

Scriptures and Doctrine :: What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does inerrancy matter?

What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does inerrancy matter? - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/9 20:45

In the //Charisma House Announces 'Most Modern Version' of KJV// thread I defended my belief of the Superiority of the KJV for the english speaking people.

much of my fondation for my side of the disscussion was on the doctrine of inspiration, almost all of the books I quoted from where not written by KJV nor Textus Receptus people, one of the books even used the NIV for its quotes.

Threads have a tendency of running off on rabbit trails but for this thread, I would like to keep the discussion off of Bible translations, even though if personally asked I will defend my belief but other than for a brief answers or to make a point that can only be made with the KJV I will make it, but not try to critize other translations that differ, I would like to keep this disscussion translation neutral. There is alot of good strong points in favor of inspiration and inerrancy believed and written by people whom are not KJV Only, acctually I have found much better points on inspiration from books that are not written by KJV onylist than by them who are.

I have a book in front of me that to me does not make since, it is written by a liberal southern baptist Clayton Sullivan. 'Toward a mature faith does biblical inerrancy make since?' In which clay makes an extreme case in opposition to inerrancy, that I do not believe any common posters to SI would agree with.

So What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does biblical inerrancy matter?

Re: What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does inerrancy matter?, on: 2013/2/10 4:49

Personally I have never made any real effort to look into the historical roots of English Bible translations. At the same time I realise that there is a reality to contend with so far as the question goes "does inerrancy matter?" To answer that question satisfactorily would clearly necessitate both an ability to read Hebrew and Greek as well as Aramaic in the case of the Book of Daniel, as well as Latin and Old English. That is all beyond myself and I guess it is beyond most other people as well. The second and seemingly lesser approach is to try to demonstrate from a non phonological position that error is as a result of changes of meaning intentionally or otherwise hidden within the new translation or translations. This perspective is essentially a seeking to prove occult (hidden) activity either by Satan or else "men" for a purpose of producing a "universal" bible which will be embraced in the end of the age.

The difficulty with either of these approaches, even if one had the knowledge and resources to undertake such an enquiry, is that even this itself could lead to error and the imputation of ideas into the scriptures which would amount to adding or else taking away from the word of God. Therefore it is understandable why some men emphasis being led of the Holy Spirit when reading scriptures, rather than an intellectual ability to understand by reason, which Bible translation is more accurate. Your other thread makes this point very well when a sister taking the second of the two approaches as briefly outlined above, is in finality "exposed" as a cook, somewhat in a poor spirit. Those who believe themselves to be linguistically gifted, whether they can read Hebrew or Greek or not, say that not being able to read Hebrew or Greek must of necessity disqualify a person from being able to speak into this difficult subject. This does of course completely neglect to take account of the fact that many of the translations which are "doubted" were made by men who could read Hebrew and Greek themselves.

Just to make my own position clear. I would gather up just about every translation from the 19th century onwards and burn the lot of them. This however has nothing to do with either of the positions stated in this thread. Although I have consistently seen that many translations have become biased with perceptions of life, more reflecting this age of gross deception in which we live, I have also seen that the linguistic emphasis and inevitable semantic expression of modern translations contradicts in many instances, what my spirit witnesses to by the Holy Spirit. To that end I place my own reliance on the leading of the Spirit to understand scriptures and anticipate that He will lead me into a fuller and more profitable understanding of Christ Himself. This had better be experiential of the truth as well as comprehending the truth, otherwise it is

s all vanity in any event.

This link is a pleasant look at English translation which gives an historical perspective on the subject.

<http://www.greatsite.com/timeline-english-bible-history/>

Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2013/2/10 6:05

“For a mature faith does biblical inerrancy matter?”

Unfortunately, yes, it matters, because the doctrine of inerrancy is perhaps the deadliest man-trap the devil has ever devised for the people of God. Here is a shortened version of an old essay of mine titled “The Cult of Biblicism,” which is so well-written that the impartial reader will surely deem it Infallible:

The Reformers believed that Sola Scriptura (“only scripture”) would answer all questions, resolve all doctrinal disputes and provide a basis of unity for all believers.

Today there are over 32,000 warring denominations, all claiming the Bible as their Authority. Clearly, Sola Scriptura has not worked out the way it was supposed to.

The doctrine of biblical inerrancy, which was supposed to set Truth on objective grounds and guard against “subjectivism” has instead led to the most arbitrary kind of subjectivism: we can believe whatever we want to believe, and make the Bible tell us we are right.

The reason is that the Bible, by its very nature, has no authority. It is a helpless book, totally at the mercy of its interpreters. Consider the endless debates about freewill vs. predestination, pre-trib vs. post-trib and eternal security vs. reprobation. People can make the Bible say whatever they want it to say, and the Biblicist method of “exegesis” facilitates this: just hop-scotch thru the Bible stringing together proof-texts that support your pet doctrines and disregard the rest.

We can even use inerrancy to prove that the Bible is false, if that’s what we want to believe. We are told that “the Bible is the infallible, verbally inspired Word of God and there are no contradictions, inconsistencies or scientific inaccuracies in it. If there were a single error, that would prove it is not the Word of God, since God doesn’t make mistakes.”

If that is the standard, then it is easy enough to discredit the Bible by listing all the contradictions (Deut. 24:16 - Josh. 7:19-26; 2 Chron. 25:4 - Is. 14:21), discrepancies (Matt. 28:10,16 - Luke 24:49; Matt. 27:5 - Acts 1:18; Acts 9:7 - Acts 22:9), misattributions (Zech. 11:12-13 - Matt. 27:9) and apparent misinterpretations (Hosea 11:1 - Matt. 2:15; Zech. 9:9 - Matt. 21:1-7).

The doctrine of inerrancy has destroyed the faith of millions by making the Bible the supreme authority over heaven and earth, and then basing its authority on a standard of journalistic perfection that it does not meet up to.

Inerrancy is one of the very few religious doctrines that can be proven wrong, but it remains the foundation of Industrial Religion.

Why then do we cling so stubbornly to the creed of Biblicism? Because “the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” Heb 4:12

This sort of divine communication was never to man’s taste, so we wave the Bible and say, “This is the Word of God!” Because the Bible is an object that we can control, whereas the Living Word of God, Jesus, is a Subject who acts upon and controls us.

We all know that false teachers can put the Bible to evil use. If the Bible is the Word of God, then God has lost sovereignty over His own Word. Was Satan speaking the Word of God when he quoted Scripture to Jesus?

The Word of God is not a static deposit of truth that God has handed over to men and devils to do with as they please. The Word of God is an ongoing event: the event of God speaking to us.

May He speak to us today and deliver us from the Bibleonian Captivity!

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/10 8:29

you guys are talking over my head. can i just say that if what we hold in our hands has mistakes and mistranslations and may not be correct then we have nothing, and all the people who say the bible is a book of myths and fables may have a point after all. also, what duz it say about god that he could not preserve his word? what a weak and pathetic god who belongs in the same category as zues or joseph smith.

if we can not trust what is in our hands then we are wasting our time and lets go party and get drunk and be gluttons becuz what else is there 2 live for? eat, drink and be merry for tomorrow we die.

i am a natural born skeptic, but i am shocked 2 find a christian forum where believers call in2 question the very scriptures they say they believe. oh i know, every1 couches their words in very spiritual language and theological rhetoric but in essence for all the "intellect" being bantered about; all that is really being said is that u do not believe what u have in ur hands is true. it cant be counted on. if not then it brings into question EVERYTHING we say believe from creation to salvation to heaven.

and people are down on me becuz i am a skeptic? more amazing is that those who voice their opinions the loudest here readily admit that they have never studied the history of the english bible. think about how that sounds.

throw ur bibles away. they can not be trusted. the heathen are correct.

Re: What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does inerrancy matter?, on: 2013/2/10 10:57

Quote:
-----more amazing is that those who voice their opinions the loudest here readily admit that they have never studied the history of the english bible. think about how that sounds. skepticguy

Having said that I personally have never studied the history of the English Bible I suppose I ought to ask.....how does it sound?

I would just like to say brother that I cherish the scriptures above all other texts and don't regard the scriptures as though a "book" at all. Not even many books for that matter. I give less regard to historical relevance than I do to knowing the scriptures and so I haven't seen a need to study the history of the English Bible. That is not to say that I said I was ignorant of the basic facts of history. I wrote what I did to create emphasis and not to facilitate or provoke a reaction amounting to seeming ignorance on my part. When all is said and done my trust is in God and His sovereign power to lead all men into the truth including myself. I hope that I would never actually just voice an opinion, especially the loudest one, but if I do no doubt there are brethren who will be swift to remind me of it!

Can I say brother that there is a huge difference in realising that some translations have interpretive errors in them or else omissions because of using different textual sources from the ancient world, and thinking that this amounts to God being impotent if it can be proven true. Adam was perfect in all his ways yet he sinned. He wasn't even deceived as was Eve, yet he still sinned. So he must have acted wilfully. Was God, the One true and living God, who created the heavens and the earth and all that is in them before the fall, less than the One true living God after the fall? Adam's actions did not diminish God. Neither do various bible translations which have errors and omissions because the men who served God in these various translations made mistakes or else in good conscience ignored minority texts in favour of majority texts. Paul said "if Christ be not raised from the dead...." If this is true then I will come to the public house with you and stop calling you brother. No contention over the scriptures and the validity of various translations is going to set my feet on the road to the public house. Praise God for that at least!

Re: Many good thoughts! - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/10 11:47

amrkelly,wayneman,and SkepticGuy Many good thoughts!

Waymen wrote RE:

///Unfortunately, yes, it matters, because the doctrine of inerrancy is perhaps the deadliest man-trap the devil has ever devised for the people of God. Here is a shortened version of an old essay of mine titled "The Cult of Biblicism," which is so well-written that the impartial reader will surely deem it Infallible:

The Reformers believed that Sola Scriptura ("only scripture") would answer all questions, resolve all doctrinal disputes and provide a basis of unity for all believers.

Today there are over 32,000 warring denominations, all claiming the Bible as their Authority. Clearly, Sola Scriptura has not worked out the way it was supposed to.

The doctrine of biblical inerrancy, which was supposed to set Truth on objective grounds and guard against "subjectivism" has instead led to the most arbitrary kind of subjectivism: we can believe whatever we want to believe, and make the Bible tell us we are right.

The reason is that the Bible, by its very nature, has no authority. It is a helpless book, totally at the mercy of its interpreters. Consider the endless debates about freewill vs. predestination, pre-trib vs. post-trib and eternal security vs. reprobation. People can make the Bible say whatever they want it to say, and the Biblicist method of "exegesis" facilitates this: just hop-scotch thru the Bible stringing together proof-texts that support your pet doctrines and disregard the rest. ///

Waymen, I hold to a very solid conservative belief in inerrancy as demonstrated in the other thread.

But I will agree that you bring up some very important points that I agree with!

but also I feel that you take those same good points over the deep end.

In a similar way to what the denomination of the church that I attend is affiliated with has.

Such a position has over the years destroyed an historically sound denomination.

There are many spirits and if the spirit contradicts the written Word then we need to question the spirit.

The denomination that I am speaking of Strongly promotes being led by the spirit and not being led by the dead letter, but their spirit has led them in complete opposition to the Written Logos, to such an extent that they have left the true inward Logos.

But having said that, I will agree with you that there is a "The Cult of Biblicism" We see it, You see it, I see it. People who fight tooth and nail for the doctrine of inerrancy, but deny that doctrine in personal practice.

And I will go as far as to say that most of the books written on KJV superiority have that feel to me personally and sometimes almost leave me with a sick feel after reading them.

Yet when I am reading my Bible and Believe my Bible regardless of the supposed contradictions, I do not have that sick feel.

I go away very much with inward assurance of my position, and much (true) peace and that (peace is not the peace of hidden pride, as what one can go away with after reading KJV-only material.)

We know that "The Cult of Biblicism" is not a new cult, we know that it was a Jewish cult of Jesus' day, he pointed it out, But he also pointed out that those of that cult actually did not believe the scripture, He pointed out to them if they actually believed the scripture then they would have relieved whom He was.

So Jesus did not tell those of the "The Cult of Biblicism" of his day, that they put too much belief and trust into the scriptures, He never makes that argument!!!(search the scriptures and see!) , but instead his approach was one of pointing out to them, as you have made aware that those whom are of the "The Cult of Biblicism" do not believe the scripture, because if you truly believe the scripture then no, you do not make the scripture say whatever you want it to say. but instead you allow God to lead you to the true interpretation of scripture.

If you truly believe the scripture you do not allow systematic interpretations, Theology, and such traditions to make the ((Word of God of none effect)) Jesus referred to the written Word, as the Word of God, let us not refer to it as less.

edit: to be continued

Edit: PS: while reading over this again I found this statement a little odd at best: wayneman wrote ///Here is a shortened

version of an old essay of mine titled "The Cult of Biblicism," which is so well-written that the impartial reader will surely deem it infallible:///

I do find the Bible infallible, but I think in light of Scripture, Wayne's essay regardless of how well written will surely be deemed as fallible.

Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2013/2/10 13:16

proudpapa,

I had little hope that you would share my belief in Wayne's infallibility.

But you do raise an important point: denominations that reject infallibility eventually drift into dead liberal theology or wild "charismatic" excesses. So I understand perfectly why so many believers feel that it is essential to uphold the doctrine of inerrancy. But the fact is that it has proved ineffective as a defense mechanism against doctrinal error and division.

I have a personal grudge against inerrancy and the field of Christian Apologetics as a whole. As a teenager I heard the Word of God and believed and was baptized. Two years later I walked away from the faith; religious rationalism was my downfall.

First, I was told that there could be no contradictions in the Bible, since God wrote it. But I soon discovered that there were hundreds if not thousands of contradictions and inconsistencies. So I turned to the Apologists for answers, but their explanations and "proofs" were so weak and specious that they talked me right out of believing.

I was smart enough to see that the doctrine of inerrancy did not hold up under scrutiny, but not smart enough to see that the fault lay with the church's doctrine of inspiration, not with the Bible itself.

The Lord could have given us the kind of flawless Bible that fundamentalism requires, but He didn't, probably because He doesn't want us to be fundamentalists.

Apologetics hands the victory to the enemy by meeting infidels on their own ground: fallen human reason vs. fallen human reason. Paul did nothing of the kind:

"For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of no effect." (1 Cor. 1:17)

"And my speech and my preaching were not with persuasive words of human wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power, that your faith should not be in the wisdom of men but in the power of God." (1 Cor. 2:4-5)

"For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal but mighty in God for pulling down strongholds, casting down arguments and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of God." (2 Cor. 10:4-5)

We don't need logical formulations to defend the Bible: we know the Bible is truth because the Spirit of Truth bears witness, not because some egghead reasoned us into believing.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/10 15:19

Hi wayneman,

I appreciate your reply because it better helps me to understand your position and where you are coming from on this to pic.

wayneman wrote ///But you do raise an important point: denominations that reject infallibility eventually drift into dead liberal theology or wild "charismatic" excesses. So I understand perfectly why so many believers feel that it is essential to uphold the doctrine of inerrancy. But the fact is that it has proved ineffective as a defense mechanism against doctrinal error and division.///

I agree the doctrine of inerrancy has not preserved denominations from falling away from the truth. But I see this because denominations as a rule bring the Bible into bondage by their treatise, councils, articles of faith, theologies and other such traditions, that make the Word of God of no effect.

They bring to bondage the freedom of conscience (the ears to hear) to their adherents, they in essence and all reality do not support the inerrancy of scripture they deny it.

wayneman wrote ///I have a personal grudge against inerrancy and the field of Christian Apologetics as a whole. As a teenager I heard the Word of God and believed and was baptized. Two years later I walked away from the faith; religious rationalism was my downfall.

First, I was told that there could be no contradictions in the Bible, since God wrote it. But I soon discovered that there were hundreds if not thousands of contradictions and inconsistencies. So I turned to the Apologists for answers, but their explanations and "proofs" were so weak and specious that they talked me right out of believing.///

Hi wayneman,

As I briefly alluded to in the other thread I had a similar experience as does many Christians. What is really bad is when those same ones that preach the scripture is infallible become the ones whom point out supposed contradictions.

For me it caused a Crisis of Belief, and caused me to lash out very much as a skeptic alluded to as what would be reality if we did not believe that we can trust the Bible that we have.

You know what I was upset with God, because He would allow seeming contradictions in the scripture that were bound to throw off any rational mind from believing the Bible.

In absolute spiritual agony I looked down two paths the one I could try to hang on to my faith and be bound by all these rules and stuff (As Paul says if 'if there be no resurrection' 'we are of all men most miserable' (Pascal's Wager does not cut it!) the other path I could do as I wanted, live however I wanted, be as wicked as I wanted, pursue any thing I wanted. But you know what I seen in the end of this path, I seen myself in Hell mad at God because of allowing the seeming contradictions, In essence I still believed (Because of this, I doubt anyone deep down does not believe)

I do not know if this spiritual agony and all these things flashed before me happened in minutes or hours.

It was the lowest point of my Life, I had no one and no where to turn but the moment I realized that I still believed, a sense of Joy swept over me and I praised God that He did not let go of me even when I was so willing to let go. But shortly after that Joy came, fear swept my soul, like I had never felt before, fear that I blasphemed God and that there was nothing I could do to correct it.

I stayed struggling in the Faith seeing myself as holding on to the edge of a cliff for years becoming more and more Christian in appearance outwardly but tormented with fear that I had stepped over the line.

Then I came across a man that was no pretender, He came in the Spirit and he was teaching from the jot and tittle of scripture which was upsetting the carnal Christians in the study, I instantly recognized that he was in the Spirit but all of the other Christians just wanted to argue with him.

As I wrote in the other thread :

///"I showed him this contradiction,

I thought, I would shake his faith when I showed him,

no instead he so calmly said I will find the answer the explanation to the seemingly contradiction.

His faith was grounded, he had already been through a terrible crisis as I have to.

When you bounce back from a crises and God reveals himself to you in away that He never has before,
You become grounded and confident in your faith.
He found the answer for me and after he did I was still a little sceptical but very impressed of his faith.
Faith is passed onto faith not from good worded rational argument.
I have Faith that the nature that the Bible speaks of its self, is reality, I hope others can see my unswearing faith in the
Sovernity of God and embrace such faith.
The answer that he gave me I found was also believed by others it can be found in Edwin R. Thiele's 'The Mysterious N
umbers of the Hebrew Kings'
and also Floyd Nolen Jones 'The Chronology of the Old Testament' which is a defence of the Masoretic text
I learned something from finding the answer to this seemingly contradiction,
I learned how to read the Bible.
It is a much deeper book than many Christians realize,
Listen I have learned to love the seeming contradictions, Between kings, chronicals, the prophets, the new testament the
re are hundreds upoun hundreds of them.
We need to ask ourself why Did Sovern God inspire such minute detail in the original autographs, if He new that such de
tails would not be preserved??
What a Joy beyond measure to look at a condridiction with no appearent solution and believe it any how,
and to totally give up on ever finding a solution and to trust Gods Sovern hand in it being that way.
Do you know what happens when you have pushed thru with faith and believed anyhow?
I find most often the minute I have trully given up and stop thinking, a sollution appears as clear as Crystle.
Once you have that answer the entire Bible becomes more real and more dimensional.
Sometimes it can be weeks or months or longer for in answer. (WE as Christians no how hard it is to let go) But the sollu
tion comes when you are totally broken and have given up on finding the sollution,
and Willing to trust without sight."//
[https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=48237&forum=48&start=20&vie
wmode=flat&order=1](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=48237&forum=48&start=20&viewmode=flat&order=1)

hopefully to becontinued!

Re: wayneman - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/10 16:48

Hi wayneman

wayneman wrote///I was smart enough to see that the doctrine of inerrancy did not hold up under scrutiny, but not smart
enough to see that the fault lie with the church's doctrine of inspiration, not with the Bible itself.
The Lord could have given us the kind of flawless Bible that fundamentalism requires, but He didn't, probably because H
e doesn't want us to be fundamentalists///

I agree that God does not want us to be pharisaical fundamentalist but He also does not want us to be liberal sadducees
.

I will ask you a question that I asked in the other thread that I do not believe anyone answered.

What scripture did Jesus use to prove the resurrection of the dead with the Sadducees ??

The 'smart enough' is our down fall, the 'smart enough' is our carnal mind it is the flesh(sarx)rom 8:7 Gal 5:17

Faith in other hand, by biblical definition is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.(Heb 11:1)

That is faith is the (inward certainty) the evidence and substance of things that we know, but that we can not see or prov
e Solely by naturalistic means by our 'smart enough'.

scripture demonstrates to us That 'the trial of our faith, is much more precious than of gold that perisheth'

and we see God putting his people through such trials of faith through out history

Abraham 'was smart enough' to know that Sara was too old to produce children, because he 'was smart enough' he reconciled his smarts with Gods promise and created Ishmael,
We have Ishmaels being produced on all sides of the inerrancy doctrine.

The israelites spent 40 years wandering in the wilderness because they 'was smart enough' to know that they could not beat the giants in Canaan.

It was when Peter 'was smart enough' that he began to sink after walking on water.

The entire Bible could be summarized as Believing Gods Words when all of our 'smart enough' is opposed to believing.

Listen, I understand why many are taking an extreme position on inerrancy when we look at the pharisaical qualities that often accompany fundamentalists, But as the saying goes lets not throw the baby out with the bath water.

Wayneman wrote ///The Lord could have given us the kind of flawless Bible that fundamentalism requires, but He didn't, probably because He doesn't want us to be fundamentalists.
Apologetics hands the victory to the enemy by meeting infidels on their own ground: fallen human reason vs. fallen human reason. Paul did nothing of the kind:///

But wayneman, you are using the same contradictory double talk that the fundamentalist use in their inerrancy doctrines.

You are using fallen human reason 'smart enough' to deem the Bible as fallible but at the same time calling your own fallen human reasoned 'essay so well-written that the impartial reader will surely deem it Infallible'

I find obvious flaws through out the small amount of your essay that you posted

Wayneman your essay stated /// We all know that false teachers can put the Bible to evil use. If the Bible is the Word of God, then God has lost sovereignty over His own Word. Was Satan speaking the Word of God when he quoted Scripture to Jesus?///

Satan's strategy from the beginning was 'hath God said' which was in reference to a command that was given before Eve whom he asked, was even created, her understanding of the command most likely was taught translated to her by Adam.

Satan's strategy has been to twist and turn and omit Gods Written Word.

Wayneman you said /// If the Bible is the Word of God, then God has lost sovereignty over His own Word. Was Satan speaking the Word of God when he quoted Scripture to Jesus?///

I answered this in the other thread the context of the event demonstrates how much power is in the Written Word, this scripture in no way undermines the written Word. (we need to read our Bibles deeper, they are not just another novel)

First we must admit that Jesus Christ 'God who was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory'

When tempted by the tempter on every single point relied not on what was going on in His head, but on The Written Logos.

On other hand when the tempter came he did not do as you mistakenly assumed in your (in)fallible essay, no, he did as always, he distorted the verse he omitted part of the verse out of context.

I brought this point up in the other thread:

///psalms 91 from the Bible

11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

psalms 91 from the satans translation

11 He shall give his angels charge concerning thee:

12 and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.

Do you notice any differences in the translations??

The different versions was between psalms 91 and Satans version of psalms 91, That he used with the temptation of Jesus in Matthew ch 4 v 6

What you should know about Inerrancy by Charles C. Ryrie moody press 1981

p77

"The second temptation also illustrates the importance of plenary inspiration. Satan tried to entice the Lord to throw Himself off the pinnacle of the Temple by assuring Him that he could claim the promise of psalms 91:11-12 that Gods angels would guard Him. But in quoting those verses Satan omitted part of verse 11: "to guard you in all your ways." The omission distorts the meaning of the promise, which is that God will keep the righteous on their journeys, not that He will preserve them when they take needless risks. A needless risk was exactly what Satan had proposed to Christ. The Lord replied that to bank on part of a verse would be to tempt God. Instead He would rely on every word that came from God, including every word of Psalms 91:11-12." ///

I hear a lot of unbiblical talk about believing in the Bible somehow quenches the Spirit. but that is not what the Bible teaches nor is it my experience.

When reading John ch 5:39 do not stop reading until Jesus is through making His point in v 47
if you have a bible with subject headings that break up this into different thoughts throw it away.

For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me.

47 But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?

Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2013/2/10 17:32

"What scripture did Jesus use to prove the resurrection of the dead with the Sadducees ??"

Exodus 3:6 - "'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." Matt. 22:32

BTW, I didn't expect anyone to take seriously my joke about Wayneman Infallibility.

Anyway, we are closer together than I first thought. I also experienced that agony of doubt. Ever since I first heard the Gospel I have known deep down inside that it is Truth, even when I was intellectually convinced that the Bible was legend and folklore. It was the Mystics - Boehme, Law, Grubb, and Theologia Germanica - who rescued me from Doubting Castle.

The Light began to dawn when I came across William Law's statement that, "He who relies on his Reason relies on that Faculty which is weakest and most unreliable in Man."

And from Boehme: "Reason must yield up its own Hearing and Life, and give itself up to God, that God may live in the Understanding of Man, else there is no Finding in the Divine Wisdom."

"As little as a piece of work can apprehend him that made it, so little also can man apprehend and know God his Creator, unless the Holy Ghost enlighten him; which happeneth only to those that rely not upon themselves, but set their hope, will and desires upon God alone, and move in the Holy Ghost, and these are one spirit with God."

"Not I, the I that I am, know these things; but God knows them in me."

"Science cannot abolish faith in the all-seeing God, without worshiping in His place the blind intellect."

I no longer rely reason, but on revelation.

And I realize now that doubt is the dialectical partner of faith; doubt overcome makes faith stronger, like when Sampson overcame the roaring lion and came home with handful of honey.

"When you bounce back from a crises and God reveals himself to you in away that He never has before, You become grounded and confident in your faith.

He found the answer for me and after he did I was still a little sceptical but very impressed of his faith.

Faith is passed onto faith not from good worded rational argument.

I have Faith that the nature that the Bible speaks of its self, is reality, I hope others can see my unswerving faith in the Sovereignty of God and embrace such faith."

Well, so do I.

Re: What is the true test of scripture?, on: 2013/2/10 18:41

Quote:

-----by Charles C. Ryrie moody press 1981 p77

"The second temptation also illustrates the importance of plenary inspiration. Satan tried to entice the Lord to throw Himself off the pinnacle of the Temple by assuring Him that he could claim the promise of psalms 91:11-12 that God's angels would guard Him. But in quoting those verses Satan omitted part of verse 11: "to guard you in all your ways." The omission distorts the meaning of the promise, which is that God will keep the righteous on their journeys, not that He will preserve them when they take needless risks. A needless risk was exactly what Satan had proposed to Christ. The Lord replied that to bank on part of a verse would be to tempt God. Instead He would rely on every word that came from God, including every word of Psalms 91:11-12."

No doubt this will sound arrogant if it does I apologise but its time to say it plainly.

This observation given by Mr Ryrie is itself partially true, in that had Christ thrown Himself down, an act which would ordinarily have lead to His death, He would have been taking a needless risk. Yet Christ came to die. Surly the reality in this use of scripture by Satan had more to do with trying to get Christ to act independently of the Father's will as evidenced by Messianic prophecy in scripture. Jesus revealed in John's gospel that He had "authority to lay down life, and to take it back again". Also there are several clear examples in the gospels where Jesus simply walked away from danger by His own authority in determining the time and manner of His death according to Messianic prophecy "and He shall stretch out His arms", and not the will of men or angels. Even in the garden Jesus told Peter that if He desired it He could call upon hosts of angels to come to His defence when the temple guards came to arrest Him by violence. To place the emphasis else where is really to miss the deeper purpose of Satan quoting scriptures in order to tempt Jesus.

And herein lies the problem with how we understand scriptures.

Inerrancy is not the real issue. To know that the word of God is trustworthy is a matter of faith as well as obedience. Satan didn't distort the passage in the way it is often claimed. Quiet the reverse as a matter of simply reading the psalm and the quotation of the psalm. This one verse may well have been taken out of the fullness of the meaning of the psalm

but even this does not change the reality of what the wicked one said. The angels were given charge over Christ and Christ Himself confirmed it both in this second temptation, by not rebuking Satan in the same way He rebuked the pharisees who themselves accused Christ of labouring by the power of Satan in denial of the truth; thereby blaspheming the Holy Spirit; but also in the garden by direct expression and confirmation of it to Peter's attempt to defend Him against the violence which was about to be done to Him. Moreover the first attempt to arrest Jesus resulted in the whole guard being thrown to the floor. If Satan had been able to throw Jesus to His death, he would surely have done so. Just as the storm which raged against Christ on the waters was surely against Him, yet He was able to rebuke the wind and the waves. The fact is he wasn't able to harm Christ at all, because as the Lord said at the supper table, "behold the ruler of this world cometh, and he has nothing in me". This is the real meaning of the passage, not some spurious attempt to give another meaning to "keep the righteous on their journey". The passage has to do with Christ Himself and not all men. It is a Messianic prophecy which must be true or else the scripture itself is proven false.

This is the only basis for testing the scriptures. Does God Himself bear witness of what is written, evidenced by its outworking in the visibility of men and angels? Or does it fall to the ground? All of this speaks to the futility of trying to "prove" the scriptures by whatsoever means other than by comprehending that the gospel of Christ is the spirit of prophecy and all that is written therein is life and light. Just as in John's gospel in speaking about His death and the shedding of His blood, Jesus said "except a man eat of my body and drink of my blood He can have no life in himself". To which a number of those who followed Him were no longer able to believe in Him because they were no longer able to believe in the words which Christ spoke concerning His body and blood, saying "this is too difficult a thing to believe"; then they left. The Lord said to His chosen apostles "shall you leave me also?" To which Peter said, "to Whom else shall we turn, you have the words of life". The apostles no more understood the meaning of the Lord's words than the other followers did. Yet Peter knew that Christ was the One Who was able to give life.

The whole purpose and the only purpose of scriptures is to reveal Christ crucified for sin. It is a mystery which was kept hidden for ages past and is still hidden from the one who does not put their faith in Christ Himself and none other. Any one can quote scriptures most accurately and even learn the original language they were written in, but this of itself will not produce life unless the scripture is proven true by God and not men.

Re: , on: 2013/2/10 20:19

Belief in the word of God does not rest on the doctrine of believing they are without error. But rather belief in the truth of God's word comes from a work of the Holy Spirit. It is the Spirit who convicts of sin, judgement, and righteousness.

Paul reminds us that his preaching was not with wise and persuasive words. But with a demonstration of the power of God. So that one's faith may not rest on one man's wisdom but on the power of God.

In these discussions it is quite easy to overlook the role of the Holy Spirit.

My thoughts.

Bearmaster.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2013/2/10 21:10

I agree with you, Bear.

Jesus is the Supreme Ruler of the Universe(s). He "commands all men everywhere to repent."

He bought all men with a price. Those who do not submit to him as Lord are rebels and will be treated as such.

We do not owe allegiance to the scriptures, we owe allegiance to The King.

That being said, I certainly agree that the HS will use the scriptures to lead us to the King.

Regarding inerrancy, I guess an example would be helpful. I know some numbers may be off in Chronicles, but I am wondering if Wayne can give an example of a supposed contradiction that "makes a difference."

I used to think that the 4 gospel accounts of the resurrection were inconsistent and irreconcilable, until I heard a good teacher explain that while different, they are not irreconcilable.

wayneman - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/10 23:34

Hi wayneman,

PP asked "What scripture did Jesus use to prove the resurrection of the dead with the Sadducees ??"

wayneman correctly wrote: ///Exodus 3:6 - "'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.'" Matt. 22:32///

When I discovered this I could not believe it, Jesus made the case for the resurrection of the dead based on the verb tense of (I am) rather than (I was). He was making this point using copies of copies that were about 1500 years after the original writings. He had just told the Sadducees that they erred not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. This doctrine astonished the multitude.

When I discovered this I looked throughout books to see if anyone else had noticed this reality, most books on inspiration do not ever mention it, I finally came across 2 books the one is by a German Gerhard Maier 'The end of the historical critical method' the other by Ryrie that I quoted before.

I do not find anything in scripture ever undermining its own authority, even though I will agree that the letter without the Spirit killeth it breaks us, It did me after I regained my trust in it, the fear that I spoke of in the last post still plagued me and even more after I regained trust in the scripture and years had passed, it was not something I could just throw off by forgetting. I am thankful now for it because otherwise I would not have truly known my own depravity.

My own sins some habitual hidden gross sins at the time, did not ever truly break me because I always rested in comparative righteousness because of the lack of authenticity I seen around me.

But that hidden fear in light of Scripture broke me. Rather I was destined to Hell or not, I had know where else to turn but to the Cross, when I truly did I experienced an instant realm of Grace and instantly the Bible changed from a Book of Laws to a Book of Grace, and instantly a question that I had always asked myself about Cain and Able was answered.

So I understand how trusting in the dead letter is futile but even if someone whom is not not enlightened actually stops viewing scripture from a preconceived lens and starts believing its nature as it reveals of its self than it is going to do its 1st purpose and that is as a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.

But after that it works in accordance with faith to for doctrine and for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness:

That we may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

wayneman wrote ///Anyway, we are closer together than I first thought. I also experienced that agony of doubt. Ever since I first heard the Gospel I have known deep down inside that it is Truth, even when I was intellectually convinced that the Bible was legend and folklore. It was the Mystics - Boehme, Law, Grubb, and Theologia Germanica - who rescued me from Doubting Castle.///

I have to admit after I read your first post, I had a stereotype of a more Liberal and not as real, as you have demonstrated in these last couple of posts, I am enjoying the fellowship.

I am thankful for these Mystics rescuing you from the Doubting Castle. those are some excellent quotes from the mystics, I have a William Law book but never spent much time in it, a lot of the realities that is mentioned in those quotes I have gathered over time.

wayneman wrote ///I no longer rely reason, but on revelation///

That is wonderful.

I do not at all find that this undermines inerrancy but should also be applied to the Written Revelation as to gain more revelation.

Peter says of his personal eyewitnesses account of our Lord Jesus Christ majesty, and of his mystical experience on the Holy mount, where he personally heard the voice from heaven he said of all of this: that we have a More Sure Word than even that of our own experience, and Peter says that it is the word of prophecy, the prophetic books in Scripture.

2 pet. ch 1

16 For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty.

17 For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

18 And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.

19 We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts:

20 Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/10 23:58

Hi amrkelly

amrkelly wrote ///The whole purpose and the only purpose of scriptures is to reveal Christ crucified for sin. It is a mystery which was kept hidden for ages past and is still hidden from the one who does not put their faith in Christ Himself and none other///

I would disagree that the only purpose of scripture is to reveal Christ crucified for sin, that indeed is the schoolmaster part,

but scripture itself says that it is also profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

When we accept it as a Holy and perfect book with every Jot and tittle being placed exactly as God's sovereign hand as willed it to be placed, it very much becomes a spiritual book, the Most Spiritual Book and the deepest book.

When we except the seeming contradictions as sovereignly placed and trust those contradictions as a means of showing us deeper realities and meanings we push into spiritual realities.

I understand the negativity toward the fundamentalist that fights hand and nail for inerrancy and yet never experiences spiritual realities but I do not find that this negates God's sovereign hand in placing the exact Jot and tittle that He wants for our generation.

Re: What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does inerrancy matter?, on: 2013/2/11 4:27

Quote:
-----I understand the negativity toward the fundamentalist that fights hand and nail for inerrancy and yet never experiences spiritual realities but I do not find that this negates God's sovereign hand in placing the exact Jot and tittle that He wants for our generation. proudpapa

Yes and therefore remembering or else comprehending that this generation is more blasphemous, lawless and wicked than any other since the foundation of the world should give us cause for deep concern over the "kind" of bible God will permit at a time of apostasy and rebellion in His own house.

Therein lies the explanation as to why we have so many useless and contrary versions of the bible.

Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2013/2/11 6:47

"I am wondering if Wayneman can give an example of a supposed contradiction that 'makes a difference.'"

Significantly, NO! All of the discrepancies in the scriptures, including those I listed in my first post, are trivial. From Genesis to Revelation there is a remarkable continuity in the things that really matter - e.g., there are 18 factual discrepancies between the 4 gospel accounts of Calvary and the Resurrection, but all agree on what really matters: Jesus Christ died for the sins of the world, rose from the dead and lives forever.

On doctrinal issues such as Election and the Second Coming, apparent contradictions are resolved in terms of *paradox*. Divine truth is always paradoxical. The carnal mind does not like paradoxes; its nature is to think along the lines of either/or, but God's truth often is both/and: *both* election *and* free will. Religious rationalists cannot abide this, so they embrace a "moeity" (one-half of the truth) and call it "total truth" or "systematic theology."

Systematic theology is an effort to encapsulate divine truth in a closed, finite system that answers all questions. This is closer to gnosticism than faith.

Perhaps the Lord loaded the Bible with paradoxes and evidences of human frailty to help us resist the temptation to make an idol of the Bible, or make ourselves systematic theologians.

proud papa,

This thread is based on a contentious topic, and had the potential to degenerate into a brawl. Happily, that has not happened. This is a good discussion.

I have participated in this thread in the hope that anyone who is in Doubting Castle because of some doctrine of inspiration that they heard in Sunday School will see that 1.) They are not the only ones; 2.) They are making things unnecessarily complicated by taking Pop Theology seriously; 3.) There is no reason to remain in doubt of the testimony of the apostles and prophets; 4.) The Bible is not our teacher; it is the textbook of the One Great Teacher. John 14:26

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/11 8:20

so in other words i am correct; we can not trust that the scriptures we have now are true. if u say "parts of it are true" then i ask "which parts? how do u know? r the true parts just the parts u like?"

u all write pages and pages of words. they mean nothing. u have brought the very scriptures in2 question. basically what each of u are saying is a quote as old as the garden of eden: "hath god said?" (loosely translated means "did god really say this? i doubt it. how could u ever know for sure?"

sad. very sad.

i like this board, and am beginning 2 feel a little more accepted here than i did originally, but i must say that there is much compromise on this board. catholic mystics are given credence and the scriptures r doubted 2 the point where the average reader of this board can easily walk away thinking "why believe the bible? they dont!"

Re: - posted by wayneman (), on: 2013/2/11 8:46

Skeptic

None of the mystics I named were Catholic, and Theologia Germanica was Luther's second-favorite book. No one is assaulting the Bible; I am calling to account that form of Protestant Priestcraft that teaches us to put our faith in the Book rather than the One the Book points us to.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/11 8:53

when i referred to catholic mystics i was referring to other conversations on this board where we are encouraged to consider the words of certain catholic mystics.

as for the rest of ur post, i have no idea what ur saying. "priestcraft"? sounds like a video game.

a little less showing off our intellect and a little more plain speak.

SkepticGuy - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/11 9:19

Hi SkepticGuy

SkepticGuy wrote ///when i referred to catholic mystics i was referring to other conversations on this board where we are encouraged to consider the words of certain catholic mystics.///

Some of those catholic mystics, that some have encouraged have been catholics but they were also persecuted by their own church , such as Guyon I have heard Tozer quote her and also I have heard Waldvogel quote her.

// Madame Guyon's most devout disciples after her death were to be found among the Protestants and especially the Quakers. Evangelicals such as (((Charles Spurgeon))) and Johan Oscar Smith were also influenced. Both (((Watchman Nee))) and (((Witness Lee writings))) were very much influenced by Madame Guyon. Her works were translated into English and German, and her ideas, forgotten in France, have been read in Germany, Switzerland, England, and America.

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

Re: What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does inerrancy matter? - posted by RobertW (), on: 2013/2/11 10:10

To the original question:

Quote:

-----So What are your thoughts?? For a mature faith does biblical inerrancy matter?

Yes. Because the way that we view the scriptures in terms of inspiration and authority will weigh very heavily on what we believe and in turn how they influence the decisions of our lives. Because I believe that the original autographs of the scriptures are inspired of the Holy Spirit, my approach to studying the word of God is such that I desire to know exactly what the Holy Spirit said through that inspiration. I assume that the word written is the exact word that the Holy Spirit wanted written. I can then move from that reality towards understanding what those inspired words mean. I am referring to the original Hebrew and Greek texts.

The Lord Jesus regarded the Old Testament scriptures to be the Word of God. (Luke 24:27) He appealed to their authority and interprets them to the Disciples revealing Himself therein. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophesy.

In 1 Timothy 5:18 we have a quotation that contains part Old Testament and New Testament revelation together. " For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward." This is a combination of Deut 25:4 and Matthew 10:10 or Luke 10:7. Paul, by inspiration, combines what he regarded as scripture with scripture.

Peter regards the words of Paul as scripture as we read in 2 Peter 3:16 "... as he does in all his letters when he speaks in them of these matters. There are some things in them that are hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do the rest of the Scriptures." Here we have Peter placing Paul's writings on par with the "rest of the scriptures". We also have implied that twisting the words of scripture will lead to destruction. This is because he regarded them as absolutely in authority.

Holding this view of the scriptures is essential to having a right understanding of God, man, man's condition and God's answer to man's condition. The scriptures are not a compendium of all knowledge, they are a "God's eye view" of events

hat bring revelation to us concerning God's redeeming acts through history. The Germans have a word for this approach to the scriptures they call heilsgeschichte. It simply means "Salvation History." When a person is born of the Spirit they are enabled by the Spirit to discern and understand the words that are written. The Holy Spirit, that serves as the representative of Jesus Christ, takes us individually through our own personal Luke 24:27. If we will approach the scriptures with a good conscience, taking advantage of every means of knowledge and understanding that He provides for us, we can rightly divide the Word of Truth. But you have to believe that what you are studying is exactly what the Holy Spirit inspired or you will have nothing to tether you to Truth. Blessings, Robert

Re: SkepticGuy - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/11 11:21

Quote:
-----Hi SkepticGuy

SkepticGuy wrote ///when i referred to catholic mystics i was referring to other conversations on this board where we are encouraged to consider the words of certain catholic mystics.///

Some of those catholic mystics, that some have encouraged have been catholics but they were also persecuted by their own church , such as Guyon I have heard Tozer quote her and also I have heard Waldvogel quote her.

// Madame Guyon's most devout disciples after her death were to be found among the Protestants and especially the Quakers. Evangelicals such as ((Charles Spurgeon))) and Johan Oscar Smith were also influenced. Both (((Watchman Nee))) and (((Witness Lee writings))) were very much influenced by Madame Guyon. Her works were translated into English and German, and her ideas, forgotten in France, have been read in Germany, Switzerland, England, and America.

...and? lots of people have been tortured or persecuted for lots of different faiths. duznt mean a thing. muslims blame the ir violent acts on what they perceive as centuries of persecution. r we going 2 start quoting mohammad on this board next? even hitler was persecuted 4 what he believed at 1 point. he was in jail as a political prisoner when he wrote mein komp. its a bit scarey what sum of u thinks verifies sincere belief in christ.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/11 11:26

Quote:
-----heilsgeschichte

bless you!

Re: , on: 2013/2/11 14:15

Quote:
-----...and? lots of people have been tortured or persecuted for lots of different faiths. duznt mean a thing. muslims blame their violent acts on what they perceive as centuries of persecution. r we going 2 start quoting mohammad on this board next? even hitler was persecuted 4 what he believed at 1 point. he was in jail as a political prisoner when he wrote mein komp. its a bit scarey what sum of u thinks verifies sincere belief in christ.

I wonder if anyone will spot the subtle differences between Mien Kampf (My Struggle) and Experiencing the Depths of Jesus Christ. The tilte may give it away a little but here is another clue:

Just four years after the war to end all wars, an Austrian then living in Bavaria planned a pamphlet to be called Settling Accounts. In it he intended to attack the ineffectiveness of the dominant political parties in Germany which were opposed to the new National Socialists (Nazis). In November 1923, Adolf Hitler was jailed for the abortive Munich Beer Hall putsch along with men willing and able to assist him with his writing. The end result was Mien Kampf.

Jeanne Guyon (1648-1717) was a French woman, widowed at the age of 28 after an unhappy marriage. She was a mys

tic and spiritual counselor whose writing of A Short and Very Easy Method of Prayer (later re-named Experiencing the Depths of Jesus Christ) evoked immediate controversy: stirring many in France to greater devotion to Christ, but leading to persecution and book burnings by the religious authorities of her day who believed her emphasis on quiet prayer undermined religious duty.

Is it possible that we may have missed the point of quoting from a 17th century mystic and faithful sister in the Lord and why we do not quote from the political rantings of a self driven egotist and perverse dog of war.

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/11 14:42

brother amrkelly, u certainly have a flare for the dramatic. i did not quote from mein kampf, nor suggest his writings were similar to this catholic lady u like.

u missed my point entirely. my point was that the authority of god's word alone is what verifies if sum1 is a believer or not, not the fact that sum1 was persecuted. even hitler was persecuted, but that didnt make him right.

there r sum who say that if u r not being persecuted for ur faith then u better take a look at what u believe. but i fear many have taken this too far and somehow believe that IF u are persecuted for ur faith then ur faith is legit in the eyes of god.

history says "not so". if it were so then we would all be mormons. joseph smith was persecuted, jailed, beaten, run out of town and eventually martyred for his faith. if i use the reasoning of sum here we must conclude that he was a born again believer.

that was my point, but thank u for the entertaining way in which u misunderstood me, my friend. :-)

Re: , on: 2013/2/11 15:04

Quote:
-----there r sum who say that if u r not being persecuted for ur faith then u better take a look at what u believe. but i fear many have taken this too far and somehow believe that IF u are persecuted for ur faith then ur faith is legit in the eyes of god.

You are right of course some people do say that a real faith produces persecution. I think what is meant by this though may not be the kind of "persecution" which Joseph Smith experienced or as you say Hitler provoked against himself. The reality though is that Joseph Smith wasn't really persecuted, he was feared and not without good reason the same could be said for Hitler. It seems to me that when those who say true faith produces persecution what they really mean is that at a true faith and calling of God by very nature of the reality of what that means (being born again) sets the individual at odds with the world. So that just as the world hated Christ, so the world hates those who are truly possessed of His life. Hate in this sense does not necessarily mean hunted down or persecuted to the point of death. It will however always mean "at variance" with the world and therefore not held in favour by the world.

I'm glad you didn't take offence at my drama!

Re: - posted by SkepticGuy, on: 2013/2/11 15:18

i enjoy our conversations my brother. never offended by u, or any1 else for that matter. i've even learned to play good with the bearmaster.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2013/2/11 16:03

There is a passage worth quoting here, but we must not take it in reverse:

Yes, and all who desire to live godly in Christ Jesus will suffer persecution. (2 Tim. 3:12 NKJV)

Above is an example of how persecution is to be expected for a true believer, but if we take it in reverse the statement breaks down. In other words, all who suffer persecution do not necessarily desire to live godly in Christ Jesus.

I think we also need to define what the scriptures mean by "martyr". The word means 'a witness'. This is someone that can in one sense authoritatively testify of the truth of the Gospel. "You shall be my witnesses (martyrs)...., said Jesus." A tr

ue martyr that is killed is like unto Stephen or faithful Antipas (or the rest of the martyred disciples and apostles). What was Stephen's testimony at the end? "Lord lay not the sin to their charge." (Acts 7:60) This is evidence of the indwelling Holy Spirit. His testimony was powerful. Paul was a faithful witness as well and communicated a similar statement in 2 Timothy 4:16.

The difference between these men and other men such as Joseph Smith is that they did not take up arms and fight like Smith did. He effectively died in a shootout and is said to have employed an at the time, state-of-the-art Allen's six-shooting revolver. Based upon the Biblical definition of martyr, Joseph Smith falls quite short. Jesus laid down His life as an expression of love and loved to the end. So did Stephen and the rest. In this way their lives became living epistles, that though may not be effectual in debate, weighs mightily on the conscience. Blessings, Robert

Re: wayneman - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/2/11 17:36

Hi wayneman

wayneman wrote ///proud papa,

This thread is based on a contentious topic, and had the potential to degenerate into a brawl. Happily, that has not happened. This is a good discussion.

I have participated in this thread in the hope that anyone who is in Doubting Castle because of some doctrine of inspiration that they heard in Sunday School will see that 1.) They are not the only ones; 2.) They are making things unnecessarily complicated by taking Pop Theology seriously; 3.) There is no reason to remain in doubt of the testimony of the apostles and prophets; 4.) The Bible is not our teacher; it is the textbook of the One Great Teacher. John 14:26///

I agree this is a good discussion.

I have never disagreed so much and yet at the same time agreed so much with some one on a topic.

I think letting each other know where we were coming from really helped.