

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHT YOU THINK**

**I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHT YOU THINK - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/12 14:34**

There was a young boy who grew up in a village where the people in his village believed that apples were oranges, There wasn't any person around him who believed otherwise. When the boy got older he decided that he wanted to leave his village and explore more of the world in that which he lived. As he was walking he saw another young man over in the distance walking towards him. When they met each other on the path they began to talk, and told each other their stories and where they had come from. As they talked they noticed they both had a lot in common. (They both were from villages far away, and they both decided to leave their village to explore more of the world.)

As they were talking the first young man reached out and grabbed an orange. After he took a bite he asked the other if he wanted some of his orange. The 2nd young man turned his head slightly and said, "Orange? That's an apple." The first young man was unaware that the other young man grew up in a village where everyone believed that an apple was an apple.

Which one is correct in what they believe an apple is?

**Re: I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHT YOU THINK - posted by RobertW (), on: 2009/1/12 14:52**

Quote:

-----Which one is correct in what they believe an apple is?  
-----

The one that believes an apple is an apple.

The problem is that people take the liberty of using words in a way that is not true to their etymology. When a person pours a meaning into a word that is different than its first and historical usage then problems begin. Ron Bailey has a saying that, "Words don't have definitions, they have histories." This is why we should be as pedantic as is reasonable in our discussions. Another of his illustrations I like is that of calling your goldfish a *dog*.

I can call my goldfish "dog" all I want to until I have a sitter come over to babysit my "dog". When the sitter goes to get a book on how to care for dogs it begins to have serious consequences for my goldfish. ;-)

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/12 14:59**

I've heard that quote before, now I know who said it.

In the illustration I'm referring more to relativism than etymology. (sorry I should've added that in the illustration.)

So, if he was taught that an apple was an orange, is right, and the other one right because he believes what he was taught?

**Re: I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHT YOU THINK - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/12 18:19**

If we refer to the object in question: they are both correct.

If we refer to the name given to the object in question: they are both correct.

If we refer one boy to the other they are both right and both wrong.

Whenever we relate the world with the world, all is relative and subjective; just as it is also vain and perishing and shall be done away by fire. The question lacks a proper independent reference (referee) to validate an impartial objective answer (judge). Objectivism requires an independent origin by which all truth may be substantiated and that source is the One, true eternal God.

As it is, if I may ask, what does this have to do with the gospel?

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 9:55**

"What does this have to do with the Gospel?"

Are people who grew up believing that Buddha, Alah, or a tree is the only one who can save, are they wrong?

**Re: - posted by LoveGodsWay2, on: 2009/1/13 9:59**

Quote:

-----Are people who grew up believing that Buddha, Alah, or a tree is the only one who can save, are they wrong?

**YES!** They are all wrong!

The gospel is about who Jesus is and what He did for us.

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 10:26**

LoveGodsWay,

That statement you quoted from me was a response to a question about an illustration that I typed. I'm glad to see that you are aware of the condition of those that are lost. The point of it is that because we believe that it is Christ who saves, then we should be telling people about Him.

**Re: - posted by LoveGodsWay2, on: 2009/1/13 11:17**

stephent,

ooohhhh. I thought you were seriously asking that question.

I agree. We should be telling all people about Jesus and what He has done for us.

God bless you.

**Re: relativism vs revelation - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 14:17**

Quote:

-----Are people who grew up believing that Buddha, Allah, or a tree is the only one who can save, are they wrong?

I am glad to see this was more than a philosophy exercise; just making sure.

I was thinking about the question as it relates between the two men and the fruit and as it relates from the creation to the Creator. To begin, the use of the english language is a deceptive narrative and inherently provokes a biased judgment from the reader. That is to say, "apple" = *apple* and not "orange". To properly state a question of relativism we must eliminate this definition,

ie. "apple" = *banana* and "orange" = *banana*

Or, better yet, to recognize a false reference point is being provoked, namely, the *name* given to the fruit rather than the fruit itself.

ie. "the apple" = *the fruit* and "der apfel" = *the fruit*

So now who is right and who is wrong? Is english the only correct language? Or, is german not also viable?

In this way we have two different languages, or names, being used; when we consider the english and german language have both been equated to indicate that particular fruit, we quickly come to recognize the point of reference. The objective reference is the fruit itself and not the language being used to identify it. Hence the common rebuttal, just because I call a fish a dog, or say I can fly, does not make it so.

### Romans 1

18. For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness;
19. Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.
20. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:
21. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.
22. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools,
23. And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things.
24. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves:
25. Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen.
- ...
32. Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.

### Isaiah 44

8. Fear ye not, neither be afraid: have not I told thee from that time, and have declared it? ye are even my witnesses. Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any.
9. They that make a graven image are all of them vanity; and their delectable things shall not profit; and they are their own witnesses; they see not, nor know; that they may be ashamed.
10. Who hath formed a god, or molten a graven image that is profitable for nothing?
11. Behold, all his fellows shall be ashamed: and the workmen, they are of men: let them all be gathered together, let them stand up; yet they shall fear, and they shall be ashamed together.
12. The smith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with hammers, and worketh it with the strength of his arms: yea, he is hungry, and his strength faileth: he drinketh no water, and is faint.
13. The carpenter stretcheth out his rule; he marketh it out with a line; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man; that it may remain in the house.
14. He heweth him down cedars, and taketh the cypress and the oak, which he strengtheneth for himself among the trees of the forest: he planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it.
15. Then shall it be for a man to burn: for he will take thereof, and warm himself; yea, he kindleth it, and baketh bread; yea, he maketh a god, and worshippeth it; he maketh it a graven image, and falleth down thereto.
16. He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied: yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire:
17. And the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god.
18. They have not known nor understood: for he hath shut their eyes, that they cannot see; and their hearts, that they cannot understand.
19. And none considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire; yea, also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh, and eaten it: and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?
20. He feedeth on ashes: a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?

Therefore, the question arises, when we speak of "God" do we not all identify and define and equate the same object of reference? No. We speak of the only true God who has manifested himself by the revelation of Christ Jesus and the eternal Spirit. They speak of their vain imaginations: "who changed the truth of God into a lie" and "they glorified him not as God" but worshipped him as something else. They worshipped and idolized the creation and not the Creator, ie. "God" = *Creator* and "God" = *creation*

Thus we come to two different definitions, wherefore we know that one is absolute verity and the other is absolute vanity. The relativism occurs when we begin to take "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen" of God and describe and relate those attributes to another object which is NOT God; confusion then arises because the junction is littered with truth, as a poison is covered with sweet chocolate. To wit, "this is chocolate" (or the true God), h

however, the object in reference is "poison" (a god created by vain imagination).

That is the deceitfulness of language, we may very well be describing the nature and characteristics of an "apple" and yet all the while the object of reference is a *banana* (or false god). My point being, relativism is not a substantiation of truth but is a progressive reasoning of truth, and therein consists the "glass ceiling" between reason and revelation.

I find the following explanation by R. L. Dabney, taken from his book *Evangelical Eloquence*, to be accurate in this point:

#### Lecture xii. Sources of Argument.

excerpt pg. 186-190

You will observe, if you examine the lists of the sources of arguments which I recited from other authorities, that they are all virtually included in the seven which I have now explained -- self-consciousness, intuition, deduction, sensation, experience, induction and testimony. And the last five all owe their authority to the first two. Conviction of the understanding is always traced ultimately to self-consciousness, or to some intuition, or to some union of the two. But while these are the primary sources, any truths of which the mind has, through them, become convinced, may in turn become secondary sources. Of these, some will be found more proximate and some more remote. Their practical value as sources of argument in preaching may not be according to their nearness to primitive judgments, but will rather be decided by their nature and their range of application.

Now, for the preacher, the chief of these secondary sources is the testimony of the sacred Scriptures. Their authority as our rule of faith is inferred immediately from their inspired character; for if God is perfect truth, as must be assumed, or else all search for truth anywhere is preposterous, and if the Bible is God's word, then it is infallible, and of course authoritative over the soul. But is the inspiration of the Bible self-evident to its readers? I answer, it is not immediately self-evident -- that is to say, the proposition, "The Bible is inspired," is not axiomatic -- but it is readily found to be true upon bringing the internal and external evidences of it under the light of our self-consciousness, our mental and our moral intuitions. This is but saying that God, in revealing himself to man, has clothed his revelation with an amount of reasonable and moral evidence adapted to the creature's nature, and sufficient, when inspected, to produce a perfect conviction. Thereupon the word of God assumes its place as of plenary authority over the soul in the department of which it professes to teach, that of our religious beliefs, duties and redemption.

Let me here request your attention to two vital remarks. One is, that the fullest and most submissive faith is supremely reasonable. This is demonstrated by the fact that the postulate from which the authority of the Word over the soul inevitably arises (this, namely, that the Bible is inspired) has been irresistably commended to the reason itself. Hence it is simply impossible there should be any competition between right reason and true faith. This is the Protestant, or, in other words, the Bible system. It does not demand the reception of the Scriptures as God's word in advance of rational evidence that it is such, upon the pretended authority of the Church, or on any such illogical pretext. But it presents to the reason and conscience credentials which triumphantly establish the claims of revelation, and then it places the Bible on the throne of the soul as authoritative witness for God -- authoritative because proved true. The enlightened reason now delights to bow implicitly to it, and in doing so it finds the highest consistency with its own nature.

The other statement is this: **Intelligent faith is still not rationalistic, in the vicious sense of that term.** The basis of faith is not human speculation, but God's infallibility. It may be asked, "Did we not just now require the Scriptures to submit its claims of infallibility to our reason?" I answer, No; the point is only a verbal fallacy. If a trope must be suggested, it would be far more correct to say that the Scriptures impose their irresistible evidences upon the reason. The Scriptures exercise all that authority which their own intrinsic truth confers; thus reason does not confer, but receives. **Here, the difference, is the radical difference between intelligent faith and rationalism.** Faith makes reason the recipient of revealed light; rationalism makes it the source. Faith begins by recognizing, on reasonable grounds, the infallibility of the Word, and thenceforward bows to it implicitly. Rationalism denies that infallibility, and calls the Word in question at every step, making reason the source and measure of authority in every doctrine. In the true believer the reason receives the teachings of the Word as the eye receives the light of the sun. There are certain actions with the eye with reference to the light, the raising of the lid, the direction of the axis, the refraction of the rays. But these actions are merely receptive. The light is from the sun, not from the eye. So the light in the soul is from the Word; the actions of the reason touching it are only receptive, not productive; the authority which the reason recognizes is that of God, and not its own.

You now perceive that when once the inspiration of the Scriptures is established, they become practically the great storehouse of proofs for pulpit argument. Their teachings, though not so primary in the order of analysis as those of the self-consciousness and the intuitions, are far more extensive and useful; for even these primitive faculties are not always infallible: the Word is always so. **They, unaided, can discern but a very few religious facts and verities, and none of them**

**ese few are saving truths.** Revelation discloses all those secrets of the divine mind which are necessary for salvation. When we begin to reason from first truths to moral and theological conclusions, such are the darkness of mind and conscience and the perversion of will produced by sin, our deductions have but little value, save as they are confirmed by revelation. The Bible is, therefore, for the preacher, the great armoury of weapons of conviction.

This examination of the sources of mental conviction has now led us to two principles, which need no further proof after the enunciation. These I give you as the foundation of all rules for pulpit argument:

1. In every resort to reasoning, recur as closely as possible to the primary sources of conviction, self-consciousness and intuitions.
2. Rely mainly on the testimony of the Word.

-- end quote --

I find these statements to be an incredible insight. Rationalism can not furnish one with "the wisdom that leads to salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (**2 Timothy 3:15**), hence, God has bid us to "not lean upon our own understanding" but to trust in the Lord with all our hearts, for he alone is Savior. Just as Peter declared, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." Wherefore Jesus replied to him, "Blessed are you, Simon Barjona, because flesh and blood did not reveal this to you, but My Father who is in heaven."

Truly, salvation is revelation, and not rationalization. Once we equip ourselves with this knowledge and appropriate our evangelism accordingly we shall put aside all relativism and handle "the great armoury of weapons of conviction," the word of God which pierces to the very thoughts and intents of the heart, as it is fitted to the nature of fallen man, and is able to quicken the condemnation of the conscience and awaken a dead soul by the power of the Holy Spirit.

**Re: Relativism vs. Revelation - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 14:42**

My point being, relativism is not a substantiation of truth but is a progressive reasoning of truth, and therein consists the "glass ceiling".

What do you mean by, "progressive reasoning of truth" and, "glass ceiling."

I think it means: relativism describes concepts of truth without holding to what is true.

**Re: - posted by Ruach34 (), on: 2009/1/13 14:43**

LoveGodsway - why was Stephens affirmation consolation to you and rested your concern?

What if he was asking for real and had some inward problems about it?

Would your hackles have gone up, as it appeared with your emphatic "YES!", due to his disagreement?

Just had a concern that compassion is not our lead aim. I know for myself, when I preach to the homeless, I often think they need tough preaching because they are worse off than me instead of preaching to them hard because of my love for them. This is a serious error and ought to be guarded against from every believer.

Thanks for reading...

**Re: Relativism vs. Revelation - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 14:58**

Quote:

-----What do you mean by, "progressive reasoning of truth" and, "glass ceiling."  
-----

progressive reasoning of truth = "these primitive faculties are not always infallible: the Word is always so. They, unaided, can discern but a very few religious facts and verities, and none of these few are saving truths." That is, the reason, the carnal mind, cannot discern spiritual things, ie. revelations of Christ Jesus. The "glass ceiling" being a metaphor of the irreconcilable chasm between reason and revelation that exists without the aid of God, the divine Revelator.

Quote:

-----I think it means: relativism describes concepts of truth without holding to what is true.  
-----

That is more or less what I have written. For example, describing the nature and characteristics of God as they are revealed through what has been made (the creation), which can be used for concepts of truth, without ever being able to reach the conclusion of truth -- it progresses without end and continuously is tossed about by "every wind of doctrine" and thus is never settled.

ie. the inherent inspiration of the knowledge of God leads man to recognize there is a Creator, however, by reasoning and analyzing creation we cannot come to any conclusive evidence for Who that Creator is.

Therefore, left to our carnal and darkened minds, we cannot discern God through what has been made; although we may come to entertain relative (fallible) "concepts" of God.

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 15:09**

I'm with that...now, for those who hold to reasoned truth and not revealed truth, are they guilty if it hasn't been revealed?

**Re: Relativism vs. Revelation - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 15:30**

Ah, my friend, you see it has already been revealed: "they are without excuse" (**Romans 1:20**).

#### **John 1**

**9.** There was the true Light which, coming into the world, enlightens every man.

**10.** He was in the world, and the world was made through Him, and the world did not know Him.

**11.** He came to His own, and those who were His own did not receive Him.

**12.** But as many as received Him, to them He gave the right to become children of God, even to those who believe in His name,

**13.** who were born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God.

"Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God"

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness"

Another translation says, "who suppress the truth in unrighteousness" -- we cannot hold or suppress truth unless we have received truth in the first place.

#### **John 3**

**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.

The condemnation of everlasting fire is NOT ignorance or darkness but is LIGHT. Every man is judged according to what the Father of lights has revealed to him. Hence, they are accused of "resisting" and doing "despite unto the Spirit of grace."

#### **Acts 17**

**22.** Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious.

**23.** For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you.

**24.** God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands;

**25.** Neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things;

**26.** And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation;

**27.** That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us:

**28.** For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring.

29. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.
30. And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:
31. Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.

**Re: Relativism vs. Revelation - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 15:38**

Also, to qualify my previous post: I am not implying that the revelation of Christ is necessarily given unto every man; none-the-less, the revelation of the Godhead is given to every man.

Now, in this regard, if any man turns at the Lord's rebuke he has promised:

**Proverbs 1**

22. "How long, O naive ones, will you love being simple-minded?  
And scoffers delight themselves in scoffing  
And fools hate knowledge?
23. "Turn to my reproof,  
Behold, I will pour out my spirit on you;  
I will make my words known to you.

And also,

24. "Because I called and you refused,  
I stretched out my hand and no one paid attention;
25. And you neglected all my counsel  
And did not want my reproof;
26. I will also laugh at your calamity;  
I will mock when your dread comes,
27. When your dread comes like a storm  
And your calamity comes like a whirlwind,  
When distress and anguish come upon you.
28. "Then they will call on me, but I will not answer;  
They will seek me diligently but they will not find me,
29. Because they hated knowledge  
And did not choose the fear of the LORD.
30. "They would not accept my counsel,  
They spurned all my reproof.
31. "So they shall eat of the fruit of their own way  
And be satiated with their own devices.
32. "For the waywardness of the naive will kill them,  
And the complacency of fools will destroy them.
33. "But he who listens to me shall live securely  
And will be at ease from the dread of evil."

That is to say, if any man turns at the Lord's wrath revealed against all ungodliness, he shall guide them into all truth and revelation of Christ Jesus. He shall not leave them ignorant of the riches of glory in Christ Jesus, no matter who or where they are.

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 15:38**

Fair to say then that the guy in the jungles of wherever is going to hell.

**Re: - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 15:42**

If any man turns (repents) by the Lord's wrath revealed against all ungodliness, he shall guide them into all truth and revelation of Christ Jesus. God shall not leave them ignorant of the riches of glory in Christ Jesus -- no matter who or where they are.

That is the divine Providence of God.

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 15:51**

ok...but how can one turn if he's never heard the Gospel?

**Re: - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 16:10**

Quote:

-----ok...but how can one turn if he's never heard the Gospel?  
-----

That is the divine Providence of God.

### **Romans 10**

**13.** For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

**14.** How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?

**15.** And how shall they preach, except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things!

**16.** But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah saith, Lord, who hath believed our report?

**17.** So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

**18.** But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world.

**19.** But I say, Did not Israel know? First Moses saith, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you.

**20.** But Isaiah is very bold, and saith, I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me.

**21.** But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

I should agree, Isaiah is very bold when he prophesies, "I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me."

Does this satisfy your question as to those obscure "bush people" who never heard of Christ?

And also, hearing the gospel preached is not the only means God uses to turn people from their wicked ways unto life. Paul here is particularly testifying of salvation and not what produced that repentance which led to salvation. For you see,

### **Romans 2**

**4.** Or do you think lightly of the riches of His kindness and tolerance and patience, not knowing that the kindness of God leads you to repentance?

### **2 Corinthians 7**

**10.** For the sorrow that is according to the will of God produces a repentance without regret, leading to salvation, but the sorrow of the world produces death.

What I have described here is what leads a man to repentance and to seek after God, and not the salvation itself. Thus the divine providence of God is what brings the preaching and revelation of the gospel of Christ to everyone who turns at his rebuke:

### **Romans 1**

**16.** For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek.



Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 16:22

I'm a little confused about what you are saying. You said, "And also, hearing the gospel preached is not the only means God uses to turn people from their wicked ways unto life. Paul here is particularly testifying of salvation and not what produced that repentance which led to salvation." But in the Scripture you quoted on Romans 10:14 says, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" What else can cause this "repentance" that you are describing?

Re: - posted by boG (), on: 2009/1/13 16:43

Quote:  
-----I'm a little confused about what you are saying. You said, "And also, hearing the gospel preached is not the only means God uses to turn people from their wicked ways unto life. Paul here is particularly testifying of salvation and not what produced that repentance which led to salvation." But in the Scripture you quoted on Romans 10:14 says, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" What else can cause this "repentance" that you are describing?  
-----

My apologies for not making that distinction more clear.

Paul says, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"

Now this is concerning the preaching of Christ.

What I said, "And also, hearing the gospel preached is not the only means God uses to turn people from their wicked ways unto life. Paul here is particularly testifying of salvation and not what produced that repentance which led to salvation."  
"

This is concerning the inherent revelation of God that is given to every man. However, this revelation as revealed by the conscience and intuitive nature of man is clouded and perverted by the sinful nature of that man.

Quote:  
-----What else can cause this "repentance" that you are describing?  
-----

Other than the preaching of the gospel there is first and foremost the revelation of the wrath of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness which can of itself bring godly sorrow. The instruments of preaching are also useful for bringing godly sorrow by assisting the awakening of that inherent truth within miserable souls, as well as to preach the revelation of Christ Jesus and him crucified; so that within repentant sinners the word preached may be united with the faith that is being worked into their hearts by that sorrow given by God.

Thus we have the progression: godly sorrow (from a variety of sources, though all originating from the same Spirit of Truth) and this in turn produces a repentance which may lead to salvation. "May lead to salvation" as it is also noted that repentance does not naturally beget salvation: they are independent of each other. And this further emphasizes that "glass ceiling". The act of regeneration (to be born-again) is the free act of God upon a **repentant sinner**. And "free act" meaning that God is neither indebted nor provoked to be merciful upon the justly condemned sinner, only that he has eternally promised according to his own mercy, that he is God, to save them from their sins and reconcile them to himself through Christ those who repent and believe.

**Re: - posted by stephent, on: 2009/1/13 17:10**

"a repentant sinner"? Can someone who is dead in their nature repent? My understanding is that there is no repentance apart from the preaching of Christ. If one could repent apart from preaching Christ, then preaching Christ is one of two ways one can be saved.