Did Jesus go to Hell when he died? - posted by e-mail (), on: 2006/3/31 13:52
If anyone has already posted something like that I would like to know. Thanks for your help.

Re: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died? - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/3/31 14:10
Man there is so many different stories about this and some even think he picked up a set of keys like you would start your car with while he was there. I personally think because he holds the keys to Life and Death meaning now that the battle has been won you now have a choice between everlasting life and death in Hell when before you had no choice. But he brought back no physical keys.

I personally think his spirit did go to the pits of hell but, I did find this and this is my belief:

Some theologians believe that during the three days between Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection, He descended into Abraham’s bosom 3 (Luke 16:19-31), proclaimed to them the mystery of the gospel, and then led them into heaven to dwell with God. The belief is that they were not permitted to enter into the presence of God in heaven until after the atonement. Once that had happened, Jesus who had died, descended to Abraham’s bosom, proclaimed the gospel, and then led its residents into heaven.

So, even though we cannot precisely determine where Jesus was and what He did during those three days, it seems apparent that He presented the gospel message (not to have them get saved) to those in spirit prison and possibly also to those in Abraham’s bosom.

Re: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died?, on: 2006/3/31 14:16
Did Jesus go to Hell when he died? I don’t know. It doesn’t say he did in Scripture anywhere, so I am led to believe if it is not in Scripture (clearly) then it didn’t happen at all.

We’ll find out when we get to Heaven I suppose.

Re: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died? - posted by MSeaman (), on: 2006/3/31 15:23
I don’t know about Jesus going to hell, but I read in Ephesians 4:8-10:

8Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.

9(Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?

10He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)

What does it mean when he says Jesus descended into the lower parts of the earth?

Re:, on: 2006/3/31 15:54
Barnes says this of Eph 4:9

Into the lower parts of the earth - To the lowest state of humiliation. This seems to be the fair meaning of the words. Heaven stands opposed to earth. One is above; the other is beneath. From the one Christ descended to the other; and he came not only to the earth, but he stooped to the most humble condition of humanity here; see Phil 2:6-8; compare notes on Isa 44:23. Some have understood this of the grave; others of the region of departed spirits; but these interpretations do not seem to be necessary. It is the "earth itself" that stands in contrast with the heavens; and the idea is, that the Redeemer descended from his lofty eminence in heaven, and became a man of humble rank and condition; compare Ps
Re: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died? - posted by PTywama3 (), on: 2006/3/31 16:02
Rev. 20:14 "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."

Christ descended into hell, but hell is temporal. History and popular concept distort two concepts into one, here, and it might just be safe to say "yes and no" to your question. Reading Revelation ch. 20 v. 12-15 might give you a little backg round in the differentiation.

Re; on: 2006/3/31 16:10
Hell, temporal? This is not mere "history" and "popular concept"... this is the Word of God:

Mat 18:8 Wherefore if thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee: it is better for thee to ente r into life halt or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet to be cast into everlasting fire.

Mat 25:41 Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

Mat 25:46 And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.

2Th 1:9 Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his pow er;

Mar 9:48 Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.

My dear friend, cut it out of your Bible if you do not agree with the above Scriptures. But don't tell anyone that you take t he whole Word of God.

Re: - posted by Greenquality, on: 2006/3/31 16:13
Luke 23:43 Verily I say unto thee today shalt thou be with me in Paradise... Jesus was speaking to the thief, who also was on the cross.

Re: - posted by Greenquality, on: 2006/3/31 16:14
Luke 23:43 Verily I say unto thee today shalt thou be with me in Paradise... Jesus was speaking to the thief, who also was on the cross.

hades vs hell - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/3/31 16:17
brethren
the place Christ went to when He died was to sheol which is (or was) the holding place of all the people (save for enoch and elijah) who lived before Christ came. it is made up on Abraham's bosom (the holding place of the righteous) and the holding place of the damned (where the rich man went in Luke 16) there is also a place of holding for those angels who p ut on human bodies and had children (the nephilim)with human women. please note that Luke 16 is not a parable but in f act an explanation of what happened to the righteous and unrighteous before Christ came. so Christ went there to free t he righteous and take them to heaven. now this place is also called hades and will itself be cast into the lake of fire along with the damned, the devil and his minions and this lake of fire burns forever. so when we speak of hell this i think is the place we should mean. Christ didn't go into the lake of fire coz whoever ends up there is not coming out coz that fire is fo rever...

Re: hades vs hell, on: 2006/3/31 16:23
Thats true Ironman, that Hell is not the lake of fire.

Did the Son of God descend into hell, yes!!

Psalms 16:10 For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

Peter is speaking the same scripture in it's fulfillment on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2:27
Re: - posted by Smokey (), on: 2006/3/31 16:29

1Pe 3:19 By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison;

I believe that this event is Jesus preaching the gospel to the souls that were drowned in the flood. This group died without law, or grace, so God also sent the Savior to them (in prison) to share the gospel.

Blessings Greg

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/3/31 16:29

Quote:
-------------------------
Healingwaters wrote:
That's true Ironman, that Hell is not the lake of fire.

Did the Son of God descend into hell, yes!!

_Psalms 16:10 For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption._

Peter is speaking the same scripture in it's fulfillment on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2:27

-------------------------

So did the son of God physically go or did his soul? this can be confusing. :-?

In the spirit Jesus went and preached to the spirits I feel.

Re: - posted by Greenquality, on: 2006/3/31 16:49
then why did Jesus say in luke23:43 we shall be in paradise today?

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/3/31 16:54
well i'm not sure if His body went, but the ones who were in hades/hell were souls. i think his soul went down there. i guess it's of no consequence he could have gone there in body or not, doesn't make any difference to me really.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/3/31 17:00
bro G.Q.

Quote:
-------------------------
then why did Jesus say in luke23:43 we shall be in paradise today?

-------------------------

because they were about to go there. on the other side there is no concept of time as we know it hence a thousand years being as a day and a day being as a thousand years, it makes no difference.

perhaps the thief went to sheol with Christ and was then off to heaven with everyone else there or maybe he went straight to heaven, who knows these things? :-?
You know there is a lot of things left unturned in the word and I personally think God wanted it that way because maybe he felt we would have enough problem figuring out most of it anyway and if this is true my guess would be only the hard core Christians would find the answer to something that really has no answer. :-)

Quote:

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/3/31 17:08

Hi everyone. I hope that my limited understanding of this question will be of some benefit to us. Please take these explanations as from one lowly worker to others, who still see many things as through as glass darkly. Thank you.

I do not believe that our Lord suffered in Hell after he died upon the cross. I believe rather that He suffered the full, complete, unrestrained measure of God's wrath against sin, beginning somewhere around(or possibly after) these moments.

Quote:

--

and...

Quote:

--

from somewhere in those moments up to this...

Quote:

--

I believe that when Christ said

Quote:

--

that this marks the final and complete end of His suffering for our sins in Atonement. I believe our Lord is saying here that the whole and complete debt of sin had been now fully and wholly paid.

I also believe that the wrath of God against sin is unending in duration, however I believe this can be accounted for in view of the limited duration of these things by considering the eternal nature of Christ's being; that since Christ is eternal, He
could while on earth, drink the eternal cup of God’s wrath.

Perhaps we should also pause to consider this from the prophet Isaiah

Quote:
------------------------- Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin....
-------------------------

and...

Quote:
------------------------- He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied.....
-------------------------

Back then to the eternal nature of the wrath, I also believe that this strange phenomenon testifies to this having occurred during this time upon earth

Quote:
------------------------- Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour.
-------------------------

I say that because Christ said of the future punishment

Quote:
------------------------- And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.
-------------------------

the darkness that covered the land calls to mind this darkness that our Lord spoke of here.

Also, it has already been said that Christ indicated the believing thief would be with Him in paradise that day, which I think also supports this understanding.

Your’s for His service,

Chris

Re:, on: 2006/3/31 17:49

Quote:
------------------------- I personally think God wanted it that way because maybe he felt we would have enough problem figuring out most of it anyway
-------------------------

This is true for the carnally minded, but for the Spiritually minded, we will eventually know all things as we give ourselves over to the Word and Prayer.

Now regarding this issue about the body in hell.

Man is composed of Body, Soul and Spirit.

1 Thessalonians 5:23 And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and bod
y ....

This is what happened to all 3 components of our LORD.

When the body of Jesus died on the cross, His Spirit went to God. Proof?

1) Luke 23:46 And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost.

2) Ecclesiastes 12:7 Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.

The body of Jesus went into the ground or in this case a tomb. Proof?

1) Ecclesiastes 12:7 Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was:........

2) Mark 15:46 And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre.

The soul of Jesus went into Hell. Proof?

1) Psalms 16:10 For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

2) Matthew 26:38 Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death:

3) Acts 2:31 He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.

There is a distinction between the soul and the Spirit as some have said that the soul is the same as the Spirit.

Hebrews 4:12 For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.

---

**Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2006/3/31 21:59**

Part of the ancient creed is that after his death, Christ descended into hell. Christ does seem to have gone to hell to preach to those in prison according to the Scriptures. But if He did indeed do that (as exactly what happened isn't clear in Scripture), there is no indication that He actually suffered in hell.

Some theologies require that Christ suffered in hell to make atonement, especially since He was made sin, and in order to full bear the wrath of God due to those who are sinners. But, the Scriptures make it perfectly clear that His suffering in the flesh the death of a sinner was sufficient. If He had to suffer in hell, then the question begs to be asked, how long would he have needed to suffer in hell to make atonement?

If one really pushes the suffering in hell theology as needed for atonement, then in my opinion the logic requires that Christ needed to remain forever in hell in order to make atonement. But, His death upon the cross was sufficient.
Hello...

The idea that Jesus "went to Hell" following his death on the cross is found in alot of the coptic "gospels" from between the second and sixth centuries A.D. Interestingly, many of these same New Testament apocryphal books also contain alot of heavily unscriptural doctines that were particular to the Roman Church (such as the concept of an "Immaculate Conception"). However, these pseudo-Scriptures were dismissed by many of the patriarchs of the early Church.

I have not seen any evidence in the Word of God that would make me accept such a doctrine as any sort of evident truth. In fact, I believe that the victory that Christ gained was through his death on the cross -- and not through the popular modern idea that Jesus needed to go to Hell in order "to take the keys from Satan."

I am also very hesitant to believe many of the popular concepts of "paradise" and "Abraham's bosom" as pseudo-purgat ories. Those concepts just sound so...unBiblical.

:-)

He also preached to the spirits in prison, those who are held captive, where is the prison for spirites? So this is to me a Diven - mystery! To say yes or no, how can are answers be in black or white. Remember we are still looking thr the smok ey Glass of The diven nature of God who is everywhere! how are sins forgiven? we can explain what we know from the bible, or the act of... but truly this is a matter of faith, in the Diven mysterie of sins being forgiven, which is unseen, or invis ble. How can we explain some of the things which happen in the natural world, which are unexplainable.

Hi Greenquality...

I agree. To state such things are "doctrinal" is very misleading (and probably unwise). At most, such belief is speculati on. Thus, all such ideas like this should be stated as speculation, rather than fact.

:-)

bro Karl, Bro Karl, Bro Karl!!!

amen bro, amen the Lord rewards those who dilligently seek Him. check this out

Jeremiah 33:3

Call unto me, and I will answer thee, and shew thee great and mighty things, which thou knowest not.

now we can sit on our butts if we like (to our detriment ultimately) or we can seek the Lord in all dilligence.

bro the Lord had you break down what happened to Christ after the crucifiction, man whoa!!! i asked who knows these th ings in my last post and i'm sure glad someone did!!!

bro Billpro
i'm unsure what to make of your last post about hardcore Christians finding answers to things which have no answer (y ou said)so i'd like some clarity. should we not be hard core in our walk of Faith?
Brethren,

I posted on this topic a while back after I heard Kent Hovind's interpretation:


Hovind said that Christ moved in three capacities after He gave up the ghost.

----------

1) His spirit went to heaven:

Psalm 31:5 "Into thine hand I commit my spirit: thou hast redeemed me, O LORD God of truth."

Luke 23:46 "And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost."

----------

2) His body went to the tomb

Acts 13:29 "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre."

----------

3) and His soul went to hell:

Psalm 16:10 "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

Psalm 139:8b "if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there."

----------

I was shocked by this view, along with the idea that Christ led the captives to heaven after the atonement, that were waiting in Abraham's bosom. Hovind also went over the difference between hell and the lake of fire.

Hell is like jail, where the lake of fire is like prison. Hell holds the damned until they are judged and cast into the lake of fire:

Rev 20:

And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.

And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.

The more I go over Hovind's view, the more I buy into it.

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss, on: 2006/4/1 21:54

Hi letsgetbusy...

Quote:

-------------------------

Psalm 16:10 "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

Psalm 139:8b "if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there."

-------------------------

I may open myself up to some strong criticism for writing this, but these verses are some of those places where the KJV may have been incorrect in the wording of its translation. The idea that Jesus went to Hell was well-regarded in early Ro
man Catholic tradition (thus appearing in the corrupt coptic and NT apocryphal "gospels") even though it was rejected by many early Church leaders during the same time period.

The Hebrew word used in those verses is sheol. This word can be translated as the grave (or death, darkness, or great depth) -- since it obviously used as such in verses like Genesis 37:33-35; Genesis 42:37-38; I Samuel 2:6; II Samuel 22: 5-6; I Kings 2:6-9; etc... Often, this is part of the confusion about whether or not Hell is in the "center of the earth." It is commonly realized now that Hell is obviously not in the "center of the Earth" (remember, you can see PARADISE from He II - Luke 16:23).

The NIV translates the aforementioned word as grave as do many of the other translations. Interestingly, other translations taken from the Textus Receptus (such as the older-than-the-KJV Reina-Valera Antiqua in Spanish) often translate the same word as "sepultura" (literally, the grave).

On a side note, I find Kent Hovind's interpretation of this concept quite interesting (Hell being like jail and the Lake of Fire being like prison). However, the idea of Old Testament believers going to Hell seems (and were supposedly brought to Heaven by Jesus when he "led captivity captive" and "released the captives") seems a little too much like the Catholic concept of purgatory.

Did Jesus go to Hell? There is definitely arguments both pro and con. However, an even more important question is whether or not such speculation should enter into doctrine -- or even whether it should be taught definitively. Remember, there are lot of doctrinal divisions in the Body of Christ as a result of individuals taking stands on issues like this which, with speculation, enters into defining doctrine. Even on this website, there are "hard core" believers that take stands on issues that serve to separate us. There are arguments among many sincere believers about the end time prophecy, spiritual gifts, Bible versions, Biblical dress codes, music, etc... One "hard core" believer is convinced that "God told him/her the truth" about such doctrine -- which puts that believer at odds with another believer who feels that "God told him/her" the opposite.

I believe that we should search out these matters. But we should also be careful about taking a "stand" on such issues prematurely -- or whether we should even "take a definitive stand" on such issues to begin with. We should be very careful about what doctrines to consider as absolute truth when such doctrine is still highly debated. There are controversial concepts that we can know for certain -- but I don't know that this is one of them.

:-)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/4/1 22:02

the Lord Jesus decened into hades according to Acts. And on the cross the Lord said to the other thief, "This day you shall be with me in paradise".

Our problem is that the King James version doesn not make distinctions between hades, Gehenna, Tartarus, etc. It translates all these words into one english word, "Hell".

But in the Greek, the New Testament word for the "abode of the dead" is Hades, not hell. And in the bible Hades consist of two sections, the bosom of Abraham which is the place of the spirits of the just, and torments which is the place of the spirits of the unjustified.

The Lord Jesus decended into hades, the abode of the dead and He emerged with the keys of death and hades.

Gehena, the Lake of fire is reserved for the Devil and his angels and those who are his in the last day.

Graftedbranch
Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/1 22:24

Basically I guess I could care less were he went and all that won't get me saved if I were not already, and I don't think he wants us spending much time on the past my guess he would want us to look forward Faith moves forward Like Paul, our focus is to be on what Â“lies ahead,Â” not looking back but looking forward to the Â“upward call of God in Christ Jesus Â” (Phi. 3:12-14). as long as I know where he is now, and that would be at the right hand of the Father so I am good to go with that. :-)  

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/1 23:21

bro Chris  
Christ went down to hell/hades to free those who were there who died before He came. Hell was the holding place of the righteous (Abraham's bosom), the damned and there was also a mountain in which the angels who had children with women (nephilim) were held. it was a temporary holding place which itself will the thrown into the lake of fire:  

revelation 20:14  
14 And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. 15 And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.  

now evidently this holding place will be used again in some measure in the future (see Rev 6)before being cast into the fire which is hell proper which burns forever and ever.  

8 And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hell followed with him. And power was given unto them F5 over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with hunger, and with death, and with the beasts of the earth.  

Christ says He has the keys of Hell in revelation 1  
17 And when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: 18 I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.  

i don't know that the enemy had the keys to hell at any point but that part of hell in which the rich man went in luke chap 16 was not a nice place to be and those souls there were in trouble big time. Perhaps this is where the concept of purgatory comes from the fact that there is this temporary holding place before going to heaven or hell (when one is here his fate is sealed it seems) so it is not like purgatory where one waits till someone prays you out.  

there is no mention of abraham's bosom in the rest of the word...it's there in the book of enoch though, and the secrets thereof which happen to be canon scripture in the Ethiopian orthodox church yet not in the western church...mmm...perhaps we westerners may be missing something?  

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/2 0:40

From the KJV:  

The Hebrew  
1) "Sheol" is translated into: hell, the grave, and the pit in the Old Testament.  

The Greek  
2) Geenna (or gehenna) is always translated "hell" in the NT.  

My take: Matthew and Luke used both "gehenna" and "hades." Mark only "gehenna." The Matthew 11 / Luke 10 reference of Capernaum has them falling from exaltation in heaven then down to "hades." It seems that "gehenna" is the very place of burning and flames, while "hades" includes the gates, and the speaking of the overall geographic area, as is the case with how Lazarus saw the man below.  

Like you wouldn't say, "Hades fire," but rather, "gehenna fire." And you wouldn't say that one, "refused heaven and ende
d up in gehenna," but rather he, "refused heaven and ended up in hades."

3a) Hades is translated into "grave" in Corinthians. Paul wrote "O death (thanatos), where is thy sting? O grave (hades), where is thy victory?"

This is a reference to Hosea 13, and in perfect line with Revelation (see below). This usage is obviously not speaking of the pit of the damned, because hell doesn't swallow the redeemed, and then they later receive victory over it. We, as Christians, either don't feel the sting of death, or we receive victory over bodily death. The first part is translated saints, the latter is resurrection saints. I am positive the KJV translators took all this into account. Remember they were considered head and shoulders above their peers.

3b) Hades is translated into "hell" in every case in the NT except for Paul's use in 1 Cor 15. So if one is to say that the word was translated wrong in 1 Cor, they are really saying that Paul either wrote "hades" when he should have written "M nemeion" (grave), or that the correct word was lost in copying manuscripts.

Paul said the word "hades" while describing the grave that a corpse lies in. If Paul had used the word "gehenna" in the latter part of 1 Cor 15, he would have been saying that God redeems us from hell, not the grave. Hosea says we are ransom from Sheol. A ransom is a return. So if Paul said we are returned from hell, he would be making doctrinal error. Paul was right, and so were the KJV translators.

Hades is translated into "hell" four times in Revelation, but always with "hell and death" or "death and hell." Death (thanatos) is riding a horse in this reference, and hell (hades) is following him. Seems that both are persons. Makes perfect sense why Paul would say, ""O death (thanatos), where is thy sting? O grave (hades), where is thy victory?" This is enough to keep anyone from forming too solid of an understanding. Death and hell are persons and places. One follows the other, and they are judged simultaneously with the damned.

3c) Tararoo (or taratus) is translated "hell" in 2 Peter. This is considered the lowest depth of hell. So tararoo is always translated "hell." If we had a common word in English for the lowest part of hell, my guess is they would have used it.

Re: - posted by Combat_Chuck (), on: 2006/4/2 0:52

Re: - posted by cchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/4/2 1:39

Hi IRONMAN...

Quote:

there is no mention of abraham's bosom in the rest of the word...it's there in the book of enoch though, and the secrets thereof which happen to be can on scripture in the Ethiopian orthodox church yet not in the western church...mmm...perhaps we westerners may be missing something?

I've heard this preached before. And yes, I have read much of the Book of Enoch. But let me make this clear, the Book of Enoch (at least, the "version" that we have today) is not inspired. Not only is it controversial -- it is really confusing. It fails the test that was used when determining what was cannon and what was fiction. And I definitely have very strong reservations about your "mountain in Hell" theory.

As for the doctrine about Abraham's bosom -- I don't feel that there is a place called "Abraham's Bosom." I believe that Lazarus was literally being embraced by Abraham.

There is another position on the topic of the whereabouts of our Lord during post-crucifixion/pre-resurrection period. So me of the individuals that believe in this pseudo-purgatory "holding area" for righteous people from the Old Covenant (th place often referred to as "Abraham's Bosom") believe that Christ went there. They teach that the grave ("sheol") is divided into both Hell and Paradise. "Hell," of course, is a place of torment while "Paradise" is a place of temporary bliss. The individuals that believe this feel that Jesus went to "preach" to those righteous people from the Old Covenant in the Paradise section of "Sheol" and not actually in Hell.
My point is this: None of us know with any absolute certainty that any of this sort of speculation is true. So we should be very careful about spreading it to others as if it is truth.

:-)

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/4/2 10:57
Hi everyone.

--- Quote:
My point is this: None of us know with any absolute certainty that any of this sort of speculation is true. So we should be very careful about spreading it to others as if it is truth.
---

Chris, I agree brother. I also think the tendency for us to want to have answers for everything is strong. It has been a long and hard lesson for me to learn how to say 'I don't know' and not feel like I am somehow less of a Christian because of it.

Unfortunately I think one of the reasons I have struggled with that the most is pride, and not wanting to appear to others as not knowing. This is a snare brothers.

Now, some of you may indeed have the correct understanding of this question; that would be great! Chris gives us some excellent advice however.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/2 11:06

--- Quote:
ChrisJD wrote:
Hi everyone.
Chris, I agree brother. I also think the tendency for us to want to have answers for everything is strong. It has been a long and hard lesson for me to learn how to say 'I don't know' and not feel like I am somehow less of a Christian because of it.
---

Amen! Amen! and can I get one more AMEN!!  :-P

Re:, on: 2006/4/2 11:37

--- Quote:
And yes, I have read much of the Book of Enoch. But let me make this clear, the Book of Enoch (at least, the "version" that we have today) is not inspired
---

Why is it not inspired? So which version is inspired for you to make this assumption? Let me tell you why I am against your statement.


Jude 1:14 And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of his saints, 15 To execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.
This quote comes from the book of Enoch. So how do we pick and choose what is inspired?

One needs to ask, is Jude's epistle inspired?

If we say yes, than what book of Enoch was Jude reading, and why can't we quote from it as Jude did?

Also FYI, in the original KJV, the very first copies that were printed off (might be hundreds), the Apocrypha was apart of it. I believe it was about 100 years later that it was removed.

So who gave them the right to vote these books out? One set of men voted them in, and then another set of men voted them out.

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/2 12:24
bro Chris

Quote:
-------------------------
I've heard this preached before. And yes, I have read much of the Book of Enoch. But let me make this clear, the Book of Enoch (at least, the "version" that we have today) is not inspired. Not only is it controversial -- it is really confusing. It fails the test that was used when determining what was canon and what was fiction. And I definitely have very strong reservations about your "mountain in Hell" theory.
-------------------------

but bro, it is canon scripture in the eastern orthodox and the ethiopian orthodox. The western church seems to have some disdain for the eastern church in my opinion and i believe that the enemy hid the book of enoch for his own purposes. if it is canon scripture in the eastern churches i think we should seriously consider that the early church fathers were wrong in excluding it. these same men almost kept the revelation from the canon. why the Lord allowed it to be so if for His own glory..

i've heard experts on ancient writings refute the book of enoch and say it is rubbish. then again experts have been wrong before and the Lord's tendency is to use the foolish things to confound the wise...

well we don't have to agree but if the Lord leads, check out "the Called" by bro Rahman, available on amazon.com

much bro

God bless

Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/2 12:38
bro Karl

you bring up and interesting point in that what is attributed to enoch in the book of jude doesn't appear in any of the o.t. books of the canon...i think that since the book of enoch is canon scripture in the eastern church, it has credibility.

Quote:
-------------------------
Also FYI, in the original KJV, the very first copies that were printed off (might be hundreds), the Apocrypha was apart of it. I believe it was about 100 years later that it was removed.
-------------------------

it seems to me satan hid these books to keep the reality of hell under wraps. hell appears 54 times in the bible (KJV version) 23 of which are in the new testament. It seems to me though that the mention of hell in the new testament does confuse hell and the lake of fire because hell is cast into the lake of fire and Christ is speaking of the permanent hell. the hell which follows death in revelation is like a garbage dump, picking up all the dead that death has slain.
Re: swallowed - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/4/2 15:11

Quote:
-------------------------
This quote comes from the book of Enoch. So how do we pick and choose what is inspired?
One needs to ask, is Jude's epistle inspired?
-------------------------

Quote:
-------------------------
it seems to me satan hid these books to keep the reality of hell under wraps.
-------------------------

The question of whether Jesus went to hell seems to be quickly swallowed by the greater question of whether or not we can trust our present day bible.

We really do live in a post-modern era where no knowledge is certain and revisionism is the only credible discourse any more. Yet this "enlightenment" is a devil's bargain, because once we start to unravel our church history...we find the thread goes all the way back to the beginning.

Why stop with the King James bible? Why not agree with Celsus, the ancient Greek philosopher who questioned the selection process for the 4 gospels? In 170 he asked, in his treatise against Christianity titled True Doctrine, why should one give greater credibility to what is written in Mathew, Mark, Luke and John then to other stories about Jesus? How are these accounts that the Christians selected, verifiable in the first place?

Yet if we take Pauls' promise "that all things work together..." seriously, then we must take it seriously historically before we can take it personally. If we allow our Arminianism to talk us out of the sovereignty of God we have gone too far and need to return to the road. If Satan really is capable of hiding God's word from us, then what good is bible study at all? What good is prayer?

I'm just throwing out my own form of caution...I know we are tired of useless traditions but let's not rush to embrace all radical thinking too fast.

Blessings,

MC

Re:, on: 2006/4/2 15:21

I don't believe Enoch to be dangerous to any's Theology and I think we need to look at that quote in Jude and read Enoch and see "why" those who chose our canon left it out.

That's the only book outside of our canon that I've questioned in that way.

I saw the possible reasons why those who did form our present canon 'may' have left it out and I also consider the last 5 verses of Daniel.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/4/2 15:32

Quote:
-------------------------
I don't believe Enoch to be dangerous to any's Theology
-------------------------

That may be sister...but questioning the credibility of our bible certainly is. If we open this discussion for one book, we can't close the discussion on the others.

I think, if we can't find what were hoping to see in our present Canon, then it's sensible to abandon our hunt and move o
n. Making room for other books because they support some notion that is important to us is unacceptable even in it's slightest form.

Small vector changes lead to miles off course down the road...at least that's been my experience with everything in this life so far. ;-)  

MC

Re:, on: 2006/4/2 15:44
I fully understand your reasoning MC, definitely see, but one criteria for a book to be considered was ... was it quoted in the N.T.. 

There aren't any others that are, but that one.

Any others are 'not' to be considered on that foundation, fer shur.

Re: hmm - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/4/2 16:03
Well you raise a good point. Enoch certainly does have some attractive verses for discussing the prophetic. I wonder why our church fathers put it aside? Probably some 4th century squabble that had nothing to do with Christian scholarship or integrity...more then likely some ambitious Bishops were paid off by some special interest.

Maybe our scriptures really are incomplete afterall...

MC

Re: I'm not 'that' open-minded :) -, on: 2006/4/2 16:25
Just wonder about Enoch ... that's all ... 

Jude 1:14-15 Now Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied about these men also, saying, "Behold, the Lord comes with ten thousands of His saints, to execute judgment on all, to convict all who are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have committed in an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him."

We first learn of Enoch in Genesis 5 but it leaves us with questions. Hebrews 11 has the answers and Jude quotes Enoch! How did Jude come to know the words of Enoch? They are not in the Bible. The answer of course, is The Book of Enoch. A book which is actually quoted by Jude in the New Testament. What is the Book of Enoch and where did it come from?

Enoch was the great-grandfather of Noah. The Book of Enoch chapter 68:1 "And after that my great-grandfather Enoch gave me all the secrets in the book and in the parables which had been given to him, and he put them together for me in the words of the book of the parables."

The Book of Enoch was extant centuries before the birth of Christ and yet is considered by many to be more Christian in its theology than Jewish. It was considered scripture by many early Christians. The earliest literature of the so-called "Church Fathers" is filled with references to this mysterious book. The early second century "Epistle of Barnabas" makes much use of the Book of Enoch. Second and Third Century "Church Fathers" like Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origin and Clement of Alexandria all make use of the Book of Enoch. Tertullian (160-230 C.E) even called the Book of Enoch "Holy Scripture". The Ethiopic Church even added the Book of Enoch to its official canon. It was widely known and read the first three centuries after Christ. This and many other books became discredited after the Council of Laodicea. And being under ban of the authorities, afterwards it gradually passed out of circulation.

At about the time of the Protestant Reformation, there came to be a renewed interest in the Book of Enoch which had long since been lost to the modern world. By the late 1400's rumors began to spread that somewhere a copy of the long lost Book of Enoch might still exist. During this time many books arose claiming to be the long lost book and were later found to be forgeries.
The return of the long lost Book of Enoch to the modern western world is credited to the famous explorer James Bruce, who in 1773 returned from six years in Abyssinia with three Ethiopic copies of the lost book. In 1821 Richard Laurence published the first English translation. The famous R.H. Charles edition was published in 1912. In the following years several portions of the Greek text surfaced. Then with the discovery of cave 4 of the Dead Sea Scrolls, seven fragmentary copies of the Aramaic text were discovered.

There are scholars who believe the Book of Enoch was published before the Christian era by some great unknown of Semitic race, who believing himself to be inspired in a post-prophetic age, borrowed the name of an antediluvian patriarch to authenticate his own enthusiastic forecast of the coming Messiah. The Book of Enoch is divided into five basic parts, but it is the The Book of Parables (37-71) which gives scholars the most trouble for it is primarily concerned with a figure called "the messiah"; "the righteous one"; "the chosen one" and "the son of man."

The Book of Enoch Chapter 46:1-2 There I beheld the Ancient of days whose head was like white wool, and with him an other, whose countenance resembled that of a man. His countenance was full of grace, like that of one of the holy angels. Then I inquired of one of the angels, who went with me, and who showed me every secret thing, concerning this Son of man; who he was; whence he was; and why he accompanied the Ancient of days. He answered and said to me, This is the Son of man, to whom righteousness belongs; with whom righteousness dwelleth; and who will reveal all the treasures of that which is concealed: for the Lord of spirits has chosen him; and his portion has surpassed all before the Lord of spirits in everlasting uprightness."

(1) 1 Enoch

Discovery of the "Lost Text"
"The Greek word pseudopigrapha is a Greek word meaning ‘falsely superscribed,’ or what we moderns might call writing under a pen name. The classification, 'OT Pseudopigrapha,' is a label that scholars have given to these writings."

"The Book of Enoch is a pseudopigraphical work (a work that claims to be by a biblical character). The Book of Enoch was not included in either the Hebrew or Christian biblical canons, but could have been considered a sacred text by the sectarians."
- Milik, Z. T., ed. The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4

The Book of Enoch is an ancient composition known from two sets of versions, an Ethiopic one that scholars identify as ‘1 Enoch’, and a Slavonic version that is identified as ‘2 Enoch’, and which is also known as The Book of the Secrets of Enoch. Both versions, of which copied manuscripts have been found mostly in Greek and Latin translations, are based on early sources that enlarged on the short biblical mention that Enoch, the seventh Patriarch after Adam, did not die because, at age 365, 'he walked with God' - taken heavenward to join the deity."
- Zecharia Sitchin, When Time Began

"I Enoch, also known as the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch, is the oldest of the three pseudopigraphal books attributed to Enoch, the man who apparently did not die, but was taken up to heaven (Gen 5:24). The book was originally written in either Hebrew or Aramaic, perhaps both, but it survives in complete form only in Ethiopic (Ge'ez), and in fragmentary form in Aramaic, Greek (1:1-32:6; 6:1-10:14; 15:8-16:1; 89:42-49; 97:6-104), and Latin (106:1-18)."
"The materials in 1 Enoch range in date from 200 B.C.E. to 50 C.E. 1 Enoch contributes much to intertestamental views of angels, heaven, judgment, resurrection, and the Messiah. This book has left its stamp upon many of the NT writers, especially the author of Revelation."

"Prior to the eighteenth century, scholars had believed the Book of Enoch to be irrevocably lost: composed long before the birth of Christ, and considered to be one of the most important pieces of Jewish mystical literature, it was only known from fragments and from references to it in other texts. James Bruce changed all this by procuring several copies of the missing work during his stay in Ethiopia. These were the first complete editions of the Book of Enoch ever to be seen in Europe."
- Graham Hancock, The Sign and the Seal

"The Book of Enoch remained in darkness until 1821, when the long years of dedicated work by a professor of Hebrew at the University of Oxford were finally rewarded with the publication of the first ever English translation of the Book of Enoch. The Reverend Richard Laurence, Archbishop of Cashel, had labored for many hundreds of hours over the faded m
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an manuscript in the hands of the Bodleian Library, carefully substituting English words and expressions for the original Geez, while comparing the results with known extracts, such as the few brief chapters preserved in Greek by Syncellus during the ninth century."
- Andrew Collins, From the Ashes of Angels - The Forbidden Legacy of a Fallen Race (1996) p. 21

"The original Aramaic version was lost until the Dead Sea fragments were discovered."
"The original language of most of this work was, in all likelihood, Aramaic (an early Semitic language). Although the original version was lost in antiquity, portions of a Greek translation were discovered in Egypt and quotations were known from the Church Fathers. The discovery of the texts from Qumran Cave 4 has finally provided parts of the Aramaic original. ..Humankind is called on to observe how unchanging nature follows God's will."
- Milik, Jazef. T., ed. The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4

Composition
"1 Enoch, preserved in a full, 108-chapter form in Ethiopic, consists of five parts and one appended chapter. It originated in Aramaic (perhaps Hebrew for chaps. 37-71), was translated into Greek, and from Greek into Ethiopic."
- James C. Vanderkam (Professor of Hebrew Scriptures at the University of Notre Dame)

"The Aramaic Book of Enoch...very considerably influenced the idiom of the New Testament and patristic literature, more so in fact than any other writing of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha."

"As it now stands, 1 Enoch appears to consist of the following five major divisions:
(1) The Book of the Watchers (chaps. 1-36);
(2) The Book of the Similitudes (chaps. 37-71);
(3) The Book of Astronomical Writings (chaps. 72-82);
(4) The Book of Dream Visions (chaps. 83-90); and
(5) The Book of the Epistle of Enoch (chaps. 91-107)."

"Chaps. 1-36 The Book of the Watchers may date from the third century BCE. Parts of its text have been identified on several copies from Qumran cave 4; the earliest fragmentary manuscript (4QEnoch) dates, according to the editor J.T. Milik, to between 200 and 150 BCE. All Qumran copies are in the Aramaic language."
- James C. Vanderkam

"James Vanderkam divides the first part of 1 Enoch into five sections:
1-5 a theophany followed by an eschatological admonition
6-11 the angel story (stories)
12-16 Enoch and the failed petition of the angels who descended,
17-19 Enoch's first journey,
20-36 Enoch's second journey (chap. 20 is a list of angels who are connected with the journeys)."
- Tom Simms (CrossTalk)

"Chaps. 37-71 The Book of Parables (or the Similitudes of Enoch) may have been composed in the late first century BCE; a number of scholars prefer to place it in the first or even the second century CE. Milik assigns it to the late third century CE. No fragments of these chapters have been found at Qumran, and some think their original language was Hebrew, not Aramaic."
- James C. Vanderkam

"Chaps. 72-82 The Astronomical Book, like the Book of Watchers, may date from the third century BCE; the oldest copy of it seems to have been made not long after 200 BCE. Sizable portions of the text are preserved on four copies, written in Aramaic, from Qumran cave 4. The Aramaic original appears to have been much different and much longer than the Ethiopic text, adding far more astronomical details."
- James C. Vanderkam

Authorship
"A world view so encyclopaedic that it embraced the geography of heaven and earth, astronomy, meteorology, medicin
e was no part of Jewish tradition - but was familiar to educated Greeks, but attempting to emulate and surpass Greek wisdom, by having an integrating divine plan for destiny, elaborated through an angelic host with which Enoch is in communication through his mystical travels."

- Chris King, "The Apocalyptic Tradition"

Although the Book of Enoch is considered as apocryphal, it was clearly known to early Christian writers as the following quote from 1 Enoch 1:9 indicates:

"In the seventh (generation) from Adam Enoch also prophesied these things, saying: 'Behold, the Lord came with his holy myriads, to execute judgment on all, and to convict all the ungodly of all their ungodly deeds which they have committed in such an ungodly way, and of all the harsh things which ungodly sinners spoke against him.'"

- Jude 14-15

2 Enoch

"2 Enoch, or the Slavonic Apocalypse of Enoch, was written late first century C.E. in Egypt by a Jew. It survives only in late Old Slavonic manuscripts. It may have been composed originally in Aramaic or Hebrew, later being translated into Greek, and later still being translated into Old Slavonic. It is an amplification of Gen 5:21-32 (from Enoch to the Flood). Major theological themes include:
(1) God created the world out of nothing (24:2);
(2) seven heavens (30:2-3) and angelic hosts;
(3) God created the souls of men before the foundation of the earth (23:5);
(4) abodes of heaven and hell are already prepared for righteous and sinners; and
(5) ethical teachings, which at times parallel those of the NT and Proverbs."


Date: 07/22/2000 Author: David Chariot "beth_marcaboth@hotmail.com" posted in alt.religion.christian.pentecostal

-BEGIN

About the Book of Enoch
(also known as "Ethiopian Enoch" or "1 Enoch")

The Book of Enoch (also known as 1 Enoch) was once cherished by Jews and Christians alike, this book later fell into disfavor with powerful theologians - precisely because of its controversial statements on the nature and deeds of the fallen angels.

The Enochian writings, in addition to many other writings that were excluded (or lost) from the Bible (i.e., the Book of Tobit, Esdras, etc.) were widely recognized by many of the early church fathers as "apocryphal" writings. The term "apocrypha" is derived from the Greek word meaning "hidden" or "secret". Originally, the import of the term may have been complementary in that the term was applied to sacred books whose contents were too exalted to be made available to the general public.

In Dan. 12:9-10 we hear of words that are shut up until the end of time and, words that the wise shall understand and the wicked shall not. In addition, 4 Ezra 14:44ff. mentions 94 books, of which 24 (the OT) were to be published and 70 were to be delivered only to the wise among the people (= apocrypha). Gradually, the term "apocrypha" took on a pejorative connotation, for the orthodoxy of these hidden books was often questionable. Origen (Comm. in Matt. 10.18; p. 13.881) distinguished between books that were to be read in public worship and apocryphal books. Because these secret books were often preserved for use within the esoteric circles of the divinely - knit believers, many of the critically - spirited or "unenlightened" Church Fathers found themselves outside the realm of understanding, and therefore came to apply the term "apocryphal" to, what they claimed to be, heretical works which were forbidden to be read.

In Protestant parlance, "the Apocrypha" designate 15 works, all but one of which are Jewish in origin and found in the Septuagint (parts of 2 Esdras are Christian and Latin in origin). Although some of them were composed in Palestine in Aramaic or Hebrew, they were not accepted into the Jewish canon formed late in the 2nd cent. AD (Canonicity, 67:31-35). The Reformers, influenced by the Jewish canon of the OT, did not consider these books on a par with the rest of the Scriptures; thus the custom arose of making the Apocrypha a separate section in the
Protestant Bible, or sometimes even of omitting them entirely (Canonicit, 67:44-46). The Catholic view, expressed as a doctrine of faith at the Council of Trent, is that 12 of these 15 works (in a different enumeration, however) are canonical Scripture; they are called the Deuterocanonical Books (Canonicit, 67:21, 42-43).

The three books of the Protestant Apocrypha that are not accepted by Catholics are 1-2 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh. The theme of the Book of Enoch dealing with the nature and deeds of the fallen angels so infuriated the later Church fathers that one, Filastrius, actually condemned it openly as heresy (Filastrius, Liber de Haeresibus, no. 108). Nor did the rabbis deign to give credence to the book's teaching about angels. Rabbi Simeon ben Jochai in the second century A.D. pronounced a curse upon those who believed it (Delitzsch, p. 223). So the book was denounced, banned, cursed, and shredded - and last but not least, lost (and conveniently forgotten) for a thousand years. But with an uncanny persistence, the Book of Enoch found its way back into circulation two centuries ago.

In 1773, rumors of a surviving copy of the book drew Scottish explorer James Bruce to distant Ethiopia. True to hearsay, the Book of Enoch had been preserved by the Ethiopic church, which put it right alongside the other books of the Bible. Bruce secured not one, but three Ethiopic copies of the book and brought them back to Europe and Britain. When in 1821 Dr. Richard Laurence, a Hebrew professor at Oxford, produced the first English translation of the work, the modern world gained its first glimpse of the forbidden mysteries of Enoch.

Most scholars say that the present form of the story in the Book of Enoch was penned sometime during the second century B.C. and was popular for at least five hundred years. The earliest Ethiopic text was apparently made from a Greek manuscript of the Book of Enoch, which itself was a copy of an earlier text. The original was apparently written in Semitic language, now thought to be Aramaic.

Though it was once believed to be post-Christian (the similarities to Christian terminology and teaching are striking), recent discoveries of copies of the book among the Dead Sea Scrolls found at Qumran prove that the book was in existence before the time of Jesus Christ. But the date of the original writing upon which the second century B.C. Qumran copies were based is shrouded in obscurity. It is, in a word, old. It has been largely the opinion of historians that the book does not really contain the authentic words of the ancient biblical patriarch Enoch, since he would have lived (based on the chronologies in the Book of Genesis) several thousand years earlier than the first known appearance of the book attributed to him.

Despite its unknown origins, Christians once accepted the words of this Book of Enoch as authentic scripture, especially the part about the fallen angels and their prophesied judgment. In fact, many of the key concepts used by Jesus Christ himself seem directly connected to terms and ideas in the Book of Enoch. Thus, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Jesus had not only studied the book, but also respected it highly enough to adopt and elaborate on its specific descriptions of the coming kingdom and its theme of inevitable judgment descending upon "the wicked" - the term most often used in the Old Testament to describe the Watchers.

There is abundant proof that Christ approved of the Book of Enoch. Over a hundred phrases in the New Testament find precedents in the Book of Enoch. Another remarkable bit of evidence for the early Christians' acceptance of the Book of Enoch was for many years buried under the King James Bible's mistranslation of Luke 9:35, describing the transfiguration of Christ: "And there came a voice out of the cloud, saying, 'This is my beloved Son: hear him." Apparentl y the translator here wished to make this verse agree with a similar verse in Matthew and Mark. But Luke's verse in the original Greek reads: "This is my Son, the Elect One (from the Greek ho eklelegmenos, lit., "the elect one"): hear him." The "Elect One" is a most significant term (found fourteen times) in the Book of Enoch. If the book was indeed known to the apostles of Christ, with its abundant descriptions of the Elect One who should "sit upon the throne of glory" and the Elect One who should "dwell in the midst of them," then the great scriptural authenticity is accorded to the Book of Enoch when the "voice out of the cloud" tells the apostles, "This is my Son, the Elect One" - the one promised in the Book of Enoch.

The Book of Jude tells us in vs. 14 that "Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied..." Jude also, in vs. 15, makes a direct reference to the Book of Enoch (2:1), where he writes, "to execute judgment on all, to convict all who are ungodly..." The time difference between Enoch and Jude is approximately 3400 years. Therefore, Jude's reference to the Enochian prophesies strongly leans toward the conclusion that these written prophesies were available to him at that time.

Fragments of ten Enoch manuscripts were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. The famous scrolls actually comprise on
ly one part of the total findings at Qumran. Much of the rest was Enochian literature, copies of the Book of Enoch, and other apocryphal works in the Enochian tradition, like the Book of Jubilees. With so many copies around, the Essenes could well have used the Enochian writings as a community prayer book or teacher's manual and study text.

The Book of Enoch was also used by writers of the noncanonical (i.e. apocryphal or "hidden") texts. The author of the apocryphal Epistle of Barnabas quotes the Book of Enoch three times, twice calling it "the Scripture," a term specifically denoting the inspired Word of God (Epis. of Barnabas 4:3, 16:5,6). Other apocryphal works reflect knowledge of the Enoch story of the Watchers, notably the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Book of Jubilees.

Many of the early church fathers also supported the Enochian writings. Justin Martyr ascribed all evil to demons whom he alleged to be the offspring of the angels who fell through lust for women (from the Ibid.)-directly referencing the Enochian writings. Athenagoras, writing in his work called Legatio in about 170 A.D., regards Enoch as a true prophet. He describes the angels which "violated both their own nature and their office." In his writings, he goes into detail about the nature of fallen angels and the cause of their fall, which comes directly from the Enochian writings.

Many other church fathers: Tatian (110-172); Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (115-185); Clement of Alexandria (150-220); Tertullian (160-230); Origen (186-255); Lactantius (260-330); in addition to: Methodius of Philippi, Minucius Felix, Commodianus, and Ambrose of Milan also approved of and supported the Enochian writings.

The twentieth-century discovery of several Aramaic Enochian texts among the Dead Sea Scrolls prompted Catholic scholar J.T. Milik to compile a complete history of the Enochian writings, including translations of the Aramaic manuscripts. Milik's 400-page book, published in 1976 by Oxford (J. T. Milik, ed. and trans., The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) is a milestone in Enochian scholarship, and Milik himself is no doubt one of the finest experts on the subject. His opinions, based as they are on years of in-depth research, are highly respected.

One by one the arguments against the Book of Enoch fade away. The day may soon arrive when the final complaints about the Book of Enoch's lack of historicity and "late date" are also silenced by new evidence of the book's real antiquity.

- END

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on 2006/4/2 17:56

Hi everyone.

I found this quote troubling

Quote:

-----------------------------------In fact, many of the key concepts used by Jesus Christ himself seem directly connected to terms and ideas in the Book of Enoch. Thus, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that Jesus had not only studied the book, but also respected it highly enough to adopt and elaborate on its specific descriptions of the coming kingdom and its theme of inevitable judgment descending upon "the wicked" - the term most often used in the Old Testament to describe the Watchers.

-----------------------------------

This statement seems nearly blasphemous considering Christ's declaration concerning His words and teachings

Quote:

-----------------...the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.

-----------------

Quote:

------------------Jesus answered them, and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me.
Perhaps we should be certain that this book is indeed the very word of God before we imply that the Son of God 'adopted' and 'elaborated' on it's teachings?

Also, what are the qualifications of the people being quoted concerning this book. Are they filled with God's Holy Spirit?

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/2 18:05**

sis annie

whoa that's some interesting information there concerning that book of enoch...

**Re: Panic attack !, on: 2006/4/2 18:11**

Ha, ain't you got no sense a humor bud? :-D

There's an email address up in there somewhere's that you could ask. I just pulled this one off the net and there's another like it on yourgoingtohell.com/enoch.html. Ha.

Did Jesus ever quote the O.T.? 8-) I guess Jude shouldn't have quoted it then. Ha.

http://www.ccel.org/c/charles/otpseudepig/enoch/ENOCH_1.HTM

**Re: - posted by IRONMAN (), on: 2006/4/2 18:12**

bro ChrisJD

---

i guess we, or the experts have a tendency to think that Christ had to study these things as we/they do. He knew all these things always as far as i'm concerned.

the thing which still gets me is that Abraham's bosom isn't mentioned anywhere else in the word except when Christ mentions it in reference to Lazarus in Luke 16. It is in the book of enoch though. Obviously Christ had no need of studying these things since He Himself was present with God when all these things were being written.

**Re:, on: 2006/4/2 18:21**

It says up top there who wrote that bottom part and I put it into google, but didn't know which one to post here ... now ... :-? .

Just copy and paste "David Chariot enoch"

into google.

**Re:, on: 2006/4/2 18:23**

Just in case you thought I was kidding about "yourgoingtohell.com" ha ... here it is ...

http://yourgoingtohell.com/enoch.html
General Topics :: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died?

Re:, on: 2006/4/2 18:38
hey, yourgoingtohell has a message board ... ha ... http://www.laststophell.com/repent/

I reckon they're some young people with some "Rev.s" on there. Different, huh ? :lol:

IRONMAN, the book of Enoch itself, without anyone's commentary on it, doesn't make me nervous at all. I think we won't "gotohell" if we look at it. ha.

yourgoingtohell is far from the only site looking at it. I do know some more mature sites ... ha ... that do have it on their sites, but I dare not post them now. Ha. I may have to go take a tranquilizer ... ho-ho.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/4/2 18:47
Hi Annie,

Quote:
-------------------------There's an email address up in there somewhere's that you could ask. I just pulled this one off the net and there's another like it on yourgoingtohell.com/ enoch.html. Ha.
-------------------------

Since you are responsible for the content that you present here for your brothers and sisters to digest I think it would be more appropriate for you to address this.

Quote:
------------------------Did Jesus ever quote the O.T. ? I guess Jude shouldn't have quoted it then. Ha.
------------------------

The issue of concern is the suggestion that Christ used words found in the book of Enoch to form His teachings.

Thanks for considering this.

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/4/2 19:24
Hi Ironman,

I looked in e-sword and Vincent's word studies says that "Abraham's bosom" was a rabbinical phrase equivalent to being in paradise with Abraham. Apperantly it was a phrase that Jews of His day would have known and understood?

Maybe then the Lord is using a phrase from the vernacular of the day to make His point more understandable? Just a thought.

Take care.

Re:, on: 2006/4/2 19:31
Chris, In order to continue the conversation that started before I posted to this thread, I looked for a "somewhat" "all-side d" and not "all for" article for conversation, so I think you just didn't understand why I posted that to the already in progres discussion.

Note, that at the top of the article it gives quotes "against" Enoch also.

Now I think I should have had a tranquilizer with my supper :-D.
bro Chris

well they would have known what that meant, hence the disciples didn't ask for an explanation. the thing still is though th
at it appears nowhere else in scripture or should i say western canon scripture but it is present in eastern canon scriptur

e. i wonder if the sources you quoted think the book of enoch to be inspired, i would guess not hence their conclusion on

this.

evidently what the Lord was talking about was what happens after death and the disciples knew what abraham's bosom

was.

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/4/2 23:33

Quote:
---------------------------Now I think I should have had a tranquilizer with my supper
---------------------------

:-P

Well, I guess I'm turning out to be a good ole' fashioned fundamentalist in my later years. I tend to have an allergic react
on whenever Christians start the discussion on the veracity of Canon. In my experience, no matter what fine point is at st
ake, it ultimately becomes a no-win discussion for the body.

I think we just have to make a decision that Christian epistemology is different then secular epistemology as we make ro
om for supernatural revelation. If we believe our revelation is of God, then we should believe it continues to be protected
by God.

Consider this point: just knowing when Charlemagne influenced scripture, and what he influenced about it, is not the sa
me as knowing why and how he did so. Afterall, God moves Kings on His chessboard even if we can't see His hands. Belie
ving God has revealed His Word doesn't mean much unless we also believe He has the ability to preserve His W
ord for us inspite of Kings, Bishops, and translators. I just don't see any alternative. The two go hand in hand...or hand in
glove as it were.

I trust you guys feel the same way...I'm only trying to articulate it.

Blessings,

MC
That's what I wondered if you were saying...

Well if we move from the level of inspired down to merely interesting then there are a whole lot of early writings that we could discuss. I agree with you!

BTW, I'm glad your day was a good one!

Blessings,

MC

Re: - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/4/3 0:27

Hello...

Wow -- this thread has seemed to go in a completely new direction (now about the book of Enoch).

I have read the book of Enoch several times. Yes, Enoch himself was quoted in the Epistle of Jude -- but that is the end of any quotation from Enoch. When I wrote that we do not know which version of Enoch that Jude was referring, it is quite possible that the current Book of Enoch is just a hodge-podge of some actual quotes from the original texts thrown together with all of apocryphal and uninspired material. It contains several sub-books, and they seem to not be related at all.

This seems to be the case with several of the other Coptic gospels and books that were rejected in the established canon. Some of those books contain quotes that are remarkably similar (and sometimes, the same) as things recorded in the Four Gospels. However, upon closer inspection, we can easily reject those books because they contradict the character of Christ. In fact, we reject the books of the Apocrypha as being uninspired -- even if they are historically accurate. The New Testament mentions that Jesus went to the Temple during the Celebration of Hanukkah (the Feast of Dedication in John 10:22-23) -- which is spoken of in the Apocrypha. But we still reject those works. Why? Because it is clear that those works are not inspired.

The book of Enoch is the same. Yes, the quote from Jude is contained in it. However, we don't know if it was just added from a previous portion of sayings and quotes. In fact, the book also speaks about angels held in prison for 10,000 years (from Enoch's Book of Watchers 21:6 -- when the earth's age from Adam to now is just about 6000 years), about angels (not demons) having sex with women and then receiving punishment, the subsequent order to destroy all of the descendants of these angels, Abel's spirit "making suit against" the descendants of Cain, and many angels actually making decisions without consulting God. All in all, while it is quite interesting -- it cannot be considered Scripture.

Like the debate about whether or not Jesus went to Hell, any of this is pure speculation. We need to rightly divide the Word of Truth. It is interesting to remember that Sodom had no Bible. Neither did Noah. Neither did Adam, Enoch or Abraham. And throughout the ages (until the invention of the press), very few individuals owned a copy of Scriptures. Jews went to the synagogue to hear readings of Scripture. And the early church copied and shared the epistles with one another. For the early believers, they didn't have a written Bible. But they knew the Lord. It is by knowing the Spirit of the Lord that we are able to rightly divide what is undeniable truth from what is fiction.

This being said, can anyone say with any sort of honest absolute certainty that Jesus went to Hell? Can anyone claim with absolute certainty that this current "Book of Enoch" is inspired?

Of course not.
If you would like to read a copy of the Ethiopian "Book of Enoch," then visit this (http://www.ancienttexts.org/library/enoch/) website. I believe that you will find it both interesting, but very suspect.

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/3 0:40

I agree that canon is decided by God.

I also agree that God moves kings like pawns, Christian or not.

We discussed canon quite a bit. Here were some things about canon and non-canonical books:

A book can be true and good, but still not canon. If I reproduced an account of Jesus, and it was 100% historical and doctrinally correct, that does not make it canon. God decides that.

A book that is not canon, and not 100% accurate is still valuable for study. Not for doctrine, reproof, and the like, but for information.

My opinion on Enoch is that if God had wanted the 67th book in the Bible, it would be there today. That doesn't mean it cannot be quoted in Scripture. There are multiple works in Scripture that are quoted that are not canon. The Book of the Wars of the Lord, the Book of Jasher, the Book of Enoch, etc. Paul's quote of the Greek poets does not make their poems canon.

God chooses the canon. Man discovers it.

The apocrypha needed to be translated, not to be canon, but for the same reason you keep a copy of the Book of Jasher. You don't do your devotions by it, but it is still a valuable piece of literature. It is not God's love letter to His people, but that doesn't mean that it is junk.

Mein Kampf, the Book of Mormon, and the Koran are not to be lived by, but being ignorant of them is silly to me. I think the fear of books is ungodly. God will protect His witness as he reads the enemy's playbook.

So the fact that a book is around today that is related to Christ or the prophets, and it is not one of the 66 inspired books does not qualify it for burning. But neither does a book qualify for canon because God mentions it.

(Demons are angels that are fallen. Maybe I am mis-reading you, though.)

Re: on: 2006/4/3 1:30

Quote:
-------------------------------
letsgetbusy wrote:
Mein Kampf, the Book of Mormon, and the Koran are not to be lived by, but being ignorant of them is silly to me. I think the fear of books is ungodly. God will protect His witness as he reads the enemy's playbook.
-------------------------------

Now that's good Brother LGB.

You can say that because you're mature in the Lord. Grounded and not fearful.

How could a missionary not know about Islam or 'whatever', if they're entering their territory or if some kid comes to your youth group and wants to know what is wrong with this or that ... how could you give an intelligent answer unless you knew about this or that? Do you know how many kids walk out because they get this blank stare from whomever they're asking things about. Enough blank stares and Christians are labeled as ignorant uneducated opiod of the people people. I think the Love for others causes us to want to know enough to help as many people out as we can - Bottomline and period there.
Re: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died?, on: 2006/4/3 4:09

Anyhow, back to my serious side. Here's two good writings.

http://www.IdolpOB.org/descend.html

http://www.apologeticspress.org/articles/1789

Re:, on: 2006/4/3 9:29

Quote:
----------------------Maybe our scriptures really are incomplete afterall...
----------------------

This is a true statement, but just because they are incomplete does not make them uninspired.

For example, we read in the Old Testament

Joshua 10:13 And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day.

2 Samuel 1:18 (Also he bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow: behold, it is written in the book of Jasher.)

We have a book called Jasher that is supposed to be apart of Old Testament writ, that existed at one time, but no longer exists today.

This is what I mean by incomplete. Our Textus Receptus gives us a 'link' so to speak, that these things have been written in a book called Jasher and than come to find out that the book doesn't exist.

There is a possibility that it may one day be unearthed.

There is one thing that I would love to see unearthed and that is some evidence that Joseph was indeed second in command to Pharoah. Oh, I believe it because God's word tells us, but it would be nice to see some secular evidence.

Re:, on: 2006/4/3 9:52

Quote:
----------------------it is quite possible that the current Book of Enoch is just a hodge-podge of some actual quotes from the original texts thrown together with alot of apocryphal and uninspired material.
----------------------

Again, who says what goes and what stays?

We can say the same thing about the bible.

What parts are not inspired? I have read parts of the book of Enoch, the read to me is very much that of the book of Ezekiel.

That period in which this great man lived was called the Old World. That system and way of life was totally different than what we have today. They had a world wide ecosystem that was one big green house, the air was ten times better than ours, and that kind of oxygen made man live longer, plants and vegetables would produce longer and were bigger. These are quotes from creation scientist. They say that because we breathe in less oxygen we only use 10% of our brain, at that time, they breathed in a different oxygen which enabled them to be healthier, stronger. But within a few thousand years corruption was found that staggered the imagination.
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You know we have little information of that period, we have no idea that it's possible that they were involved in industry, technology, not like computers or such, but other things that brought this society to it's end. That caused God to say that's enough, "I'll get a man to build me a boat so I can preserve life." This boat had to have been massive, to fit every set of animals therein, Cats and rats and elephants, green alligators and chimpanzees, cows, horses, sheep, pigs, llamas, Emus, Rhinos, Lions, Tigers and the list goes on and on. The wood and the pitch like tar, had to have been in abundance. We see pictures of this little boat with Noah and animals sticking their heads out of the boat.

But I tell you the truth, they only had one window, it wasn't to be a pleasure cruise down the Tigris and swing back up the Euphrates.

I have no idea how I got unto this subject. :-?

Re: - posted by cccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/4/3 12:46
Hi Healingwaters...

But should a concept be taught as "doctrine" when it is merely speculation? That is the problem with teaching such things (like Jesus went to Hell, requiring women in your church to wear hats, and, gulp, "baptism for the dead" - I Corinthians 15:29-34).

It is my personal opinion that established doctrine should NOT be based upon the speculation from a single passage. It seems that such speculation that becomes mandatory custom is what often divides the body of Christ the most.

:-)

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/3 14:18
chris,

I am not sure whether you were referring to the idea of Jesus going to hell, or Enoch being canonized.

Here are the main verses (that I know of) that discuss Jesus going to hell:

Psalms 16:10 "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

Acts 2:31 "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."

If you don't believe Jesus went to hell, no problem. It seems pretty clear to me from this OT verse, and its confirmation in the NT, that Jesus did go to hell. More than one verse discusses this.

Re: - posted by cccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/4/3 15:12
Hi letsgetbusy...
Quote: 
-------------------------t
I am not sure whether you were referring to the idea of Jesus going to hell, or Enoch being canonized.
-------------------------t

Actually, I am speaking about the danger of taking definitive stands on any doctrines or beliefs that are not completely validated by the Word of God.

The Scriptures that you mention are taken from the word sheol -- which speaks of the grave. This has been mentioned before. In fact, there are versions older than the KJV that are also taken from the Received Text that are clear on this. For instance, many foreign language versions simply use the word "sheol" rather than try to interpret the verse inaccurately. But most versions (including older-than-the-KJV foreign translations also taken from the RT) simply use an equivalent to "grave," "death," or "utter darkness." Modern translations like the NIV make this distinction, even though the Hebrew and Greek words are the same in their sources.

But my question is whether or not we should base doctrine on speculation that is quite controversial in any interpretation or scripturally debatable. Is it proper for individuals to declare something as fact that is actually speculation?
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:-)

Re:, on: 2006/4/3 16:38

Quote:
-------------------------
It is my personal opinion that established doctrine should NOT be based upon the speculation from a single passage.

-------------------------

Amen!

And you having said that that the only conclusion to this off shoot thread is to accept the entirety of the book of Enoch as sacred text and should be read by all, but doesn't necessarily mean that it should be placed in our existing bible. Tradition will make sure that it stays out. The book Enoch is a prophets book and should be treated as such.

There are scores of people that do not believe in the covenantal way of salvation. They believe and are water baptized and stop there without going all the way to being baptized by the living Christ Himself.(I am talking about those who know these things) They consider that to be done away with, so regardless if it's in the bible, the book of Enoch stands among those teachings whom people have rejected. Yet the bible says that the holy Spirit is the refreshing, "with stammering lips and another tongues will I speak to this people but with all this, they will not hearken".

The one's who reject the refreshing of Pentecost are the same one's in whom the prophet has declared that won't listen. Stiff necked are they, and uncircumcised in heart.

I said all this to say that it doesn't matter what men say about rejecting the book of Enoch, they have proved to me that they don't know what they are talking about. If they reject somethings to be in our past regarding doctrine that the Apostle Paul spoke of in Hebrews 6 than their word is false and cannot be trusted. If they are steering their congregations away from the truth of the Son of God, than why should I heed to them when they say that the book of Enoch is not inspired, it's clear to me that these men are not inspired so why should we listen to them.

Alrighty than, what was the original topic again?.-o

Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/4/3 21:32

Hi everyone.

Chris,

Quote:
-------------------------
It is by knowing the Spirit of the Lord that we are able to rightly divide what is undeniable truth from what is fiction.

-------------------------

Excellent point brother. Though perhaps we could refine this a bit more and include being led of and following closely to, the Holy Spirit? It also reminds me of this Scripture

Quote:
-------------------------
But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in him.

-------------------------

and before this he wrote

Quote:
-------------------------
I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth.

-------------------------
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So then it causes us to wonder why is there so much confusion and disagreement? It seems to me that many errors in judgment arise because of our sins.

Quote:
-------------------------
His own iniquities shall take the wicked himself, and he shall be holden with the cords of his sins. He shall die without instruction; and in the greatness of his folly he shall go astray.
-------------------------

Our Lord said

Quote:
-------------------------
The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.
-------------------------

but...

Quote:
-------------------------
But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!
-------------------------

and...

Quote:
-------------------------
Then spake Jesus again unto them, saying, I am the light of the world: he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.
-------------------------

So often we are not aware of our sins and the effect upon our judgement is also obscured

Quote:
-------------------------
Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression.
-------------------------

I say this looking back upon personal experience also, at times when I was so lifted up with pride that I had lost much sensitivity to things which before I would have shunned.

And we err in thinking that only 'gross' sins really effect us. I do not believe it. I believe the most effective Christian life (and perhaps most opposed) is the one that is living in a greater degree of victory over sin, both outward AND inward

Quote:
-------------------------
the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me.
-------------------------

Nothing.

Someone told me one time that you cannot win in spiritual warfare without a pure heart. I do not doubt the weight of this statement. I have shared the Gospel in some really rotten places, with people who were horribly oppressed. I believe that when we enter into the Gospel fight for thier souls, the spirits that are either in them or are oppressing them will seek to test you and see if there is anything 'in you' that could give them a foothold. I can remember quite a few times being awa
re that satan was putting something before me to trip me up and get me out of the Gospel fight.

So, what's the point and why did I digress?

Maybe if we spend more time on our faces asking God to search us, we'd make fewer errors in judgement and have more agreements about the Truth.

---

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/3 21:51**

Heresy = G139 &amp;#945;&amp;#953;&amp;#769;&amp;#961;&amp;#949;&amp;#963;&amp;#953;&amp;#962; hairesis (maybe why we call it "hairy doctrines") From G138; properly a choice G-138 - to take for oneself, that is, to prefer.

---

**Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/3 21:53**

chris,

It's not just the word sheol, bro. I am showing you from the quote from Acts that Luke confirmed the Psalms quote by also saying Jesus went to hell "in Greek." I will post it again.

Acts 2:31 "He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."

That Greek word is Hades. Luke used the same word when describing the falling of Capernaum into hell, and the location of the rich man in flames that was opposite Lazarus.

If you don't want to believe that Jesus went to hell, okay. But it is not just one verse, it is not just in one language, and it is not just the Old Testament. I am not trying to beat anyone up, but I was trying to show this by quoting from Psalms and Acts about Jesus in hell.

-------

As far as the KJV being in error, please read the various version prior to 1611 on Psalm 16:10:

1395 Wycliffe: For thou shalt not forsake my soule in helle
1535 Miles Coverdale: thou shalt not leave my soule in hell
1568 Bishop's: For thou wylt not leaue my soule in hell
1587 Geneva: For thou wilt not leave my soule in the grave

Prior to the KLV, three of the four major English versions translated the word "hell."

-------

Wesley on Acts 2:31 "his soul was not left in Hades"

***Okay, so if you side with the Geneva and the NIV about Psalms 16, how do you explain Acts 2:31?***

---

**Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/3 22:20**

Wow, by the time I find out here if Jesus did go to Hell when he died, I might already be in Heaven and can ask Jesus personally I bet he knows, but I bet even if I were able to send back the facts there would still be some Christian's that would want to debate what Jesus said, why not there doing it now. :-P
Re: - posted by letsgetbusy () , on: 2006/4/3 22:35
That's hilarious.

Re: - posted by cccuhhrrriisss () , on: 2006/4/3 23:29
Hi letsgetbusy...

I have already explained some of my personal beliefs about the translation. Even the Acts 2:31 passage is just reiterating the verse from Psalms 16:10. In that original verse, the Hebrew word is "sheol." Even the word used in Acts is the mythological word "hades." (http://www.blueletterbible.org/tmp_dir/words/8/1144121462-3760.html) Hades can mean "the grave, death or hell."

But much more importantly, I must ask whether you feel so safe and certain about this issue enough that you feel convinced of a need to state such speculation as an established FACT? What then if what you teach is not fact? It is dangerous to state things as doctrinal fact when it may indeed be speculation -- including educated or deduced speculation.

To me, this illustrates one of the most terrible circumstances that divides the body of Christ. A group of individuals feel so strongly about an issue that is, at best, speculative. They end up forming congregations that will embrace this speculation as doctrinal fact -- even teaching that those who don't adhere to such teaching are immature or undiscerning (or even misled). Of course, there are some things that are quite clear from the Word of God. But I truly believe that, in order to truly understand the heart of God, we must look past meaningless doctrinal divisions. Yes, we should continue to study and search. But we should never be so hard-hearted that we would be willing to distance ourselves from someone because they don't agree with our spiritual or scriptural speculation. This might mean that we should be careful to distinguish what is ultimately clear from the Word of God -- and what is merely speculation.

I believe that Leonard Ravenhill was a wonderful example of this. I know that he held very strong beliefs on many matters. But I have yet to hear a message where he preached a sermon on an Scriptural interpretation about the horns of the beast in Revelation. While he probably had some strong beliefs about certain things, he was careful not to teach such things as fact. As a matter of fact, he seemed to be very careful about what he said when he spoke.

Brother Ravenhill also held company with many believers from various denominational backgrounds. It seemed that he was concerned first and foremost with your relationship with Christ. Do you truly know Him? If not, do you want to? When I met Brother Ravenhill in his home as a young teen, he asked me a lot of questions. I arrived at his door unannounced. His wife asked if I had an appointment. When I told her that I did not, she told me to please wait for a moment. She returned and let me in to the living room.

For a few minutes, I was startled by his probing questions. It almost seemed like he was "checking me out." But after a while, I must have said something that made his eyes widen. He nodded to his wife, and she went to bring us some cookies, crackers and tea. Brother Ravenhill apologized for this, telling me that he does this to screen those who truly understand what it means to have a relationship with Jesus from those who are simply well-meaning people seeking a spiritual guru. We fellowshiped and shared for an hour. He gave me some spiritual advice -- that I hold very dear. And afterward, we prayed. Brother Ravenhill never asked me questions about where I stood on doctrinal issues (like whether or not Jesus went to hell). He didn't ask me whether or not I spoke with tongues, believed in a pre-trib or post-trib rapture, what version of the Bible I read, or whether or not I believed in eternal security. He spoke primarily about the condition of the Church. And since I was so young, he spoke about the terrible condition of young people within the Church.

I wish that we could all be so welcoming of one another. So again, I must ask whether or not we should be teaching doctrine that is speculation? Should we be forming churches where doctrines are based upon controversial interpretations of a particular passage or concept? While I believe that all of these matters can and should be taught -- we should be careful to mention that this is our own speculation.

Sadly, most teachers and pastors today do not do this. They are so concerned about people lining up to their "vision" for the church (or agreeing with the official church position on precise matters) that they become inclusive institutions. It is so difficult to find a pastor that will encourage the congregation to search the Scriptures for themselves through much prayer before believing what is taught. Pastors and teachers need to know that it is okay to not know everything. It does not make me have less faith in their leadership. In fact, it makes them seem more real. Instead, we hear messages about how a congregation is "underneath the umbrella authority of the pastor and church leadership" -- chiding us to line up with the direction of the leadership without objection.
On a personal note, I believe that there are alot of such "established practices" in many churches that truly needs to be questioned. Perhaps alot of our ecclesiatical customs and traditions are not based upon Scripture. Why does "revival" s till larry? Perhaps the question can only be answered intrinsically.

:-)

**Re:Balance, on: 2006/4/4 3:27**

Chris, to answer your points, may I use two that I already posted, only because it's hard for me to repeat at this hour... thank you if you can understand - but I wanted to reply to your post too, if you don't mind. Guess that's sort of silly for me to say. Here’s a post to a Revival Board thread.

from posted article;
- a subject avoided and rejected

Quote:
---------------------------------------------------How to take up a controversial issue, how to open up a sensitive subject without causing conflict and much mental strife? How to pr ovide an environment, a moment of consideration for a cause which has been forcibly dismissed and removed from the agenda? How to handle an item which causes a sense of condemnation and which, according to the many, ought to render the daring messenger a large sign to wear which says "Judgmental" and "Pompous".

The necessity of a spiritual awakening is such an item. The word, used in a Christian context, disqualifies and condemns present conditions in favour o f something else. This word threatens the present order and the tranquillity produced by hard labour in private as well as by common efforts.

---------------------------------------------------

Jesus said "In Spirit and Truth".

Paul said, 1Ti 4:16 Take heed unto thyself (holiness), and unto the "doctrine"; continue in 'them': for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.

The Quote above should and does fit or applies to, the subject of "Discernment Ministries" too.

What I see is one without the other and it can be just as this quote says for those concerned for the error in the 'church'.

Seeking a right relationship with the Lord in our own lives, or requiring the need to be "revived" because our heart's are hardened, is of course a necessity ... but what I also see is throwing out sound doctrine to reach some sort of end, which 'some' call "Revival".

If we don't get the sound doctrine part down first, we'll follow anyone who even says that word "revival".

We can't depend on Pastors or leaders to lead us into all truth. God holds us individually responsible to be before Him fo r "Spirit and Truth".

The days of eating the meat and spitting out the bones are about over when following "teachers or prophets".

Because they did not have the "agape" for the "truth", God will send them a strong delusion.

Signs and wonders and false teachings, are part of Jesus' warning.

While we're seeking to be revived from the dead, we Must seek to love and find Truth, lest we get swept away by the Co unterfeit Revival that we are on the heels of.

God Bless.
Actually, I won't bother with the second quoted post that is on Pastorfrin's "Shepherd" thread. It was my last post on the thread. But I feel to post from my heart of hearts to you.

Brother Ravenhill had a "burden" from the Lord to us to "get right with God". I started reading his works almost 30 years ago, along with Finney, Keith Green and David Wilkerson, and Wimie Pratney, and Tozer etc. etc. that are found here at SI, and why I love SI and recommend the contents to all I know.

But you must understand, that was Ravenhill's burden from the Lord. Was he wrong to be how he was? No. Of course not. It was men like him that got me on the run-way to a straight course of "no-nonsense" Christianity and I am so very grateful that I started with all that are now Home in Heaven. Glory to God Only.

But me being timid, had no idea that the Lord would put a totally different burden on me then what these men had given me.

I posted above what that is.

Eschatology is not a forbidden subject because Ravenhill didn't get into it. He wasn't called.

Finney wrote a book on Masons, but does that mean Wilkerson should? No.

But what they are, when you put the whole lot of them together is the Whole of the Body represented and covered.

John, although he was sort of the Love Apostle, was mostly an Apologist and then received The Revelation.

Paul, "da man", was also an Apologist. The strongest shortest most powerful man in our New Testament. HE is who we should glean from when trying to discern if "doctrine" is important.

Was it important to Paul? Ha, what a question. I love Paul and John and Peter and Jude. They're the men we should judge by.

Paul for his strong stand on Doctrine and John, Paul and Peter for their stand on Eschatology.

Some of us are called to Apologetics/Discernment type ministries, so you can't hold all of us up to Ravenhill's burden.

God places the burden on people and if you say we should except each other, then except on a Biblical basis, as each having their own 'calling/burden' and each calling, differing but making up a whole healthy body 'if' permitted to operate or be heard.

You see, I get torn only by which calling/burden is calling/burdening at the time. I have a burden for the lost ... so I try to spend time there. Then Apologetics/Discernment is high on my list, because if I get them saved, 'where' am I to send them to be fed of good pasture?

Then, I see we are in the Last Days, so that burden burns in me like a fire and that's where it ignites both the burden to hurry to get them in, plus the knowledge of the absolute need for sound doctrine gets the apologetics/discernment burden burning. I can't help it Chris, I'm not built like Ravenhill in those areas and I don't expect anyone else to be a Ravenhill clone.

He had his job and he did it well. But if some are called to other burdens, we can't say they're not from God. The arm can't say to the leg, I don't need you.

You always post strong. You state your points strong ... with few "I think", but you state them as concrete, yet if we do, then I feel intimidated to not conform to the image you've stated is for all of us.

I mentioned before about true truths or absolutes and they are there for us in His Word. He hasn't missed a trick as far as making His thoughts clear. We can search, seek and find.

Even in the taboo subject of Eschatology. Taboo to some only, of course, not all. Also, examining the teachings or leadership of others.

Spirit-Truth-Love - the inseparable 3.
One without the other is wood, hay and stubble.

Follow Paul through all of his books and nothing else for a while and then maybe our common ground will become leveled.

I Love you Brother. You know that.

Annie

P.S. I put two links to up for the "Was Jesus in Hell" if you've had a chance to glance at them.

God Bless.


Hi MeAgain...

I do believe in discernment and apologetics. And I do believe that there are individuals that are gifted as such and thus better equipped for such tasks. And of course, I also believe that there are absolutes. Even this issue has an absolute answer -- either Christ went to Hell when he died or he did not. But does any of us know with absolute certainty the truth about this issue? If not, then why do we preach it as such?

Undeniable absolutes from the Word of God should be the established doctrine of the Church. Many things are completely clear -- repentance, faith in God, baptisms, the laying on of hands, resurrection, judgment, etc... (Hebrews 6:1-2). And there are supposedly "controversial" issues that are also completely clear from the Word of God (like homosexuality is definitely a sin, abortion is murder, etc...). We should have no problem with preaching things that are clear from the Word of God.

But the problem that I have is with preaching something as an absolute that cannot be confirmed as undeniable truth. Many churches have historically made doctrine out of speculation and assumption. Even in areas of discernment, it is typical to find two individuals that disagree.

There are some things that are not elaborated upon in the Word of God. For instance, other than speaking in other tongues (and the subsequent preaching by Peter), what else did the believers on the day of Pentecost do? We really don't know. Modern charismatics often preach that they walked around like drunks (being "drunk in the Spirit" they often call it). However, the book of Acts states that they were accused of having too much wine because they were speaking with other tongues (Acts 2:6-13). Did they sing? Did they lift their hands? Did they kneel in prayer? Did they jump up and down? My point is that the Word of God did not specify many of the actions that day. Why? Perhaps it wasn't really that important. Perhaps it was so that we would not put our eyes on any sort of manifestation. Or perhaps we are not supposed to make a doctrine by resorting to such speculation.

There are things that are ultimately clear from the Word of God. These things are BEYOND any sort of reasonable debate. Such sound doctrine can be preached -- even if there are still individuals that disagree. Why? Because they are based solely on what is written in the Word of God. Yet I do believe that we should be able to discuss even debatable issues. We can even arrive at our own personal conclusions. We can even share those things when we teach. But should an individual preach such things as fact? I do believe that we should state speculation (and even refutable "discernment") as such.

There are doctrines that define certain denominations. For instance, some churches are distinguished because they embrace the principles of Calvinism (or "eternal security," or "once saved/always saved"). When I am questioned by some fellow believers about this issue, I typically tell them, "Who cares?" I know that I have given my heart to the Lord, I fellowship with Him daily, and my heart will always long for Him. The highlight of my life is to spend time with God. But it is also evident to me from the Word that people who are living in sin will not inherit the Kingdom of God. Even many of the most devout Calvinists will state that if you are living in sin, then "you weren't really saved in the first place." I truly question whether or not such a doctrine -- even if you truly believe it -- should be taught in the first place? Again, it is pure speculation. Yet many churches have formed doctrine out of this sort of speculation.

The same can be said of many other beliefs. There are churches that are split because an individual believes that they perceive some great "truth" from the Word of God, and then they create a church that makes such formed doctrine esse...
ntial to the church teaching. I know of a Church that was split over the concept of tithing. A lay minister stated his doubt about the concept, and left the church over it. He stated that he was tired of being judged because he didn't believe in the concept. So he formed a church that met in the streets. And you know what? It grew to nearly a fifty members. But two years later, that church split because of another "doctrinal" conflict.

I truly believe that we should be careful about making absolutes (in an establishment of doctrine and customary practice sense) out of issues that are not necessarily absolute. Such issues have historically served to divide the Body of Christ. Personally, I feel comfortable attending many churches -- even some of those where I do not fully embrace their doctrinal I stands. I feel the liberty to ever-so-often attend a Calvary Chapel, Assembly of God, Baptist, Presbyterian, Christian Missionary Alliance or even non-denominational home meetings, etc... The small church that I now attend is non-denominational. While it preaches the undeniable doctrines of the Church -- it tends to avoid issues that are not so firmly established by the Word of God. While the pastor or teachers may share something that is speculation -- they treat it as such. I know some individuals that believe in "once saved/always saved" and those who do not. I know some who believe that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, and some who do not believe it. And there are individuals that believe in tithing to the Church, tithing to the pastor, or not being confined to a tithe at all. But you know what, we are all believers.

This is one of the wonderful things about the SermonIndex community. We all come from a variety of denominational backgrounds -- but we all have a hunger to know Christ, see Him magnified in our lives and in the lives of the Church, and to see this world come to truly know Him. While we don't all agree on a lot of issues (thus, the disagreements in the forums), we mostly all agree on what is important. The things that are important (and clear) can be "shouted from the rooftops." The things that are not clear are discussed between fellow believers. Most of the conflict arrives when someone wants to "shout from the rooftops" something that isn't clearly a doctrinal fact.

:-)

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/4 14:58

chris,

First, brother, I am not dividing myself from you. We have a discussion area here so that we can debate and search for truth. I don't separate myself from brothers and sister that disagree with me on tongues, Bible versions, and the like. However, I am looking for the truth in every doctrine. If God put it in the Bible, I want to know about it.

I don't think that disagreeing about biblical topics is division. I think we mistake when we give up the debate just because we disagree. When we start name calling, we've gone too far. Otherwise, let us continue to sharpen swords.

Ravenhill did bring up doctrinal issues. He made comments about how the dispensationalists forgot about Hebrews 11. He commented how tongues was NOT the initial baptism of the Holy Ghost. Spurgeon preached Calvanism from his pulpit, but asked God to "elect some more." Wesley and Whitefield debated by letter over freewill, but were longstanding friends.

Yes, I really am saved. Yes, I pray for revival. Yes, I witness to the lost. But that does not mean I cannot search for doctrinal truth. I am looking to be proven wrong if I am. Do I want to be proven wrong by a brother in conversation, or after speaking to a group?

If I have been unkind, please correct me. But the Scriptures were inspired "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." I have disagreed with people and then months later started to reconsider. I am not foolish enough to believe I am correct about all doctrine. But unless I talk about it with my brothers, how will I know if my understanding is correct. I want to make sure I am enduring sound doctrine. This is one reason I like to get outside the walls of my church to discuss doctrine. I want to make sure I have not fallen into this category:

"For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears"

All this being said, if Hades is mythological, and I ask this to find the truth, how did John see him in the book of Revelation:

Rev 6:8 "And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was (Thanatos), and (Hades) followed wit
Rev 20:14 "And (Thanatos) and (Hades) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second (Thanatos)."

As far as the canonization of Enoch, canon is not decided by who wrote the book. If Moses wrote a book about Israel, it is not automatically canon. If John wrote about the laying on of hands or something, that does not bring it immediately into place as a 67th book. Canon is decided by God. Each book is placed by God for "doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." But just because a book is not canon does not make it garbage, either.

I go back to the topic by stating that it seems clear from Psalms 16, Acts 2 (with reference to Revelation) that Jesus' soul did enter hell.

Reidhead seemed to be pretty open about this topic on "10 Shekels and a Shirt." I don't think he is in error for doing so.

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/4/4 18:20**

Let's get busy, how are you? I want to share with you my understanding of the verse that you quoted concerning Christ entering Hell. Let me know what you think, alright? First,  

--- Quoted Text ---

I go back to the topic by stating that it seems clear from Psalms 16, Acts 2 (with reference to Revelation) that Jesus' soul did enter hell.  

--- Quoted Text ---

And again the specific verse, from Acts...

--- Quoted Text ---

Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

--- Quoted Text ---

Alright. Let's look again at the context. Peter is preaching to the Jews and is setting forth Christ. And at this point he is setting forth a **particular** part of Christ's work, the *resurrection*, see also verse 24 prior to this.

He points them to David's ministry as a prophet and the revelation God had given him concerning the resurrection from the dead. The force of Peter's application of this verse to Christ is found in verse 29.

--- Quoted Text ---

Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.

--- Quoted Text ---

His point being then that these words in verse 27 could not have been speaking of David himself, because David's body was still in his sepulchre, it *saw corruption*. Verses 30-32 go on to say this specifically.

So, I think the doctrine that Peter is setting forth by applying Psalm 16:10 is the resurrection from the dead. In doing so he is saying that Christ was raised from the dead according to the scriptures. In verse 31, when we read of His soul not being left in Hell, musn't we understand this in connection with the rest of this verse, that His body did not see corruption. It did not stay in the grave!

While it may (I do not know) have been true of the patriarchs and David (and other believers), that their souls went to a holding place after death, I do not think this verse is teaching the same about Christ, but rather is emphasizing that He was raised from the dead (did not see corruption).

Consider this from Isaiah 53:10
General Topics :: Did Jesus go to Hell when he died?

I believe this was wholly accomplished before and up to the Lord's death, or during His passion as we call it. The idea that Christ was in Hell (or a holding place) or anywhere else other than Paradise, seems to imply that His work of Atonement was not complete at His death, however I do understand that this being in Hell may be understood by some as having some other purpose besides suffering, such as retrieving the keys of death (this seems more like a metaphor for authority over death however). And remember Christ said

So, to reiterate I beleive that Peter's application of verse 29 is to establish the teaching of the resurrection of Christ from the scripture.

I also found this from Wesly's explanatory notes on Acts 2: 27

Let me know what you all think.

Re:, on: 2006/4/4 18:38
Brothers, I may not agree with Kent Hovind's interpretation ... but one thing that shows through in this ... is if He did go there, if He did as the Apostle's Creed says, which I 'think' they may have gotten that from Eph 4:9 "(Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?)" ... I don't know ... the main thing is He Asc ended as the Victor.

Will those who say the Apostles Creed be in trouble with God if they don't see this thread? Ha. Nooo. But I think what is important here, is that we understand each other as persons, while we still can and see how we come across to the other.

Chris, I said your posts "intimidate me" ... but not because there's something in them that sounds legalistic or hard or anything like 'mine' - HA - but your style is like, a polished put down. You talk down to us. I'm sorry ... I do it too maybe more blatantly, but you do it in such a way, that a moderator could never say "Hey, don't do that". Ha.

Iron sharpens Iron, and I've found, HE uses the best of friends to do that with, because the other knows there is love behind it.

Not too many folks intimidate me. I find a sense of humor helps with those who really pounce on me, but with your repli es, I wonder who are you talking to? As if me or the other person doesn't already know the things you are saying ... as I said, a sort of 'talking down' or just talking without the personal in it.

Well, I mean no harm, believe that or not, but it's just that instead of getting heart to heart discussions anymore, I just see more dissertations and well ... I feel left out of your reply, even though it's addressed to me. And I only bring it up again, because you hadn't addressed it in your reply. Feel free to slam me one if you feel that's what's due.

Anyhow ... I wanted to offer you both a very good book, since you both are in Graduate School. Ain't about Hell though. Ha. Just about speech. Hope it becomes helpful. I think you may find it is. http://www.professionalserve.com/doublespeak/diapraxC.htm

Love and stuff.
TTYL
Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/4 20:53

ChrisJD,

Let me make sure I am reading you correctly. You are saying then that the words Sheol and Hades are speaking of the grave in OT and NT. If this is the case, what is the difference in Thanatos and Hades:

1 Cor 15:55 "O (thanatos), where is thy sting? O (hades), where is thy victory?"

Rev 6:8 "And I looked, and behold a pale horse: and his name that sat on him was (Thanatos), and (Hades) followed with him."

I would assume that you would say the following:

thanatos=death

hades=grave

If hades means grave, how do you apply the following:

Luke 16:23 "And in (hades) he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/4 22:20

Quote:

ccchhmmnliissss wrote:
Hi MeAgain...

I do believe in discernment and apologetics. And I do believe that there are individuals that are gifted as such and thus better equipped for such tasks. And of course, I also believe that there are absolutes. Even this issue has an absolute answer -- either Christ went to Hell when he died or he did not. But does any of us know with absolute certainty the truth about this issue? If not, then why do we preach it as such?

Can I get another Amen!! :P

Re:, on: 2006/4/4 23:06

man 9 pages on this question geeze who cares i know where he is now

aj

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/5 1:41

Quote:

-------------------------

prayerbone wrote:
man 9 pages on this question geeze who cares i know where he is now
aj
-------------------------

I totally understand were you coming from and just for this exact reason is why I have dropped out of my Bible Study group, they wanted to do this I mean they would even do this on just one word in a scripture not a whole scripture rather than move on and just worship the King.
When I left I said this is not a Bible study this is a Bible debate group, you would be surprised how many have called me to tell me they wished I would come back and I was right about the group and that they did get a little carried away.

Someone said it in an earlier post on this thread that for some reason we as Christians feel like we need closure on every scripture and personally I feel there are some that only God can offer you closure on.

I love a good debate but I refuse to debate my Fathers word until it gets so blown out of proportion you wonder if your debating the Word or the New York Times. :P

**Re:, on: 2006/4/5 10:56**
well i wrote that slightly moody im afraid...i was watchin a movie and quickly posted that..it was about the rwanda war in the 90s..through out the film it had captions about the war..like day three 30,00 dead, man what people do to people.. by day 100 nearly 1 million people slaughterd just so shocking ..like wowee when we post something somone at that very time is being killed somewhere was sobering...

andy

**Re: - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/4/5 18:13**
Hi Letsgetbusy, hope you are doing well. First, thanks for setting those different terms(thanatos and hades) out like that. It was helpfull.

Quote:
-------------------------------Let me make sure I am reading you correctly. You are saying then that the words Sheol and Hades are speaking of the grave in OT and NT. If this is the case, what is the difference in Thanatos and Hades:
-------------------------------

No, I think I see your point, but I wasn't trying to deal with the terms at all. I don't think we have to in this case, becuase Peter is teaching that this verse establishes the doctrine of the resurrection in scripture, not so much that it teaches anything specific about the nature of death or hades. I hope that make sense.

Maybe it was the case that everyone else that died before Christ went to hades and their bodies decayed, but I think this case is different becuase our Lord is here destroying the power of death through His sinless sacrifice and resurrection.

It might seem like I am trying to avoid the issue of the definition of these terms, but I am not. I just believe they are a non-issue here. In other words, what I understand that this verse is teaching is that whatever or wherever hades is, Christ did not go there, no, His body did not even decay, becuase God raised Him from the dead.

Maybe if I pull up that quote from Wesley on this again it will be helpfull to our understanding too...

Quote:
-------------------------------Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades - The invisible world. But it does not appear, that ever our Lord went into hell. His soul, when it was separated from the body, did not go thither, but to paradise, Luk_23:43. The meaning is, Thou wilt not leave my soul in its separate state, nor suffer my body to be corrupted.
-------------------------------

Let me know if this helps to clarify or not.

Peace be with you.
Hi let's get busy and MeAgain...

I apologize if it seemed like my words were directed at you (or anyone in particular). That was definitely NOT my intent. Nor do I attempt to "talk down" to anyone with my posts. If it seems that way, I hope that you know that it has never been my intent.

For clarity: I do not believe that any sort of Biblical discussion is wrong -- even if two or more parties disagree (unless of course, it turns into something ugly). Such debates can indeed be healthy and can serve to encourage us to search the Scriptures for the truth of a matter. As believers, we can discuss a lot of controversial issues -- even if this may lead to debate or disagreement. This is a wonderful right as long as we are not trying to pass judgment about the spiritual condition on of those that do not accept our own persuasion or speculation as fact (concerning issues that are not completely clear from the Word).

However, my point from the beginning concerns whether or not we (or more precisely, local churches) should even take firm positions on doctrine that is really mere speculation. It is this type of "doctrinal division" that often separates rather than unites true believers. And when an individual is convinced about a matter (that is still mere speculation), they often feel inclined to defend their belief with great tenacity. How often are feelings hurt in the S1 forums when one brother or sister is "chastised" by another brother or sister that knows that they're "right" (but in reality, they are simply convinced)?

The fact remains that many denominations were formed because of such differences in doctrinal persuasion. But what if we did not feel the need to "push" such speculative issues upon one another? Granted, there are doctrines that are harmful and need to be addressed. But many of those doctrines themselves began out of such discussions concerning an individual's or group's speculation (or persuasion) over a particular issue that is not completely clear from the Word of God.

Did Jesus go to Hell when he died? This is a great topic for discussion among believers. The only danger is when someone begins to state as doctrinal fact what is merely speculation. This danger is not limited to this topic. It covers all manners of conversations in the Body of Christ. Too often, people forget to mention that they are persuaded or convinced about an issue. Instead, they mention it as a fact that cannot be ignored by others. They rely on their own understanding, their spiritual and Scriptural education and their ability to hear (or discern) from God about what they are convinced of.

The problem is that there are often many others that use the same criteria that arrive at a separate opinion.

Please don't confuse what I am saying with a disbelief in absolutes. The Word is truth. In fact, it is the only undeniable and indisputable truth we have. But the fact remains that many people see the Word through different sets of eyes. We are all at different areas of spiritual growth and understanding. I say this from firsthand experience. There have been things that I actually shared with others as fact in the past, that I am now convinced was simply my own persuasion based upon what I was taught or learned through personal study. At times (as a younger believer), I even questioned in my heart the spiritual condition of some that didn't agree with me. I have repented and prayed that the Lord would remove such suspicion and pride from my heart.

I simply believe now that we should be slow to speak about matters that are not clearly established by the Word of God. Should a belief that "Jesus went to Hell" be preached as a fact from the rooftops? Or should it simply be discussed among brothers as an issue in which we should, through prayer and study, draw our own conclusions? In some churches, if you do not accept the status quo doctrine of the Church (including the most peculiar practices and customs), then you can be ostracized or even disfellowshipped. I have met individuals kicked out of some churches for simply not agreeing with "holy laughter" or being perpetually "drunk in the Spirit."

I am a very non-confrontational guy (usually). But I have actually been confronted by church leaders that didn't like the fact that I did not simply accept their teachings as undeniably sound.

For instance, I personally believe in tithing. I do my best to cheerfully give my tithes and offerings to the Lord. I don't judge those who do not, and I am not totally convinced that the Lord even requires a tenth. But I also give it secretly. I do not write it on an envelope for tax or legal purposes. I don't want anyone to know what I give, when I give, or how often I give. I usually drop it into the top of our church safe. One day, a former pastor confronted me about my "giving." He said that he looked at the contribution roll sheet in order to determine who was giving -- and who was not. He said that he did this to determine whether those who give the most get blessed the most (he had recently attended a Kenneth Hagin/Kenneth Copeland/Jesse Duplantis seminar in Tulsa). He noticed that my name seldom appeared on this roll (in fact, it
only appeared when I forgot to bring cash and had to write a check). Very nicely, I told him that it really wasn't anyone's business whether or not I gave to the Lord, and that the matter was simply between myself and the Lord. This was so foreign to him that he almost became enraged. He accused me of trying to be "more spiritual" than himself. I honestly and wholeheartedly apologized to him if he perceived it in that way, but I was going to simply continue giving the way that I felt was the best from my understanding of the Word of God. The very next Sunday, he asked the Church to hold their tithe and offering over our heads. He asked everyone to look around and see what we were all giving. He then asked, "Are you embarrassed of what you are giving to the Lord?" (He learned this at the seminar). I simply didn't hold up anything. I also noticed alot of embarrassment on the faces of many people -- including those who were giving "alot." But I felt content because it really didn't matter to me.

My point is that there are so many churches that try to enforce their own peculiar or particular doctrinal beliefs upon a congregation. And sometimes, this drifts to our own personal relationships. Sometimes we are completely convinced on certain issues. But often, there is alot of room for debate about such issues. However, some churches (or individuals) are willing to disfellowship with other believers (or dismiss their brotherly love and trust) over some of the most peculiar doctrinal issues. Some churches will throw you out for forgetting to cover your head. Some churches will throw you out for not tithing. Some churches will throw you out for drinking a cup of wine. Some churches will throw you out for speaking in tongues. Some churches will throw you out for not speaking in tongues. Some churches will throw you out for wearing pants or jeans. Some churches will throw you out for not using the KJV. Some churches will even throw you out for a cutely being physically sick (lack of prosperity, they said). And of course, this list could go on and on. We probably all have experienced this, or know of others that have experienced such ostracization due to doctrinal disagreement.

My question is this: Should ANY Church (or individual) be forcing such doctrinal persuasions and speculative positions on the rest of their congregations (or fellow believers)? I suppose that is really the heart of what I am trying to say. Remember, there is still reason to heal on the Sabbath.

:-)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/6 10:24

Quote:

ccchhhrrriiisss wrote:
For instance, I personally believe in tithing. I do my best to cheerfully give my tithes and offerings to the Lord. :-)

To the Lord? would that mean to the Church? because the word says when you give to the least of me that you have given to me. My personal belief is if I give to anyone that is in need that I am giving to the Lord that is my form of tithing, because the tithe belongs to the Lord and I don't think the Church is the Lord. :-)

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiisss (), on: 2006/4/6 12:47

Hi MrBillPro...

Quote:

To the Lord? would that mean to the Church? because the word says when you give to the least of me that you have given to me. My personal belief is if I give to anyone that is in need that I am giving to the Lord that is my form of tithing, because the tithe belongs to the Lord and I don't think the Church is the Lord.

You make a great point. And this is a great example of the idea that I am trying to convey. I have often wrestled with the concept of Biblical tithing -- including whether or not we are still required to give a tenth at all. Currently, I feel impressed to give my tithe to the Lord, through the local church "storehouse" where I currently fellowship with believers. This way, I leave the choice of distribution to the individuals that are appointed to see "over this business" of serving tables (Acts 6:1-7). I am not limited to the tithe, however. The Church that I attend is quite small. During some months, the need is greater than another. Thus, many of us feel impressed to give more during those months. Typically, I also try to give to overseas evangelists and pastors that I know are faithfully serving the Lord there. And I also work with the poor in my community. Right now, I do not have alot. But I have seen the Lord increase the little that I have given in order to meet a lot of need.

However, I am not convinced about the issue of tithing enough to actually be "immovable" in it. I have never heard the Lord speak to me about this issue -- even after much prayer. And I have heard alot of great arguments from believers tha
t stand on the other side of this issue. Thus, I would not feel comfortable preaching my belief to others as a doctrinal fac
t. I feel liberty to share my opinions and speculations about this concept with others. But it is not firmly established in m
y heart enough to “shout it from the rooftops.” Nor do I judge any other views with even the least bit of suspicion.

Should a church preach such a concept that is not clearly established by the Word of God? Should such a church force
this issue on their “members?” Should individual believers attempt to “force” such speculative beliefs on others? It is m
y opinion that, in order for a doctrine to be impressed upon others, it needs to be completely and clearly established by t
he Word.

:-)

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/6 14:57
I just looked up store house in my strongs exhaustive concordance with greek and hebrew dictionaries and store house
means “Owtsar” Armory, Cellar, Garner, or Store, but no word about a Church, were is a scripture I can go to that say's
The Church is also the Store House?
Thanks Bill

Re: - posted by ccchhhrrriiiss (), on: 2006/4/6 17:43
Hi MrBillPro...

Again, this is a valid point. I'm not certain about how the word “storehouse” should be translated. Here is a
(http://www.blueletterbible.org/tmp_dir/words/2/1144358718-3587.html) link about the origins of the word.

However, the question remains whether such a doctrine of mandatory tithing should be preached to people -- when the
doctrine itself is still quite questionable. While it is a good thing to discuss the issue, one might question whether this sh
ould be a requirement at local churches? If not, then why should we also preach so many other questionable doctrines
as if they are fact?

:-)

Re: church being the storehouse - posted by jubilee, on: 2006/4/7 0:12
Hello my name is Jubilee and I just happened in on your discussion and wanted to share a thought that has been studie
d a lot by me. I believe that the new testament church is not required to give a 10% tithe but a 100% tithe. The word say
s that we are not our own, but we are bought with a price and that we should no longer live unto ourselfe. We are serva
nts of the Lord and therefore the only thing we are required to do is to get up each morning and ask God what He would
have us to do with all that He has entrusted to us. I believe in giving a minimum of 10% but to be fully aware that nothing
we possesses is our own but a trust that we are to be stewards over for God's purposes. We give our lives and substance
to Him to do with as He chooses. This is the place of safety where He meets our every needs. If I give my all to Him He
gives His all to me. I am secure in His moment by moment provision. Just a thought to ponder :-) The early church had a
ll things in common and didn't count anything they possessed as their own.

Jubilee  :-D

Re: - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2006/4/7 23:00

Brothers,

Could we stick to the topic? No, I would not shun or kick you out because you disagree with me about whether or not Je
sus went to hell. I will put this back out there and if no one answers I will leave it alone.

If you believe that Acts 2:31 is speaking of the grave with the word Hades here:

"He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corru
ption."

...then how do you reconcile that the rich man was "in torments" when in Hades in Luke 16:23:

"And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom."
Both verses use the word Hades, and both are written by Luke.

I am not asking for your overall stance on whether or not Jesus went to hell or not, I am asking for an explanation of what Hades means, and it's usage in the two verses. If Hades is "the grave," then what are the torments that the rich man is experiencing in "the grave?"

---

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2006/4/7 23:50

Quote:
-------------------------
letsgetbusy wrote:
Brothers, 
Could we stick to the topic?
-------------------------

What if we said no? :-P