

JESUS SAYS THERE IS NO FORGIVENESS FOR BLASPHEMY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Jesus' claim to fame and what makes him a huge player in the religion "marketplace" is the centrality of generous forgiveness in his message. Rivals such as Buddha flatly deny there is any real forgiveness. There is only karma. Muhammad turns forgiveness into a lottery, Allah might forgive and he might not. The lesson here is that Allah will not have his mercy taken for granted and has not tied himself down to a promise to forgive that people will take advantage of. Back to the fame of Jesus. Is this fame misplaced?

When Jesus warned that it is better to lose your life in this world than to sin he implied that sinners would face something worse than death, everlasting punishment. Jesus is hinting that we can commit a sin that will never be pardoned. We will see that he also said that it can be committed in this world and not just as you leave this world. This is not the same thing as the doctrine that whatever serious sin you carry unrepentedly out of this world will never be forgiven for there is no second chance.

It makes no sense how Christians claim to be sure that Jesus said no sin committed in this life is unforgiveable and then can claim that if you die in sin then there is no forgiveness. Why can't your final choice be made at 10 years old as easily as it can be when you die at 100?

The Church struggles with the passages about the sin that will never ever be forgiven that Jesus mentioned. It makes the incredible assertion that Jesus meant only the sin of unrepentance and its not forgiven for God will not force his gift of forgiveness on you.

Jesus contrasted it with, "any sin or blasphemy committed by man can be pardoned". This is very general. Any sin or blasphemy is unforgiveable if it won't be repented. Yet we are asked to believe that Jesus was not being general but was simply saying that hating the Holy Spirit shows you are so evil you are managing to keep God's love and grace from softening you. If that does not ring true it shouldn't.

It makes no sense to say that one sin out of many cannot be forgiven when you mean it cannot be repented for any sin might not be repented. The mundane sins such as sex outside marriage or stealing or tax evasion are usually not repented! Jesus really did mean a sin flatly will not be forgiven. Its something specific.

Any sin can be the sin that shows how much you hate God. It does not have to be blunt blasphemy. It doesn't have to be verbal. So Jesus clearly designated insulting the Holy Spirit verbally as the one unforgiveable sin. That is very selective and unfair.

Mark 3:29-30 speaks of the unpardonable sin so early in the gospel that its significance is undeniable. It is early in the earliest gospel! Gospel means good news. This book calls itself gospel and so that heightens the importance of this statement about the unpardonable sin. The gopeller is trying to warn us by putting that in and in such detail!

Matthew 12:31-32 includes the eternal sin teaching as well. Matthew could have left it out for it was his choice if he wanted to do that but he did not.

Nothing in Mark or Matthew indicates that any sin at all can be forgiven. There could be sins so bad that forgiveness will not happen.

Luke 12 surprisingly has it too despite Luke stressing how Jesus forgives more than the other gospels did.

We must remember that whoever thought these texts should be put in the gospels thought they were clear enough. They had a clear idea of what they meant. But church attempts to rob them off their force are unconvincing. Instead of admitting that Jesus was wrong, lies are told. The words of Jesus are made too elastic. The Church wants to confuse and hide what Jesus meant. There seems to be a fear that you can be praying and a minister like those scribes and Pharisees and still be totally empty of God. Those scribes and Pharisees may even have felt forgiven and been wrong. This scares the Church so much.

These texts are linked with Hebrews 6 which speaks of sinners who cannot be forgiven for they are too stubborn to repent. They are said to taste the work of Jesus and then they hold him up for contempt crucifying him on their own account. The Bible says that our forgiven sins put Jesus on the cross in a mocking way and which shows real malice but this one says the unforgiven ones do that too. The idea is that sin is malice though it may not feel like that. It is like how you don't always realise you have malice for another.

“It is impossible [to restore and bring again to repentance] those who have been once for all enlightened, who have consciously tasted the heavenly gift and have become sharers of the Holy Spirit, And have felt how good the Word of God is and the mighty powers of the age and world to come, If they then deviate from the faith and turn away from their allegiance – [it is impossible] to bring them back to repentance, for (because, while, as long as) they nail upon the cross the Son of God afresh [as far as they are concerned] and are holding [Him] up to contempt and public disgrace” (Hebrews 6:4-6).

The Amplified Bible’s note “because, while, as long as” is incorrect. You don’t say it is not impossible to bring blasphemers back as long as they blaspheme and blasphemers can change so the verse means something that is impossible to stop doing.

Some say a Christian means a person who is saved once for all by Jesus and whose Heaven is guaranteed.

Christians who say that once you are saved you are always saved say that the text does not refer to saved people losing their salvation but to those who draw near to being saved but then draw back. This seems to be an erroneous interpretation for all Christians have resisted prior to conversion and up to the point where they decide to convert. The text complains that you cannot make the people it condemns repent meaning that it is plain to be seen that they are so godless that it is a waste of time inviting them to repent. So the text could mean people who draw near and make their opposition to Jesus obvious and hold him up to public shame. They have committed an unpardonable sin.

They could be people who don’t have the kind of redeeming faith that God gives, supernaturally caused faith. It is possible to be a believer in Christianity on the human level without letting God give you the gift of faith. Faith is seen in the Bible as union with God and belief is a part of it. It is the work of God.

The favoured interpretation is that true Christians who repudiate their supernatural faith and apostatise lose their salvation and will never be saved. Repentance depends on the grace of God. God has made their repentance impossible for he will not help them to repent. Any repentance they have is just human repentance or artificial where God is concerned and so it is not acceptable to God who says that repentance that pardons is supernatural and bestowed by grace.

Catholics say the passage is about the results of mortal sin despite their sentiment that it can be repented. It is possible that it does refer to real Christians but not to them losing their salvation. The Bible believes that Jesus obeyed God in the sinner’s place to please God for the sinner. They will not be forgiven if they leave the faith nor will they believe again in this world.

I would say that Hebrew 6 is on about stubbornness but there is no evidence this gives any light on what Jesus meant.

Jesus could have said, “Whoever says a word against the Holy Spirit shows how stubborn they are in evil and will never turn to God.” Why did he word it like, “Whoever says a word against the Holy Spirit will never be forgiven but is guilty of an eternal sin”? The two mean different things, entirely different things. Jesus never had taught that forgiveness is just given by God. As a Jew, he would have upheld the rules that have to be used to access forgiveness. The rules were that repentance and atonement sacrifice at the temple and penance were needed and then you were forgiven. There were specific religious duties that needed to be kept and then forgiveness was assured. It was not a matter of simply telling God you would do the good thing instead of the bad if you had a second chance and proving it by living your life and getting the sin pardoned so you could be free to be good.

Jesus was talking about general blasphemy how it can be forgiven so it is not a case of saying that the eternal sin against the Spirit was only possible as long as Jesus was in the world. Jesus is thought to mean they won't be forgiven for they will keep their sin even until they die and after that it is too late.

So there is no salvation if you say the Holy Spirit is evil. To say his works are evil is by extension to call him evil. This accuses atheists of being destined for damnation for atheists hold that evil proves that God is evil if he, hypothetically, exists. This blasphemes the Christian doctrine that God works in and through evil which he hates to redeem and purify his children.

Anyway why the harshness? Why such a terrible doctrine? What is Jesus' problem?

Does Satan get power if one starts to say that what God is doing through the Holy Spirit is his evil work?

Jesus does allude to Satan’s power for he says that if Satan puts demons out that is a foolish suggestion for a house that is divided against itself cannot stand and Satan would be destroying his own work. That contradicts the fact that evil people and evil are chaotic. He was the one who said that evil is chaotic and messy! His argument only makes sense if Satan is possessing his own demons so to be possessed by a demon means nothing, it is really Satan who is the problem.

We might think the Pharisees and Scribes knew clearly who Jesus was and that God was in him doing all this good but they chose to oppose him with evil lies. But Jesus regards not being with him as being against him so their shameless opposition

to him is no big deal. Opposition is oppression and how ugly it is irrelevant. Jesus bans neutrality where he is concerned, "He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters" (Matthew 12:30).

It is held by many that this is what Jesus called blasphemy against the Spirit: The scribes and Pharisees were resisting the evidence the Spirit provided for him and regarding it as false. They were making a liar of the Holy Spirit. They were blaspheming. Yet nothing in the text says the men uttering the blasphemy knew Jesus' good deeds well. REPEAT: THERE IS NO REASON TO THINK THAT THE CRITICS OF JESUS' MIRACLE WHO SAID IT WAS SATAN WERE ENGAGING IN NOTHING MORE THAN IDLE GOSSIP.

For that reason, the argument that the unforgiveable sin is incorrigible opposition to God's involvement in the world to heal evil collapses.

Now, Jesus said something else quite interesting.

The New Testament gives an example of exorcists using Jesus as a magic word for getting demons out and it ending in failure and trouble. They were abusing Jesus and acting without any pretence at having authority from him.

In Matthew 12:27 Jesus says to the Jewish critics, "If I cast out demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your sons cast them out?"

Christians say that he is not saying they are successful exorcists but only seem to do some good. A person who thinks they are possessed might improve and it might have nothing to do with the Jews exorcising them but looks as if it does.

But he is saying, "Why do you demonise the exorcisms I do and not those of your sons?"

That means nothing unless he and they could really exorcise. Christians want to gaslight here.

Others may say he means, "You see they really do have some success but look at how successful mine are? I just tell the demon to go and it goes and they cannot have that level of success." Again that is reading things into what he said that are not there.

Keep it simple. He put himself together with the Jewish exorcists so that any exorcisms they do are done by the Holy Spirit. And to say his were from Satan is to attack their's too.

He then says, "But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you. Or how can one enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods, unless he first binds the strong man? Then indeed he may plunder his house." (Matt. 12:28–29).

Jesus' exorcisms differ from the others in one respect, they back up his claim that he is bringing the kingdom of God.

The strong man is the Devil. When did Jesus then tie him up? Some think it was when he was challenged by him earlier in the desert. But the story says that Satan went away to try again later. So it is not that. It is simply the exorcisms. What else can it be?

It is the weaker man who ties up the stronger one. Jesus has to outwit Satan. This is a shocking nod to the power of Satan and shows the Jewish critics of his exorcisms were not as stupid as we want to think. It is clear proof that Jesus is not God.

There was a tradition among some exorcists of trying to trick the demon to get it out. This could be evidence that Jesus was doing those kinds of exorcisms too. It reflects badly on Jesus if he was being that manipulative.

Having established that Jesus has made it a sin to knowingly speak ill of the Holy Spirit we find errors in his teaching that prove he was a charlatan and that he himself certainly blasphemed the Holy Spirit.

We have all insulted the Holy Spirit for we have all called his works the Devil's work or as good as. Doubting God's revelation is calling the spirit a liar according to Christian dogma and the Bible. To call God a liar is to call him the Devil. Unbelief is a sin. We have all doubted and disbelieved. Is Jesus saying that none of us can be saved?

Jesus just wanted to kill his listeners with despair for he never acted like one who believed that nobody could be saved when he preached to them which brings out the conman in him. If we can repent we prove him wrong.

Some Christians point out that all sin is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Jesus illogically and deceitfully denied this fact for he said that anyone who blasphemed him would be forgiven but there was no hope for anyone who said something nasty about the Holy Spirit. Jesus must have thought that salvation was impossible for the person who committed this blasphemy on the Spirit. If he was told that all sin is this blasphemy he might have replied that this was only true if they

directly meant to offer it to the Holy Spirit. But direct or indirect it is the same result: the Spirit is still insulted. He might have thought that those predestined to salvation would not commit it even in sinning for God preserved them like he allegedly preserved him (and his mother if the pope is to be believed) from sin.

Read Matthew 5: 13-16. Jesus said to his hearers that they were the salt of the earth and that once salt loses its flavour it is no good and cannot be made to have flavour again. It is only fit for throwing out for people to trample on it. Believers say that salt was used to preserve. But he is discussing salt from the taste angle. When he does not say anything about it preserving he has the most common use in mind - salt flavouring foods. Why does Christianity lie about him meaning preservation? Because if only his followers flavour the earth as he said then that means he is saying they are the only good thing on earth. They make the earth worthwhile. That is a highly offensive and divisive statement. He clearly implied that you could become beyond redemption in this life.

Jesus himself blasphemed the Holy Spirit with his evil and vile doctrine. He is in Hell forever if that blasphemy cannot be pardoned.

All that is further confirmation that this unpardonable sin existed. He should know if it did for he committed it.

The doctrine of the eternal sin leads to dangerous and frightening sectarianism. Suppose a Christian faction claims to be the true Church. It follows that anybody who believes it and hesitates to join it is committing a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. This is the case if it is so that it was not that the Jews insulted Jesus so much as they refused to believe in him and support him but said the Devil was doing his works for him.

Despite the Roman Catholic claim that apostolic tradition and the universal belief of the early Church is as much infallible revelation from God as the Bible the Roman Church does not believe the primitive Christian doctrine that if you sinned after being baptised there was no forgiveness in this world or the world to come. The early Christians had no quality of life thanks to the gospel and their only consolation was the hope of Heaven. The Cathars later believed that there was no forgiveness after baptism which they performed by laying hands. This doctrine led to people committing suicide to avoid sin as soon as the hands were laid. The doctrine of the eternal sin which is so easy to commit and yet so fatal implies that it is best to go somewhere where you will be martyred for your good deeds and your faith so that you are gone from the world before you can be deprived of any chance of Heaven. The Church is accountable for murder simply by preaching the gospels. It serves no purpose to argue that the Church does not mean any harm by promoting books that talk about the eternal sin for that is like telling somebody to kill their neighbour and then saying it was not your responsibility if they go and do it.

A decent God would not have doctrines like the unpardonable sin. He goes down to the sinner's level and lower by having it. The tradition of such sin and its lengthy prevalence in the post-apostolic Church shows how the early Church must have been in the grip of terror and fear thanks to their "gospel". The apostles used terror to get power and to be able to dictate to people what God allegedly wanted. Writings that seemed to blaspheme Christianity were destroyed or allowed to fade out of existence lest they would draw people to the unpardonable sin. Jesus whether non-existent or evil could not have hoped for a better propaganda system so that he became a fleshed out saint in the brainwashed eyes of the Roman Empire. The gossellers knew their declarations could not stand on their own for there were too many implausibilities and lies so they put in the veiled threat that anybody that said their hero was empowered by Satan would be guaranteed to be lost forever so that they would become too scared to see or care about the real truth in those superstitious times.

The Church has gone to a lot of trouble to hide the meaning of the eternal sin doctrine. It doesn't like it. The doctrine led to the Cathar heretics committing suicide in case they would commit the sin. The doctrine is vile and proves that the gospels are nonsense. The Church cannot complain if people take it all literally for there is no hint in the text of any other interpretation. The interpretation is legitimate and should be respected. Yet a priest or bishop who accepts it will be forced to step down. The Catholic professor will be fired from the Catholic university.