

Revivals And Church History :: Did Lot Fear Friendship With God More Than He Feared Compromise?

Did Lot Fear Friendship With God More Than He Feared Compromise? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/2 15:42

I wanted to start a discussion that stems from Bro. Ron's (Philologos) Abraham My Friend week before last. I have given this much thought and reflection and I think I may see something here:

"When morning dawned, the angels urged Lot, saying, "Arise, take your wife and your two daughters who are here, lest you be consumed in the punishment of the city." "But he lingered; so the men seized him and his wife and his two daughters by the hand, The Lord being merciful to him, and they brought him forth and set him outside the city. And when they had brought them forth, they said, "Flee for your life; do not look back or stop anywhere in the valley; flee to the hills, lest you be consumed." "And Lot said to them, "Oh, no, my lords; behold, your servant has found favor in your sight, and you have shown me great kindness in saving my life; but I cannot flee to the hills, lest the disaster overtake me, and I die. Behold, yonder city is near enough to flee to, and it is a little one. Let me escape there - is it not a little one? - and my life will be saved!" "He said to him, "Behold, I grant you this favor also, that I will not overthrow the city of which you have spoken. Make haste, escape there; for I can do nothing till you arrive there." Therefore the name of the city was called Zoar."

When the Angels finally pulled Lot from the city and they were heading out; there seems to have been a fear that Lot had of what I will call here; "The Mountain." ('Hills' in this translation) As Ravinhill says; "First Lot pitched the tent toward Sodom, then he was in Sodom, and then Sodom was in him." When it was time to go, Lot "lingered." What was he afraid of? What was holding him back? Surely we could say it was as Bro. Ron so rightly put it, "A little bit of Egypt", but could there be another mystery staring us in the face here?

Â And Lot went up out of Zoar, and dwelt in the mountain, and his two daughters with him; for he feared to dwell in Zoar: and he dwelt in a cave, he and his two daughters.

After Lot saw the destruction of the cities round about, he changed his mind about Zoar and fled to the mountains (hills). Zoar simply means "little" or as we could say, "a little compromise." But why did Lot fear the mountain? Why did he fear that place where he could get alone with God and be forced to walk and live by faith? Why did he fear the walk that Abraham enjoyed? It seems to me that Lot simply did not want to get that close to God. He was content to have Abraham rescue him from his condition as he was taken captive from Sodom. He was content for God to have to send Angels to drag him from Sodom. And when he could have asked Abraham to make some room away from Sodom, did Lot inquire of it? Nay, he returned to Sodom.

There came a point when they were fleeing the city that (as I read the passage) it seems to indicate that Lot's wife was behind him logistically. When he was focused on fleeing she had no one to serve as an accountability figure. It was just her and God. Lot could not look back to see her and with judgment falling she sinned against the Lord and disobeyed the command. Hence, "Remember Lot's wife." Lot could keep an eye on her while he was in Sodom, but now they are on the run and everyone has to work out their own salvation with fear and trembling. Would she stand the test? Would she keep her integrity when her man was not looking? Remember Lot's wife!

After the city was destroyed and his wife was dead Lot then got the message about compromise. He fled from Zoar ("little") and headed to the mountains. Why did so much destruction have to hit to get him where God wanted him in the first place?

And here I see is a primary key to understanding compromise; people simply don't want to get that close to God. Like Israel, they don't want to see the glory. They will take the commandments, but they don't want to walk "that close" to God. They know that if they seek the glory of God they must forfeit their own glory. Is this the great fear? Is this why we don't see revival? Christians are simply afraid of a mountain top experience with God. They are afraid of that level of commitment and surrender. They prefer to allow Abraham to serve God and they will simply rely on him (Abraham) as their 'contact' with God. They don't want a relationship with God like that. They want to save their lives. They want to allow others to do it.

What is going to drive the Church in our generation from ZOAR?

Re: Did Lot fear "the mountain" more than he feared compromise? - posted by Gideons (), on: 2004/12/2 16:23

This is an interesting topic.

What is the primary motivation behind compromise? Is it fear or something else?

I don't think Lot compromised not because of fear but he didn't want to fully repent. Lord I'm going to leave Sodom but I can't go live with Abraham. He didn't realize how much better his life would be if he simply turned from those things the Lord directed him to do.

I've been much like Lot most of my life (Lord I'm willing to repent but it has to be on my terms). Fortunately, the Lord is no longer allowing that compromise in my life.

What will it take to leave ZOAR? Probably a couple of trips to the woodshed, at least that's how the Lord deals with me.

Ed

Re: What was the sin of Sodom?Eze 16:49 - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/12/2 23:34

eze 16:49-50 in brown -driver-briggs hebrew definitions Zoar is define as insignificance. Valley experiences are hard to handle after haveing the things of the world and in a day losing them all and on top of that your wife also, and 2 sons in laws , so there was much grief and a basic distrust of God keeping his Word not to destroy Zoar. Lot has not settled the fact of his security in The Lord, but it must be noted that his intervention did save Zoar from certain destruction.No doubt he never gave it a thought as he fled to save self.To the mountains, we'll hide in a cave. As to Lot's wife I believe in her heart she never left Sodom, she enjoyed the things Sodom offered---1 Cor says that a married man cares for the things world how he might please his wife---7:33---thats why a little later it says if your married to be as if your not, its in this respect of affection and its relation ship to the things of the world. Just a thought, what do ya think??

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/3 8:47

Quote:

-----Just a thought, what do ya think??

Hi Dozman,

Yes, the word can mean "Insignificant." I discovered that as well. Zoar was sure to be destroyed also. They were spared for a time. The thing that rings in my mind the most is that Lot was being rescued by two angels that God sent to get him and yet he questioned how the same God could keep him in the mountain? Seems a little fishy.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by Gideons (), on: 2004/12/3 9:25

What confuses me about Lot is that he was described as righteous. I don't understand why looking at what is in scripture. Am I missing something?

2 Peter 2:7,8

And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked: For that righteous man dwelling among them, in seeing and hearing, vexed righteous soul from day to day with unlawful deeds;)

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/3 9:48

Quote:
-----What confuses me about Lot is that he was described as righteous. I don't understand why looking at what is in scripture. Am I missing something?

I think that it demonstrates the longsuffering and mercy of God. Sort of like a prodigal son who is never at home in the pig pen. When we get to the end of his life he comes to himself and leaves the "little" and seemingly "insignificant" compromise of ZOAR. Yet, Sodom was woven in the hearts of his daughters.

Notice that the name "Lot" means "veil." This makes me think of the children of Israel who was willing to take the laws and agree to them and yet did not want to see the glory. It is still the same for them in Rabbinic circles. They don't want God, but they will take "His Word" or at least their rendition of it. I think this is the key to almost everything as Christians and non-Christians; "Do you want God or not?" Will you draw near as He draws you unto Himself; or will you resist the Holy Ghost.

His daughters even caught on to this method of excuses when they said there were no men left to raise up seed in the Earth. Well, where did they get the wine from? Surely it was made by some man. I seriously doubt it was some sort of home brew?! They had been to ZOAR and knew that there were people left.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: Frivolity and Preaching - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/3 14:20

There is a perplexing verse in this passage that deals with Lot trying to get his son-in-laws to leave this wicked city. They are said to have thought that Lot was "mocking." One translation uses the word "jesting." The Hebrew word is Tsachaq and it means, to "laugh, mock, to sport, play, make sport, toy with, make a toy of." Why did they assume he was "joking?" Could it be that there was a flippancy or pattern of light heartedness that caused them to think he was "joking?" I have to wonder, what was there to laugh about in Sodom? What could have caused them to think this man was not serious? Do you see the danger of frivolity? Sure, we can laugh and have a good time. But at what point did he earn a reputation for being insincere?

As it was in the days of Lot so shall it be...

Re: - posted by Gideons (), on: 2004/12/4 9:03

You're absolutely right Robert. The troubling thing to me is that apparently his sons-in-law never heard Lot make a serious stand against the sin in Sodom.

It certainly directs me to ask the Holy Spirit to search my own heart.

Re: Good points - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/12/5 23:53

Just got back and I'm catching up. So, I thought your points were good, think of it this way. Lot chose what looked like the best land when he and Abraham separated (the fruit looked good to the eyes). I believe at one time Lot walked by faith in The Lord along with Abraham but then through a series of choices his testimony became so watered down that his witness was useless---he had lost his saltiness. In Eze the basic description of Sodom is worldliness and ease. Sounds a lot like the church today. John said that loving the things of this world puts one at enmity with God. I believe Lot knew right and wrong but was passive in his stand and like 1Cor he started caring more for the world or its things because of his wife. In a sense, his worldliness was judged in his wife and the fruit of his sins or that element of flesh he came out of Sodom with found its fullest expression in the unlawful activities between his daughters and his incestuous relationship, sin having conceived brought forth its fruit --- Moab. Basically a watered down mixture of what Abraham was. I see the same in the church today. Their greed makes it hard to witness to thoughts in the world. There is something I'd like to add, th

Revivals And Church History :: Did Lot Fear Friendship With God More Than He Feared Compromise?

e 3 temptations that Jesus overcame are the same 3 temptations that have plagued man all through the history of the world from the beginning. John puts it "the lust of the eyes, flesh and the pride of life. I believe this is really what we see being enacted by Lot through things He loved. Sometime people close to us don't really know our hearts in an area but, they see our actions or compromises and form beliefs and behaviours based on us. So what do ya think??? Bless ya ---Bro. Daryl

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/6 5:06

Quote:
-----What confuses me about Lot is that he was described as righteous. I don't understand why looking at what is in scripture. Am I missing something?

Is justification, the declaration that a man is right with God, a lifelong declaration of the judge, or an 'as at that time' utterance? Does it pertain to past offences or does it give future-proof immunity for life?

oops, I think I just heard someone take the lid off another can of worms. :-?

Re: - posted by Gideons (), on: 2004/12/6 7:44

Brother Daryl,

Excellent analysis. I see a parallel between Lot and the modern day church in America. Until we get back to what Jesus wants versus our own wants, there's not much hope for change. Lot was always interested in making the next deal for himself. So the question I must ask myself is whether I'm using God to get what I want or submitting myself to His desires for my life.

Quote:
-----Is justification, the declaration that a man is right with God, a lifelong declaration of the judge, or an 'as at that time' utterance? Does it pertain to past offences or does it give future-proof immunity for life?

Brother Ron, I'm treading on this can of worms here very carefully if that's possible for someone as clumsy as myself. :-o

I think of a number of chosen men that ended up not following Jesus at the end of their lives. Look at the life of Solomon, Saul, and Judas Iscariot. They decided to no longer follow Christ and went their own way at the end of their lives. Did that grant them future proof immunity?

I don't think so and there's a number of other people I could have mentioned in addition to the ones I listed. As you may have noticed, I'm not Calvinistic. I'm not criticizing those who are but own view after years of searching on the topic is that one can lose their salvation.

And yet another can of worms is opened. ;-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/6 8:01

Quote:
-----I don't think so and there's a number of other people I could have mentioned in addition to the ones I listed. As you may have noticed, I'm not Calvinistic. I'm not criticizing those who are but own view after years of searching on the topic is that one can lose their salvation.

That's not another 'can of worms'; it was the exact can I had in mind! :-D

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/12/6 8:12

Quote:

-----Does it pertain to past offences or does it give future-proof immunity for life?

I recall Carl Bangs, a local theologian formerly with Nazarene Theological Seminary (the man who wrote the works on Jacobus Arminius titled "Arminius" A Treatise on the Dutch Reformation) saying that it is only possible to have a present assurance of present salvation. He rejected the notion of a present assurance of final salvation. This is a real sticking point with a lot of believers, but I believe it is quite consistent with the multiplied warnings of scripture. There are too many ifs to ignore.

I have a cousin who is schooled in modern Calvinist view (not to be confused with Calvin's Calvinism) and we discuss this almost every time we meet. Many do not realize that both Calvinism and Arminianism have grown well beyond their original contexts. There are issues on the table now that were not discussed in their day. However, where the former TULIP ended with the "perseverance" of the Saints, modern eternal security believers have changed that "perseverance" to a different word; preservation. Instead of saying the saints will persevere as evidence of their election; they say that by virtue of their having trusted Christ as Savior they are guaranteed to be preserved by God positionally righteous and holy regardless of how one may live. Now, personally I don't mind if a person wants to believe that and they love God and walk in the Spirit; it's when that doctrine is used as a crutch to keep sinning that I have a problem with it.

Simple probability ought to have a chance to weigh in on this topic. Say that there were 100 passages in scripture that seemed to indicate eternal security and 10 that indicated otherwise. There is a 10 to 1 statistical probability that eternal security were legit. Would you rest your immortal soul on that? Would you risk that type of Russian Roulette with your soul? How about 100 to 1? How about 10,000 to 1? How about 100,000,000 to 1? Beloved, if there was even a shadow of a doubt that this doctrine is false we ought to think about our immortal souls.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/12/6 9:05

Quote:

-----it is only possible to have a present assurance of present salvation. He rejected the notion of a present assurance of final salvation.

Thanks, Robert, straight into my notebook!

Re: Noted - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/12/6 15:15

That's good stuff.

Re: - posted by Gideons (), on: 2004/12/6 15:55

The way I would phrase this is that I would ask a rhetorical question which is "How can I be a follower of Christ if I'm not really following Him?"

Re: Agreed - posted by dohzman (), on: 2004/12/6 16:10

See this is my point exactly, however some people have very little accountability because they have only been given limited light or understanding to walk in. In charismatic circles what bothers me is the hyper spirituality I see where they neglect the plain teachings of scripture. Here's an example ---- James 2 I have actually heard individuals teach that the helping of poor brothers and sisters should be led by the Spirit and they keep it in the etheral realm where the hearer can be free from faith with works by saying they didn't feel led by the Spirit to help. I generally teach in the churches that you don't need the mind of Christ on a matter where the Word of God is perfectly clear.