

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: What about Mark 10:17-22

**What about Mark 10:17-22, on: 2016/12/2 18:23**

Mark 10:17-22 (NASB)

The Rich Young Ruler

As He was setting out on a journey, a man ran up to Him and knelt before Him, and asked Him, "Good Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And Jesus said to him, "Why do you call Me good? No one is good except God alone. You know the commandments, 'Do not murder, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Do not defraud, Honor your father and mother.'" And he said to Him, "Teacher, I have kept all these things from my youth up." Looking at him, JESUS FELT A LOVE FOR HIM and said to him, "One thing you lack: go and sell all you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me." But at these words he was saddened, and he went away grieving, for he was one who owned much property.

Brethren in view of the discussion going around as to whether God loves everyone or only loves those He has chosen. How do you answer the above question. That is that Jesus shows love for the rich young ruler who clearly rejected the invitation of the Master to follow Him.

Curious to know what your thoughts are on the above account. That Jesus felt a love for the rich young ruler. By the way this account is taken from The New American Standard Bible which is considered one of the most accurate word-for-word translations available. This account is not from a paraphrase or dynamic equivalent Bible. I'm sure if you check the King James translation the text will also read about Jesus feeling a love for the Rich Young Ruler.

Respectfully submitted.

Caps are for emphasis only.

-bbs-

**Re: What about Mark 10:17-22 - posted by RogerB (), on: 2016/12/2 19:26**

God provided love in the person of Jesus:  
John 3:16 for God so loved the world

John 3:19 But men love darkness

The trappings of the world deceive man. The Antichrist is deceived and all who believe he is who he claims to be. We all need the scales to fall from our eyes.

We are all sinners but God has extended love to us and helped us see. We extend love everyday like Jesus.

**Re: What about Mark 10:17-22 - posted by proudpapa, on: 2016/12/2 19:35**

Many Calvinist as well as many others often interpret this as evidence that the rich young ruler excepted the Gospel at a later time.

**Re: PP, on: 2016/12/2 20:15**

But the Calvinists and others really do not know do they?

The fact is Jesus did show or feel love toward one who rejected His invite to follow Him. Hard to refute the text. Though the Calvinist will explain it away to fit their theology.

Simply my thoughts dear brother.

-bbs-

**Re: James , on: 2016/12/2 20:17**

Do agree dear brother.

**Re: What about Mark 10:17-22 - posted by savannah, on: 2016/12/3 7:37**

"And there followed Him a certain young man , having a linen cloth cast about his naked body; and the young men laid hold on him: And he left the linen cloth, and fled from them naked."â€ Mark 14:51, Mark 14:52.

The insertion of this story of the young man with the linen cloth needs accounting for. Mark omits many important details in the story of Christ's arrest, apparently in the interests of brevity. But this same evangelist, who in his passion for brevity omits items of importance, inserts this story about the young man with the linen cloth, though it is trivial in itself, and in no way affects the course of events. Why did this stern economist of words spare two verses in his brief and pregnant Gospel to tell this irrelevant story about some unknown young man? There must have been some strong reason operating on Mark to induce him to insert it.

A Personal Interest.

The usual way of accounting for its insertion is by saying that the little incident must have had some special interest for Mark himself; indeed that he himself was the young man of whom he speaks. If that supposition is right, we can understand how the story came to be inserted. If Mark was the young man in question, the incident was not trivial to him. The act that brought him even into momentary contact with Christ on that dread and bitter night would be one of supreme interest and importance. There are other guesses as to the identity of this young man. Some commentators, for example, think that he was James ,the brother of our Lord; others, the son of that unknown friend of Christ's who lent Him the Upper Room; whilst Dean Plumptre and Ian Maclaren make the ingenious guess that he was Lazarus. But all fail to account for the insertion of this trivial incident in the narrative. The one supposition that has real plausibility and likelihood is the one most often adopted, namely, that the young man was Mark himself.

After the Gospel Manner.

Let me indicate some of the things that lead me to think this young man was the evangelist himself. (1) I begin with this, that Mark should introduce himself into his narrative in this anonymous way is exactly in keeping with the Gospel manner. Take the Fourth Gospel for illustration. In that Gospel John has to narrate many incidents in which he himself took part , but he never once mentions himself by name. He speaks of himself, half shyly as it were, as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," or "that other disciple." It often happened that artists would introduce their own portraits into the pictures they were painting. But they always put their own portraits in the background. And one had to be familiar with the painters' features to recognise them at all. It was so with the evangelists. If they have to come into the picture, they keep to the background; they stow themselves away in some inconspicuous corner. They introduce themselves anonymously, and for Mark to speak of himself in this way as "a certain young man" is exactly in keeping with evangelic usage.

The Touch of an Eye-witness.

(2) The vivid detail of the narrative seems to suggest the eye-witness. Speaking broadly, this Gospel is Peter's Gospel. The uniform account of tradition is that Mark was Peter's "interpreter," and amanuensis, and that he wrote down the vari

ous details of his Gospel as he heard Peter narrate them. Now Peter could not have given him this story. For Peter had taken flight and had not yet recovered from his flight. And even when he did recover, it was "from afar" that he followed, and he was not in a position to know what happened in the near vicinity of Christ Himself. But, if Peter did not give Mark the story, whence did he get it? The almost irresistible conclusion is that Mark puts in here a little bit "on his own." The detail of it, as I say, suggests the personal narrative. And the detail comes out specially in the use of the Greek word which is translated "linen cloth." The evangelist specifies a costly kind of linen cloth, a "sindon" which, according to Edersheim, "no doubt corresponds to the Sadin or Sedina which, in Rabbinic writings, means a linen cloth, or a loose linen wrapper, though, possibly, it may also mean a night-dress." Apparently it had been used as a coverlet for the bed. That the evangelist should specify in this way, should be so minute and exact, and should crowd so much detail into the account, all points to the conclusion that he was writing of something which happened to himself.

#### Mark's Circumstances

(3) Once again, all that we know about the evangelist's circumstances favours the idea that the young man was Mark himself. First of all, we know that Mary, Mark's mother, lived in Jerusalem. It is quite possible her house may have been situated in one of the streets through which the procession marched on its way from the Garden to the Judgment Hall. Furthermore, we know that Mary's house was a large house, sufficiently large to accommodate the prayer-meetings of the Church. It was in her house that the Church had met for prayer when Peter lay in his prison, and it was to her house that Peter made his way on his release. We infer that people who live in large houses are possessed of ample means, and so we conclude that Mary, Mark's mother, was a well-to-do woman. This is supported by the fact that one of her connections, Barnabas, was a landed proprietor and a rich man. If Mary was the well-to-do woman we have every reason to think she was, then we can understand how it was that it was a sindon in which her son wrapped himself when he made his hurried rush into the street.

#### Mark's Character.

(4) Moreover, everything that we know of Mark's character fits in exactly with the description of the young man here given. Mark is referred to, as you will remember, more than once in the Acts. He accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey. All went well while they were in Cyprus. But when they crossed over to the mainland of Asia Minor, and were about to face the notorious dangers of the Pamphylian mountains, Mark suddenly deserted the mission and returned to Jerusalem. That is exactly the same kind of person as this young Prayer of Manasseh, who, with headlong enthusiasm championed Christ, but when he found his championship of Christ's cause brought him into trouble, left the linen cloth in the soldier's hands and fled.

#### Mark, the Stump-fingered.

(5) And, finally, I call your attention to the curious epithet by which Mark was distinguished in the early Church. He was called Mark "the Stump-fingered." We are not told why he was so called. But may not the explanation be found, as Dr David Smith suggests, in this incident? Perhaps the incident, after all, may not have been quite so trifling as Mark's account would lead us to suppose. Perhaps he lost more that night than his linen cloth. The Roman soldier was in no mood to brook interference, and it may well have been that Mark's interposition on behalf of Christ was rewarded with a sword slash which whipped off his finger.

#### The Impulse.

And now let us just look at Mark's exploit on this dark betrayal night. We must think of Jesus as being led through the streets of Jerusalem from the Garden to the high priest's palace. The passing of the procession caused considerable uproar; the torches the soldiers carried flashed light into many a darkened room and wakened many a sleeper. Some, I have no doubt, got up to see what was astir. Mark was not content simply to get up, he went out, simply casting about him the first article on which he could lay his hands, which happened to be this "linen cloth," this fine linen garment. When he got into the street, he found that a prisoner was being led away for judgment. A second look, as the glare of the torch fell on his face, told him this prisoner was none other than Jesus—the Man about Whom all Jerusalem was talking; the Preacher to Whom Hebrews, along with thousands of others, had listened with such keen delight in the Temple: yes, and I can go further, the Jesus in Whom he and his mother had already begun to trust as the promised Messiah, the Man Who had won their souls. Wishing to know what Jesus had done, and why He was being dragged along by the soldiers and the high priest's servants, Mark, undressed as he was, followed with the crowd, keeping as near to Jesus as he could.

#### The Test.

I will believe that, as he walked, love for the Christ and indignation at the treatment meted out to Him, was filling Mark's soul. At a certain stage of the journey something happened, some insult was offered to Christ, some rough and brutal deed was done to Him by the soldiers who held Him on either side, and at last the indignation that was swelling and surging in John Mark's soul became vocal. He made vehement and passionate protest. And upon that, some of the other soldiers in the band, promptly proceeded to lay hands on Mark himself, meaning to drag him off along with Jesus. But that was more than Mark had bargained for. At the rough grasp of the soldier's hand and at the flash of his sword, Mark's heat quickly cooled, and concern for Jesus gave way to anxiety for himself. He had no intention of standing in the dock as a prisoner side by side with the Lord. So by a sudden wrench he extricated himself from the soldier's grip, and leaving behind his "linen cloth," and possibly his finger, he fled naked.

That is the story. And from that story we may gather a lesson or two for life today. Mr Spurgeon has, I believe, a sermon on this incident, which he divides into two heads. (1) Here is Hasty Following. (2) Here is Hasty Running Away. Those are the two thoughts which the story inevitably suggests.

Hasty Following.

Here is hasty following. Everything about Mark in this midnight adventure betokens inconsiderateness and haste. If he had thought for a moment, if he had meant to follow Christ to the bitter end, he would not have been content with the linen cloth about his naked body. That was no garb in which to face danger and peril for the Lord's sake. The "linen cloth" in a sense is symbolic and characteristic of a merely temporary discipleship. For that headlong zeal that made Mark "follow with Christ," when He was in the hands of the soldiers, and all His disciples had fled, I have nothing but admiration. There is something generous, unselfish, noble about it. I only wish we had more of it in our Christian life and our Christian service today, for nobody can say that the modern Church suffers from excess of zeal. What I criticise is not the enthusiasm, but the hastiness of it. It was not a reasoned, considered, steady enthusiasm. The "linen cloth" which was his only garment carries "temporariness" stamped upon it. And a Temporary, at the time, Mark turned out to be. At the touch of the soldier's hand and the sight of the naked sword, Mark's enthusiasm fizzled out. "He left the linen cloth and fled naked."

â€”Its Peril.

What does Tennyson say about "haste"? Is not it this? "Raw haste, half-sister to delay." Raw haste is half-sister to delay, and unthinking enthusiasm is half-sister to desertion. As I read the Gospels I am almost driven to believe that Christ feared haste as much as anything. He knew the Christian service and the Christian life were not lightly to be embarked upon. He knew there were difficulties to be encountered, and hardships to be endured, and perils to be faced. He knew that the difficulties and the hardships and the perils lasted the whole way. The Christian life was a long and arduous campaign. A mere fit of enthusiasm would carry no man through it. It would need courage, not simply dash, but steady courage, a fixed and resolute will to enable a man to endure to the end. And so our Lord would have no man become a disciple in a hurry. He was constantly bidding would-be disciples stop and think. He bids men sit down first and count the cost. For in the Christian life it is not the first step only which costs, it costs all the way through. And it is only he who can endure to the end who gets saved. And because Christ is anxious that no follower of His should turn deserter, He bids us still stop and think before we embark upon His service. It is not to ease Christ calls us, but to labour. It is not peace He sends, but a sword. It is not to comfort He invites us, but to a campaign. A "linen cloth" is no equipment for this business. No, if we mean to see it through, we shall have to take to ourselves the whole armour of God, the breastplate of Righteousness, the shield of Faith, the helmet of Salvation, and the sword of the Spirit. For the men Christ wants are not the men who follow Him today and desert Him to-morrow, but men who will be faithful unto death and so receive the Crown of Life.

Hasty Desertion.

Hasty following in John Mark's case issued in hasty running away. It may be, as Dr Watson suggests, that the thought of the appearance he would make arrayed before the Jewish Court with only this linen cloth about him, had something to do with his flight. That makes no difference to the truth I am now trying to enforce. Even if it were modesty and not fear that lay at the root of his desertion, it remains true that it was his haste in following, that led to his haste in running away. And the one generally ends in the other. Our Lord in His parable of the seed warned us of this tragic and disappointing sequence. The seed sown on the rock, He said, represented those who, when they heard the word, straightway with joy received it. But when tribulation or persecution ariseth because of the word straightway they are offended. They were in a hurry to begin, they were in a hurry to give up. There is not a Church in the land, there is not a Christian minister in the land who does not know of men and women who began but were not able to finish, who did run well but who are not on the course today. What of ourselves, have we faltered? Are we of them that draw back?

The Changed Man.

I have talked of Mark's hasty following and his equally hasty running away. But that was not the end of Mark's Christian career. Had it been so this Gospel that bears his name would never have been written. I am not going to trace his history, but to remind you of one little fact about Mark. Venice boasts of Mark as its patron saint, and there, close to the Grand Canal, you can see the pillar dedicated to his name. And on the top of the pillar a lion. The lion of St Mark! That is Mark's symbol in Art—the lion! He does not shape much like a lion in this incident. The timid hare would seem to us a fitter symbol of this man who ran away at the first onset of danger. But the Church is right. The lion is Mark's legitimate symbol. For this man got the better of his timidities and fears, and developed into a brave and dauntless soldier of the Cross. Christ changed him, Christ transformed him, and Mark, the runaway, at Alexandria laid down his life for his Lord.  
John Daniel Jones

**Re: Savannah , on: 2016/12/3 8:02**

Brother the topic under discussion is the rich young ruler. The text under discussion is Jesus felt a love for Him. Yet the young man turns away from Jesus after He invites him to forsake his wealth and follow Him.

John tells us Jesus knew the hearts of all men. Certainly Jesus knew that this young man would turn away from him because he could not forsake the things of this world. Yet Mark says that Jesus felt a love for this young man.

When I was involved in Calvinism I was taught that God loved only the sheep and hated the goats. Yet I could never get a satisfactory answer from my Calvinistic teachers regarding this text. Oftentimes the text would have to be twisted to fit the five canons of Dort interpretation.

It was only after I was delivered out of the darkness of Calvinism and brought back to the simplicity and purity of devotion to Jesus. I saw that the New Testament teaches that Jesus does have a love for all men. But there will be those such as the rich young ruler that will reject that love and turn away from Him.

It is far easier to accept the plain and simple teaching of scripture that God loves all men. Then to try to twist a text of scripture to fit a theological system.

Simply my thoughts.

-bbs-

**Re: bearmaster - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/12/3 8:26**

Blaine, am I missing something here??

You posted many warnings on the previous threads telling folk they should not start topics on the Cal/arm debate and that they were breaking forum guidelines and yet here you start the very same thing.....eh!! You confuse me.

**Re: Dave , on: 2016/12/3 8:45**

Sorry Dave. Not trying to initiate a Calvinistic discussion. But there have been threads suggesting God loves only the sheep and not the goats. Or God loves the elect and not the non elect.

I am asking that those who hold to the view that God loves only the elect to explain the love of Jesus to a man who rejected Him.

I believe the scriptures teach that God has a love for all men. But there will be those who will reject the love of God. As such the wrath of God will abide on them.

Hope this clarifies my position. Or at least what I'm trying to convey in this thread.

-bbs-

**Re: - posted by Sree (), on: 2016/12/3 9:03**

The greatest proof that God loves all including those who reject him is in John 13.

Now before the Feast of the Passover, Jesus knowing that His hour had come that He would depart out of this world to the Father, having loved His own who were in the world, He loved them to the end. 2 During supper, the devil having already put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, to betray Him, 3 Jesus, knowing that the Father had given all things into His hands, and that He had come forth from God and was going back to God, 4 \*got up from supper, and \*laid aside His garments; and taking a towel, He girded Himself.

We see the connection there, Jesus loved his disciples till the end, even though one of them has already decided to betray Jesus. Satan has already put that in his heart. Jesus also washed the feet of Judas who was about to suffer eternal destruction. Jesus loved him so much that he kept hinting about the sin Judas was about to commit, first as if he was speaking to 3rd person (â€œTruly, truly, I say to you, that one of you will betray Me.â€), finally he spoke straight to his face (â€œThat is the one for whom I shall dip the morsel and give it to him.â€ So when He had dipped the morsel, He \*took and \*gave it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot.). Still Judas did not repent and perished.

It is a great lesson to all of us. Let us repent when we hear the Lord addressing us as if he is addressing a 3rd person.

**Re: Blaine - posted by dfella (), on: 2016/12/3 10:33**

Blaine,

Thanks for sharing this portion and I would like to attempt to answer one of your statements. I totally agree that God loved this ruler even though he had chosen his own riches above God. I believe God is long suffering, forbearing, and patient, not willing that any should perish and know God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked.

But the statement that God only loves those whom He has chosen does not make sense to me and would like to speak to this. I hear and have heard this statement many times and must say again I believe, it is we, us, who determines whether we are chosen because God has given us the freedom to choose.

I said in the other thread, choice was given in the beginning in the book of Genesis in the garden. God told Adam and Eve that they could eat FREELY of every tree in the garden but were commanded not to eat of the tree in the midst of the garden. He tempered our freedom of choice with a command and because we are not puppets, computers, or robots but rather free moral agents God is not going to pull strings, or input only information that will yield His desire because He wants us to choose to love and obey Him, not force, or program us to.

We know that many are called but few are chosen. I know many say that it is God that does the choosing, but I do not believe that at all. We choose, we determine, God simply sees and knows our beginning and end before we are born.

God knew when He created the angels that 1/3 would rebel, but He still created them and that there are 2/3 who chose not to rebel. God knew when He created Adam and Eve that they too would disobey but He created them anyway. God knew that their sin of disobedience would pass upon all men but He created them anyway.

I brought up Hitler and Judas in the other thread, what is the difference between Adam & Eve, as opposed to Hitler, Judas, and all the rest of mankind? Mankind was not involved in the creation of Adam and Eve, however, Adam and Eve and the rest of mankind are and have been involved in the furtherance of creation.

Fallen humans begetting fallen humans who happen to have the freedom to choose.

While God saw that everything He created in the beginning was good, including man which He created in His own image, God knew, God did not cause, God did not choose, God did not predestine He just KNEW, that man would disobey Him.

While God's love is sufficient and available to ALL He is not going to force it, manipulate it, determine it, or make the choice for us to choose it. I do not know any other way to say it or help others see how I see it in my own head.

We are FINITE, God is INFINITE. We do not have the ability to see both the beginning and the end, and personally I am VERY glad that that is the case.

There will be a day that will come when we see Him that we shall be like Him, we will only then SEE as He now sees and we shall know all things. When we look back we will be very amazed how simple His truth really was and is, and how difficult and complicated the devil our adversary made it.

I again go back to the question, does God STILL love those who have left this world and having rejected Him? If Hitler is in hell right now, do you still believe God loves Hitler? Or has God's hatred been accounted to Hitler's account because of Hitler's choices?

Remember we are looking back in a PAST tense, not a present or future tense. If it were present or future, I would then not say God's love would not be available to Hitler.

Going back to the scripture Psalm 5:5, It says that the fool will not stand in God's sight and that He hates all workers of iniquity. It does not say He hates their works, He hates them. If it does not mean what it says, what does this verse mean?

When Jesus returns to this earth He is coming in wrath, judgement, and fury and will be taking fiery vengeance upon all those who have rejected Him.

Wrath is not chastening. Wrath is not love. Wrath will be carried out on those who have rejected Christ, again they choose to reject and bring upon themselves this wrath.

John 3:36 He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

The wrath that this verse speaks of is an impending wrath which is determined by man, it is decided by man's choice.

While we are still alive we can choose to turn from sin and see life and remove this wrath that is resting upon us because of our sin and rejection, if not, we bear the consequence. God will not be blamed.

Looking forward in the present and future tense I do not want to say God hates anyone, but if one chooses to rebel and reject Christ and end up in hell, they will run the risk of heaping God's hatred upon themselves.

Once one is in hell what difference would it make to them whether God loves them or hates them at that point? It's an honest question.

BD

**Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/12/3 11:33**

Blaine, I really don't have an issue with people posting about things that relate to Calvinistic theology, for or against. As I said on another thread, we should be able to discuss these things in a spirit of learning. What I am pointing out is the contradiction in you making a very big deal on a similar topic started by Savannah that it should not have been allowed and folk should stop starting such discussions.

Your post here is clearly the same subject, but coming from the other side. But instead of posting into the original thread of Savannah's you started a new one, which in reality will just be a continuation of the other one. I'm ok with you doing this, but having done so you should not chastise others for posting on these or similar subjects. It gives the impression that it's ok to post your point of view, but wrong for others to post views that you disagree with!

BTW, I am not Calvinistic in my theology, so not defending anyone here, in fact I probably agree with you on this issue, but that is not the point. We have to be consistent in our what we say and do.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2016/12/3 15:42**

its Hippocratic Dave thats what it is.....

could it be that it was Jesus humanity loving in this case we all talk about that in another context and agree that Jesus lived as a man and fulfilled the law as such

**Re: Dave , on: 2016/12/3 16:15**

Setting aside then the name of the theology. Does the New Testament teach that God loves only the sheep and not the goats? If He loves only the sheep then how does this explain His love for the rich young ruler who appeared to be acting like a goat?

-bbs-

**Re: , on: 2016/12/3 16:34**

Quote:

-----its Hippocratic Dave thats what it is...  
-----

The Hippocratic Oath is an oath historically taken by physicians. It is one of the most widely known of Greek medical texts. In its original form, it requires a new physician to swear, by a number of healing gods, to uphold specific ethical standards.

**Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/12/3 16:46**

So Mark, your sarcasm is ok is it when someone makes a spelling mistake? Or are you just picking on people because of what was posted on a different thread. That is very low brother! You should apologise.

**Re: , on: 2016/12/3 17:00**

Brethren some in this forum are implying, if not outright saying, that God loves only those He has chosen. The sheep if you will. This will imply God hates those He has not chosen. The goats if you will.

So I ask again why does Jesus feel a love for the rich young ruler who turned away from His invite to follow Him.

-bbs-

**Re: , on: 2016/12/3 17:03**

Is it possible the premise that God loves only the sheep but not the goats is not taught on the scriptures.

-bbs-

**Re: , on: 2016/12/3 17:12**

Sorry Gary...forgive me for correcting your spelling but I thought it was funny to see that medical term and didn't think it would hurt to lighten things up brother:-) Unless of course you have thin skin but then I remembered you are an Aussie and can handle it:-)

Dave don't get your knickers in a knot brother, it's just the internet:-)

I stand by my comments though that we should not be disparaging brothers and sisters in Christ based on what rumors



we read on the internet. Get to know them first then you can make a proper judgment...right?

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/12/3 17:28**

D. Fella-

I have tried in the past to accept the position that you take- that God can foreknow without influencing freewill.

This is a very deep subject and I tried to live with your explanation for a while until a gentleman on another forum explained logically how that is not possible. The reason that it is not possible is because God's foreknowledge would be perfect. Therefore, if he has foreknowledge that I will eat a peanut butter and onion sandwich for lunch tomorrow (delicious by the way) then by golly that is what I am going to have. It may FEEL like I am freely choosing to eat this, but if God has truly foreseen this then how could I be free to choose otherwise?

I suppose the answer may be that His ways are higher than our ways. Perhaps it has something to do with the multiverses and string theory and dark matter. But of course I don't understand that either.

**Re: - posted by Elibeth, on: 2016/12/3 18:11**

Brother Bear,  
The Lord has a GREAT compassion and love for us all.  
The Scriptures say, it is not His will that ANY perish.

Jesus, and also John The Baptist came preaching / teaching everywhere,  
"Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand."  
"Repent, ... make straight paths for your feet."

Save yourselves from the wrath to come.

He did that for us when we were yet sinners. It was His love for us, ...  
not wanting us to burn in hell.

Even when He speaks to us, as he spoke to the rich young man, (His leading by His Spirit, ... His commanding us, ... His will for us), we have an option, ... He speaks, leads, draws, ... (that is His command to us.  
(individually) He put His finger on this man's riches.

The rich young man chose his own will / word ... desire.

I believe in all these things Jesus is showing us examples, and we know that all Scriptures written by the inspiration of God,

I am seeing more and more, that what Jesus did when He walked this earth,  
it has a specific meaning for us in a spiritual way.

For instance:

His healings:  
The blind, ... He wants us to see Spiritually, ( give us eyes to see )  
The deaf, ... Ears to hear Spiritually  
The crippled, ... our walk, ... in The Spirit  
The dead, ... Lazarus is our example, ... dead, bound from head to foot, ...  
Isn't that the way we were when we came to The Lord ?  
And now, this young rich man, ... and us when The Lord speaks, ... puts His finger on any number of things in our life, ...  
What will we do ?

I believe this Scripture is given to us, for an example for hearing / obeying.  
Being "lead by The Spirit of God"  
I know my wording is not very good, but it is from my heart and the seeing

that The Lord has been so gracious to give.

Loving all,  
-----  
elizabeth

**Re: Elisabeth , on: 2016/12/3 18:25**

Sister I am in agreement with you. I believe God shows His love to us to draw us to Himself. Yst there will be those, such as the rich young ruler who will turn away from the love of Jesus to the things of this world. That is so sad.

-bbs-

**Re: on topic - posted by savannah, on: 2016/12/3 19:50**

Blaine, you said, "Brother the topic under discussion is the rich young ruler. The text under discussion is Jesus felt a love for Him."

As in my first post, so with this one as well. The comments on Mark 14:51,52 from John Daniel Jones referred to the rich young ruler in Mark 10. Here again is another man who believes that this rich young ruler was Mark himself.

Ray Steadman on the rich young ruler -

And Jesus looking upon him loved him, and said to him, "You lack one thing; go, sell what you have, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me." At that saying his countenance fell, and he went away sorrowful; for he had great possessions. (Mark 10:21-22 RSV)

Jesus is saying, "You have the qualities it takes to enter the kingdom. You are simple and direct, you are teachable, and you are obedient. That is, you have been. Now let's see how much you have retained of those qualities How obedient are you now? How far do you carry this willingness to act upon what you know to be true? You lack but one thing: go and sell all that you have, and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come and follow me."

There is an ironic humor in the young man's response: "He went away sorrowful, for he had great possessions." Would you go away sorrowful if you had great possessions? If you had just won fifty thousand dollars in a television give-away program, would you go away sorrowful? No, you would be rejoicing. But this young man went away sorrowful, because he had great possessions. Why? Of course the answer is that he could see there was no way he could serve two masters. Jesus in that marvelous way of his, had pierced right to the heart of this young man's life, right to the deep things of his spirit, and had shown him that he was owned by another god. This young man, who had everything that money and power and youth could give him, nevertheless had wanted something far more important. He saw it, caught a glimpse of it, wanted it -- eternal life not just living forever, but a quality of life he knew he lacked, an emptiness within his spirit he could not fill. But he knew this could fill it, and he wanted it. But he was sorrowful, because he also knew, at the words of Jesus, that he had to give up the other in order to have this; he could not have both. This is why he went away sorrowful -- because he had great possessions.

As you know, I do not believe this is the end of the story. I pointed this out in the initial message in these studies on Mark. I believe, from various indications in Scripture, that this young man was Mark himself. It is only Mark who tells us that when Jesus looked at this young man, he loved him. How could Mark know that, if Jesus had not told him? And Mark was indeed a rich young man, a member of the aristocratic ruling class in Israel. He fits this picture in many ways. And only Mark tells us of the young man who flees from the scene of the arrest of Jesus, leaving his garment in the hands of the s

oldiers, and runs off naked into the night. If this was indeed Mark, then there must have come a time when this young man, weighing what Jesus had said, understanding that he was putting all his present comfort and material wealth in the balance against eternal life, against the importance and value of his soul both now and in eternity, understanding that he was giving up the satisfaction of all the deep things of his manhood in exchange for these paltry riches, decided to put it all away and obey Jesus. He gave everything away, and had nothing left but a robe, and came and followed Jesus. And that is why he writes this Gospel.

Now, this is my own speculation. It is not what the Scripture teaches. It is the Stedmaniac view. You may not agree, and that is fine. Â Â Ray Steadman

I will say to you as Ray Steadman says above, you may not agree, therefore your query remains unanswered, and that is fine with me.

But I do believe that the rich young ruler was Mark himself, which is more than a satisfactory answer for me regarding your query.

**Re: - posted by dfella (), on: 2016/12/4 12:33**

Blaine said,  
â€œBrethren some in this forum are implying, if not outright saying, that God loves only those He has chosen. The sheep if you will. This will imply God hates those He has not chosen. The goats if you will.  
So I ask again why does Jesus feel a love for the rich young ruler who turned away from His invite to follow Him.â€

Blaine,  
I am certainly not dogmatic on this and definitely believe that no oneâ€™s salvation is in jeopardy if they believe otherwise.

I believe that we choose God, not that He chooses us. If I choose to reject God, it's my free choice. I still believe God's love is available to me, but if I die and do not receive God's love, it's my choice, I rejected Him, He did not reject me. I would be the fool, God forbid.

I agree the rich young ruler was loved by God, God's love was available but if he chooses to reject God's love and THEN dies without receiving that love, it avails him nothing. So I am only suggesting or implying and again I am not dogmatic on this, that God's hatred would only be used in a past tense.

If we choose to die, rejecting God's love, and look back, we chose to be hated. Jesus says by our own words we will be justified and by our own words we will be condemned. I believe it is not only our words but also our confession and actions.

I just do not see any benefit in saying God still loves those who rejected Him and end up in the lake of fire, and I put ALL the burden of that choice on them, not God.

If we as well as the rich young ruler reject him while we are still alive and there is still hope that we might turn then yes I believe God loves us and him right up to our last breath.

Blessings!

**Re: Todd - posted by dfella (), on: 2016/12/4 12:42**

All is well Todd, again it is not a salvation issue and I am quite content in being wrong.

LOL on the peanut butter and onion sandwich, I have actually had that but the sandwich also contained a juicy hamburger and bacon as well, sounds crazy but God knows it's good!

Another favorite is a fried egg and peanut butter sandwich!

Blessings!

**Re: too close to home for me, on: 2016/12/4 16:21**

I happen to belong to a church where the doctrine of 'Crunchy Peanut Butter is Better' is fiercely defended!!!

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2016/12/4 18:06**

John 15:19 If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

John 15:16 Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you.

1 Corinthians 1:27-31 But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

I was one of those "are not", and now I am a "are".

God has made unto me, "in Christ Jesus". He is my all. All my glory is in Him and He in me.

Colossians 1:27-29 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

Because of He that is in me I can now ((CHOose)) without Him I could not. I only believed because of Him and His proving to me who He is. I could not believe without He being birthed in me, by Christ in me, by the Holy Spirit truth, and by Paul that Jesus chose to send to me that I might hear and believe.

Amen

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: , on: 2016/12/4 18:53**

"Because of He that is in me I can now ((CHOose)) without Him I could not."

100% wrong and a clever lie of the calvinists. All throughout the bible from the front cover to the back is instruction from God to choose Him and we see example after example of men and women doing so.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/12/4 19:48**

Philip wrote: "Because of He that is in me I can now ((CHOose)) without Him I could not. I only believed because of Him and His proving to me who He is. I could not believe without He being birthed in me, by Christ in me, by the Holy Spirit truth, and by Paul that Jesus chose to send to me that I might hear and believe."

I don't mean to be obtuse but that sounds like you have to be saved before you can be saved.

**Re: , on: 2016/12/4 20:24**

Okay let me see if I get this straight. Jesus feels a love for the rich young ruler. The Lord invites him to go sell everything he has and give to the poor and come follow Him. The rich young ruler turns away from Christ and does not accept the invitation.

Okay one would say that the rich young ruler turned away from Christ because he was not chosen by God. So if the rich young ruler was not chosen by God. Why did Jesus feel a love for Him?

At this point I am totally confused. Would somebody please clear up the above conundrum. I mean those of you that are of a certain theological suasion that will remain unnamed.

-bbs-

**Re: , on: 2016/12/4 20:45**

Bear

Say I made something of great value available and accessible to all.  
Say I knew who would accept and those who reject the gift beforehand.  
Say I loved them all equally before making the offer.  
Say I do not know what I am writing about

Hope that helps.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2016/12/4 22:28**

What is born again mean and who gives the birthing? Does this sound like another person in scripture? Who am I if this happens? Another person, who?

For everyone on sermonindex, I am not a Calvinist. I am a rebirthed new creation by the Spirit of Christ born again in me by His Spirit, by the Work of the Father at the Cross. God My Father has made Him to me my all in all. Jesus Christ is my believing in faith, my not earthly wisdom, but heavenly, my righteousness, not mine but His that is in me, my sanctification by the Seal of the Holy Spirit Teacher of Christ in me, my redemption by His Blood, of which none of the above has anything to do with my own responsibility.

Colossians 1:28-29 Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus: Whereunto I also labour, striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.

Whose working? Certainly not mine. Praise God, To Him be all the glory of Him, "saving me to be saved" in Christ, even before the foundation of the world in Gods creation.

Is this not what Paul is saying that which was given him by Jesus Christ Himself?

1 Corinthians 1:29-31 That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: miracles - posted by savannah, on: 2016/12/5 4:04**

awakened posted,

"Because of He that is in me I can now ((CHOose)) without Him I could not."

100% wrong and a clever lie of the calvinists. All throughout the bible from the front cover to the back is instruction from God to choose Him and we see example after example of men and women doing so.

-----  
As there are physical miracles, so there are spiritual miracles.

Just as it was impossible to obey the command of Jesus in the following passages physically, except by His miraculous power, so it is impossible to obey the command of Jesus spiritually, except by His miraculous power.

Physical miracles

And when He had said these things, He cried out with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth." John 11:43

Then saith he to the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it forth; and it was restored whole, as the other. Matthew 12:13

Jesus said unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole and took up his bed and walked, and on that day was the sabbath. John 5:8,9

Spiritual miracle

And when you were dead in your transgressions and the uncircumcision of your flesh, He made you alive together with Him, having forgiven us all our transgressions. Col. 2:13

And you, being dead in your trespasses and sins... ,made us alive with Christ even we being dead in trespasses by grace you are saved and He raised us up together and seated us together in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus. Eph. 2:1,5,6

And they were exceedingly astonished, and said to him, "Then who can be saved?" Jesus looked at them and said, "With man it is impossible, but not with God. For all things are possible with God." Mark 10:26,27

Just as in the passages of physical miracles referenced above, when Jesus commanded, He empowered them to do so, so it is with the Gospel, when the command to repent and believe is given, the spiritually dead sinner is empowered to do so.

Both are by the miracle working power of God alone.

Give credit where credit is due!

That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit. The flesh profits nothing!

**Re: Blaine's question answered - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/12/5 4:23**

Blaine, Why can't you accept that Savannah has answered your question about the Rich Young Ruler? We may not agree, but answered he/she has!

The fact is no one knows what the outcome of this young man was, i.e. if he ultimately did forsake all and follow Christ or not. Savannah assumes he did (and was probably the gospel writer, Mark), you assume he did not. Neither can be proved, so it is a pointless argument and no point in trying to pursue your point anymore on this.

There are plenty of plain scriptures that speak of the love of God for men, you don't need speculative examples such as this to make your case.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/12/5 8:24**

Luke 6:35-36 But love your enemies, do good, and lend, hoping for nothing in return; and your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High. For He is kind to the unthankful and evil. Therefore be merciful, just as your Father also is merciful.

We are told to love our enemies because that is what God does. God does not hate his enemies and then tell us to love ours.

A drunkard may tell his son not to drink because he hopes his son will aspire to a higher standard. Obviously, this line of reasoning cannot apply to God.

**Re: Heydave, on: 2016/12/5 14:25**

Mark 10:17-22 (NASB)

The Rich Young Ruler

As He was setting out on a journey, a man ran up to Him and knelt before Him, and asked Him, "Good Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" And Jesus said to him, "Why do you call Me good? No one is good except God alone. You know the commandments, 'Do not murder, Do not commit adultery, Do not steal, Do not bear false witness, Do not defraud, Honor your father and mother.'" And he said to Him, "Teacher, I have kept all these things from my youth up." Looking at him, JESUS FELT A LOVE FOR HIM and said to him, "One thing you lack: go and sell all you possess and give to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me." But at these words he was saddened, and he went away grieving, for he was one who owned much property.

David you accuse me of speculation. Brother I am not the one attempting to speculate or make the text above say something that is not in the scripture. External sources I have looked at do not bear witness to Savannah's assertion that the rich young ruler is Mark.

And again I'm not the one trying to distort or twist a text to fit a certain theological system that our brother holds too. But I am accepting the plain reading of the scripture above.

Again the passage above indicates that God had a love for the rich young ruler. And the rich young ruler rejected the love and the invite of Christ because he could not leave the things of this world.

A plain reading of the text indicates God love all men. But His love can be rejected.

My thoughts.

-bbs-

**Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2016/12/5 15:16**

Blaine, I would have thought it was clear in what I wrote, that I was not accusing YOU in particular of speculation, but I am sorry if that was not clear. The point I was making was it cannot be known EITHER WAY if the Rich Young Ruler (who ever he is) later repented and forsoke all to follow Christ. You have to accept that. Yes it is clear Jesus loved him in his present lost condition, but Savannah's point is that he could have got saved later. For your point to be valid, you would have to assume he never got saved later. BOTH are speculation.

I believe Jesus loves ALL, including the lost because all are invited to turn and be saved, because He died for all mankind. The scriptures are clear to me on this.

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/12/5 15:54**

I kind of like the theory he was Joseph of Aramathea. Of course that is just a theory but seems to fit- he was rich and a ruler (a pharisee).

**Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2016/12/5 20:20**

For God so loved the world...that he gave his only begotten Son. It is so clear that God truly loves all the people born in the world. His love is so strong that he gave his Son to be crucified for all the sins of the world.

That whoever believes in Him (his Son) should not perish but have everlasting life. It is also clear that no matter how much God loves us we must believe in his Son (who died for our sins) in order to receive eternal life and not perish in our sins.

The scripture teaches that we are saved by grace through faith. It is God's grace that causes us to be saved by faith in Christ who shed his blood for the forgiveness of our sins.

God gives to all a measure of faith. The ones who place their faith in Christ can be saved and the ones who will not place their faith in Christ will be damned.

God's sovereignty does not negate man's responsibility.

Blessings to all!

**Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2016/12/6 7:28**

Luke 9:23 Then He said to them all, "If ~~any~~ **anyone** desires to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me.

Rev 22 says that "whosoever will" may drink freely from the water of life.