
Subject: Eternal Torment Part 2

Posted by [Derick N.](#) on Tue, 20 Nov 2007 20:18:30 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Rather than continue another thread on Eternal Punishment, I thought I would get down to serious theological cases of the issue.

I will start with Duncan's last post in the old thread asking me to reply to certain scriptures which in the minds of some, prove that God enjoys to have His former subjects and citizens of the world tormented forever to satisfy the demands of His Offended Justice.

I will take this one scripture at a time so as not to overburden the faint of heart at the prospect of "bailing the ocean out with a spoon".

Duncan wrote on Tue, 20 November 2007 12:15 Since you keep asking for more scripture (as if one time from the mouth of Jesus isn't enough), the following are a few more "holes in your bucket"...

I never asked for more scriptures, but rather said that any and all scriptures may easily understood to represent the Eternal Punishment as Death rather than Torture.

Duncan wrote on Tue, 20 November 2007 12:15
Jude 7 - "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

This is the context:

"Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire."

Obviously the fire that burned Sodom and Gomorrha is not burning presently, so it can hardly be said to be literally "eternal", can it?

Who is the one spiritualizing scripture now? Is it a spiritual fire that continually burns somewhere in space?

Did they magically land in "hell" after their cities burned? No, they suffered the judgement of fire *in this life* as a judgement for their sin. That would be the *first death* spoken of in scripture.

The fact that you would use a bible search program and copy and paste any occurrence of "eternal fire" and then apply it to the final judgement shows how weak this position is.

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Duncan](#) on Tue, 20 Nov 2007 21:00:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Please enlighten me as to how I am spiritualizing this verse?? You are totally ignoring the word "eternal." Not only are you spiritualizing, you are omitting it as inspired scripture, as well. You are now telling me that even though that's what the verse states, the Bible doesn't really mean "eternal".

Yes, I did use my software to look for the Greek word eternal, but that doesn't change the fact that the word is still there. The use of this word in Jude is the same word Jesus uses for "eternal life." You can't deny or gloss over the fact that this word is used. I am only taking the Bible for what it literally says, over and over again.

I will have to conclude that your human mind (I will include myself in this assumption) has a hard time with the things of God. Fortunately, this is not a doctrinal error that puts your salvation at risk. Like moulder said, neither of us is going to change the other's mind, so let's move on to the next topic.

Duncan

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [william](#) on Tue, 20 Nov 2007 22:27:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'd like to know who doesn't use software in lieu of looking it up in Strong's or Young's?

I also wonder how using software makes the argument "weak"?

Maybe Mr. Rogers will tell us tomorrow!

Can we sing now?

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Derick N.](#) on Tue, 20 Nov 2007 23:54:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Tue, 20 November 2007 16:27 I'd like to know who doesn't use software in lieu of looking it up in Strong's or Young's?

I also wonder how using software makes the argument "weak"?

Maybe Mr. Rogers will tell us tomorrow!

Can we sing now?

This is what this forum is for:

"This section is for serious discussions concerning doctrine"

It is not for following someone around and insulting them. No wonder there are so few posters here.

It is not the use of the software that makes the argument weak, it is the application it was used for. Randomly using Jude7 just because it contains the words "eternal fire", even though it has no pertinent relationship to the debate of the final disposition of the wicked.

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Derick N.](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 00:08:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duncan, I surely believe Jude 7 is inspired as is all other scripture, but it does not teach eternal damnation, but it is taught as an example of God's wrath against sin. It does not say that these people are being tormented in hell for eternity, but rather suffered the vengeance of God's Eternal Righteous Flame of Justice.

The same Flaming Sword which kept Adam and Eve out of Eden fell on the residents of these sinful cities. This same righteous indignation before which all flesh withers and dies fell upon them.

You can say you don't want to talk about it anymore, and Moulder can insult me as he likes, but it doesn't change the fact that Jude 7 cannot be speaking of the Lake of Fire, which has not even been created yet.

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Duncan](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 14:30:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Derick,

OK, for the sake of argument, I will take the bait about Jude 7. However, there are many other verses that I gave where Jesus is talking about the Lake of Fire and eternal punishment. Surely you don't believe that I have taken those verses out of context?

As for not talking to you anymore, I never said that. I stated that this subject has been beaten to death (eternal, at that), and it looks like we both have strong feelings. As such, I'm not sure what further discussion on this particular topic would be beneficial. I would rather move on to another error that I can clear up for people.

Duncan

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Derick N.](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 16:52:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duncan wrote on Wed, 21 November 2007 08:30: Derick,

OK, for the sake of argument, I will take the bait about Jude 7. However, there are many other verses that I gave where Jesus is talking about the Lake of Fire and eternal punishment. Surely you don't believe that I have taken those verses out of context?

As for not talking to you anymore, I never said that. I stated that this subject has been beaten to death (eternal, at that), and it looks like we both have strong feelings. As such, I'm not sure what further discussion on this particular topic would be beneficial. I would rather move on to another error that I can clear up for people.

Well since you can't clear up this "error", I guess you better move on to another one.

I started with Jude 7 and will take on one scripture at a time of those you gave me. They can all be easily explained in the light of Eternal Death as the punishment for sin.

For me these debates are not about "feelings", as I don't have any investment to "feel" one way or the other about this issue. It is about how I understand the revelation.

And I never baited you. You offered Jude 7 as irrefutable proof of eternal torment, and it clearly does not apply.

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Duncan](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 17:16:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thanks, but you still never "easily explained" the other verses.

Duncan

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Derick N.](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 18:09:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duncan wrote on Wed, 21 November 2007 11:16 Thanks, but you still never "easily explained" the other verses.

Duncan

I'll take one verse at a time for simplicities sake... there is more than one person here that posts long, rambling rhetorics which is almost impossible to reply to. Better to keep it simple.

I will be gone for a few days, and will take up where I left off upon my return. Hopefully Moulder won't miss me too much.

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Duncan](#) on Wed, 21 Nov 2007 19:44:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Have a Happy Thanksgiving!

Duncan

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Duncan](#) on Mon, 26 Nov 2007 18:45:48 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Michael and Derick,

The following is something I thought about over the Thanksgiving holiday that doesn't fit into your theory.

The book of Revelation tells us that the anti-christ and the false prophet (both of whom are humans) will be cast into the lake of fire. At the end of the 1000-yr reign, Revelation tells us that the devil will be cast into the lake of fire where "the beast and the false prophet are. And they will be tormented day and night forever and ever."

Again, this scripture shoots holes in your theory. Obviously the anti-christ and the false prophet are not immediately annihilated, because they are still there after 1000 years. In addition, the Word states that they will be tormented day and night for "ever and ever." (Greek for torment is "basanizo" which means "to torture.")

My point in all this is that here are two humans, specifically mentioned, that are not annihilated. If your theory is correct, no human could escape annihilation, including the beast and the false prophet.

Duncan

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Duncan](#) on Mon, 26 Nov 2007 18:49:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Gentlemen,

Another scripture just popped into my head while I was typing my last post. I haven't had time to look it up, but you have heard it before.

When discussing people who reject their ministry, Jesus tells the disciples that it will be better for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgement than for those people.

My question is this: If every sinner is annihilated, how can one suffer greater punishment. The punishment is exactly the same! Either you cease to exist or you don't. There is no in-between.

Duncan

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Tue, 27 Nov 2007 05:19:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duncan wrote on Mon, 26 November 2007 12:45Michael and Derick,

The following is something I thought about over the Thanksgiving holiday that doesn't fit into your theory.

The book of Revelation tells us that the anti-christ and the false prophet (both of whom are humans) will be cast into the lake of fire. At the end of the 1000-yr reign, Revelation tells us that the devil will be cast into the lake of fire where "the beast and the false prophet are. And they will be tormented day and night forever and ever."

Again, this scripture shoots holes in your theory. Obviously the anti-christ and the false prophet are not immediately annihilated, because they are still there after 1000 years. In addition, the Word states that they will be tormented day and night for "ever and ever." (Greek for torment is "basanizo" which means "to torture.")

My point in all this is that here are two humans, specifically mentioned, that are not annihilated. If your theory is correct, no human could escape annihilation, including the beast and the false prophet.

Duncan

First off my view of Annihilation does not say someone must be instantly destroyed. It looks more and more like you did not read the study I posted.

Second the word ARE that you are using for emphasis is not in the original text demonstrated by the way it is in italics.

Third the phrase for ever and ever does not mean what you think it does. It simply implies multiple ages which again does not refute what I believe.

How long is an age? According to Peter it is known only to YHWH himself.

8: But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. 2 Peter 3:8

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2

Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Tue, 27 Nov 2007 05:24:12 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Duncan wrote on Mon, 26 November 2007 12:49Gentlemen,

Blessings,
William

Subject: Re: Eternal Torment Part 2
Posted by [Michael The Disciple](#) on Wed, 28 Nov 2007 15:27:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

moulder wrote on Wed, 28 November 2007 00:06Great thoughts Duncan!

Michael says the word is in italics (true enough) but he doesn't offer us an alternate translation...
He says:

Quote:Second the word ARE that you are using for emphasis is not in the original text demonstrated by the way it is in italics.

I'm not sure why he would mention this, unless the verse could be better translated in some other manner?

If we concentrate really hard maybe we can figure out the meaning of some of these words that we've been misusing all of our lives!

Altogether now... hmm

Blessings,
William

It could just as easily be the word WERE. Since we are not privy to the manuscript it is taken from I guess we dont know. The translators themselves evidently were unsure.