

Chapter 1 : Ligon Duncan on the Fathers « The o Æ philo gue

A Response to Al Mohler, Ligon Duncan, and T4G "You just got a shout out from Al Mohler at T4G." A friend posted the notice on my Facebook wall while I was at work, and as I could not immediately access the Together for the Gospel (T4G) live video feed, my mind raced until my next short break.

What might Mohler have said? I have a tremendous amount of respect for Mohler, and the thought that he might have mentioned me in a positive light excited me. Sadly, I had been naive. And his comments were not at all positive, but were instead derisive and even mocking. With his brief words, he had misrepresented the conference, the ministry, and the broader conditionalist movement. I believe that he should know better. I tried to contact Mohler, asking if he would be willing to discuss his comments with me, but I have not yet heard back from him. So, in this article I shall respond to his comments and those of his co-panelist Ligon Duncan. If you like, you can hear them in this video before reading on: Mohler and Duncan discussed our conference and the conditionalist movement in their broader discussion about theological liberalism. He declined, but we ended up hearing from highly-regarded conservative speakers including Craig Evans and Gregg Allison. Mohler should also know, better than anybody, the second principle we employ, namely, that it is possible for tradition to have interpreted the Bible wrongly. We are not questioning Godâ€™Mohler is way too generous to his own position thereâ€™we are questioning fallible men, as fallible people ourselves. I told my story of becoming convinced of the view, a journey that began in earnest when I first interviewed Edward Fudge, author of *The Fire That Consumes*, on my personal podcast. What I wanted, and what I want to this day, is exegesis. I want to know what the Bible says. I think we need to accept whatever Scripture says, whichever side of this debate it supports. My commitment to the authority of Scripture, and to letting it dictate my convictions about hell, is shared by a great many in the conditionalist movement, including those whose emotions are most aroused by the traditional viewâ€™and Mohler knows it. Despite his experience with me and his familiarity with Stott and Fudge, at T4G Mohler nevertheless chose to characterize the conditionalist movement, and the Rethinking Hell Conference, as emotionally driven. It would be wrong of you to do that. I am now standing in moral judgment over your action if you do that, God. Had they been there, they would have heard plenary speaker Preston Sprinkle express both his comfort, on the one hand, with whatever the Bible says God will do to the unsaved in hell, and his conviction in recent years, on the other hand, that biblical authors teach annihilationism with unanimity and virtual unambiguity. One of his closing slides captures the basis for that conviction: So two of the plenary speakers Sprinkle and I at the conference Mohler charged with being motivated by sentiment and embarrassment of the doctrine of eternal torment, and two well-known conditionalists Stott and Fudge with whom Mohler is publicly familiar, all affirm and exhibit a commitment to biblical authority. I think a stronger focus on exegesis would have been more compelling rather than a continued appeal to traditional church teaching. Hell and the Atoning Work of Christ. It is ironic that Mohler cited this text in implying that we conditionalists are like the serpent, denying the truthfulness of Scripture. I do not think I am any more committed to the authority of Scripture than Mohler. Image already added Liked it? Take a second to support Rethinking Hell on Patreon! Should Christians rethink Hell? Nigel Cameron Paternoster, , Packer Is Still Wrong: Readings in Evangelical Conditionalism, eds. Anderson Cascade, , Modern Scholarship Reinvents Eternal Punishment, eds. Peterson Zondervan, , Peterson Zondervan, , 88; Christopher W. Will the Unserved Be Punished Forever? Peterson, Two Views of Hell: No Eternal Life in Hell?

Chapter 2 : Orthodox Presbyterian Church

The Lord's Day Evening November 18, "A Christian Response to the Elections" Romans The Reverend Dr. J. Ligon Duncan III One of my interns pointed out to me that four of the sermons in the Romans series had, for one reason or another, not been recorded, so we had an entire series of messages covering from Romans 1 all the way to Romans 16, but we were missing four of them.

It is a discomfoting and disheartening time for the reformed community. Many Christian leaders I respect and listen to are divided on the issue that was raised at this conference: Following right on the heels of the controversial MLK50 was one of the largest Christian conferences in America. It was clear the organizers had an agenda. The agenda was to push their understanding of the issue of ethnic reconciliation in the church. Matt Chandler, David Platt, and Ligon Duncan all addressed the issue of ethnic relationships within the church, and I am very troubled by what I saw from some of the famous faces of the Christian Church. I mean that, it is wonderful. It is an excellent sermon. However, he did make an application in the sermon related to ethnic reconciliation, which is when the wheels fell off. Let me be clear: Ligon Duncan is a wonderful man of God, an excellent preacher, and a brother in Christ. I recommend him and have no ill will toward him. But, this sermon application which has gone viral is unhelpful to this controversial, national conversation. He utilized political rhetorical techniques which only served to confuse the point rather than move the conversation forward. Many may be doing that; I am not. When I say he is being political, I am not saying he addressed an issue that should not be addressed. Matt Chandler made an excellent point at the conference when he mentioned that once after preaching a sermon on abortion, that sermon went viral, and everyone loved it. I am not decrying political topics being preached and addressed from the pulpit, for I do not even think that is possible. Pastors can preach topics that some may consider political because it is impossible to avoid this. One cannot avoid being political in that sense. Douglas Wilson made this point in his book *Empires of Dirt*. If a minister preached against them a thousand years ago, he was preaching against moral failings, and he was not being political. He was being public, but not political. When I do it, I am preaching against moral failings too, but I am also being political. Rather, it was the nature of the idol being challenged-and this idol aspires to omnipresence. We are told ad nauseam to keep our morality out of politics. It would be more appropriate to tell the idolmongers to keep their politics out of morality. Public morality need not be a matter of the legislator. But if the legislature concerns itself with everything, then any faithful Christian expression will immediately be concerned with the political. What I am criticizing is the use of politically rhetorical techniques to distort and manipulate a message. I believe Ligon Duncan did this whether incidental or purposeful. His critique is scathing and difficult to argue with. However, I believe it needs an amendment. Orwell has a section on meaningless words. He describes how words are used ambiguously or with a private definition so often that they lose meaning altogether. This is, in effect, what Ligon Duncan does with this entire sermon application. Specifically, with the second commandment itself. That is, the person who uses them has his own private definition, but allows his hearer to think he means something quite different. Duncan of participating in: Are there large populations of people who deny the existence of the scientific enterprise? Are there large religious groups that think it sinful or immoral to study earth scientifically? What even is science? Apparently, asking the federal government to criminalize, rather than subsidize, tearing apart a baby limb from limb means one actually wants to see all women imprisoned and stripped of their rights. These have all lost their meaning because of this political manipulation game, and this is exactly what Ligon Duncan did. By way of a side, note how artificially placed this application is. Keep in mind, this sermon is not about race relations at all. Of all the applications he could have gone to, why this one? Then, of all of the wonderful things he said in this sermon, why did T4G showcase this portion? Anyway, to get back on track, there is no doubt that it is true that holding slaves and treating them as so many Americans did is absolutely a violation of the second commandment. But that is not the issue. The wheels fell off when Duncan began to speak politically, and he does this when he describes how these reformed Christians got away with refusing to apply the second commandment of our Lord. There were church splits over this issue. It seems plenty were willing

to talk about it and fight over it. Contextually, it is the reformed Christians of the 19th century. Contextually, it is the owning of slaves and the racism which comes with it. Clearly it is any Christian listening. Duncan is addressing us, his modern audience. Duncan changed his topic. He is no longer addressing slavery, but the current racial debate surrounding these conferences. The fallacy of equivocation is defined as: A key term or phrase in an argument is used in an ambiguous way, with one meaning in one portion of the argument and then another meaning in another portion of the argument. Duncan just shifted definitions in one sentence. He conflated the issue of chattel slavery with all of the racial issues reformed Christians today disagree with him on. Apparently, to disagree with him, Platt, Chandler, Anyabwile, and the rest of the T4G speakers who addressed this topic at all, merits being likened to slave-owners—kind of like how disagreeing with an abortion glutton will get you likened to a person who disagrees with women having rights. Through subtle equivocation, Duncan changed definitions, and rather than being clear, and specifically explaining what the issues today are, and where those who dissent from him are wrong, he phrased his sermon in such a way as to make anyone who disagrees with him, or T4G at all, equal to a 19th century slave owner. His language is sloppy and irresponsible because it is ambiguous and manipulative. The issue today is not about the morality of slave owning or racism. Of course that is a clear violation of the second commandment. No one is getting antsy applying the second commandment to slavery and kidnapping, and he knows that. The issues being debated today are the severity of racism within the Christian church, and methodology of addressing it. This is the dadgum second commandment. And this is exactly why I say Dr. Duncan is guilty of equivocation; this is his tacit admission of my above point that the debate today is about the methodology of approaching ethnic reconciliation, not racism itself. Yes, believing that chattel slavery and the kidnapping of African Americans was sinful is not cultural Marxism. Yes, the second commandment does apply directly to that issue. But that issue is not why people are accusing these men of cultural Marxism. What the issue is, and how we respond to it, has nothing whatsoever to do with simply believing in the second commandment or not. This is why his language is thoroughly political. Christians who reject baby-murdering are not getting antsy about giving women their rights. Christians who question man-made climate change and evolution are not anti-science. This language stops the conversation. It convinces all dissenters they are actually racist, when in reality, many of them have very biblical points to be raised which do not contain a lick of racism or antinomianism. But it also gives opportunity to reflect on that twist in our soul that rose up and killed him. They take issue with being told their grandparents are guilty of that crime. And to take issue with this article, written by one of the speakers at T4G, is nothing close to the same situation as 19th century slave-owners not wanting to talk about slavery. Duncan linked them together in a political move to manipulate. But he has missed the real issue, he has missed the point, and he may have done so knowingly. When the MLK50 conference writes a worship song with the following lyrics:

Chapter 3 : Ligon Duncan - racedaydvl.com

The response of our Lord. And yet we find, and this is the last thing I would like to point to you today. We find our Lord's own response to him recorded in the passage in verse 4 and 7 and

Should We Leave Our Churches? Ligon Duncan and Mark R. William Shishko Date posted: The historic Christian faith has maintained that outside of the visible church "there is no ordinary possibility of salvation" Westminster Confession, XXV: Those who are being saved are added to the church Acts 2: Christ promises his presence with his church until the end of the age Matt. We grow to maturity in the context of church life because the very glory of God is pledged to the church "to all generations forever and ever" Eph. In his Institutes of the Christian Religion, John Calvin speaks of the visible church as the "mother of believers" cf. But now, against this biblical and historical background, along comes Mr. Harold Camping, cofounder and president of Family Radio Network, to announce "the end of the church age," both in writing and via his string of radio stations. The readers of his book, *The End of the Church Age. We are not even to pray for them* p. Supposedly, "God has commanded that the believers must depart out of their churches" p. One would think that such a brazen denial of biblical teaching would be universally rejected as poppycock. In obedience to Mr. Talbot, associate professor of philosophy at Wheaton College, have teamed up to produce a brief, but rich, response to Mr. After summarizing his claims, the authors succinctly list the various errors and issues and then offer biblical replies. This provides an excellent primer on the biblical doctrine of the church. It offers individuals and churches material to help inoculate Christians against antichurch mentalities that go well beyond Harold Camping. Harold Camping ought not to be regarded as a Christian, let alone a credible Bible teacher. Churches on every level have called him to repentance for his heretical teachings, but he has not listened. One should read Matthew I urge you to use this book to help deliver people who are under the influence of one who has risen up from "among us.

Chapter 4 : Confessionalism and Pietism: A False Dichotomy? - Reformation21 Blog

Ligon Duncan, Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology at Reformed Theological Seminary in Jackson, Mississippi, has written a paper entitled What About Theonomy! In this short treatise, it is Duncan's contention that theonomy cannot be sustained theologically, historically, or confessionally.

And sure enough, the experimental Calvinists echo Pastorette Osteen. Osteen, perhaps unwittingly does in her misguided exhortation. The very first question of the Westminster Shorter Catechism gets at this. The resounding answer is: That is what we live for. Whereas many of our contemporaries think that God is the chief means to our highest end happiness, the Reformed do not believe that God is a means to an end, he is The End. He is the reason and aspiration for which we exist. There is no ultimate happiness and satisfaction and fulfillment and joy apart from him. We do not believe that those two things are in contradiction. Indeed, we believe that they are inseparable. Christian Hedonism teaches that all true virtue must have in it a certain gladness of heart. Therefore the pursuit of virtue must be in some measure a pursuit of happiness. And the happiness, which makes up an essential part of all virtue, is the enjoyment of the presence and the promotion of the glory of God. Therefore, if we try to deny or mortify or abandon the impulse to pursue this happiness, we set ourselves against the good of man and the glory of God. Rather we should seek to stir up our desire for this delight until it is white hot and insatiable on the earth. And then Piper chimes in with Edwards: Self-love, taken in the most extensive sense, and love to God are not things properly capable of being compared one with another; for they are not opposites or things entirely distinct, but one enters into the nature of the other. Self-love is only a capacity of enjoying or taking delight in anything. Now in the world of Reformed Protestant objections to Lutheranism, it is also striking to see how the funny Lutheran guy thanks to our New Jerusalem correspondent responds to the Osteen comment: In their sermons and books, both Joel and Victoria Osteen give full-throated endorsement to the prosperity gospel, a theology which states that those enduring hardships, poverty, and sickness have only their lack of faith and confidence to blame for their suffering. The first is that it has no basis in the Scriptures and conveniently ignores all of the words that Jesus speaks about the question of suffering, the cost of discipleship, and the blessedness of persecution. The second is that it offers nothing but despair to those who are faithfully enduring the crosses Christ has given them to bear. In other words, the funny Lutheran guy sees here a version of the prosperity gospel. And lo and behold, along comes Mark Jones to confirm the point: I am of the view that powerful preaching, by a minister who labours week-in, week-out, with his flock has a strong correlation to his own godliness. Personally, I rarely listen to preachers under the age of 45” with apologies to my friends who are ministers under 45 you know who you are. In 1 Timothy 4: Persist in this, for by so doing you will save both yourself and your hearers. What a thought, for ministers, that watching ourselves and our teaching has eternal consequences for us and our people. And there you have it” making the world safe for celebrity pastors how else do we explain their success or their joy?

Chapter 5 : Ligon Duncan – Old Life

Reformed Bias Exposed. Is the Doctrine of Imputation Found in The Epistle to Diognetus? NOTE: For the catalyst for this post, see Bryan Cross's post about Ligon Duncan's lecture: Did the Fathers Know the Gospel?, which contains (in the thread) Duncan's response.

Did the Fathers Know the Gospel? Statement of Purpose – The following is an attempt to demonstrate what would have been obvious to me if I were inclined to consciously and aggressively counter my Reformed bias by limiting my interpretation to what is actually within the text. Without such analysis of thought-flow one cannot perform safe exegesis the process by which one pulls meaning out of the text itself, but ever risks her interpretation to that infamous activity known as eisegesis the process by which one reads into the text what she wants to see. It is necessary that the reader have in front of her a copy of this letter in order to truly follow the logic of the exegesis: Greek Texts and English Translations, 3rd ed. Holmes Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, , The Epistle to Diognetus, IX 1. The above interpretation 4 is confirmed by the text itself as the author speaks of the contrast again in just this sense. In other words, it is overwhelmingly likely that the seven phrases which follow this main verb and are explicatory of it are listed in typical parallelism fashion, and therefore mean virtually the same thing. These parallel phrases mentioned above are the following: Likewise verse 4 bears the same idea of necessity as does verse 3. O the sweet exchange O work of God beyond all searching out, O blessings past our expectation Unless we take this last clause completely out of the logical and grammatical range of the context, our author is most naturally understood to be reiterating his main idea as he has been doing since the latter half of verse two –not introducing some brand new idea at the end of the section. The idea of substitution, to be sure, is in the text quite clearly i. Such concepts are simply absent from the text. The language and logic nowhere imply such a reading, much less demand it. The section is sufficiently understood in terms of penal substitution. Thus I conclude that Protestant bias has won the day in the interpretation of this text to the negligence of diagrammatical analysis. My good brothers, if I have been in consequential error in my interpretation due to my own ignorance or blind spots, I have conveniently left you my step-by-step analysis by which you could demonstrate which is the weak link in my exegetical development. Please make use of my numbered propositions for reference if you choose to interact. I welcome all who would wish to correct me on this one condition –show me in which step s my exegesis breaks down, and how it effects my other propositions. Otherwise, I would not be confident you have followed my argument.

Chapter 6 : Ligon Duncan and the Dadgum Second Commandment – Resisting the Winds

The Reverend Dr. J. Ligon Duncan III If you have your Bibles, I'd invite you to turn with me to the gospel of Luke, the twenty-fourth chapter. We have been in the gospel of Luke together since , which is a good argument for coming to Sunday evening worship so you can.

Chapter 7 : Tag: ligon duncan | Rethinking Hell

Lig Duncan says he doesnt groove on cultural marxism. I believe racedaydvl.com is he becoming a theonomist, or maybe just taking a higher view of the law in gener.

Chapter 8 : Bring the Books: Ligon Duncan Responds to the NIV Annoucement

Ligon Duncan (MDiv, Covenant Theological Seminary; PhD, University of Edinburgh) is chancellor and CEO of Reformed Theological Seminary, chairman of the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, and a Council member for The Gospel Coalition.

Chapter 9 : Should We Leave Our Churches?

Ligon Duncan began his application of the commandment to love our neighbors as ourselves by informing his listeners that racial tensions today would not be what they are if reformed Christians in America would have applied this commandment to the institution of slavery in the 19 th century.