

ETERNAL SECURITY (51)

totally committed to God and His Word. Furthermore, if the teaching that you may lose your salvation is designed to prevent one from falling into sin, how do we explain that two of the greatest proponents of this false belief system in our age have fallen into such terrible sin that the entire world laughs at them - Jimmy Swaggart and Jim Bakker. Obviously their Arminian doctrine did not prevent them from sin. Certainly their sin would be at a level that would require one to lose his salvation, for in both cases their sin disgraced God on a national and international level. What we learn from this is that believer you can lose your salvation does not prevent one from sinning, it only promotes false doctrine.

QUESTION #14 – What are the passages that the Arminian says proves you can lose your salvation?

We begin this important section with a quote from Lewis Sperry Chafer:

“Of all the contentions offered by Arminians, their appeal to the Scriptures is that feature most worthy of candid consideration; for it will be admitted by all who attempt to expound the Word of God that there are several passages, which, when taken in what appears on the surface to be their meaning, do seem to imply that one once saved might be lost again. The challenge is one respecting exact meaning of the portions of Scripture involved and how in the Divine mind, since the Word of God cannot contradict itself, they are to be harmonized with a much greater array of Scripture testimony – a body of truth which Arminians seldom essay to discuss – which permit of no varied interpretations and which dogmatically assert the eternal security of the true child of God. The challenge is also how these supposed insecurity passages may be made to harmonize with the truth of the believer’s position both in the elective purpose of God, as an object of sovereign grace, and in the body of Christ with all that that membership secures. It will be seen also, that there is no strain placed upon those Scriptures, when so interpreted that they harmonize with the passages which declare the safekeeping of Christians. Over against this, the passages asserting security, along with the demands of the doctrine of sovereign election and sovereign grace, can be interpreted in but one way, unless great violence is done to them by the taking from or adding to them of mere human opinions. That Arminians do not discuss them is a significant fact in itself” (Vol. 3, pp. 290-291).

Dr. Chafer makes some very valid points regarding the Arminians’ appeal to Scripture:

- 1) They neglect the context .
- 2) They fail to attempt to interpret the passage in which the verse actually sits.
- 3) They fail to harmonize their pet passages with other passages that contradict their position.
- 4) They totally neglect the Biblical doctrines of Divine Election and Divine Grace.
- 5) They do not consider the matter of Divine Sovereignty.

One cannot disregard these critical matters of interpretation and expect to come to a true interpretation.

ETERNAL SECURITY (52)

Arminians tend to pull a few verses out of the Bible without attempting to harmonize those same verses with their immediate context or the rest of the Bible with its doctrines and theology. To sum up the main point, generally speaking, **the Arminian fails to study to rightly divide the Word of Truth.**

It will be immediately admitted that there are a couple of very difficult passages that upon surface reading have presented some difficulty to Bible interpreters. However, it must also be admitted that whenever one does come across one of these rare passage, one must always attempt to interpret it in light of many clear teachings and plain passages which deal with the theme in question. It is **never** right to interpret clear and plain passages in light of one or two obscure passages. It is **always** right to interpret obscure passages by several clear and plain passages.

Direct, clear revelation is always the basis of interpretation for seemingly difficult passages. In any form of study, one always moves from the simple to the complex, not the reverse.

In most instances, the context will clear up the supposed problem. But in situations where there appears to still be some difficulty, one must always begin with the plain teachings of other passages and the majority of teachings of key doctrines to help determine true meaning.

There are some major interpretive errors that Arminians, as we shall show, tend to make in their handling of the Word of God. For example, Arminians tend to totally overlook the dispensational setting of a passage. They also tend to fail to distinguish between passages that are dealing with false teachers. They fail to draw a distinction between the profession of salvation and the possession of salvation. They fail to distinguish between passages that pertain to fellowship as opposed to salvation. They also fail to distinguish between passages that refer to a believer's rewards rather than to his salvation. As Chafer says, "Failure to rightly divide the Word of Truth is the root of doctrinal evil" (Vol. 3, p. 292).

In order to systematize this section, we will examine the Arminian passages under two key interpretive headings:

- 1) Passages which are misinterpreted dispensationally.
- 2) Passages which are misinterpreted contextually.

Interpretive Heading #1 - Passages of Scripture which are misinterpreted dispensationally.

There are certain passages that an Arminian claims will substantiate his belief that one can lose his salvation, which **do not even remotely refer to New Testament, Grace Age salvation, but refer to a completely different dispensation.** These passages are often thrown out as those that prove you may lose your salvation, which actually have nothing to do with N.T. salvation.