

T Josiah Richardson

January 28, 2016 ·

The first question of the Westminster Shorter Catechism reads, "What is the chief end of man?" The Catechism's answer: "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever."

God graciously linked the pursuit of our chief purpose with our greatest experience of joy.

- Hugh Ross

Seth Campbell HUUUUUUUGH

Seth Campbell and...boom goes the dynamite

Rusty Freeman I disagree with the notion of "enjoy Him forever"

That's only for the elect

Paul M. Dohse Sr. I guess my question would be, "Where does the Bible say that or imply it anywhere?" I have read the whole Bible, and most of it multiple times, and cannot recall that idea anywhere. The only thing that comes to mind is, "This is the end of the matter; all hath been heard: fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man" (Ecc 12:13). Since obeying God is synonymous with loving God and others, which fulfills all of Scripture, I guess I wonder why the contradiction doesn't raise red flags.

Josh Robinson That's because there's not a contradiction, Paul. All one must do is look at the proof-texts that the Assembly cited in the Shorter Catechism. The catechism's answer is deduced from Scripture by good and necessary consequence.

"Quest. 1. What is the chief end of man?

Ans. 1. Man's chief end is to glorify God,(1) and to enjoy him for ever.(2)

(1) I Cor. 10:31; Rom. 11:36.

(2) Ps. 73:25-28."

<http://www.westminsterconfession.org/.../the-westminster...>

The Westminster Shorter Catechism - The Westminster Presbyterian

[westminsterconfession.org](http://www.westminsterconfession.org)

Ward Hiney Also, Neh. 8:9-12

Rusty Freeman I would ask, is it the intention and plan of God to bring to pass the chief end of man?

Anthony Ray It is God's intention and plan to bring about, well, his intentions and plans.

Rusty Freeman Then obviously it is NOT God's intention and plan for all men to enjoy Him forever

Rusty Freeman Do all men glorify God?

And Do all men enjoy Him forever?

Anthony Ray All men glorify God, but they don't all enjoy him.

Rusty Freeman I agree, therefore it is NOT the chief end of some men to enjoy Him

Josh Robinson It is the chief end, but all men don't live up to that chief end, because 1) they suppress the truth of God in unrighteousness (Romans 1), and 2) they remain spiritually hardened.

Josh Robinson Just because they don't enjoy God doesn't in anyway invalidate that all men are called to treasure and enjoy God.

Anthony Ray The Catechism doesn't say that all men meet their chief end, just what the chief end is.

Ward Hiney It's a statement of objective truth, not a summary of the subjective 'ends' or 'purposes' or 'intents' of any particular men. Objectively, the teleological, designed purpose of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever.

Rusty Freeman Is not "chief end" synonymous with "chief purpose"?

In my opinion, chief end implies, connotes, insinuates chief purpose. Or so it seems to me

Rusty Freeman And logically, if the chief purpose(according to God) of some men is not attained, then God's purpose has been frustrated and God is not God

Rusty Freeman So Ward, do you believe that God designed all men to enjoy Him forever?

T Josiah Richardson 1 Thessalonians 5:18

Give thanks in all circumstances; for this is God's will for you in Christ Jesus.

Are we thwarting God's will whenever we fail to give thanks in *all* circumstances? No. We must be careful to remember the distinctions of God's decretive will and His prescriptive will.

Rusty Freeman Granted, T Josiah but, "chief end" does not carry the idea of a prescriptive will

Ward Hiney Rusty Freeman 'chief' meaning 'highest' or 'most primary', and 'man' could be taken to mean 'mankind', all men collectively. Obviously God's intended, decreed will for the non-elect is not to enjoy him forever, but the highest possible purpose of that non-elect man is still the glory of God, even if that glorification is the glorification of His justice and longsuffering with regard to the measure of life afforded that man. So, yes, all men, indeed all creation, glorifies God inescapably.

T Josiah Richardson If the chief end of me working out is to bulk up, then the end is determined by the means. They necessitate each other. If I don't work out, I won't bulk up.

If I do not Worship God, I will not Enjoy Him; and I will never be satisfied in any other Enjoyments than the Worship of God. We were made... Our purpose, if you will... Is to Worship God and in Him we will have everlasting Enjoyment. When we deny our purpose, we deny Christ.

Rusty Freeman T Josiah Richardson your last post seems to suggest that man determines his chief end and not God.

If God's chief end was to "bulk up", He wouldn't fail to do so

T Josiah Richardson The Reformed faith does not deny Human responsibility. We are Compatibilistic as Scripture teaches, affirming both the Sovereignty of God and the free creaturely will of man.

We are not fatalistic as some would make a caricature and say we are zombie robots.

Though we do not determine our ultimate Future, we do not deny that man's responsibility is to Worship God and bring Him glory.

We were all made with a chief end, a purpose to fulfill. Scriptures make it clear what that purpose is and that some will deny their purpose and elect to fulfill their own self Worship through any other object than God Himself.

Rusty Freeman Ward, I totally agree that the chief end of all men is to glorify God, either in salvation or damnation. So if we are being logically consistent, it follows that the chief end of some men is to enjoy Him forever and some men not to enjoy Him forever

Ward Hiney Your confusion is explained in your equivocating between 'end' as 'objective teleological purpose' and 'final state' or 'subjective intention'

Rusty Freeman You'll have to unpack that for me Ward

Ward Hiney The objective teleological purpose of mankind, the highest possible purpose, of mankind, is to glorify God and enjoy him forever. This is what mankind was made for, and what they will, collectively, accomplish, by the sheer gracious providence of God.

Some men individually may design all manner of highest purposes to which they dedicate themselves - highest in their own subjective estimation, relative to their other purposes or what have you.

Some men also arrive at a final state in which they are not enjoying God. In this sense, their 'end' is damnation - but this is not the sense in which 'chief end' is used in the catechism answer.

When you equivocate these categories, you misunderstand what the catechism is teaching, and it becomes obviously self-contradictory with respect to other answers in the catechism itself.

Rusty Freeman Proverbs 16:4 NASB

The Lord has made everything for its own purpose, Even the wicked for the day of evil.

I think that single verse refutes the catechisms notion that the chief end of all men is to enjoy Him forever.

T Josiah Richardson Thoughts Paul M. Dohse Sr.?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. My thoughts? Those verses cited bolster Ecc 12:13 more than they do the Westminster Confession and its catechisms. Especially since the WC is predicated on progressive justification which is a false gospel.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...because Calvin believed in progressive justification.

Rusty Freeman Opposed to eternal justification?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Don't confuse the issue with Reformed BS. Calvin believed that we maintain our salvation by obtaining continued forgiveness for "present sin" through the "means of grace" ie, salvation found only in the church and the authority of pastors to forgive sin. Its salvation on the installment plan if you obey the elders. Hence, Calvinists like John Piper state continually that "believers still need to be saved."

Rusty Freeman I don't believe any of that stuff Paul

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Then you are not a true Protestant.

Rusty Freeman So you agree with Calvin and Piper in your previous post?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. No, because I am no longer a Protestant since I have discovered what one really is. I called myself one many years until I found out what Protestant orthodoxy really teaches.

T Josiah Richardson Do you have a specific term for what you are exactly?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. "Believer."

Paul M. Dohse Sr. or, "Biblicists."

Rusty Freeman I don't agree with those exact statements that Calvin or Piper made either. I would call myself a monergistic believer and believe that salvation is monergistic and by the sovereign grace of God based on the intercessory work of Christ alone on behalf of His chosen people. People believe because they have life, not in order to obtain life. Man takes NO responsibility in a monergistic work of salvation.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Salvation, or the new birth, is a onetime finished work in the believer. The baptism of the Spirit occurs once. Christ made the first part of the baptism possible by dying on the cross, the Spirit made the second part possible by resurrecting Christ from the grave. God the Father elected the means of salvation. Salvation is Trinitarian.

Rusty Freeman Yes salvation is monergistic from the trinitarian God of scripture.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. And it is a finished work. One cannot be unborn.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. And by the way, does anyone here know what the 3 elements of Calvin's election were? Calvin's election doctrine had a 3-fold construct. It entails 3 different classes of elect.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. What were the 3 classes, and what are the implications for those in the church?

Rusty Freeman On what basis do men go to heaven, and on what basis are men born again Paul?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. By the new birth.

Rusty Freeman On what basis is the new birth applied?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...obtained by faith alone.

Rusty Freeman I don't really care about Calvin and his 3 classes

Rusty Freeman So one must activate or have faith in order to be born again (new birth)?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. "Activate"? Huh? Faith is passive. The question concerns the definition of new birth.

Rusty Freeman Maybe produce faith is a better word. Does faith initiate the new birth (aka, regeneration, born again, passing from spiritual death unto spiritual life)?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. While Peter was still saying these things, the Holy Spirit fell on all who heard the word.
45 And the believers from among the circumcised who had come with Peter were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out even on the Gentiles...Consequently, faith comes from hearing the message, and the message is heard through the word about Christ.

Rusty Freeman While Peter was still saying these things, the Holy Spirit fell (the special endowment and empowerment of the indwellment of the Spirit of those who are already born again aka new birth, regeneration, born of God) on all who heard (John 8:47 he who is OF GOD HEARS God's Word) the word.
45 And the believers (1 John 5:1 Everyone who believes HAS BEEN, past tense, past completed action, born again) from among the circumcised who had come with Peter were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out even on the Gentiles

I do not equate the gift of the Spirit to the new birth.

Even as the Lord Jesus Christ taught, he who hears my words and believes has already passed (past tense, previously before hearing and belief) from death unto life.

Rusty Freeman John 5:24 NKJV

"Most assuredly, I say to you, he who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has everlasting life, and shall not come into judgment, but has passed from death into life.

A man believes because he HAS BEEN born again. A man is NOT born again because he believes.

John 1:13, 5:24, 8:47, 10:26, Acts 13:48, Eph 2:1, Gal 4:6, 1 John 5:1

The new birth precedes any fruit of faith. It is the Spirit who gives life, the flesh profits NOTHING John 6

But in your theology, the flesh is indeed profitable because you believe that a man has faith in the flesh prior to the new birth, thereby being profitable in the flesh to bring about spiritual life. That logic is relentless regardless of any vain attempts to deny such

Rusty Freeman BTW, that's salvation by sovereign grace as taught in the scriptures

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Rusty Freeman Oh boy, here we go, make it an election issue to distract from the progressive justification issue. Typical.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. <http://www.amazon.com/Its-About-Election.../dp/B00HFEON7A>

It's Not About Election The subject of Calvinism is almost always associated with the free will/election debate...amazon.com

Rusty Freeman I don't believe in progressive justification

I believe in eternal justification

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Ok.

Rusty Freeman It's about Christ alone and His redemption on behalf of His chosen people. Matt 1:21

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Ok.

Rusty Freeman But in your theology, the flesh is indeed profitable because you believe that a man has faith in the flesh prior to the new birth, thereby being profitable in the flesh to bring about spiritual life. That logic is relentless regardless of any vain attempts to deny such I repeat

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Nice Gnostic statement Rusty.

Rusty Freeman Nice accusation without substantiation

Paul M. Dohse Sr. I would have to first teach you about Gnosticism which I have not the time to do, but I can point you in the right direction. All scholars agree that Calvin and Luther got their doctrine from Augustine who was an avowed Neo-Platonist.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Hence, progressive justification is the logical outcome of Dualism.

Rusty Freeman Good Lord, stick with the text I presented. Quit appealing to men that I could care less about.

Rusty Freeman Opening question. On what basis do men go to heaven? On what basis are men born again?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. I reject the premise of the opening question. Sorry.

Rusty Freeman Of course you reject it. Isn't that convenient and revealing.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Um, why? Because I am not the average Kool-Aid drinker that you are used to dealing with?

Rusty Freeman I wouldn't know. You won't actually deal with scripture

Paul M. Dohse Sr. No, you want to make the issue order of salvation instead of progressive justification. I am not playing your word shell game.

Rusty Freeman It seems very evident previously in this thread that your answer as to why men are born again is on the basis of faith. I have exhaustively shown why that is scripturally false.

Rusty Freeman I said I don't believe in progressive justification therefore I see no reason to discuss the matter

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Rusty Freeman So, taking your last two statements together, man's faith is imputed to him, right?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...you are saying man's faith is imputed to him, no?

Rusty Freeman Faith is the evidence of things not seen (regeneration, new birth). It is the capacity to receive spiritual truth in which an unregenerate man does not have the capacity of faith. Faith is a gift

Paul M. Dohse Sr. "A gift" implies a onetime event. So, you don't believe that God has to maintain faith in the believer. Once the gift is received, the believer is enabled to do good works.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Hence, believers can do good works, and are sealed to the day of redemption.

Rusty Freeman No, I don't believe that God has to maintain faith in the believer. We exercise our God granted faith according to our freewill. Yes, believers are enabled to do good works, works are the evidence of faith and salvation, not the condition for. We, believers, are saved by Christ alone and sealed by the Spirit for the day of redemption

Rusty Freeman Salvation is based on Christ alone plus absolutely nothing else

Rusty Freeman Come to think of it, we are kept by the power of God through faith. But I believe that is the object of our faith, Jesus Christ, and not the faith in and of itself

Paul M. Dohse Sr. So, if we continue to believe in Christ, God will continue to keep us. Does that not then depend on our faith?

Rusty Freeman No, it depends on the work of Christ. If a man has faith, the man is a beneficiary of Christ's atoning work and the everlasting covenant.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. So there is a continuing imputation of faith to the believer.

Rusty Freeman Did I say that?

Rusty Freeman Faith is a gift and a provision of the everlasting covenant. It is the capacity to receive spiritual truth, it's the evidence of things not seen, and there is vital (living) faith, active faith, and mental faith. All of God's regenerate children possess faith, some greater than others.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. So, how does this fit into the Protestant doctrine of double imputation which states that a perfect keeping of the law must be maintained in order to maintain salvation. Since we can't keep the law perfectly, what is the role of faith in our lives regarding the law? You yourself attest to the idea that Christ died for our sins AND our righteousness, right?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. https://youtu.be/9O0m_OtSVKk

Wretched: RC Sproul: Double Imputation

youtube.com

Rusty Freeman 2 Corinthians 5:21 YLT98

for him who did not know sin, in our behalf He did make sin, that we may become the righteousness of God in him.

Right, I agree with double imputation. The role of faith is the assurance that this imputation is a reality in our lives. We can live by faith, knowing that the righteousness that we need was obtained on our behalf by Christ.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Right, and for continued keeping. We are KEPT by the power of God THROUGH faith. That is your rendering of that passage. We are saved by a faith imputed to us, and kept by faith in the death and perfect obedience of Christ to the law. So, in justification AND sanctification, faith is imputed to us and we are completely out of the loop lest it be a FAITH OF OUR OWN. This necessarily defines the new birth as a mere ability to ONLY see or perceive the *sovereign gospel.* What you believe is absolutely NO different than that of any other Reformed Gnostic hack that has ever come down the pike.

Rusty Freeman Justification is based on Christ alone. Sanctification requires our willing obedience which has no effect on our justification. I believe that men are saved by what Christ alone did and not what they do. If trusting in the finished work of Christ alone makes me a reformed gnostic, then guilty as charged. Better than the alternative which is basing salvation on what men DO or adding to the work of Christ because He didn't get the job done. That's the only other alternative to which I assume you're part of.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Blah, blah, blah, it's the Reformed word shell game. If one considers what you have said all together in this stream, the only logical conclusion is a conflation of justification and sanctification (progressive justification). When called on it, you focus on justification talking points while allowing for synergism in sanctification to be assumed. It's a deceptive cultic communication method. Taking your definition of faith alone with you affirmation of double imputation, no other logical conclusions can be drawn.

Rusty Freeman I just separated justification and sanctification in my last post. So your accusation is unsubstantiated.

There is no progressive justification. It's a one time instantaneous act whereby God counts a sinner righteous based on the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ alone. Then there's positional sanctification, and experiential sanctification.

Rusty Freeman Since we are either guilty or not guilty before the throne of God, I'm not even sure how one progressively becomes "the little less guilty" until they reach not guilty without a system of merit or works. I deny works based eternal salvation period. Progressive justification isn't even remotely tenable in salvation by sovereign grace because I go to heaven based on the merit of Christ.

On what basis do you believe that you go to heaven?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Uh, where to start with this typical Gnostic Reformed doublespeak? And you know what you're doing. "It's a one time instantaneous act whereby God counts a sinner righteous based on the penal substitutionary atonement of Christ alone." You are careful n...See More

Paul M. Dohse Sr. "Since we are either guilty or not guilty before the throne of God..." We do not stand in any final judgement where we either have Christ's "covering" of righteousness or not as set against the law. At this point, yes, you will be at that judgement because as the Reformed hack that you are, you are still under law. That final judgement will only be those judged by the law, we are NOT under law. Christ didn't die to cover our sins, he died to end our sins.

Rusty Freeman In what sense did Christ die to "end our sins"? Because every single believer I know admits to doing things wrong and doing things that are in opposition to God's very nature, which is sin.

And there is now no condemnation (not guilty bruh) for those who are in Christ Jesus. Romans 8

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Because he died to end the law (Rom 10:4, Col 2:14) and where there is no law there is NO sin: Rom 3:19, 20, 4:15, 5:13, 7:6,8, 1Tim 1:9, Gal 2:19. Read Galatians 3 CAREFULLY and with your OWN mind. There is ONE seed unless the law can give life, and it can't. If Christ obeyed the law for us, and that is part of our salvation because it is the imputation of righteousness, that means the law can give life. Who keeps it is NOT the point, we are made righteous APART from the law. "Apart" means a-p-a-r-t or SEPARATE from the law. If double imputation is true, how in the world is that a righteousness

apart from the law? Also Romans and Hebrews, we were saved by the ONE act of Christ, NOT 2. We died with Christ which means we are no longer under the law of sin and death, but if he had to obey it for us, we are still under it. NO, we were also resurrected with Christ so as to be free to fulfill the law through love. The Bible no longer condemns us, but guides us in love. Sin isn't the issue, love is the issue. Double imputation = under law.

Rusty Freeman Romans 5:19 NKJV

For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by one Man's obedience many will be made righteous.

Rusty Freeman Imputation that involves obedience. Obedience to what? Gee, I wonder

Rusty Freeman Who keeps it is EXACTLY the point

Paul M. Dohse Sr. We are justified APART from the law. Uh, read the whole chapter. The obedience was ONE act (v.18), not many acts of obedience. Nice try.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The ONE act of obedience was to the cross (Phil 2:8) to end the law (Rom 10:4). Double imputation is a false gospel.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. "For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are being sanctified." Heb 10:14. What could be more clear?

Rusty Freeman So how are we made righteous before the throne of God?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The new birth...1John chapter 3.

Rusty Freeman How does that make us righteous?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Uh, well, "You must be born again."

Rusty Freeman I define righteous as absolutely perfect and Pure, Holy just as God is Holy

Rusty Freeman Right, you must be born again. But how does being born again make us absolutely Holy, perfect and Pure before the throne of God?

Rusty Freeman I'm waiting

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Because we are born of God and we have His seed within us. Read 1John 3. What makes us righteous is the reversal of slavery and freedom (Romans 6). We were once enslaved to sin but free to do good, the born again are enslaved to righteousness and free ...See More

Paul M. Dohse Sr. In other words, there is only UNDER LAW or UNDER GRACE. A definition of perfect law-keeping for righteousness is "under law."

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Here is where the confusion is: UNDER GRACE doesn't mean we are not under a law-- it means the new birth put to death the old man who was under the condemnation of the law, and resurrected him to a new creature that fulfills the law by love.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Therefore, there is NOW no condemnation for those under grace. Not because Jesus kept the law of sin and death perfectly, but because He ended it.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The new birth ends one life that was under law, if Jesus has to obey that law for us, we are still under it.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...Romans 7

Paul M. Dohse Sr. My replies will not open.

Ward Hiney What contradiction exists between Ecc 12:13 and the "chief end" statement of the catechism? I see none, care to demonstrate it?

Ward Hiney In fact, considering one cannot obey God without loving him with heart, mind, and soul, it's hard to see how 'obeying' and 'enjoying' don't each require another, but I await an explanation.

Andy Young "one cannot obey God without loving him". There is a fundamental flaw in the premise behind that statement.

It assumes that man has no ability or capacity to obey (which is the metaphysical premise of the false doctrine of total depravity). But the reality is that man IS able to obey, but the question is about what is his motivation. He can be motivated by fear. This appeals to man's most basic instinct to survive. The little boy learns not to touch the hot stove, not because he loves his mom, but because he is afraid of getting burned. One can also be motivated to obey God the same way out of fear.

But what I find even more ironic (and an even more fundamental flaw with your premise) is that with all this talk about "obedience", no one seems to point out the inherent contradiction that reformed theology teaches that believers CANNOT obey, so Jesus must obey for them.

Ward Hiney Can someone obey the command to love God without loving Him?

It's not a trick question...

T Josiah Richardson No?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. It's simple: why not be Bible specific? Here's why: the WC rejects obedience and instead endorses, "new obedience." Not the same obedience being referred to in Ecc.

Ward Hiney Where does the WC reject obedience? Why aren't you using only scripture to speak? Perhaps, as in Neh. 8 and elsewhere, explanation of the text is part of its proper application?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. No, no, I don't play that game. It's up to you to explain why the word "obedience" wasn't good enough for the murdering Puritans who wrote the WC and had to use "new obedience" instead. Hint: it's a Gnostic concept.

Ward Hiney What game? If your objection is that the WLC doesn't use "Bible-specific" language, it seems a fitting question to ask you to apply that standard to yourself as well. Why is it an objection to the catechism but not to Paul's passing thoughts?

T Josiah Richardson Good point Ward.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The point is for you to explain what they meant by "new obedience." What is the difference between the new and everyday obedience? Why so wordy?

Ward Hiney Well, if we've then abandoned the first objection, can you provide a quote or reference to where that occurs and the context that's causing the confusion? I don't know the whole thing by heart, I'd have to read the point of contention in context.

Although, I'll point out that at the time, there wasn't nearly the obsession with brevity we're currently afflicted with, and that they occasionally had thoughts requiring multiple words, or even sentences, to express.

Ward Hiney I mean, "everyday obedience" isn't the way it's put in Ecclesiastes, either. Occasionally English, as a technical language, requires qualifiers like this for clarity.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The Puritans, like Calvin, defined obedience, what they called new obedience, according to Luther's Heidelberg Disputation.

Ward Hiney I thought we were talking about the Westminster standards? Now we're on Calvin and Puritans and Luther. You'll have to provide some kind of context for what you want me to explain, where is it occurring, specifically, so I can read it in context?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Read the Heidelberg Disputation--it's a short read. It's the foundational doctrinal statement of the Protestant Reformation.

Ward Hiney Ok, just searched the document for "new obedience", can't find anything. Care to illuminate?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. No, I don't, go find an RC Sproul video.

Ward Hiney ...neat?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. No, no, I don't play that game. It's up to you to explain why the word "obedience" wasn't good enough for the murdering Puritans who wrote the WC and had to use "new obedience" instead. Hint: it's a Gnostic concept.

Rusty Freeman It's seems like someone deleted the thread about the chief end of all men is to enjoy Him forever.????

T Josiah Richardson My friend who started conversation has taken a Facebook hiatus. It removed the post when he deactivated his account.

Rusty Freeman That stinks. Oh well

Chris Curry Paul - As a Calvinist I can without a doubt say no true historic Protestant believes in progressive justification. That's rather a works based doctrine likened to what one would see come from the Roman Catholic Church.

As Protestants, we believe in progressive sanctification, but not progressive justification. Big difference.

Our justification is instantaneous upon placing our faith in Christ. Our sanctification (a completely different process) is a life-long process of being conformed to the image of Christ (Romans 8:28-30). And this sanctification is split into two different types:

1.) Definite sanctification - Once a man is justified before God he is declared holy ("set apart").

2.) Progressive sanctification - This is a life-long process where the man perseveres and proves that he has been declared righteous and holy before God.

It seems you have some very serious misunderstandings of what it means to be a Protestant and also on some other key views, and I would encourage you to take a step back and re-examine everything you've been saying, because it's clearly not expositional nor historical.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Chris, this is rather embarrassing for you, but what is our first clue that Calvin believed in progressive justification when we consider the title of book 3 and the 14th chapter of the Institutes? "The Beginning of Justification in What Sense Progressive."

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Are you saying that Calvin wasn't saying that the beginning of Justification is progressive when he said it?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. I know what I have studied for myself--you know what Reformed hacks have told you. Calvinists should read the Institutes before they call themselves Calvinists as this would seem evident.

Chris Curry Paul - I've read Calvin, many Reformers, and and the Puritans. He believed nothing of which you speak. You take a title and twist it to make it your own meaning.

Also, the whole point of the Protestant Reformation was to reform away from doctrine such as progressive justification - which, again, is a works based doctrine likened to to what you would see in the RCC. That would make zero sense for him to write in support of something that he was clearly against.

The problem isn't Calvin. The problem is your misunderstanding of his works.

Rusty Freeman Paul, your problem is that anyone who claims to be a Calvinist, must thereby claim to agree with everything that John Calvin taught or believed. Calvinist disagree as much as Arminians do.

Calvinist believe salvation is monergistic the work of one

Arminians believe salvation is synergistic the work of two.

I believe you are an Arminian if I'm not mistaken

Chris Curry Rusty - I've read some of Paul's writings. He's so far out in the woods that Arminians would gasp at what he believes.

This man is clearly deceived and is not teaching the true Word of God.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Here we go: Calvin says the beginning of justification is progressive, but he didn't really mean its progressive.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Chris Curry Really Chris? Let's get it on in a public debate and we will let the folks decide. I have a radio program we can use. We can talk about double imputation, mortification and vivification, and all of the other Reformed doctrines of which you are an expert. You want to put your money where your mouth is?

Chris Curry My copy of Calvin's Institutes.

Chris Curry The TOC.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Perfect, I will bring my copy and we can talk about what Calvin stated about a host of doctrines--his words. You going to step up, or simply run your mouth?

Chris Curry I don't have to step up anymore than I just did. You've embarrassingly been proved wrong.

Chris Curry It's best to hand you over to the Holy Spirit for discipline and correction. I can't fix a heretic.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. LOL! Cmon, I will give you the first 15 minutes to explain what Calvin really meant when he said Justification is progressive--surely you can explain it.

Rusty Freeman Who cares what Calvin said, what sayeth the scriptures? Bring the scriptures Paul

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Um, Rusty, Calvin must be pretty important as Chris Curry just turned me over to Satan for discipline for "misrepresenting" him.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Chris, obviously, has been give Calvin's "power of the keys" which is another interesting doctrine we can discuss as just exercised by Chris.

Josh Robinson Paul, I kindly ask, can you provide for us a reference and quotation of the quote from Calvin that states justification is progressive?

Chris Curry Paul - I've debated and talked with plenty of people who disagree with me on theology plenty of times. You're invitation doesn't scare me in the least.

And what most anti-Calvinists I've come in contact with have in common is that they're angry and bitter. They're not looking to humble themselves and learn, but they're just looking for an argument - to "win." They're the equivalent to a kid on a playground looking for a fight and in extreme immaturity calling out their "enemy."

This conversation between us has proven thus far to be anything but edifying. And it would do more harm than good to debate you in the spirit that you're currently in.

You can make all the remarks you want. All I can say is (in Calvin's defense) that he did not believe what you are saying he believed. The works are right in front of you, yet you refuse to read them.

Chris Curry And also, one last thing...

I'm not holding Calvin's works above the Scriptures. I'm with Rusty. What do the Scriptures have to say regarding justification? And I would say Calvin's works simply reflect what the Scriptures say.

I believe in Sola Scriptura... not Sola Calvin.... as many anti-Calvinists believe Calvinists hold to.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Woe, you misunderstand, I just want to read from the Calvin Institutes and have you explain what Calvin meant by what he wrote. NO rebuttal--your commentary will stand as stated--you will be merely answering questions. What say you?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. I read, you answer, the people decide.

Rusty Freeman Actually Paul, he said he'd hand you over to the Holy Spirit, not Satan

Chris Curry Haha this isn't my first rodeo with you, Paul. I've watched you debate and have read your works from a distance. So I'm familiar with how you roll. So I doubt that I'll be "merely" answering questions.

Chris Curry Have a good day.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. If I divert from that, it would be obvious. Why not come and give us a learning? No rebuttal, you just merely explain what Calvin "really meant" by what he said.

T Josiah Richardson Paul do you have a quotation where Calvin states that justification is progressive? I'm curious to see that.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. T Josiah Richardson Other than the title of 3.14? Well, ya, pretty much the whole chapter, but I will get you some specific citations. I could start with his assertion that our sins as Christians separate us from salvation ("grace"), and we need forgiveness for those to maintain our salvation. I will start with that one and paste it below.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Here, I will do a citation fest starting with this one: "by new sins we continually separate ourselves, as far as we can,

from the grace of God... Thus it is, that all the saints have need of the daily forgiveness of sins; for this alone keeps us in the family of God"

(John Calvin: Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles; The Calvin Translation Society 1855. Editor: John Owen, p. 165 ¶4).

Andy Young Paul, this is EXACTLY why trying to have ANY kind of discussion with these guys is an exercise in futility. Your arguments are based on an appeal to reason. Their arguments are based on an appeal to self-appointed authority (reformers, puritans, orthodoxy, et al.). Therefore, there can be no debating with you because you are already presumed to be wrong and they are already presumed to be right. It is not about persuading with them. Because they have "authority" there is no need to persuade. There can be no discussion of ideas.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Well, maybe I can convince them that I can only be taken out of the book of life once. These guys keep turning me over to Satan for discipline like what, 20 times now. But that's good work if you can get it: if you disagree with someone...just turn them over to Satan.

Josh Robinson I'm pretty sure the chapter of the 14th chapter in book 3 is directed towards the Sophists, who said that justification was progressive. Calvin addresses the argument in section 11. The title of the 14th chapter is "The beginning of justification. In what sense progressive." He's addressing their claim that justification was progressive, and he's showing "in what sense" it was claimed to be "progressive". He proves in section 11 that it is not.

T Josiah Richardson Andy that's an unfair generalization.

Andy Young You are free to think it's unfair, but you guys say these things out in the open for all to see, so I am willing to let others come to their own conclusions and let the chips fall where they may. I dare say that if John Piper or any other of the reformed big dogs told you that the sky was green and not really blue that you would believe him because he is an "authority". I know that seems like a ridiculous

analogy, but that is what it is tantamount to. You claim truth simply because some "authority" says so, even when it defies any reasonable conclusion than anyone could come to.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. T Josiah Richardson It's pretty evident that Chris thinks he has the authority to "turn me over." Andy has seen me "turned over" by many of these guys. Frankly, I find it hilarious.

Josh Robinson Right. He said he turned you over to the Holy Spirit for correction. He never stated he turned you over to Satan. That's pretty deceptive.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Josh Robinson Uh, really? That's what he meant when he said this in the section you refer to? "Moreover, the message of free reconciliation with God is not promulgated

for one or two days, but is declared to be perpetual in the Church (2 Cor. 5:18, 19). Hence believers have not even to the end of life any other righteousness than that which is there described. Christ ever remains a Mediator to reconcile the Father to us, and there is a perpetual efficacy in his death—viz. ablution, satisfaction, expiation; in short, perfect obedience, by which all our iniquities are covered" (The Institutes: 3.14.11).

T Josiah Richardson I just think that to lump an entire group of people into basically a "not worth my time" category isn't the love and longsuffering that Christ taught. Surely there should be some measure of patience and a trusting that God would show truth to those that seek it.

T Josiah Richardson Paul I hope you won't take the actions of some as a representation of all. What Chris did is what Chris did. Not what I did. Right?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. T Josiah Richardson Right, I am going to cite stuff, here is another and an answer to JR as well: "Moreover, the message of free reconciliation with God is not promulgated for one or two days, but is declared to be perpetual in the Church (2 Cor. 5:18, 19). Hence believers have not even to the end of life any other righteousness than that which is there described. Christ ever remains a Mediator to reconcile the Father to us, and there is a perpetual efficacy in his death—viz. ablution, satisfaction, expiation; in short, perfect obedience, by which all our iniquities are covered" (The Calvin Institutes: 3.14.11).

Josh Robinson Right. There is perpetual efficacy in Christ's death, which the Sophists denied. He is a perpetual mediator for his people. You made my point and made my work much easier.

Andy Young T Josiah Richardson If you guys were genuinely interested in the truth, I would agree with you. But you aren't. You only demand compliance to your self-appointed "authorities". Moreover, there is clear scriptural teaching to stop arguing with people when it is clear that you are not getting anywhere with them.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. No, when something is ended, further mediation is not needed. My sins are ENDED--NOT merely covered.

T Josiah Richardson Andy Young have you tried getting anywhere with me?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Josh Robinson Calvin is saying that a continued perfect obedience must be imputed to the believer--that's a false gospel.

Josh Robinson Paul, right. I understand what he is saying and why he is saying it. Do you continue to sin, even as a believer in Christ?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. In regard to justification or sanctification?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. See my point? Calvin made no distinction; therefore, Christians are still under condemnation.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...under law in other words...the Achilles' heel of Protestantism and Calvinism in particular.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...and it makes law the standard for justification--NOT the new birth. We are righteous APART from the law.

Andy Young I'll answer that one. No, I do not sin as a believer because I am born again; God's literal offspring. Moreover, I CANNOT sin! "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." ~ 1 John 3:9... There can only be sin where there is a law to condemn.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. One can only be under law or under grace, if we need a perfect law keeping imputed to our Christian lives, we are obviously still under law--who keeps it is irrelevant.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Andy Young Note the standard for Justification: new birth. With Calvin: the law.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Andy Young ...which is the whole point of your citation, viz, 1John 3:9.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Where there is no law there is no sin, with Calvin there is still sin, which means we are still under law.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Calvin believed that we can sin against our justification because we are still under law and need Jesus to obey it for us. That's progressive justification obtained by a perpetual returning to the same gospel that saved us.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Christians cannot sin against justification as Calvin believed, they can only fail to love in sanctification which can bring chastisement. "If you love me, keep my commandments."

Rusty Freeman and he cannot sin; not that it is impossible for such a man to do acts of sin, or that it is possible for him to live without sin; for the words are not to be understood in the sense of those who plead for perfection in this life; for though the saints have perfection in Christ, yet not in themselves; they are not impeccable, they are not free from sin, neither from the being nor actings of it; sin is in them, lives in them, dwells in them, hinders all the good, and does all the mischief it can: or in such sense, as if the sins of believers were not sins; for though they are pardoned and expiated, and they are justified from them, yet they do not cease to be sins; they are equally contrary to the nature, will, and law of God, as well as the sins of others; and are oftentimes attended with more aggravated circumstances, and which God in a fatherly way takes notice of, and chastises for, and on the account of which he hides his face from them: nor does the phrase intend any particular single sin, which cannot be committed; though there are such, as sinning wilfully after receiving the knowledge of the truth, or denying Christ to be the Saviour of sinners, and a sacrifice for sin, and hatred of a Christian brother as such, and sinning the sin unto death, or the unpardonable sin; neither of which can be committed by a regenerate man: nor is the meaning only, though it is a sense that will very well bear, and agrees with

the context, that such persons cannot sin as unregenerate men do; that is, live in a continued course of sinning, and with pleasure, and without reluctance, and so as to lie in it, as the whole world does: but rather the meaning is, he that is born of God, as he is born of God, or that which is born of God in him, the new man, or new creature, cannot sin; for that is pure and holy; there is nothing sinful in it, nor can anything that is sinful come out of it, or be done by it; it is the workmanship of the Holy Spirit of God; it is a good work, and well pleasing: in the sight of God, who is of purer eyes than to behold sin with delight; and an incorruptible seed, which neither corrupts nor is corrupted; and though it is as yet an imperfect work, it is not impure: the reason of the impeccability of the regenerate man, as such, is

#truth

John Gill

Paul M. Dohse Sr. This is just saying that we are chastised for sin Christ covers. It makes my whole point: our sins are not covered, they are ended.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...if our sins are only covered, we are still under law.

Rusty Freeman Our sins have ended or have been paid for in a legal/substitutionary sense

But Our sins have not ended in an experiential sense. He who says he's without sin is a liar

T Josiah Richardson Andy Young so you would then affirm perseverance of the saints, that a child of God cannot lose his salvation?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. That was John's response to the Gnostic's, they said that only the body was evil and the spirit doesn't sin--salvation is obtained by Gnosis, not a saving from sin. You, like Calvin, are saying that the new birth is only a legal declaration.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. T Josiah Richardson that's not what perseverance of the saints means. Calvin believed in 3 classes of elect: the non-elect, the called, or temporary elect, and the permanent elect. Therefore, those in the church have NO way of knowing they are saved for certain until the one final judgment.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. perseverance of the saints referred to the permanent elect as apposed to those in the church "temporarily illumined."

T Josiah Richardson If one is incapable of sinning, they are incapable of losing their salvation, correct?

Rusty Freeman Paul do you sin? Have you ever committed a sin as a believer? The new birth is the impartation of eternal life. It is where an elect child of God passes from spiritual death unto spiritual life, hence born again. The new birth does not eradicate the remaining effects of sin in a believer. To suggest such is irrational and intellectual dishonesty in the highest order

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Very good point. Christians fail to love in sanctification, but cannot sin against justification because there is no law to judge them. Rom 8:2 refers to 2 nomos'

T Josiah Richardson In what sense was Andy saying he was incapable of sinning? Physically? Mentally? Both?

T Josiah Richardson Is failing to love in sanctification sinful?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Incapable of sinning against the law of sin and death. Protestantism keeps the "believer" under the law of sin and death which is the whole point of double imputation.

Andy Young I don't know how many ways I can say this. Where there is no law there is no sin. So if I am no longer under the law, then I cannot sin. I don't get what is so hard to understand about this, other than there are those who want to purposefully make it complicated so that it fits in with their orthodoxy.

T Josiah Richardson Are you capable (physically) of murder?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Yes, but if i am born again, that doesn't condemn me to hell.

Andy Young Was Joseph capable (physically) of having sex with Potiphar's wife?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Said another way: are we still, as Christians, still under condemnation? Calvin, Luther, and Auggie said, "yes."

T Josiah Richardson So you would say it would be like Genesis 20:6, where God Himself keeps you from sinning?

"And God said unto him in a dream, Yea, I know that thou didst this in the integrity of thy heart; for I also withheld thee from sinning against me: therefore suffered I thee not to touch her."

Paul M. Dohse Sr. God doesn't have to keep you from sinning, Christ died to END the law Rom 10:4.

Rusty Freeman Paul, if you are incapable of sinning against the law, then you obviously keep the law perfectly. That's quite a claim. (and a lie)

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Christians are not under condemnation they fail to fulfill the law by not loving--love fulfills the whole law.

Andy Young Um, God didn't "keep" Abimelech from sinning. He simply gave Abimelech all the facts so that he could make an informed decision. And because he was a man of "integrity", he chose not to sin with Sarah.

T Josiah Richardson "Withheld thee from sinning against me"

"..Suffered I thee not to touch her."

What do these things mean?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Rusty Freeman No Rusty, let's clarify your statement: you insist that its a lie that I cannot sin against the law of sin and death. But I am not under law and that's why progressive justification is a false gospel.

Andy Young Rusty Freeman You still miss the point. If one has to keep the law perfectly, then you have just made that the standard for justification. That's what "under law" means, which is the biblical definition of an unsaved person. That is why Christ ENDED the law with his death. When a person dies, the law has no more jurisdiction over him. When we are born again, we die and are reborn as God's literal offspring, and the law no longer has jurisdiction over us, so it cannot condemn us, therefore, we

CANNOT sin, because there is no law to condemn us. There can only be sin where there is law to condemn.

Seth Campbell How are we to understand the Apostle Paul referring to himself as the chief of sinners in the present tense? Or of his confession in Romans 7 that he does what he shouldn't and doesn't do what he should?

Andy Young For the believer, the question should never be "did you sin", but "why would you sin?" I never have to worry about keeping the law "perfectly". So even if I did happen to fail to keep some part of the law, I don't have to fear, because it cannot judge/condemn me. Since I am free of the FEAR of condemnation, I can now aggressively show LOVE! But keeping or not keeping the law has NOTHING to do with my justification.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Seth Campbell Paul also said that when he sins, it is not him who is doing it. So, you reconcile the two since you want to scripture stack.

Andy Young Seth Campbell The word translated "chief" is the greek word "protos" which means first. In fact the same word is used again and translated "first" in the very next verse. Paul is not emphasizing his capacity of "sinning" or that he was the "worst sinner ever" as some like to interpret that. He was merely relaying to the Romans that he indeed had been a sinner, but that he was saved "first" (or before they were) in order that he could be a witness and example for them.

Tim Warner Here to read comments.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Yep. And the whole "wretched man that I am" deal is a Greek word meaning someone who is persevering under affliction, so don't bring that one up either.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The picture looks like a sheep or a Lama that is under law.

Tim Warner He's disappointed in the misrepresentation of the reformed tradition. :)

Tim Warner And he's a Llama. Or she is. I'm not sure about that part.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The Reformed tradition is a false gospel.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. It believes that the law can give life because Jesus keeps it for us, but there is no fourth member of the trinity.

Andy Young That's fine. I'm ok with leaving the reformers out of it. I don't need to prove or disprove reformation theology to make my points. I'm more than happy to reason from scripture. But the problem is that any time there is a point of contention, you guys make an appeal to orthodoxy or some other teacher as your reason for why you interpret something some way. So in the end, it comes right back to reformed theology. It can't be avoided.

Seth Campbell Was Peter's exclusion of Gentile Christians in Antioch (that Paul refers to in Galatians) a sin? If not, why did Paul treat it so severely?

Andy Young You tell me? Was it? Did it condemn him? Did it affect his justification? Or was it instead a failure to show love?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Calvin says yes it did. It removed him from grace and required forgiveness to "keep us [him] in the family of God."

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Is this where I cite contemporary Calvinists who say that we need to return to the same gospel that saved us in order to keep ourselves saved?

Seth Campbell I know what I think. You know what I think. I want to know what you think. Did Peter sin? If not, why did Paul treat it with such severity?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Here is what you think like Michael Horton and John Piper et al: It removed Peter from grace, and he had to return to the cross again to keep himself saved.

Andy Young Seth Campbell If you answer my question to you, it will reveal my answer to your question to me. Do you think what Peter did was something that would condemn him (ie. affect his justification) or was it instead a failure to show love?

Ward Hiney That's a severe, profound misunderstanding of simul justus... Peter did not become unjustified, "removed from grace" in that sense - he acted in a manner incongruous with his justification, the grace he had received, which is actually possible.

Andy Young Ward Hiney That's my point, it was a failure to show love, but that is not something that condemns the believer. It CANNOT condemn the believer because there is no law to condemn him. He is not under law. Therefore he cannot sin!

Paul M. Dohse Sr. by new sins we continually separate ourselves, as far as we can, from the grace of God... Thus it is, that all the saints have need of the daily forgiveness of sins; for this alone keeps us in the family of God" (John Calvin: Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles; The Calvin Translation Society 1855. Editor: John Owen, p. 165 ¶4).

Seth Campbell So Peter's failure to show love was not a sin? But he shouldn't have done it?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Seth Campbell Did it remove him from grace?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...you can only see one perspective on sin...that under law...why?

Ward Hiney Um. Peter did sin, which is why Paul rebukes him. Since e did it, it must be possible. Sin does not render the justified believer condemned - that's the whole point of justification. You've already died in Christ, you may go, no condemnation remains. That doesn't mean that you are not sinning, but that your sins are forgiven, not rendered to your account. Rom 4:8, Ps 32:2 "Blessed is the man whose sins the Lord will not count against him."

That blessed man actually exists, and that's the believer.

Seth Campbell If Peter's failure to show love was wrong...wrong enough for Paul to treat it as severely as he did...but not a sin, what was it?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Seth Campbell a failure to love and thereby failure to fulfill the law. But unlike orthodoxy, sin does not remove us from grace, and we don't keep ourselves saved by a perpetual return to the cross via the church.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Hence, when John Piper says that Christians still need salvation, he shows his true understanding of Protestantism.

Andy Young If what Peter did was sin, then why didn't it condemn him?

Josh Robinson Because Christ is his perpetual mediator. :)

Andy Young Josh Robinson That's progressive justification!

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Andy Young that would seem evident...but hmmm.

Seth Campbell My status before God never changes. Where is the progression? I don't move in and out of justified and unjustified. That's what Rome teaches.

Andy Young If justification must be maintained rather than a one-time event, then that is progressive.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Seth Campbell No, that's what Calvin taught.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...also fairly evident.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. And why do Protestants need a PRESENT "means of grace." Hmmm?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. What did Calvin mean when he said that "present sin" "removes us from grace." What do all of the who's who of Calvinism in our day mean when they say the same thing?

Seth Campbell My justification is final. Nothing can change or alter it.

However, my sanctification is what is progressive. My growing in holiness, killing sin, and living to righteousness is what is progressive. My daily struggle to be more like Christ is what is progressive. THAT'S what Calvin and Luther and Zwingli and Knox and the rest taught because that's what Scripture teaches.

"Simul Justus et Peccator"

"Simultaneously just and sinner"

To deny this is to embrace Romanism. No way around it.

Andy Young It didn't condemn Peter because even though Peter was not acting in a loving way, because he was born again, he was no longer under law, and thus there was no law to condemn him. And because where there is no law there is no sin, it cannot be said that Peter sinned. Ward's comment was spot on when he said that Peter was behaving in a manner incongruous with his justification (his new creature-hood). That is what earned the rebuke of Paul.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Seth Campbell No, that's not at all what they taught, and the contemporary Calvinists understand that. Simul Justus et Peccator means declared righteous, but still totally depraved and in need of ongoing forgiveness for "present sin."

Andy Young The fact that Paul rebuked Peter should be very telling. If Peter did not have the ability to show love, or that obedience was somehow a work, it would have been a moot point for Paul to rebuke him.

Seth Campbell My final comment.

This isn't necessarily for Andy or Paul, because I have a feeling they won't watch, but for the benefit of those in the audience.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z1oHkDo5QMU>

What Does "Simul Justus et Peccator" Mean?

youtube.com

Andy Young Peter's actions are akin to the extended family gathering for Thanksgiving, and as soon as your brother shows up, you get up and leave because you don't want to be seen with him.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Seth Campbell Its a video about double imputation; ie, we have no righteousness via the new birth, but the new birth is only a declaration. So what's your point? It's stating what we are saying.

Andy Young We don't have to misrepresent reformed theology. They do a great job of stating pretty plainly what they believe all on their own. You just have to have the courage to hear it and not dismiss the cognitive dissonance.

Ward Hiney "Ward's comment was spot on when he said that Peter was behaving in a manner incongruous with his justification (his new creature-hood). That is what earned the rebuke of Paul."

What's wrong with behaving incongruously with one's justification if there is no law demanding congruent behavior?

You can't have it both ways, saying there are things we ought not do, but then denying there is any law saying what we ought or ought not do.

Doing that which you ought not do is sin. Peter did what he ought not to have done. Ergo, Peter sinned. Peter was also justified. Ergo, justified people sin. This isn't all that terribly complex.

Ward Hiney Unless you just badly want to be outside protestant orthodoxy for some yet-unnamed reason, I can't understand this series of objections.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Ward Hiney What is so difficult about this? You are either under the law of sin and death, or under the law of the Spirit of life, one can only condemn, the other can only sanctify. Rom 8:2. Both laws in that verse are nomos. A singular perspective on law can only result in progressive justification. What I am seeing in this stream is a perplexity over the idea that there can be separate perspectives on the law in regard to justification and sanctification. When you ask, "Did you sin today?" And I reply, "In regard to justification or sanctification," the question goes unanswered. A single perspective on sin and law can be nothing other than progressive justification.

Andy Young It only becomes confusing when you fail to make a distinction between justification and sanctification and make law the standard for justification. Which is why so many are having trouble understanding the reality that believers cannot sin.

Why would someone want to be outside protestant orthodoxy? Because it is a false gospel.

Ward Hiney "When you ask, "Did you sin today?" And I reply, "In regard to justification or sanctification," the question goes unanswered."

Dude, this is the first I've seen this reply.

When you ask "In regard to justification or sanctification", do you mean "do I have sins counted against me before God" vs. "have I failed to be entirely sanctified"?

Of course there are separate perspectives on the law in the sense that insofar as I am declared not-guilty under the law (justification), yet in my mortal body I find a law of sin, or flesh, that wars with the law of God (sanctification). Is that what you mean? No one denies separate uses of the law in this sense.

Andy Young Ward Hiney "Peter sinned. Peter was also justified. Ergo, justified people sin. "

Your logic is flawed. It is the same thing as saying a swan is a bird, a swan also swims in water, therefore all things that swim in the water are birds.

Ward Hiney //Which is why so many are having trouble understanding the reality that believers cannot sin.// It might have something to do with being plainly contradicted by scripture.

Ward Hiney //Your logic is flawed. It is the same thing as saying a swan is a bird, a swan also swims in water, therefore all things that swim in the water are birds.//

... Check again. Peter, who was justified, is recorded to have sinned. So at least one justified person sinned. This renders maintaining a position in which no justified people sin untenable.

Andy Young Once again, you are ignoring the point that I am talking about justification. And as far as justification is concerned, he cannot have sinned. It is vital to make this distinction because if all sin is sin, then perpetual forgiveness is required for the purpose of justification. But if sin is ended, then no more forgiveness is needed for the purpose of salvation. But yet, this is the very thing that protestantism does. It conflates ALL sin as condemning sin requiring a perpetual "covering" or a continued reliance on Christ to "keep the law for us", which unwittingly puts a believer back under law. The christian life then becomes a game of constant russian roulette where the believer is in constant fear of condemnation for not "living enough by faith alone", so that his salvation is maintained.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Andy, I think we are done here. What we say has no merit because it is the "first time they have heard it." Also note that as far as the very troubling statements I have cited here in regard to Calvin and contemporary Calvinists, they don't want to confront the reality of it. I can tell you that I am signing off here.

Ward Hiney Paul, I literally meant that your question you felt hadn't been answered I had only seen as part of that complaint for the first time. I didn't mean to offend you by seeing it there first, I'm sure you may well have said it earlier, but you're a man on top of that comment button, so it's hard to keep up with every thread of this conversation.

// And as far as justification is concerned, he cannot have sinned.//

Unless it's possible for the justified to sin, and for that sin to not be counted against them.

//It is vital to make this distinction because if all sin is sin, then perpetual forgiveness is required for the purpose of justification. But if sin is ended, then no more forgiveness is needed for the purpose of salvation.//

Justification is a decree, Christ's blood covers all, past, present, future, because it pays the ultimate penalty for the sin. He died, and I did *in Him*. When I am united to Him by faith, I am united to his death, which means that the penalty for my sins has been paid. It doesn't mean that I no longer actually sin in my mortal body (Rom. 7), but that the penalty for that sin has been paid, and I have peace with God through Jesus Christ. The same face-to-face relationship the Father has with the Son is mine, that's what's so glorious about our salvation. Ever have that moment when you walk in on two people looking at one another in love, be it a husband and wife or father and son or mother and daughter, and you're kind of awkward, feeling out of place? Like, "Ok, guys, I'll..just.. go"? That's their glory, it's radiant, they're at peace with each other, face to face, and we feel awkward because it's a glory not our own, we don't belong to it. That glory is a bit like the glory of the Father in relationship to the Son (pros ton Theon, John 1:1). Only in our union with Christ, we're invited in to that glory, not permitted to turn away from something not our own, but brought IN and kept there. We may no more walk away from it than the Son can walk away from the Father, so our forgiveness is final in that our adoption in our union with Christ is final.

//But yet, this is the very thing that protestantism does. It conflates ALL sin as condemning sin requiring a perpetual "covering" or a continued reliance on Christ to "keep the law for us", which unwittingly puts a believer back under law.//

I think you may misunderstand. Christ already kept the law on my behalf, and his keeping is at every moment the righteousness I have. If St. Peter stands at the pearly gate (obviously nonsense, but allow for fun), and asks by what righteousness I ought to be let in to heaven, my only answer is "Jesus". If I answer anything else, any other right thing I did or do or will do, I have lost the gospel.

Peace with God requires perfection. I don't have it. Jesus does. He offers it to me by simple faith. My justification is all of his work and none of mine. I don't know how to say this any more strongly.

//The christian life then becomes a game of constant russian roulette where the believer is in constant fear of condemnation for not "living enough by faith alone", so that his salvation is maintained.//

Man, if you grew up being taught this, I'm sorry. This is not what reformed theology teaches, nor what is taught in any reformed church I've attended - and I can well understand your vehement reaction if this is what you think it is. Everything involved in my salvation has been the gracious work of God freely given to an undeserving sinner, from my election to my justification to my sanctification to my glorification. I don't maintain my salvation by effort or any internal ordering of 'living by faith' or something - if I had to, I'd blow it.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Uh, I have studied the Reformation for 8 years, I know what I speak of. The // - // citations are good ones and reflect the problem with Reformed progressive justification. Protestantism is a false gospel.

Ward Hiney Well, an appeal to your own authority is, while a somewhat novel argument stratagem, relatively unconvincing. Particularly considering statements you're endorsing that are contradictory to statements made by men that have studied far longer than that, as well as the plain meaning of documents I can just stroll about the internets and read. If it's a contest of who's studied longest, there are a lot of well-read dead guys disagreeing with you in print as well as the living ones that've studied longer than that doing the same.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Ward Hiney Granted, most Protestants don't know what Protestants taught. And I understand that when one calls them-self a Protestant, and then gets called out for not really knowing what one is, well, see above stream.

Like · Reply · January 29, 2016 at 4:34pm · Edited

Ward Hiney The problem with thinking like that is that unless someone believes the set of conclusions you feel are logically required by your understanding of the doctrinal commitments of protestantism, they do not qualify as protestants for you. But this isn't a falsifiable hypothesis you're articulating. It's like the man that claimed to have a magic fishing net that would never let a fish escape, that when tested proved to leave many swimming animals right in its path. Upon being questioned, his reply was buttoned-up tight and yet utterly unhelpful: "What my net don't catch ain't fish".

I could do this with any position I wanted to disagree with, and it would only be compelling for a narrow set of my audience: those that 1) already disagreed with the position in view and 2) didn't require coherent argumentation to get there.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Excuse me, I only state what the Reformers themselves said and say today. My only logic is, "words mean things."

Tim Warner I am amazed that this status has garnered this much negative attention. Prior to this, I had never heard of a professing Christian that had a problem with it. Dang.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Not sure what you are saying.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. What's the "it"?

Tim Warner Paul M. Dohse Sr. The first Q&A of the westminster catechism.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. People are not going to have a problem with it because orthodoxy is their authority.

Ward Hiney If you had a compelling scriptural argument, following the WCF would require acquiescence, so that objection is a bit moot. Present the scriptural argument.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Ward Hiney Huh? Rom 8:2...t-w-o nomos' it's a simple thing.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. ...you are either under law or grace, or under the law of sin and death, or the law of the Spirit of life used for...see John 17:17. Why is this so hard to see?

Ward Hiney I'm not sure what you're meaning to say referencing Rom. 8:2. Yes, of course, and amen, the law of the Spirit has set us free from the law of sin and death. Which is why the law cannot condemn me, 8:1 - I am in Christ, who has died, paying the penalty for my lawbreaking on my behalf. Of course. What's your point?

Ward Hiney What has John 17:17 got to do with it?

"Sanctify them in the truth; your word is truth."...?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The law of the Spirit of life sanctifies, and the law of sin and death only condemns. Rom 8:2

Ward Hiney Alright, that's not strictly speaking what Rom. 8:2 says, but ok. What's that prove, to your mind?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. What does "nomos" mean?

Ward Hiney Law, generally speaking

Paul M. Dohse Sr. And how many are in that verse.

Ward Hiney Two, this isn't a point of contention.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The Reformers believed that they are two realms, flesh and Spirit, not two laws.

Ward Hiney Wait are you trying to equate one of those with the law of God en toto or something?

Ward Hiney Right, Paul appears to be using it similarly to how he's used 'law' in the preceding chapter, where there is a law in his members set over against the law of God with which he agrees in the inner man. Is that not how you read that verse?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. Romans 8:2 refers to two perspectives on the law, or the Spirit's two uses of the law: to sanctify and to convict the world of sin and the judgement to come.

Ward Hiney I think I can agree, provisionally. The law to the flesh is only death, not because the law is death in itself, but because sin, seizing an opportunity through the law, works death. That's Rom. 7. Being freed from the law of sin and death is being alive to the Spirit, and the law of the Spirit brings life - it sets us free from the power of the law to condemn - that's Rom 8:1-2, the death brought by the law in the flesh. What are we disagreeing about?

Paul M. Dohse Sr. The flesh can also be used for godly purposes. That's another consideration. In fact, the body is God's temple.

Ward Hiney Wait, do you think that Paul's flesh/Spirit distinction is the gnostic flesh/Spirit distinction? "Flesh" as Paul's using it isn't the same thing as "body", or do you disagree? I'm using it as he is in the context.

Paul M. Dohse Sr. I would disagree based on..."in my members."