

**General Topics :: Lot & Samson****Lot & Samson - posted by savannah, on: 2011/11/30 18:38**

Q. Did Lot & Samson lead holy lives?

A. \_\_\_\_\_

If no, were they saved?

If yes, can you furnish some examples from the Scriptures?

Thanks for your consideration

**Re: Lot & Samson - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/11/30 20:25**

Hey,

Hmm this is an interesting question.

I think Samson though he fell repented in the end and His faith was counted as righteousness I take this from two passages.

Hebrews 11 where he is mentioned among the faithful  
and Romans 3 where it talks of righteousness obtained through faith

32And what more shall I say? For time would fail me to tell of Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, of David and Samuel and the prophets— 33who through faith conquered kingdoms, enforced justice, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, 34 quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, were made strong out of weakness, became mighty in war, put foreign armies to flight. 35 Women received back their dead by resurrection. Some were tortured, refusing to accept release, so that they might rise again to a better life. 36Others suffered mocking and flogging, and even chains and imprisonment. 37 They were stoned, they were sawn in two, they were killed with the sword. They went about in skins of sheep and goats, destitute, afflicted, mistreated— 38of whom the world was not worthy — wandering about in deserts and mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.

39And all these, though commended through their faith, did not receive what was promised, 40since God had provided something better for us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect. Heb 11:32-39

I think with Samson at the end of his life he did lead a holy life because of the repentance that is seen with action and blessing from God though prior to this he seemed to compromise a lot.

With Lot

well the NT scriptures say  
(for by what he saw and heard that righteous man, while living among them, felt his righteous soul tormented day after day by their lawless deeds), 2 Peter 2:8

hmm I think holy and righteous are two different things  
the definition of Holy is set apart from what I know  
if that is what it is means than I dont think Lot did? since he did not separate himself but was very much a part of the wicked city? He sorta compromised a lot. Even when the angel was trying to save him he wanted to stay in the town and not the mountains (but went eventually)

I think the bible says righteous because he still believed God in faith?

those are just my thoughts

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2011/12/1 4:50**

hi, there is only one way to be saved and that is by faith in the finished work of Jesus.past ,present, and future. i would al  
so put solomon in the same discussion. one day we will know, and i am not the person who is in charge of that right now

**Re: Lot & Samson - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/4 8:01**

EvangelTam, please expound a bit on this you said below:

"I think with Samson at the end of his life he did lead a holy life because of the repentance that is seen with action and bl  
essing from God..."

Are you saying that repentance = leading a holy life?

**Re: - posted by mguldner (), on: 2011/12/4 8:24**

I would say Samson was likely saved, or at least he was commended by Paul or the writer of Hebrews as one in the "H  
all of Faith" so to speak or at least that's what I have always heard chapter 11 called.

**Re: L&S - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/5 0:17**

EvangelTam,

I was hoping you'd come back to this thread as I addressed a question to you regarding your post.

Thanks.

**Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/12/5 0:38**

O sorry yeah

What I mean was that

I believe that any true repentance must accompany a greater degree of holiness in the life of a person in that he has turn  
ed away from sin and toward God. Its sorta just the natural cause and effect.

SO in that way Samson repented and lived holy for a short period of his life

But if you talk about a life of holiness as a whole than it is hard to argue that he did.

if we throw in Solomon we could also talk about Asa and Uzziah as well the Kings who did good but then in the end did  
not. It sorta parallels the spiritual condition of many Christians today.

**Re: , on: 2011/12/5 2:04**

Lot-saved

Samson-saved

Solomon-saved

Jonathan-saved

Uzziah-saved

Jacob-saved

Barak-saved

Ruth-saved

King Saul-lost

Ananias & Sapphira- lost

Ahab-lost

Tamar is an interesting study.

Very few lost people get much air time in the Bible, enough to show what an absence of faith is.

OJ

**Re: saved by faith alone - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/6 18:21**

Old\_Joe wrote, on 2011/12/4 23:04:19

Lot-saved  
Samson-saved  
Solomon-saved  
Jonathan-saved  
Uzziah-saved  
Jacob-saved  
Barak-saved  
Ruth-saved

I agree with you Joe, not because your old either!

But, why do you suppose Zac Poonen would judge and condemn Solomon to hell?

Do you suppose it has to do with the Q&A I asked in the original post?

The Q&A in the original post is related to the thread that Greg Gordon started "CATECHISM FOR YOUNG CHILDREN". Related in that many were stumped by the question about those who are saved being only those who lead holy lives. Yet others were not stumped. This should cause many to begin to soberly examine their understanding of the Gospel of God's Grace, and His salvation which is by faith alone in Christ's finished work alone.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2011/12/6 19:11**

Lot-saved  
Samson-saved  
Solomon-saved  
Jonathan-saved  
Uzziah-saved  
Jacob-saved  
Barak-saved  
Ruth-saved

How were these made perfect?

**Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/12/6 19:39**

Oldjoe,

are you just saying Tamar is an interesting story or asking about her salvation?

If so, I think she was saved because what she shows her righteous character.

26 Judah recognized them and said, "She is more righteous than I, since I wouldn't give her to my son Shelah." And he did not sleep with her again. Ge 38:36

She risked her life to produce an heir for her deceased husband and even waited all those years for Judah's younger son to grow up! Though Judah treated her unfairly, she went to all lengths to do what was right.

This verse is brought to my mind:

But women will be preserved through the bearing of children if they continue in faith and love and sanctity with self-restr

aint. 1 Tim 2:15

**Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/12/6 19:41**

also one more question

Is it possible that Ananias and Sapphira were saved and though they were judged by God because of their disobedience it was a disciplinary act that was meant to save them?

Or were they really unsaved and inregenerate from the start?

**Re: , on: 2011/12/6 23:46**

Quote:

-----But, why do you suppose Zac Poonen would judge and condemn Solomon to hell?

-----

I am not sure you want me to answer that question regarding Poonen.

Regarding Solomon, no unsaved man ever penned a line of scripture, and more, in 1 Chr 17:11-13 God owns Solomon as a son that He will never take His mercy away from, which incidentally is more than He has written about Poonen.

I will willingly go where Solomon is, but I want no part of where Poonen is going.

OJ

**Re: , on: 2011/12/6 23:49**

Tamar's salvation is an interesting story. She is recognized as a woman of God through an act of fornication. She believed God's promise in spite of God's law.

OJ

**Re: , on: 2011/12/6 23:58**

Regarding Ananias and Sapphira it is acts 4:31-32 counts them out

Acts 4:31...they were all filled with the Holy Ghost

Acts 4:32 "...the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he possessed was his own..."

When the Holy Ghost moved he filled THEM, (those that were saved at that time) ALL in the same manner. Ananias and Sapphira were not moved in the same manner as the others. They were not of one heart and of one soul with the rest of the multitude that believed, it is this that counts them out of being saved.

OJ

**Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/12/7 0:56**

thanks that makes sense

hmmm yeah I guess the Tamar story is interesting

Though i think according to the customs of the time that was what was supposed to be done?

I guess these were strange times before the Old Covenant law was in place a lot of things were covered in God's mysterious grace?

**Re: Ananias - posted by Lysa (), on: 2011/12/7 8:58**

Quote:  
-----EvangelTam wrote:  
Is it possible that Ananias and Sapphira were saved and though they were judged by God because of their disobedience it was a disciplinary act that was meant to save them?

Or were they really unsaved and inregenerate from the start?  
-----

I know this wasn't asked of me but I humbly disagree with Old\_Joe's answer and would like to offer another opinion. (sorry Joe!) This is just one person's opinion but I believe that upon further reading, the Scriptures prove that Ananias and Sapphira were both saved and disciplined but not to save them but to save others who were there (Acts 5.5) and who would hear of the story.

To me, if you read chap 4 and 5 logically as one chapter, it shows that Ananias and Sapphira were there in Acts 4.31 when they were all filled with the Holy Spirit. Chapter 4 doesn't miss a beat as it flows straight into chapter 5 introducing Ananias.

In defense of people filled with the Holy Spirit; contrary to popular belief, the baptism doesn't make people perfect. If you are a selfish person when you are baptized in the Holy Spirit, guess what? You are STILL a selfish person afterwards! But you have the power to overcome it if you choose to allow the Lord to have His way in your life. And this was the one place Ananias could have died to his flesh but he sought to save his life and instead lost it.

I believe the key sentence to proving they were saved is when Ananias walked into the room in Acts 5.3 and Peter asked him, "Why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?" An unsaved person cannot lie to the Holy Spirit because they do not have any association with the Holy Spirit whatsoever.

I could be wrong but this is just my understanding of the Scriptures and forgive me if I've offended you by interfering with your conversation.  
God bless,  
Lisa

**Re: , on: 2011/12/7 9:19**

Interesting thread.

**Re: - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/8 13:25**

Old\_Joe,

I asked, "But, why do you suppose Zac Poonen would judge and condemn Solomon to hell?"

You answered, "I am not sure you want me to answer that question regarding Poonen."

I'd not have asked if I did not want you to answer. Now, if you're not sure you want to answer, that is up to you. But I am sure I want you to answer.

I'd also like for you to clarify what you meant when you wrote, "I will willingly go where Solomon is, but I want no part of where Poonen is going."

If any who are reading this thread/post would like proof that Zac Poonen judges and condemns Solomon to hell I can surely provide you with that.

Thanks.

**Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/12/8 14:27**

Yes please post Pooens reasoning why Solomon went to hell  
I dont think he did but he will be judged for what he did and his wayward heart.

God punished him and disciplined him for his sin by raising up opponents to oppose him (just like he did with David) but I believe he was saved.

**Re: Poonen reasoning... - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/8 22:01**

As per EvangelTam's request I am posting from Zac Poonens June 2007 - Word for the Week, which I found on the website of Christian Fellowship Church in India where he is their pastor.

The following are some excerpts from Zac's reasoning in his article regarding Solomon. He writes:

"Solomon took seven years to build the Lord's temple (1 Kings 6:38), and thirteen years to build his own house (1 Kings 7:1). So we know which he valued more!!...But despite all his worldwide reputation for wisdom, Solomon was a mixed-up man. He could pray beautiful prayers to the Lord in public, like most Christians. But in his private life, he was as godless as anyone – again like many Christians...

Solomon wrote three books in Scripture in his lifetime – two of them - Proverbs and Song of Solomon - are like new covenant books in the Old Testament. Proverbs is the finest book in the Old Testament...Ecclesiastes was written after Solomon had drifted. In it, he warns us about the dangers of worldly wisdom. This man who wrote three wonderful books of the Bible finally went to hell! Don't imagine that everyone who stands up and preaches wonderful sermons will go to heaven. How do we know that Solomon went to hell? Is it possible that the Holy Spirit would write two biographies of Solomon (1 Kings and 2 Chronicles), and not mention in either of them that he repented towards the end of his life, if he had actually done so. Such silence is very eloquent. It tells us that Solomon died unrepentant.

Why are many Christians so keen on "sending Solomon to heaven"? It's because they imagine that anyone who serves the Lord will definitely go to heaven. No matter how they live. Jesus said that many would come to Him on the last day and say, "Lord, we prophesied in Your Name, we cast out demons in Your Name, we did miracles in Your Name." But the Lord will say to them, "Depart from me, you who lived in sin." Solomon will come before the Lord in that day too and say, "Lord, I wrote three books of Scripture that blessed millions of people." And the Lord will tell him also exactly what He tells the others, "Depart from me, you who lived in sin."

Thanks be to God!

**Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2011/12/8 22:52**

Quote:

----- But, why do you suppose Zac Poonen would judge and condemn Solomon to hell?  
-----

Not only is Poonen's verdict unsupported biblically, he also denies the possibility of repentance. Ecclesiastes is surely a valid expression of repentance – and the evidence of a softened and contrite heart. Does an unrepentant heart even want to warn people to fear God!

God has an entire life time to work on a person. So why do so many have difficulty accepting the validity of –“eleventh h our” repentance? Why do many judge failures so severely, and forget that failure is God’s means of building faith – like in Abraham who failed many times - and like in Solomon?

Diane

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2011/12/8 23:16**

hi, bro.len ravenhill also believes solomon went to hell. he was asked not to do 3 things and sated himself in all 3.jimp o ne of the things God commanded solomon to avoid was having many women. one was having many horses. i have a bo ok on the 3rd.

**Re: - posted by EvangelTam, on: 2011/12/9 0:12**

This doesnt make sense because SOlomon asked God for wisdom. Its says in the bible the fear of the Lord is the begin ning of wisdom

So Solomon had to have feared God he was given heavenly, the wisdom of Christ Himself.

Through SOlomon we are given a picture of the majesty and wisdom of Christ.

he queen of the South will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of th e earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here. Matthew 12:42

Yes Solomon sinned but he prayed and God answered Him and made a covenant through Solomon to all the ISraelites. Does God not only listen to the pray of a righteous man?

Like I said before Solomon was diciplined for his sin by the opposition raised against him.

But another question I would also like to know that relates if Solomon went to hell  
Did Asa and Uzziah go to hell as well?

They both sinned against God toward the end of their lives despite previous blessing from Him in the beginning

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2011/12/9 0:56**

hi, solomon had 700 wives and 300 concubines out of many tribes of idol worshippers that lead him into idol worship 1ki ngs 11 speaks of this and Gods anger with solomon and there is no record of repentance, only of deeper decay.jimp

**Re: edit - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/9 1:10**

post removed until time is taken to pray and do a diligent search of the scripture.

**Re: , on: 2011/12/9 1:11**

Quote:

-----I asked, "But, why do you suppose Zac Poonen would judge and condemn Solomon to hell?"

You answered, "I am not sure you want me to answer that question regarding Poonen."

I'd not have asked if I did not want you to answer. Now, if you're not sure you want to answer, that is up to you. But I am sure I want you to answer.

Since you have asked, Though exalted to super-saint status here, Poonen is a false teacher who bases his salvation on his 'fruit' rather than on the promise of God.

He plainly denies John 6:47.

OJ

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2011/12/9 7:07

Quote:

----- with solomon and there is no record of repentance, only of deeper decay.  
-----

Solomon's Ecclesiastes is one of the most beautiful and powerful expressions of repentance that has ever existed. It is written by a broken and contrite man, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and preserved in the Holy Writ - all in the form of magnificent wisdom literature. To deny its stunning quality and its redemptive potential is to miss the Old Testament's most powerful Prodigal Son model. It is to deny the teaching value of failure. It is to deprive countless stray sinners of hope. It is like cutting out the heart of the gospel in the Old Testament. And more - it is like cutting out the very heart of God.

In Ecclesiastes, Solomon is reflecting on his life journey and evaluating it from his new, repentant perspective. Through a rich array of poetic devices he articulates how everything under the sun is meaningless. Everything in this temporal existence APART FROM GOD will inevitably lead to emptiness and despair. Solomon learned the hard way - by experience. He recognizes the meaninglessness of all that he had done and all that he had acquired in his life. He is profoundly honest. And because of his ability to be so deeply insightful about himself, he was able to understand the fallen and fragile disposition of humanity. We are nothing without God!!

Solomon is one of the deepest thinkers we will ever meet. He takes repentance to the very core. He realized that he had taken a bite of the proverbial fruit in the Garden of Eden - and had sought to be as god in his own right - independent from the God of eternity. But in the end he came to accept his fragile humanness - and let God be God. He says, "I know that it will go better with God-fearing men.." 8:12

Ecclesiastes is Solomon's love-offering to humanity. It is his loving and humble deed - his "cup of water" to the thirsty. It is meeting true need at the profoundest level of the heart (thirst for meaning and significance). Solomon's offering, according to Jesus, fits the criteria for entrance into heaven!!!!

If that isn't authentic repentance, then nothing else is!!!

There is no exegetical basis for condemning Solomon to hell. That verdict is based not on exegesis, but on iso-geis - that is, reading INTO the text. Such a verdict may seem to serve as an effective threat - to keep sinners on the straight and narrow. But it is a fear tactic that is not inspired by the Spirit. It squelches the hope of the gospel - and distorts God. Unfortunately such a biased perception is bound to color the way all the related scriptures are read. I fear that this is possible in Poonen's argument.

Perhaps Ecclesiastes is a book that we come to appreciate more and more only as our own repentance goes deeper and deeper (and our appreciation for fine literature).

Diane

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2011/12/9 7:47

Furthermore... It would seem to me that to suggest a book in Scripture is written by a hardened hell-bound sinner would be making a fool out of the Holy Spirit, as well as those who formed the canon!!

The liberals have "de-fused" Ecclesiastes by suggesting that it is written much later. I think the conservatives must be careful not to defuse it in their own way - and in that way diminish its profitability.

Diane



**Re: Solomon the prodigal - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/9 11:35**

Diane,

Excellent posts!

Is what you wrote all your own words?

If not, who did you glean such beautiful and compelling words from? As I'd like to read more of the same.

Thanks.

**Re: roadsign - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/12/9 12:02**

Dear Sister,

A pleasure to "meet" you Ma'am. :O)

Quote:

"Furthermore... It would seem to me that to suggest a book in Scripture is written by a hardened hell-bound sinner would be making a fool out of the Holy Spirit, as well as those who formed the canon!!"

How does one prove that Ecclesiastes was written by King Solomon? It may very well have been, but if this can't be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt, then what of the arguments you have put forth?

It may be that Solomon repented before death, (as Ezekiel 18 shows us is necessary with God), but if we can't even prove that Ecclesiastes was written by Solomon, then we cannot use this book to "prove" that he did repent, can we? Do you see what I mean dear Sister?

I wish you well in the Lord.

Doug

**Re: - posted by hulsey (), on: 2011/12/9 12:16**

It's important to keep in mind that Godly men throughout history are split on this. Brother Poonen does not stand alone on this interpretation.

Also consider that God spoke one of the greatest prophecies about the Messiah through the mouth of the pagan prophet Balaam.

Blessings,  
Jeremy

**Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2011/12/9 13:29**

Quote:

----- Is what you wrote all your own words?  
-----

Yes, sister.

Quote:

----- but if we can't even prove that Ecclesiastes was written by Solomon, then we cannot use this book to "prove" that he did repent, can we?  
-----

Yes Doug, I realize that authorship is not conclusive according to biblical criticism. Yet no reasonable alternative exists -

yet. I think the following footnote from the NET Bible site, speaks for the current situation regarding authorship:

-----  
"Apart from David, only Solomon was 'king over Israel in Jerusalem' – unless the term 'Israel' (yisra'el) in 1:12 is used for Judah or the postexilic community. Solomon would fit the description of the author of this book, who is characterized by great wisdom (1:13, 16), great wealth (2:8), numerous servants (2:7), great projects (2:4-6), and the collection, editing and writings of many proverbs (12:9-10). All of this generally suggests Solomonic authorship. However, many scholars deny Solomonic authorship on the basis of linguistic and historical arguments."  
-----

Now, I realize that my following point holds absolutely no water in scholarship, but here it is: Many years ago after studying the account of Solomon, I became deeply burdened about the outcome of his life – and so I simply asked God to show me. I am still convinced that the Spirit brought Ecclesiastes into my mind, and put the whole idea of him being a returned prodigal. I doubt that back then I would have even entertained the possibility, because that's just not what any one talked about or where my mind was at. Still to this day after much more bible studying, nothing has given me reason for a need to question the authorship. The skeptics just don't have a strong case.

By accepting Solomonic authorship, we lose nothing. We actually strengthen the unity of scripture on many points – including the two testaments. Conversely, by remaining non-committal – the loss is substantial, I fear. Ecclesiastes gets marginalized in the church, and disconnected from Solomon and his life.... and next thing you know – Solomon is in hell! It's a slippery path – and not worth the risk IMHO.

Wouldn't you say?

Diane

**Re: - posted by dietolive, on: 2011/12/9 14:04**

Dear Sister Diane,

You have well-written, and I am inclined to agree with your supposition. However, please consider my thoughts, if you will.

Quote:

"I realize that authorship is not conclusive according to biblical criticism."

Not according to biblical "criticism" per se, but rather according to the writer of Ecclesiastes. The writer does not name himself. Therefore, we cannot absolutely say it was Solomon.

For instance, I believe Hebrews was written by Paul, but beyond a male pronoun used in one place, we cannot know for certain who wrote it.

Quote:

"By accepting Solomonic authorship, we lose nothing."

I accept Solomonic authorship, probably, but since I cannot be certain, I am barred from using this "probably fact" to prove another "absolute fact." I couldn't do so logically. Do you see what I am saying Ma'am?

Quote:

"We actually strengthen the unity of scripture on many points – including the two testaments. Conversely, by remaining non-committal – the loss is substantial, I fear. Ecclesiastes gets marginalized, disconnected from Solomon and his life.... and next thing you know – Solomon is in hell! It's a slippery path – and not worth the risk IMHO."

I am not sure what you mean here. Are you looking for a particular outcome, ("isogesis"?) Or are you willing to accept the Scriptures at face value, ("exegesis"?)

I myself have to accept the Scriptures where it shows that Solomon backslid, and though I think he repented, I cannot prove this from Scripture. Whatever happened to him however, his amazing rise and devastating fall is a powerful

reminder for us all to take God and His Word very seriously. In other words, God is glorified if we look at it either way.

I recall what the apostle Paul said when he warned the Church not to follow those who sinned in the Old Testament:

“Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted....

Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them...

Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed...

Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted...

Neither murmur ye, as some of them also murmured...

Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples: and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.”

I Corinthians 10:6-11

Just my thought regarding this. I am not saying it must be one way or the other.

Be well ma'am,  
Doug

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2011/12/9 15:26**

Old-joe

Please, if you have inspiration on this from Heb 11:39, in how these Old Testament saints?, I would appreciate your view, "How are they made perfect" in Christ:?

Lot-saved  
Samson-saved  
Solomon-saved  
Jonathan-saved  
Uzziah-saved  
Jacob-saved  
Barak-saved  
Ruth-saved

How were these made perfect? Not just, "by faith", which I understand, but how and when Christ was made perfect in them.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2011/12/9 17:51**

Hello Doug. I value your gracious reply – and I will do my best in response.

Quote:  
----- I am barred from using this “probably fact” to prove another “absolute fact.” I couldn’t do so logically. Do you see what I am saying Ma’am?  
-----

Oh yes brother. In other words, we defend our “absolutes” from our preferred “probabilities”. This sounds like the backdrop for many disputes regarding scripture – even among the experts. Who am I to provide any logical conclusion in this particular matter? I do note that Mathew and Mark offer no author name; yet we accept their authorship based on criteria from the early church. Certainly, here we are comfortable with accepting a “probability” as fact (although this i

s even being questioned).

Quote:

-----The writer does not name himself. Therefore, we cannot absolutely say it was Solomon.  
-----

Yet, in Ecclesiastes there seems to be a substantial quantity of "absolutes" regarding the author - in comparison with Hebrews which offers almost none. Regarding the use of a name as conclusive evidence - even here scholars are questioning Ephesian authorship based on assorted criteria, in spite of Paul's name throughout. I have the same problem here as with Ecclesiastes because, here again, when the author gets severed off, the teachings lose potential weight. (For me it makes a difference when a teaching is backed by a real person's life story - someone you can learn more about in other parts of scripture - as Solomon and Paul)

A side note: Poonen (and others) argue that the absence of recorded repentance proves Solomon guilty. By the same token there is an intriguing absence of judgment against Solomon in the New Testament. The NT uses other examples: Sodom, the wandering Israelites (They did not enter God's rest). Here Solomon should have been the ideal model!

Quote:

----- In other words, God is glorified if we look at it either way.  
-----

I may very well arrive at this conclusion some day. For now I'm not there. Maybe there's a bit of Calvinism in me: God is able to save his own - no matter how deeply they fall - and Solomon is prime example of the power of God's mercy. Certainly Solomon reveals plenty of evidence of belonging to God - and being endowed with the Spirit. (That's surely proof for a Calvinist!)

True, Solomon's failings alone, can serve as a caution, along with the scriptures you posted. Yet Ecclesiastes gets at the root of those sins: the search for meaning apart from God. Today our society is reeling because of this same insatiable search for meaning and significance. This is driving so many of our youth into destructive life habits - in spite of the insurmountable evidence of the tragic outcomes. In view of this crisis among our youth today, I find myself extremely protective of this potential Biblical application: Solomon and his hope offered for youth. It's not just a warning to stop doing bad, but the remedy for that driving thirst: God himself.

The thin thread of probability, for me is outbalanced by a multi-stringed cord of absolutes drawn together from a very wide radius.

Diane

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2011/12/9 18:11**

The Preacher says he was the son of David, King over Israel, the wisest man in all Jerusalem, the richest, and wrote some 3000 proverbs. Checking Proverbs Solomon is the primary writer with others sprinkled in.

That is good enough for me, as with Paul in Hebrews, who had the highest education in all the land and always in his commission to preach what Christ Himself revealed to him of all his epistles, preaching Christ and Him Crucified and his position 146 times, that position being in Christ, and Christ in him.

To me truth; revealed by the Holy Spirit and conformation in my mind. Not from man.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: , on: 2011/12/9 23:49

Quote:  
-----Please, if you have inspiration on this from Heb 11:39, in how these Old Testament saints?, I would appreciate your view, "How are they made perfect" in Christ:?"  
-----

Have you received the promise of Christ's second coming? Not yet, but even though we haven't actually received the promise of the second coming it doesn't keep us from trusting in the fact that it is coming does it? The OT saints all looked FORWARD to the coming Messiah, whereas we look backward at it. Neither of us have actually seen the day, but both of us actually look to the same work accomplished on the cross as our justification before God. They were made perfect through the righteousness of faith (Rom 4) the same way the Christian is today.

The righteousness ZP and others are preaching is NOT the righteousness of faith, but their own righteousness of Rom 10:3-4, which never makes one perfect before God.

OJ

Re: basic math - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/10 0:31

OJ,

You said,

1) "Poonen is a false teacher who bases his salvation on his 'fruit' rather than on the promise of God."

And you also said,

+1) "The righteousness ZP and others are preaching is NOT the righteousness of faith, but their own righteousness of Rom 10:3-4, which never makes one perfect before God."

To sum it up you said,

=2) "I will willingly go where Solomon is, but I want no part of where Poonen is going."

I know  $1+1=2$

Tell me, is my math wrong when I add up your quotes  $1+1$  to = Zac Poonen is going to hell!

Because I know that "false teacher" as you call ZP, and those who are preaching a righteousness that is "NOT the righteousness of faith" as you accuse ZP of, are hell-bound!

Re: - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/10 0:58

Post Removed by poster

**Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2011/12/10 8:32**

Quote:

----- "I will willingly go where Solomon is, but I want no part of where Poonen is going.

I know  $1+1=2$

Tell me, is my math wrong when I add up your quotes  $1+1 = \text{Zac Poonen is going to hell!}$

-----

Savanna, Creative use of mathematical logic here! Isn't it a relief to know that logic doesn't win the day!

Of course, if we are going to "err" on the side of mercy towards Solomon, it is only fair to extend that same mercy towards Poonen. We sure don't want to be guilty of the very thing we accuse him of.

Solomon experienced divine judgments in his life time. So did his father David – and really, all of us. Judgments are God's means of bringing his straying children back to him and building their faith. (See Heb. 12:1-12) I accept that for Solomon – because to me it reflects God's nature - even if we ignore Ecclesiastes (which I think we mustn't do).

As long as a person is alive, there is a way back to God - through His long-suffering mercy and grace. Mercy triumphs over judgment - thankfully!

Maybe it was that way for Lot too? What do you think?

Blessings,

Diane

**Re: repentance as evidence - posted by savannah, on: 2011/12/11 18:20**

All this to do over the absence of repentance in the life of Solomon before he died. I have a question to you all who look for such repentance in Solomon.

Q. Can anyone direct us to the place in scripture where we read of Lot's repentance before he died?

Thanks.

**Re: , on: 2011/12/11 19:16**

Quote:

-----Q. Can anyone direct us to the place in scripture where we read of Lot's repentance before he died?

-----

Nobody can in the sense you are expecting, because it is not there.

But God counted him as righteous because Lot changed his mind in looking to another for his salvation, and THAT is his repentance! His sanctification was lacking, but his justification was perfect before God. Likewise with Solomon, and Samson for that matter....

BTW your math is good. It is the same math where Christ plus or minus nothing equals everything and Christ plus or minus anything equals nothing is derived from. Poonen along with many others who are throwing out their overcorrection to

Osteen's Christ minus are preaching Christ plus...unfortunately if each continues on their present path they will all be 'roommates' together, and it won't be in a mansion...

Just like there won't be many from Osteen's church in heaven, there won't many from SI in heaven. Osteen subtracts from what Christ has done, whereas here it is very palatable to add to what Christ has done. In both cases it comes down to a faulty view of the worthiness of self. Osteen preaches an inherent worthiness, Poonen preaches a worthiness found in for lack of a better word 'overcoming', both are false, NONE were found worthy!

What I find amazing is some so-called big name preacher comes along and casts Solomon a saint of God out of heaven and there is barely a whimper, but let the same judgment fall on said big name preacher and oh what a ruckus! This is what Matt 7:2 is all about.

OJ

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2011/12/13 1:06**

Quote: ""have you received the promise of Christ's second coming? Not yet, but even though we haven't actually received the promise of the second coming it doesn't keep us from trusting in the fact that it is coming does it?""

Yes I have received the promise and the mystery fulfillment in my spirit, He has come; already and I have prayer of Jesus Christ to the Father also, the Holy Spirit is in my soul mind teaching me these truths and who I am in Christ and that He is birthed in me. The only place I am groaning is in my flesh and He will come and change that also when He comes with a shout to claim His Bride the Body of Christ in the twinkling of an eye. Is He come in our spirit? Is the Holy Spirit come in our soul-mind? Are we sealed into Christ by the Holy Spirit?

In Christ: Phillip