there is any understanding on earth *at all*.

May He be gloried in us.