Scriptures and Doctrine :: Speaking in Tongues

Speaking in Tongues - posted by TaKa (), on: 2003/7/10 3:23

The United Pentecostal Church holds that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit an d that this experience is essential to salvation. The Assemblies of God also holds that speaking in tongues is the initial evidence of the baptism in the Holy Spirit although they do make a distinction between this experience and the new bir th. Therefore one can be saved but yet not speak in tongues.

The Initial Evidence doctrine is simply that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is an identifiable experience in the Christian b eliever's life recognized by the inevitable accompanying sign of speaking with other tongues.

Further, this doctrine does not say that some can or will speak in tongues but rather it affirms that all without exception will speak with tongues.

The book of Acts is its foundation stone. If the book of Acts were excluded from the discussion there would be no other source of information since the only other passage in the New Testament that discusses tongues at any length is 1 Co rinthians 12-14 which clearly teaches all do not speak in tongues.

The Initial Evidence doctrine simply does not have a history before the 1800's. This should at least caution us to carefu lly consider the Scriptures used to support the doctrine itself.

It is also important to note that Pentecostalism has not only accepted an understanding of the book of Acts that is "no vel" but it has also made this doctrine the most important distinguishing feature of its identity. An essential area of con temporary Pentecostal theology, then, was simply absent from the church until modern times.

Jesus briefly mentioned "tongues" in Mark 16:17 as a sign that would accompany future Christian believers. Some den ominations see this as an indication that every believer should speak in tongues.

This was, in fact, a miraculous sign that was recorded in the book of Acts. However, other signs mentioned by Jesus in cluded casting out of demons, taking up of serpents unharmed, drinking of poison unharmed, and physical healings thro ugh the laying on of hands.

Again, these signs were fulfilled through certain people in the early church, but no one could reasonably argue that all of these signs are expected to accompany every Christian.

The Holy Spirit is sovereign in the distribution of His gifts. Following the listing of these gifts, Paul adds, Â“But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He willÂ” (I Corinthians 12:11). No one pe rson has all the gifts. Every believer has received the gift of the Spirit, but not every believer has received all of the gift s which the Spirit bestows.

It is unscriptural teaching which says that all who are baptized by the Holy Spirit will speak in tongues. The Scriptures state emphatically that all saved persons have received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Â“For by one Spirit are we all b aptized into one body ...Â” (I Corinthians 12:13). All the believers at Corinth received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, ho wever all did not speak in tongues. The question asked in verse 30, Â“Do all speak with tongues?Â” is so phrased so as to convey the expected answer, Â“No.Â”

Paul said that not all of the Corinthian Christians spoke in tongues (I Corinthians 14: 5), and yet he stated clearly that a ll had been baptized with the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:13).

It is a mistake to assume that speaking in tongues is an evidence of being filled with the Spirit. All believers are comm anded to Â“be filled with (controlled by) the SpiritÂ” (Ephesians 5:18), but nowhere in Scripture are believers comman ded to speak in tongues. A Christian can be under the influence and control of the Holy Spirit and not speak in tongues. There are numerous instances when the disciples were filled with the Spirit but did not speak in tongues. See Acts 4:3

1 and 13:9-11. To be Spirit-filled is to be Spirit-controlled. Are we to believe that the thousands of mightily used men and women of God who were among the worldÂ's best missionaries of ChristÂ's Gospel and Bible teachers were never filled with the Holy Spirit because they never spoke in tongues? Perish the thought!

Three things are mentioned in Ephesians 5:18-21 as evidence of being Spirit-filled: a joyful heart, a thankful heart and a submissive heart. Nothing is said about speaking in tongues. To sum it up in one word, Christlikeness is the manifestation of being filled with the Spirit, and the Scriptures do not tell us that our Lord ever spoke in tongues.

The fruit of the Spirit is mentioned in Galatians 5:22, 23 and includes nine characteristics. Â"But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.Â" None of the sign-gifts are included in this nine-fold cluster of fruit. The Christian who is filled with the Spirit will manifest the fruit of the Spirit apart from ever having spoken in tongues. As a matter of fact, in Ephesians and Galatians, where the fullness and fruit of the Spirit are discussed tongues-speaking is not mentioned once.

All Christians should be filled with the Spirit and all are to exhibit the fruit of the Spirit, but not every Christian has all the gifts. Spirituality does not depend on speaking in tongues. GodÂ's goal for every child of His is to be Spirit-controlled, but that goal does not include speaking in tongues. No Christian need ever feel that he is lacking in spirituality because he has not spoken in tongues. Quality of life is the best evidence of the fullness and fruit of the Holy Spirit. John the Baptizer was filled with the Spirit from his motherÂ's womb (Luke 1:15), yet this Spirit-filled man did no miracles and never spoke in tongues (John 10:41).

It is a mistake to seek the gift of speaking in tongues. It is clear that not all in the church at Corinth spoke in tongues. Why didnÂ't they? The Apostle says, Â"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit ... for to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues: But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He willÂ" (I Corinthians 12:4-11).

Please note that the gifts were given Â"as He (the Holy Spirit) will,Â" not as we will, Â"as it hath pleased HimÂ" (vs. 18), not us. The reason why all the Christians did not have the gift of tongues is because all of the gifts are divinely bestowed. The Spirit divides and distributes to each believer his own gift. Not one of us is capable of choosing his own gift. The Spirit will not give a gift according to our desire and the way we pray. DonÂ't try to tell God which gift He should give to you. We are but members of the Body, and no one member has any right to tell the Head what to do.

The only biblically taught, universally expected sign of the baptism of the Holy Spirit is the transformed character of the believer. Where there once was selfishness, there is now selflessness. Where there once was hatred, there is now love. Where there once was recklessness, there is now self-control. These attributes are known as "the fruit of the Spirit," and they are mentioned in Galatians 5:22-23. These qualities can only come from God; unlike "tongues" they cannot be faked.

The "fruit of the Spirit" is the only positive outward evidence that a person has been "born again."

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by JesusisGod2 (), on: 2003/7/21 12:25

Hello Taka,

Man that is really great insight God has given you and I agree with every thing except that you mention that "it is a mistake to seek the gift of speaking in tongues"

Paul tells us to covet earnesty the best gifts, but to pursue love which is more excellant. 1 cor 12:31 and again that we are to follow after love but desire spiritual gifts 1Cor 14:1 but rather that you may prophesy. So it is not a mistake to desire the gifts but rather we are exhorted to instead desire the gifts.

I attend an Apostolic Pentecostal church who definately teach the speaking of tongues is a sign of baptism in the Holy Spirit. But I agree more to what you have said. I myself donot speak in tongues and have asked God for answers and God led me to the same conclussions as you.

I believe that God has led me to this church though because I'LL tell ya they lift up the Lord Jesus. I believe you recieve t he Baptism of the Spirit the moment you turn your heart to God and seek His redemption for your sin.

My Pastor and I have discussed this very Issue and both agree that to be concerned that someone dosent speak in tong ues is not an issue its the one that says "I dont need to" or "I dont have to" speak in tongues, for you are in danger of su pressing the gift of tongues for the Holy Spirit would not force Himself on anyone, This requires submission on our part.

Paul had said he wished they all spoke in tongues 1 cor 14:5 and also to not forbid the speaking of tongues 1 cor 14:40

But all in all I agree with what you have said and as I have mentioned I dont speak in tongues (but I do desire it) and beli eve I have been baptised in Spirit and there are gifts of the Spirit that are evident in my life and should the Holy spirit dec ide to present me with the gift of speaking in tongues, I sure dont want to denied from it because of my unbelief.

God bless you and I enjoyed reading what you have had to say. I agree that there are some extremist out there who hav e preached that if you dont speak in tongues you are not baptised in the Holy Spirit and have "pierced the faith of many" and made many feel inadequate and not wanted (myself included at one time until through Gods word He showed me ot herwise)

But lets not go to the other extreme and pass this as a gift that is unnecessary in the Body of Christ.

Praise the Name of Jesus :-D :-D

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2003/7/21 19:36

I thought I would throw this passage into the mix:

"But listen, friends, as I lay there, God the Holy Ghost came upon me. Wave after wave came rolling over me until the lo ve of God swept through me like a mighty river! So much so, that there were moments.. now listen, my daughter beside me put her hand on my shoulders and she prayed, 'Oh, God, keep his reason to Daddy.' I was never more sane in my li fe! But I was so wrought by the Holy Ghost that I cried and I laughed and I prayed.

"Someone asked me, 'Did you speak in tongues?' Oh, I was asked that again and again. No, my dear people, I've never spoken in tongues nor have I ever been in a meeting where tongues have been practiced... No dear people... mind you, when I say that, don't think that I'm denying the gifts mentioned in the New Testament, precious gifts when God gives th em. But all I can say is that it never came to me!

"But I say that the baptism of the Holy Ghost came to me... in a mighy cleansing, empowering power!

(A professor essentially asks him what difference the experience made in his life and he responds):

"Well, I think, professor, that the difference must be obvious to you from what has already happened,' I said. 'I went out t o preach the same sermons that I'd been preaching for seventeen years... went out to preach the same sermons with thi s difference- that I now saw hundreds converted, hundreds brought savingly to Christ."

- Duncan Campbel, "The Nature of a God-Sent Revival", Christian Life Publications, pp. 26-27

Re: Tongues and initial evidence - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/7/22 4:52

Hi there
an eavesdropper from across the atlantic here...
You have raised a topic which has been the cause of deep divisions to the people of God over many years. Its one of th ose areas where it is very easy to generate 'more heat than light' but its in the Book so we ought not to be afraid of givin g it some prayerful consideration.
One of the fundamental questions of the New Testament is 'When you believed did you receive the Spirit'. It is interestin g because of its implications. For example the question clearly implies that it is possible to 'believe' and yet not 'receive' t he Spirit. And secondly it clearly implies that 'receiving the Spirit' is a conscious experience otherwise how would anyone be able to answer the question.
The problems arise when we begin to define 'receiving the Spirit'. The Salvationists, by that phrase, meant a definite ex

perience of 'sanctification' in which the nature of sin in a person was dealt a radical blow. The Pentecostals, by that phra se, meant an experience distinct from and subsequent to new birth which imparted power for service. (Not all Pentecost als insisted on tongues being THE sign of that experience, although many did.)
In personal terms it is good to ask the question 'when I believed did I receive the Spirit?' so that if God has more for me I don't shut my eyes and ears to the possibility. In the NT accounts this experience always seems to be definite and cons cious, rather than a theological conclusion drawn from an interpretation of texts.
If you would like to read an extended article on your subject you might try
www.biblebased.co.uk
choose pdf files and download a file called

"Initial Evidence; An Examination of the true evidence of baptism in the Spirit G.W.North"

That doesn't mean that G.W.North thought tongues was THE evidence, but I'll leave you to read his paper.

Its not lack of faith to continue to search the scriptures. I have a favourite bumper sticker which says "if you haven't chan ged your mind recently, how do you know you still have one?"
Keep praying, keep meditating, keep thinking..
best regards
His/Yours
Ron Bailey

Re: Tongues - posted by TaKa (), on: 2003/7/22 10:49

I think by stating that "it is a mistake to seek the gift of speaking in tongues" this article is talking about seeking particular gifts rather than simply more of God Himself.

The Spirit will not give a gift according to our desire and the way we pray. We shouldn't try to dictate to God which gift H e should give us. We are but members of the Body, and no one member has any right to tell the Head what to do.

I also believe we recieve the Spirit the moment we turn our hearts to God and seek His redemption for our sin. But I als o believe there is more that God has for us than just a one-time experience.

Paul said that not all of the Corinthian Christians spoke in tongues (I Corinthians 14: 5), and yet he stated clearly that all had the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:13).

The Holy Spirit enables us to be saved, and He also goes on from day to day enabling us to remain saved. I heard a pr eacher one time who said that when the Bible says "be filled with the Spirit" it means that we are to be continually seekin g every day for the Spirit's power to help us live a godly life.

John the Baptizer was filled with the Spirit from his motherÂ's womb (Luke 1:15), yet this Spirit-filled man did no miracles and never spoke in tongues (John 10:41).

I've heard a few accounts like that of Duncan Campbell where tongues did not come into play, but where a new spiritual experience had made a big difference in the ministry of preachers.

I think there are some mainstream denominations as well as extremists who have taught that if you dont speak in tongue s you are not baptised in the Holy Spirit. I can relate to having my faith pierced and being made to feel inadequate and not wanted because of stuff like this.

I don't think we need to be concerned that someone doesn't speak in tongues, but I do think we ought to be concerned if someone says something like "I dont need to" or "I dont have to". We should be open to anything new God has for us.

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2003/7/22 19:51

Quote:
"I think by stating that 'it is a mistake to seek the gift of speaking in tongues' this article is talking about seeking particular gifts rather than simply more of God Himself.

"The Spirit will not give a gift according to our desire and the way we pray. We shouldn't try to dictate to God which gift He should give us. We are but members of the Body, and no one member has any right to tell the Head what to do."

Ok, but then how do you understand 1 Corinthians 14:1?

"Pursue love, yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts, but especially that you may prophecy."

It doesn't say to simply desire GOd earnestly here, right? but to earnestly desire spiritual gifts and especially the gift of prophecy. how do you fit that into your understanding as stated above?
I agree we shouldn't dictate to God what He should give us but that doesn't mean that we shouldn't earnestly desire these gifts and seek them and ask God for them, right? Since God wants a relationship with us then He wants to know (from us) what we want so that He can bless us with it. It's an intimacy thing I think. Because even though He already knows what you want, He wants you to ask HIm. Then you can look back and remember when you asked Him and how He provided. He wants to show His faithfulness and love. No man has the right to dictate what God should do, but God wants men to ask of Him specific things. At least that seems to be the case to me.

Quote:
"John the Baptizer was filled with the Spirit from his motherÂ's womb (Luke 1:15), yet this Spirit-filled man did no miracles and never spoke in tongues (John 10:41)."

I often hear this example (Ravenhill, etc.) and I wonder how relevant it is to the discussion. Because John the Baptist was a transitional figure (in between Old and New Testament times). His time was before Pentacost, before the Church of Jesus Christ. As far as I know, the Scripture doesn't record anybody speaking in tongues before Pentacost (the birth of the Church), because that's when the Spirit was poured out in the new way. It was the same Spirit but manifested in a new way. I think that's also why Jesus didn't speak in tongues. I think the miracles aspect is relevant to a discussion on miracles (even though this is still different because it's before Penatcost).

Quote:
"I don't think we need to be concerned that someone doesn't speak in tongues, but I do think we ought to be concerned if someone says something like "I dont need to" or "I dont have to". We should be open to anything new God has for us."

Yeah I think I pretty much agree with you here. I don't think we need to be "concerned" but I like to be hopeful that they will be able to experience that gift and any others that they are not currently experiencing. I want them all, but in a healthy way I think. I want all the fullness God has for me.

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by TaKa (), on: 2003/7/22 21:44

I think I remember reading about Saul speaking in other tongues, but maybe it didn't say "tongues" but "prophesying". I'll have to look that one up.

Yes, we should earnestly desire gifts and seek to use them to benefit our brothers and sister. God wants a relationship with us and I believe we should love Him just because of who He is rather than for what He can give us.

Yes, I believe God wants us to ask for specific things but not to show off. He wants to bless us, yes, but ultimately it should be to bring glory back to Him.

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2003/7/23 1:18

I hope to hear back on the Saul speaking in tongues/prophecying thing. That could be real good stuff for our discussion.

Quote:
"He wants to bless us, yes, but ultimately it should be to bring glory back to Him."

Ok. But what if He just wants to bless us just for us, not for Him in any way, or for anyone else? Just for us, to bless us simply because He loves us and wants to. SImple. Not to necessarily bring any glory back to Him, although that will pro bably happen, but His motive might be just because He loves us and wants a relationship with us. What do you think?

Quote:
"Yes, we should earnestly desire gifts and seek to use them to benefit our brothers and sister. God wants a relationship with us and I believe we should love Him just because of who He is rather than for what He can give us."

I agree. And I also think tongues is different than the other gifts because it is for your own edification unless someone in terprets, so i think we can seek it for ourselves. Wouldn't it be wonderful to have more gifts of interpretation functioning i n the Church?

Also, while it appears correct on the surface, I find it hard to accept that we "should" love God because of who He is alon e and not at all because of what He does/has done for us. I definately think we can worship Him because of who He is, but loving Him seems different to me.

Luke 7:42-43
"And when they had nothing with which to repay, he freely forgave them both. Tell Me, therefore, which of them will love him more?'
Simon answered and said, 'I suppose the one whom he forgave more.'
And He said to him, 'You have rightly judged."

There's somthing right about loving more for being forgiven. THe ultimate case of this would clearly seem to be Jesus' d ying for us and God's forgiving us. You see what I am getting at? Can we love Him simply for who He is? I don't know, and I guess it really doesn't matter that much (at least for me) since I do love HIm, however it has come about. But I lov e HIm for who He is, what He does, and what He's done.

I think God romances us with what He does. I mean, even us knowing who He is, that's something He did. He gave us t hat revelation right? So can we love HIm simply for who He is? Maybe we "should" but I don't really like that word so m uch. You know what I mean?

Re: - posted by JesusisGod2 (), on: 2003/7/23 12:04

Hi Todd,
thats some pretty good stuff you responded with and as you had mentioned. that when we speak in tongues its for our own edification unless someone interprets. But God is more interested in the edification of the church.

"...for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh in tongues, except he interpret, that the church may recieve edifying." 1 cor 14:5

"wherefore let him that speaketh in an unknown tongue pray that **he may interpret**. For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, **but my understanding is unfruitful."**1 Cor 14:13-14

Unless the Spirit of God also brings to you or to someone else the interpretation, your understanding is unfruitful. your s pirit may be edified but no one else is unless there is interpretation.

I like you would really like to see an interpretation of an unknown tongue within in the church to see if in fact if some are even speaking in a tongue from God!(not to say some arent genuine, as I believe they are but not all, some is seems is j ust babble) to this day I have yet to see it and I cant help but wonder if some are in fact even "forceing" this wonderful gif t

of God.

Because the scriptures says let 2 or 3 at the most speak in tongues (In the church) and let one interpret, if there is no int erpretation then (Im paraphrasing here) **shut up** and let him speak to himself and to God. 1 cor 14:27-28.

what I am trying to say is that if the tongue were from God within the church -- then I believe that the Holy Spirit would al so provide interpretation. For one thing I do know is that the Holy Spirit would never go contrary to the scriptures.would He?

wicca, satan worshippers, muslims, etc all speak in an unknown tongue and I know for certain they arent baptized in the Holy Spirit of God.

I believe the tongues are a gift for the body of Christ today but not all are going to speak in them and those that dont in n o way means that they were not baptised in the Holy Spirit! This is unscriptural.

To those who teach that if you dont speak in tongues, you are not baptized in the Holy Spirit should be warned that they are teaching a false gospel and are in danger of such cosequences that the scriptures warn of false teachings.

I myself am pentecostal and do not speak in tongues and have prayed for them as well as all of the gifts, and as of yet h ave not spoken in them. But I know for certain I have been baptised into the body of Christ and will be with my tongue sp eaking brothers when Christ come to call us home.

In the name of Jesus,
Kevin :-D

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by TaKa (), on: 2003/7/24 11:07

The churches I attend do practice prophesying and interpretation of unknown tongues and no, some are not genuine, bu t only babble. In fact, in my home church people have been escorted out of the service on several occasions for causing disturbances that were unscriptural.

I myself would not like to see more prophesying and interpreting. We have a healthy amount of that already, I think, as well as an unhealthy amount of seeking after signs and wonders.

What I would like to see is more mature Christians loving and reaching out to younger believers and discipling them, and churches that will get together 2 or 3 times a week for the sole purpose of prayer.

Yes, wiccans, satan worshippers, muslims, etc all believe and practice spiritual rituals and signs. But the Bible says that the world will know we are Christians by our love for one another and not necessarily by the signs and wonders that are displayed in our meetings.

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by Herdman, on: 2003/7/25 23:50

Following along in the discussion. Just a few things to add.

First, the disciples who were asked, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?", in Acts 19, were evidently Ap ollos' converts (Acts 18:24-28) because they only knew John's baptism (18:25; 19:3). They didn't get "saved" until Paul preached to them "that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." At the point th at they received Jesus, they would have been baptised by the Holy Ghost into the body of Christ (see below). Then they were baptised in water. When the Holy Ghost "came on them" in verse 6 to speak with tongues and prophesy, he had t o already be "in" them or they would not have been saved.

So, there is a difference between being "baptised" by the Holy Spirit and being "filled" with the Spirit.

The baptsm by the Holy Ghost into the body of Christ is a spiritual baptism that takes place when a person receives Jes us Christ. The Holy Spirit baptises that person into the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus (Rom. 6:3-6), spiritually ci rcumcises his flesh away from his soul, "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," (Col. 2:11-12), and puts him into the

body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13; Eph. 5:30-32), all of which takes place at salvation, and without water. :-o

Subsequently, this person may go through many "fillings" of the Holy Spirit (Acts 4:31; Eph. 5:18), some of which may be very profound experiences.

Second, the tongues in 1 Cor. 14 are unknown to the hearers, not to the speaker. The hearers need an interpreter so th at they will know what the "barbarian" is saying (14:11). If the speaker has the "gift" of tongues, then he won't need an i nterpreter at all (Acts 2) because every man would hear "them speak in his own language," (Acts 2:6). That's why Paul said that these tongues can be learned (14:16, 23) because they are languages.

Evidently, what was going on in this seaport is that foreigners were coming in to the congregation with something to say (14:26) but few, if any, could understand them. Their tongues were "unknown" to the congregation. So, Paul laid down some rules (14:27-28, 34) for these guys. 1) Only two people, or at the most three, 2) one at a time, 3) one interpreter, 4) no interpreter, then don't speak, and 5) men only, no women (that's a booger today). :-? These rules make perfect sens e in that case.

The mysteries, then, of 1 Cor. 14:2 are the result of a fellow speaking spanish, for example, to a totally english-speaking congregation. One fellow would ask, "What's he saying?" To which his friend would reply, "I don't know, it's a mystery t o me!" Without an interpreter, no one but the speaker and God would know what he is saying, thus Paul said, "let him s peak to himself, and to God," (14:28). :-?

Re: Tongues - posted by Hisrock, on: 2003/8/7 23:28

I must say... interesting conversations. Though I don't believe in "tongue speaking" as defined by the current foundation of Christianity, it is refreshing to hear someone say that we don't decide what the desire of our hearts are to be (Todd). T hat is totally God given and created. He establishes all the desires of our heart. He picks them according to His plan of s alvation and will for our individual lives.

As the Psalm 37:4 says, "Delight thyself also in the Lord; and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart." Does not say that we can think up any desire that we want and God will grant it, as the current foundation of Christianity believes. He and He alone decides what the desires of our heart will be. And the first is to live in His Word, etched on our hearts.

Concerning tongues, Acts 2:3-11 is very clear on the matter. "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fir e, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as t he Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heave n. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man hear d them speak in his own language. And they were all amazed and marvelled, saying one to another, Behold, are not all t hese which speak Galilaeans?
And how hear we every man in our own tongue, wherein we were born? Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the d wellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judaea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia,
Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians, we do hear them speak in our tongues the wonderful works of God."

This was not an "act," but rather individuals speaking in foreign languages that they never had the ability to command be fore the Holy Spirit came upon them. I do believe that there are individuals that are gifted today in the languages of the world by reason of the Holy Spirit of Witness. That the gospel will be proclaimed throughout the world.

A friend of mine, who was a missionary for years, speaks five languages. He told me that it was a gift of God, given of th e Holy Spirit and is to be used to glorify God. I believe that is the closest anyone will get to speaking in tongue's in the lit eral sense.

One has to examine the definition of a fiery cloven tongue to really understand speaking in tongues. As a ship divides th e waters of the ocean as it travels (cloven), so an individual totally immersed in the Word of God divides the world's doct rines from His truth, all by the fire of God's Word.

In Christ
Hisrock :-D

Re: - posted by todd, on: 2003/8/8 0:17

Hisrock,
Good to have you aboard. You bring up some very interesting points. Since you mentioned my name, I want to respo nd.

Quote:
"I must say... interesting conversations. Though I don't believe in "tongue speaking" as defined by the current foundation of Christianity, it is refreshing to hear someone say that we don't decide what the desire of our hearts are to be (Todd). T hat is totally God given and created. He establishes all the desires of our heart. He picks them according to His plan of s alvation and will for our individual lives.
"As the Psalm 37:4 says, "Delight thyself also in the Lord; and He shall give thee the desires of thine heart." Does not sa y that we can think up any desire that we want and God will grant it, as the current foundation of Christianity believes. H e and He alone decides what the desires of our heart will be. And the first is to live in His Word, etched on our hearts."

I think, perhaps, that I am not understanding you here. I am wondering if you misconstrued something I said. I would ap preciate it if you could pull out the specific referrence point. Because I don't think I totally agree with you about this.

While I do think God gives us certain desires, I think we choose to desire Him over other things. We can choose to delig ht ourselves in the Lord that He might give us the desires of our heart.

My guess is that you either are a Calvanist or have Calvanistic tendencies. Is this correct? I like to get that kind of thing right out in the open.

Paul tells us to earnestly desire spiritual gifts, and we can choose to do so. If this was beyond our control why would he mention it?
God may make the first move and give us a hint of the desire or something but we can choose what we desire dependi ng on what we choose to focus on. Right? I am not really confident on what I am talking about here. I am feeling like it might be one of those paradoxes and I haven't given this topic much thought. So this post is very "off the top of my hea d." I would really appreciate more explanation of what you are saying here.

Re: - posted by Hisrock, on: 2003/8/8 12:04

Hi All

Hi Todd, Thanks for the welcome my friend!

"My guess is that you either are a Calvanist or have Calvanistic tendencies. Is this correct? I like to get that kind of thing right out in the open."

My Answer: Absolutely not. No way, shape, or form.

My thoughts, concerning "delights of the heart,"
are that all the delights of the heart are created by Him. Since we are of the flesh, our desires, apart from God, are not H is desires. The mind is an enemy of God.

When I traveled to the Cross, placed myself on it, was crucified with Christ, and then resurrected in Him; by His grace, H e transformed me into a new creature.

At that very moment, everything changed within me. As I was emptied of self, Jesus Christ, the high priest, filled that voi d within. As self waned, I fell into the loving arms of Jesus Christ. Given over to Christ by my Father. He became Lord an d Master of my mind, soul, and spirit.

That, by the way, in my understanding, is the gift of the Holy Spirit. The baptism of the Holy Spirit. The greatest gift of Go

d's grace and mercy on this earth, is the day of Pentecost, all as a result of the Cross.

You said: "While I do think God gives us certain desires, I think we choose to desire Him over other things. We can choo se to delight ourselves in the Lord that He might give us the desires of our heart."

It is my belief that there are no choices on our part concerning desires of the heart. Upon total salvation, His plan of salv ation is totally sovereign and implemented in our lives; etched on our heart. I have become a servant of God... not my ca rnal mind, full of desires of the things of this earth. I am a new creature in Jesus Christ, see new things (a new world), an d hear new things. If a butterfly emerges in all it's splendor from the cocoon, can it return to the cocoon and maintain it's beauty?

As a result of this transformation within, through His grace and mercy in my life, I no longer question His authority, becau se His testimony and witness is now a desire of my heart.

I am now obedient and rest in the Lord because obedience to Him is a desire of my heart.

I am meek and humble before the Lord, and have His grace and mercy; more desires of the heart.

I now labor in all things with understanding and wisdom of the Lord. His understanding and wisdom has been made a de sire of my heart.

The law of the Lord is within me and I now walk on His highway of holiness. His path, His commandments, and His high way are desires of my heart.

I now have joy as I walk in this world. He has made joy in knowing Him a desire of my heart.

All these things and more He has etched on my heart. Again, as scripture says, "Delight yourself also (and trust) in the L ord; and He shall give you the desires of your heart." No were, at least that I can find, does it say we create the desires o f the heart and God is obligated to honor our request (TV evangelist might disagree with that one).

He controls all the desires of my heart, because He is the author, the creator of those desires. His desires are the delight and trust I have in the Lord above all other things that are of this earth.

Contrary to the multitudes of individuals in the current foundation of Christianity, the desires of the heart are not reasone d of the mind of humankind and conceived of the flesh. The desires of the heart are not of the wealth of this earth, rather the wealth of God's Word that He supplies. He authors the desires of the heart. He also identifies and eliminates false de sires. I have found out that His desires are not the same as our desires.

The greatest gift of Pentecost, in my opinion, is the union of the Holy Spirit with His saints. All His true saints dwell with t he Holy Spirit within 24/7. The ability to rightly discern the light of the truth from darkness. Dividing truth from darkness, a cloven tongue of fire. But I had to make the choice to surrender to Him a contrite spirit and a broken heart; the only thing I could offer Him. So that rules out Calvinism. Glory be to God!

Would appreciate hearing all your thoughts.

Hisrock in Christ Jesus

Re: - posted by JNugent, on: 2003/8/11 23:28

"What I would like to see is more mature Christians loving and reaching out to younger believers and discipling them, an d churches that will get together 2 or 3 times a week for the sole purpose of prayer."

While I believe in and support your entire statement concerning discipling, my focus is on the words, 'more mature Christ ians'. I will be as honest as possible, here. I don't know very many 'mature' Christians. I would like to know what you m ean when you say 'mature'. I'm not saying I don't know what maturity in Christ is, I would just like to hear your take on th e subject.
It would seem that all of our churches 'should' have mature Christians (mature in Christ AND mature in age) discipling yo

unger, less mature believers. But I don't see it. My experience with older Christians has not been very good. Christians whom I have known who have supposedly been 'in Christ' for some 20-30 years have not, in my experience, been intere sted in discipling younger believers. Contrariwise, they seem to be complacent, possibly fearful that they will not 'get thr ough' or be acceptable to a younger Christian, or maybe they are just 'at ease in Zion', contented enough to step into he aven when they die.
Any response you, or anyone would like to add, would be greatly appreciated. Thanks.

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by TaKa (), on: 2003/9/5 12:49

My Pastor was visiting with one of his mentors who is also a Pastor some time ago. He asked him what he thought was the greatest need in the church today. The older Pastor replied, "Fathers" - meaning spiritual mentors.

I don't know many mature Christians either. I also belive that all of our churches should have mature Christians disciplin g younger believers, but for the most part, I don't see it either.

If someone's been 'in Christ' for 20-30 years, then they will be doing the things that Christ did and walking in obedience t o the command of Christ to go into all the world and make disciples.

I always say that if those of us who have been saved for 10 years or more can't look at a younger believer and say with t he apostle Paul, "Follow me as I follow Christ", then something is wrong with us.

Yes, I believe that many are 'at ease in Zion' and they've taken the path of cheap grace where all they think they have to do is get saved and go to church a couple of times a week and they'll be okay.

This is the sad state of most of our churches today. I think God needs to send us a serious wake-up call.

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2003/9/5 20:59

I saw an interesting discussion on the desires of our heart earlier in this thread. Delight ourselves in the Lord and He will give us the desires of our heart. (Psalm 37:4). Someone mentioned TV preachers and this verse. They(TV preachers) d o love this one, but they have no understanding of it either.

Delighting ourselves in the Lord has the connotation of making Him the desires of our heart. This is spelled out earlier in Genisis with the wonderful proclamation to Abraham that God is our exeedingly great reward.

A better way to translate this verse is to say, "Make the Lord the delight of your desire, and He will give you the desires o f your heart."

Seeking out anything else, or having any other desire can only lead to emptiness and reduces our love of God to that of l oving Him for what He gives us. We are only truly fulfilled when He becomes our desire and finally our reward.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: Speaking in Tounges - posted by crsschk (), on: 2003/9/9 11:37

This is a follow up to PTC's recent reply in the thread "Prayer request" since it involved tounges, thought it best to continue here.

Here is what I wanted to respond to from that thread;
PTC wrote
Quote:
----------I'm probably one of the few pentecostals who has always been around geniune manifestations of tongues in worship services. Thou gh, on a few online voice chat things, I've heard people fake it, or have been around a few folks who have joked saying "the way you speak in tongues is to say 'see my tie tie my tie, who stole my honda' really fast." I've heard numerous false prophecies though, but, it was at a neo-charismatic (Rick Jo yner) church... where such is to be expected.

It ended up being one of the final straws for me in the church we were going to. Right after 9/11 they had a friday night s ervice which started out on the right foot, many of us were pouring out hearts over the situation as it was a time of mourn ing. Then the pastor said that they felt they should continue with what they had been teaching on, tounges. This really gr ieved me, how do you go from mourning to sign gifts on a dime?
Regardless I thought 'Lord, if this is Your will, so be it'. Then it went into this whole idea of not 'quenching the Spirit', "you have to let go of your mind, that's why so many of you can't speak in tounges, you can't let your mind get in the way". BI G red flag. Still, though this was so grevious to me I still prayed "Lord, if You want me to speak in tounges, You will do it, I will not force anything to come out of my mouth, I will not give over my mind to anyone but You"
So on it went, with a bunch of people speaking gibberish, nonsense, no interpetation whatsoever, it made me sick, it see med almost demonic, especially on this particular night. In addition to all that was this story our pastor told about being " drunk in the spirit" so bad that he got pulled over by the police because he was weaving all over the road and after expla ining to them that he had just came from a meeting and was a pastor, they gave him an escort home! Can you imagine t he implications of that? This is from a pretty well known pastor, with a huge church out here, t.v. ministry, etc. Of course with a lot of ties to Hinn, Hinckley and the like. It also caused no small argument with my wife afterwords who had been primarily brought up spitiually through this church. I believe that was the last time I ever went there, I had been hanging i n there praying for change, even attempted to get some questions answered about some of the Benny Hinn 'prophecies' (they had close ties with him) and was basically shut down with an 'don't touch the Lords anointed' kind of attitude, ironic ally this was another topic I was trying to get some clarity on)

In light of recent understanding I want to state that though this was very grevious, I still hold out hope that this church wo uld come away from this type of thing, I have a brother in the Lord that still attends there and he feels that he is to stay, maybe to be a lone voice or a help to reconcile without being a cause of division. He is equally frustrated by a lot of thes e things because they are unscriptual, my prayers are with him, that the Lord would use him to bring about positive chan ge, not because he is 'more spiritual' but just the plain fact that he really cares. This all was happening at a time when I was still very early on in my walk, still trying to sort through a lot of things. The church does a lot of good things, there m usic ministry, worship, is just incredible, involved in the community, outreach, missions, etc. Sadly it has to be tainted wit h a lot of false teaching, a muddy mixture, some of it is good, a lot of it bad, prosperity a big topic, that whole type of thin g. I guess if I was still there now I would have pursued my concerns a lot more directly with the pastor himself, though th at was what I was attempting to do in the first place. Now, I wouldn't have given up so easily. I would never want to be a cause of division for the sake of division or to push my own agenda. These things break my heart, I hate seeing people being mislead even if it is unintentional. Seems to me that there should be some kind of mutual humility in this body, the church, the Lords body, not to compromise but to be one as He stated we are to be.

Sorry for the length of this, guess you kinda hit a button in me PTC and out it came :-)

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2003/9/11 1:24

Part 1.

You all bring up some interesting points and ask some good questions. I would like to say first that I appreciate the points the you have made and I would like to try to answer them.

In taka's initial post a couple of topics arose that he repeats often.

One is John the Baptist and his being filled with the Holy Spirit in the womb. John's filling must be understood from the position of the covenants in which he appears. He was the last of the O/T prophets and so was filled like they were. He fits the pattern of a prophet being filled and cannot be taken as a pattern for the Church wich was born on the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem. He was filld in the way Isaiah and Jeremiah were filled. Unlike the day of pentecost, this was not the fulfillment of the prophecy of Joel.

The book of Acts is brought up. I'm going to quote extensively from Stanley M. Horton's book "What The Bible Says About The Holy Spirit" to give an account of what a pentecostal scholar teaches about the Baptism of (in, by, with) the Holy Spirit.

The way Peter looked at Joel's prophecy shows he expected a continuing fulfillment of the prophecy to the end of the "last days."(the age of the church) This means also that Joel's outpouring is available to the end of this age. As long as God keeps calling people to salvation, He wants to pour out His Spirit upon them. "For the promise is unto you, and to y

our children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call" (Acts 2:39)

Subsequent fillings(Fresh Fillings):

The first example of a fresh filling is of Peter before the Sanhedrin, the same Sanhedrin that condemned Jesus to death. For fear of it Peter earlier had denied his Lord. This time, as Peter stood up he was filled anew with the Spirit and gave a n answer that proclaimed the truth and glorified Jesus(Acts 4:8,10-12). The form of the Greek verb clearly indicates that this was indeed a new filling. Ervin supposes this could not be because Peter was alread filled and full. But the idea is n ot that he had lost anything form the previous filling. God just increased his capascity and poured out the Spirit anew up on him in all his wisdom and power.

The Gentiles Receive:

While Peter was preaching, the Holy Spirit fell on the shole household of teh friends and relatives of Cornelius. The six J ewish Christians who were with Peter were astonished because "on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 10:45). The evidence that convinced them was "they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God."... Something had to show this was the identical gift with that given in Acts 2:4 before the Jerusalem Christians could be sat isfied. Peter did not say, "I hope they receied the outpouring, the Gentiles took it by faith, so I think they have it, I believe they have it." He knew they were filled, not by thier testimony, but by the Holy Spirit's testimony through them. The Spirit gave the evidence, and He gave only one. "The spoke with tongues and magnified God" (exactly as in Acts 2:4,11).
Obviously, speaking in tongues was the convincing evidence here. And in a day when so many think, hope, believe, a nd then wonder whether they have the baptism in the Spirit, perhaps a convincing evidence is still needed.

The Assemblies of God believe that the Baptism in the Holy Spirit is an act that takes place after belief unto salvation ha s taken place. This can be immediate or take a period of time. Every account of a person initialy being filled in the book of Acts either explicitly states or is implied that they spoke in tongues. While no express doctrine is layed out by the Apo stles as to how this happens, there is a definate pattern recorded in the book of Acts. That is why we hold to this doctrin e.

The UPC unfortunately is a splinter group that almost enveloped the A/G's. While I love those who are apart of this move ment, it is still based on the ancient heresy of modalism.

The book I have been quoting from is an excellent commentary on the Holy Spirit as he is taught and referred to in the w hole Bible. All Christians can benefit immensly from this book. You come away from reading this knowing that God is the one in charge.

I will deal with other questions in further posts to help break up the length of my entries.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: Speaking in Tongues - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2003/9/11 2:14

Part 2.

Here are more replies to some very good posts I would say by Taka.

Taka wrote: It is also important to note that Pentecostalism has not only accepted an understanding of the book of Acts that is "novel" but it has also made this doctrine the most important distinguishing feature of its identity. An essential area of contemporary Pentecostal theology, then, was simply absent from the church until modern times.

Reply: Many things were lost as the Catholic Church slowly fell into apostacy. The Early Church was by and large filled with all of the Charismata right up untill the end of the 3rd century (200's). Many restoration movements would arise through the years that would either be put down or fall into error, many times both happened. But as the Church began to split off of the Catholic Church, at which point should we have stopped seeking the restoration of all the Church's former glory? Many things were lost to Catholicism that have been regained by protestantism. What's to say that this isn't one of them?

Taka wrote:

Quote:
----------Three things are mentioned in Ephesians 5:18-21 as evidence of being Spirit-filled: a joyful heart, a thankful heart and a submissive heart. Nothing is said about speaking in tongues. To sum it up in one word, Christlikeness is the manifestation of being filled with the Spirit, and the Scriptures do not tell us that our Lord ever spoke in tongues.

The fruit of the Spirit is mentioned in Galatians 5:22, 23 and includes nine characteristics. Â“But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.Â” None of the sign-gifts are included in this nine-fold cluster of fruit. The Christian who is filled with the Spirit will manifest the fruit of the Spirit apart from ever having spoken in tongues. As a matter of fact, in Ephesians and Galatians, where the fullness and fruit of the Spirit are discussed tongues-speaking is not mentioned once.

All Christians should be filled with the Spirit and all are to exhibit the fruit of the Spirit, but not every Christian has all the gifts. Spirituality does not depend on speaking in tongues. GodÂ's goal for every child of His is to be Spirit-controlled, but that goal does not include speaking in tongues. No Christian need ever feel that he is lacking in spirituality because he has not spoken in tongues. Quality of life is the best evidence of the fullness and fruit of the Holy Spirit. John the Baptizer was filled with the Spirit from his motherÂ's womb (Luke 1:15), yet this Spirit-filled man did no miracles and never spoke in tongues (John 10:41).

It is a mistake to seek the gift of speaking in tongues. It is clear that not all in the church at Corinth spoke in tongues. Why didnÂ't they? The Apostle says, Â“Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit ... for to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues: But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as He willÂ” (I Corinthians 12:4-11).

One of the difficult aspects of the epistle is that they are occasional letters dealing with specific situations arising in the Church. I would hope that Paul and the other writers would not have to mention and reteach the first things. Hebrews states that they don't have to lay the foundation again (I know that this is talking about repentance, but it is applicable here too). Paul is dealing with the ongoing effects of being led and filled with the Spirit. He should not have to talk about the initial response of one baptised in the Spirit to those who have been disciples, in many cases for years.

Taka wrote: Paul said that not all of the Corinthian Christians spoke in tongues (I Corinthians 14: 5), and yet he stated clearly that all had been baptized with the Holy Spirit (I Corinthians 12:13).

Reply:If you prayed for God to heal someone and he did, and never healed anyone as the result of your prayers again, would you say that you had the gift of healing? In the same sense; if when you were baptized in the Holy Spirit and you spoke in tongues and never spoke in tongues again, would you say you had that gift?

I'll quote Stanley Horton on ICor. 12.

Paul, in fact goes on to ask, "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" These questions are stated in such a way as to call for the answer, "No!" God has purposely given different gifts and ministries to different people. He wants us to realize we need each other. The Church as a body should not be satisfied with merely the first gifts(referring to an earlier part of his book listing the gifts in order so he's referring to apostles, prophets, teachers...etc.). The Holy Spirit wants to use every member and bring in all the variety that will build up the Church in unity.

There is no intention here of setting up sharp distinctions between clergy and laity, either, nor between full-time and part-time ministries. All are working together under the direction of the Holy Spirit as He wills. It is clear that some will be regularly used in particular ministries. Some are prophets, some are teachers. The verbs used in 12:30 are continous presents. Some do keep on ministering gifts of healings. Some do regularly minister to the Body in various kinds of tongues. Some do regularly interpret these tongues for the congregation. It should be noted here also that since these are talking about regular ministries to the Body, the fact that the questions call for a negative answer should not be pressed too far. The fact that all do not have a ministry along the lines of gifts of healing does not mean that God cannot usen them occasionally to minister healing to the sick. The fact that all do not have a ministry of tongues does not mean that all could not speak in tongues on occasion or in their private devotions. Nor does it rule out tongues as the initial physical evidence of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit according to Acts 2:4.

Paul does go on to challenge the Corinthians to covet earnestly the best gifts, that is, strive for the more valuable spiritual gifts. This can hardly mean the enumeration given in verse 28. It may refer rather to whatever gifts are most needed a

nd most edifyin at the time. The command also reemphasizes the fact that we do not have the gifts automatically just be cause we have the Spirit. Further steps of faith are needed. In addition, it is clear from this that though we may have a gi ft or ministry, we need not be limited to the same one forever. The Holy Spirit does apportion the gifts "as He wills," but He deos not disregard changing needs. Nor does He violate the integrity of our personalities by forcing a gift on us for w hich we do not have this earnest desire.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey
P.S. I would like to add that the gift of tongues is not what is to be sought, but the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Many have t aught wrongly that we should seek tongues. Any reading of the book Azusa Street will find out quickly that the central fo cus is on a deeper relationship with Jesus Christ, not the gifts. Augustine said that we should not throw out a system bec ause of the people who abuse the system.

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2003/9/11 2:35

Part 3.

In a previous post JesusisGod2 wrote: I believe the tongues are a gift for the body of Christ today but not all are going t o speak in them and those that dont in no way means that they were not baptised in the Holy Spirit! This is unscriptural.

Reply: Speaking of baptism some have been using 1Corinthians chapter 12. Verse 13 is one that many use to make just this point noted above. Note, however, what is being said in the first part of this verse:

"For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body..."

This is not speaking of the baptism that Jesus gives us-into the Holy Spirit-instead, this is the Spirit bapitzing us into Jes us. Verse 13 of 1st Corinthians is talking about conversion and is distinct from the baptism in the Spirit.

Now some hold to this as the Spirit batism but hold that there is a subsequent infilling.

To say that teaching the initial physical evidence is unscriptural is to ignore every incedent of its occurance in the book o f Acts my brother.

JesusisGod2 wrote: I myself am pentecostal and do not speak in tongues and have prayed for them as well as all of the gifts, and as of yet have not spoken in them. But I know for certain I have been baptised into the body of Christ and will b e with my tongue speaking brothers when Christ come to call us home.

Reply: Amen Brother, I can't wait untill we are all up there before the throne worshipping together.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2003/9/11 11:29

Part 4.

I'm going to try to reply in this next post without giving a commentary on 1Corinthians Ch.14, but it's gonna be hard not to. ;-)

Herdman wrote:

Quote:

First, the disciples who were asked, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?", in Acts 19, were evidently Apollos' converts (Acts 18:24-28

) because they only knew John's baptism (18:25; 19:3). They didn't get "saved" until Paul preached to them "that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus." At the point that they received Jesus, they would have been baptised by the Holy Ghost into the body of Christ (see below). Then they were baptised in water. When the Holy Ghost "came on them" in verse 6 to speak with tongues and prophesy, he had to already be "in" them or they would not have been saved.

So, there is a difference between being "baptised" by the Holy Spirit and being "filled" with the Spirit.

The baptsm by the Holy Ghost into the body of Christ is a spiritual baptism that takes place when a person receives Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit baptises that person into the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus (Rom. 6:3-6), spiritually circumcises his flesh away from his soul, "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh," (Col. 2:11-12), and puts him into the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12:13; Eph. 5:30-32), all of which takes place at salvation, and without water.

Reply: You have got a good grasp here on the distinction between being baptized by the Spirit(into the body of Christ; conversion) and being baptized into the Spirit (The infilling of the Holy Spirit as Jesus sends forth the promise of the Father).

Herdman wrote: Second, the tongues in 1 Cor. 14 are unknown to the hearers, not to the speaker.(huh?) The hearers need an interpreter so that they will know what the "barbarian" is saying (14:11). If the speaker has the "gift" of tongues, then he won't need an interpreter at all (Acts 2)(huh?) because every man would hear "them speak in his own language," (Acts 2:6). That's why Paul said that these tongues can be learned(???) (14:16, 23) because they are languages. :-D (ok, I had a little fun with that quote)

Reply: Ok, let's break down chapter 14. Verses 1-6 Paul addresses the problem. What was Really going on in Corinth was the mistaken pagan belief that if one babbled then their god was with them. In the pagan temples the worshipers would work themselves up into a frenzy, and when they started babbling this would be a sign that their god had blessed them . This was the sign to unbelievers that Paul is talking about in verse 22. This is set up by verse 21 where by Paul is quoting Isaiah 28:11, which is a judgement on Israel for not listening to the Lord. Paul is applying this to the pagans in their temple worship. The Corinthian Church fell into this error.

In verses 7-11 Paul is giving examples of things that are not understood by people. He uses instruments playing out of tune and two foreigners trying to communicate. These are examples of failure of communication used to explain why tongues should be followed with an interpretation. He is not explaining the mystery of tongues with the example of the barbarian.

"Second, the tongues in 1 Cor. 14 are unknown to the hearers, not to the speaker"

This is not a correct interpretation of what Paul is saying. Verse 14: For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays(speaks mysteries), but my mind is unfruitful(he doesn't understand what he is himself saying).

"If the speaker has the "gift" of tongues, then he won't need an interpreter at all"(?)

Verse 27: If anyone speaks in a tongue, it should be by two or at the most three, and each in turn, and on must interpret

Paul shows here that there is a difference between tongues and interpretations. Interpretation is equated later in the chapter with prophecying. I am studying German right now, but if I can interpret what a German is saying into English, that doesn't make me a prophet.

Acts Ch.2 is one of many examples given in the New Testament of the operation of tongues; not all of which were immediately understood by the people, thus the need for the gift of interpreting tongues.

How do you get out of verses 16 and 23 that these langueges can be learned?

"Evidently, what was going on in this seaport is that foreigners were coming in to the congregation with something to say (14:26) but few, if any, could understand them."

The context of verse 26 is clearly not talking about foreigners but of the congregation of Corinth.

The context of the text must be the determining factor of what scripture is saying. The scriptures cannot mean what they

never meant. Paul is laying out for the Corinthians an explanation of the proper use of tongues in the congregation. The context is clearly speaking of tongues as a mystery.

Verse 2: For one who speaks in a tongue does not speak to men but to God(so if I know how to speak German, I am act ually speaking to God if I'm in a room of Frenchmen?); for no one understands(this includes the speaker), but in his spirit he speaks mysteries.

I hope I have shed a little light on this subject and not just muddied the waters.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2003/9/14 13:46

Hisrock wrote: One has to examine the definition of a fiery cloven tongue to really understand speaking in tongues. As a ship divides the waters of the ocean as it travels (cloven), so an individual totally immersed in the Word of God divides th e world's doctrines from His truth, all by the fire of God's Word.

Reply: There are several things taking place at once here in Acts chapter 2. This is the birth of the church. The cloven to ngues translation could be translated as a fire appearing among them that divided up into tongues resting over each one of them.

The fire is important; but not in the issue of the baptism in the Spirit. There is something wonderful taking place here. Wh en the first sacrifice took place in the Tabernacle, God came down and consumed the sacrifice, the same took place at t he opening of Solomon's temple, now it's taking place at the birth of the Church. God is pleased with what's taking place and is in effect putting his signature on it.

Hisrock wrote: A friend of mine, who was a missionary for years, speaks five languages. He told me that it was a gift of God, given of the Holy Spirit and is to be used to glorify God. I believe that is the closest anyone will get to speaking in t ongue's in the literal sense.

Reply: This is actually the definition the Mormon's give to the gift of tongues; not a supernatural soveriegn act of God, bu t a talent or ability given to natural men. The gifts can be better understood in the whole of the Church. While individuals will operate in these ministries, they are not gifts to individuals, but to the Church as a whole in which the Holy Spirit divi des up and dispenses as He sees the need. While we may be used in these gifts, they are not ours, but always belong t o the Holy Spirit for the edification of the Lord's Church.

I do hold to the initial evidence but I am in total agreement that it is not the definitive evidence. One cannot fall back on t he excuse, "Well I spoke in tongues so I've been baptized," if they are living an immoral life. I would say that person had a false experience. It must be followed by a life that bears the fruit of the Spirit.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by dpike777, on: 2003/9/14 17:21

Seek the giver of the gifts. Christ is greater than His gifts. Get focused on Him. If you are putting your emphasis on the gifts then your actually putting the gifts before the giver and that makes an idol of the gifts-hence idolatry.

Seek Him and He will fill you in His time.

Also, When you get the gift of the Spirit, you will be the first one to know it and will not question whether you have it or n ot. The problem in allot of churches is they land hands on you and you say "Hubba dubba bubba" and they say "you just got filled". Nonsense! If someone has to tell you have the Holy Ghost, then you don't have Him. When He comes, you will know it!

Re: - posted by PastorJoeMiller (), on: 2003/12/30 17:26

Taka wrote: It is also important to note that Pentecostalism has not only accepted an understanding of the book of Acts t hat is "novel" but it has also made this doctrine the most important distinguishing feature of its identity. An essential area of contemporary Pentecostal theology, then, was simply absent from the church until modern times.

Hulsey Replied: Many things were lost as the Catholic Church slowly fell into apostacy. The Early Church was by and lar ge filled with all of the Charismata right up untill the end of the 3rd century (200's). Many restoration movements would a rise through the years that would either be put down or fall into error, many times both happened. But as the Church beg an to split off of the Catholic Church, at which point should we have stopped seeking the restoration of all the Church's f ormer glory? Many things were lost to Catholicism that have been regained by protestantism. What's to say that this isn't one of them?

It can not be one of them because nobody ever taught this before Charles Parham in 1901. You can not recapture what was never lost and we should not teach, what was never taught.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2003/12/31 0:18

Quote:
----------It can not be one of them because nobody ever taught this before Charles Parham in 1901. You can not recapture what was never l ost and we should not teach, what was never taught.

What do you exactly mean? The baptism of the Holy Spirit? It has been taught especially before the asuza street revival, people like R.A. Torrey and Andrew Murray taught these doctrines in a much more proper and fuller sense. But the expe rience of the restoration of the Holy spirit in its fulness in people really came out in the revival at azuza street.

Re: - posted by lyndon, on: 2004/1/2 13:44

Quote:
Something had to show this was the identical gift with that given in Acts 2:4 before the Jerusalem Christians could be sat isfied. Peter did not say, "I hope they receied the outpouring, the Gentiles took it by faith, so I think they have it, I believe they have it." He knew they were filled, not by thier testimony, but by the Holy Spirit's testimony through them. The Spirit gave the evidence, and He gave only one. "The spoke with tongues and magnified God" (exactly as in Acts 2:4,11). Obviously, speaking in tongues was the convincing evidence here. And in a day when so many think, hope, believe, and then wonder whether they have the baptism in the Spirit, perhaps a convincing evidence is still needed.

Tongues was the sign of baptism in the Spirit in all recorded instances except for mabye 2 or 3. Now a person could ea sily read into those two or three instances that speaking in tongues was implied.
My take on this subject is that the tongues were indeed the intial evidence which was required for Peter to know that th e Gentiles had indeed received the same baptism as the Jews and therefore had the same excess to the covenant. The reby he gave leave to baptise them into the new coventant. However, I would say that it was the initial evidence only in t hose few recorded cases in Acts. My reasoning is (and I am open to correction) that devil started coming in as an angel of light and creating counterfeit tongues, diciples, teachers, ect... Keep in mind that what makes an error attractive is the amount of truth in it. The more truth the more attractive. NObody would believe something that is 100% false. I do not believe that tongues is still the convincing evidence. Bearing in mind that convincing evidence is needed only to convinc e others of the baptism, scripture seems to clearly imply that those who receive the baptism KNOW that they kave receiv ed the Spirit. The only sign of Baptism Of The Spirit that I would call genuine each and every time is a changed life, a ch ristlike demeanor, a love for the things of Christ, a hatred for the things that Christ hates, in short Christ dwelling IN YOU .

A Work In Progress
Lyndon

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/1/5 18:32

This is a very interesting topic for me. Our last church was non- denominational but charasmatic. This is where I first lear ned to "hear' from the Lord and that I had the heart of a "prophet" yet I don't know I would call it that. I always think that a ll christians should have a hunger for righteousness and very good discernment about things that are "anti"- Christ.

I was prayed over many times to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit- which I knew I already had- but couldn't speak in tongues. When one "expert" approached me in a long line of others- he stopped when he got close and said "wow, you have the Holy Spirit all over you!" I was like, then how is that I can't speak in tongues? He prayed for me. I was the only one totally overcome to the floor with the Holy Spirit- yet no tongues!

I went home dissappointed because I knew I had other gifts (discernment, etc...) Right away the Lord gave me Romans 12, then I continued with 13and 14. I felt He was trying to tell me something there. I knew from these passages that I sho uld be grateful for the gifts I have and not worry about whether I spoke in tongues. I had some gifts that were edifying to others (wisdom, discernment, teaching)So why was I so upset about not speaking in tongues? Because of the church an d their doctrine. Many at the church told me that it WAS the evidance and that maybe I wasn't ready yet, or relaxed enou gh, or whatever.

Now I am glad that I have the gifts I have and do not speak in tongues- this is one of the things which seperated me fro m the charasmatic church (along with some discerning things in the church).

I am quite weird when I look at it. My belief in prophecy, dreams, and the miraculous keeps me out of the consrvative ch urches. But then my belief against "everyone has to speak in tongues", and other charasmatic movement things (false p rophets)- keeps me out of the charasmatic churches.

I really don't fit in anywhere. Which is why I am still at home for now.

Re: Theological Algebra - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/6 5:12

Some time ago I was playing about with something I called Theological Algebra. It may serve as I kind of 'international translator' so that when someone uses a phrase like 'baptism in the Spirit' you will have an idea of what they mean by it.

1.The Key
a. -> signifies "leading to..."
b. / signifies "otherwise knows as.."
c. = signifies "is the same as.."

2. the Reformed (Calvinist) position
a. regeneration > conversion > sealing of Spirit/assurance
i. Calvinists regard conversion as the evidence of regeneration
ii. but do allow for an assurance/witness of the Spirit to come later
iii. this would have been Dr. Martin Lloyd Jones' essential position

3. the Brethren position
a. conversion/regeneration = baptism in Spirit
i. Brethren used to say that conversion = regeneration
ii. they also distinguished between Standing and State
1) i.e. what we are In Christ and what we are In Experience
2) "reckoning" on the fact of what we are in Christ brings us into a conscious experience.
iii. Standing and State become identical.
1) This is Watchman Nee's position.
iv. there are now some Charismatic Brethren

4. the Wesleyan Holiness position
a. conversion/regeneration > pure heart/sanctification/baptism in Spirit
i. Wesley taught concerning justification and regeneration that in order of time "neither of these is before the other... but that in order of thinking... justification precedes the New Birth." Sermon on The New Birth
ii. Wesley didn't use the phrase "baptism in Spirit", but John Fletcher of Madeley did
iii. Wesleyans used the phrase Perfect Love, or Christian Perfection to describe the experience of sanctification

b. Later Wesleyan Holiness (Church of the Nazarene etc.,) people called this The Second Blessing or Sanctification

5. the Keswick position
a. conversion/regeneration > sanctification (as a process)
i. Wesleyan Holiness teaches that the root of sin is removed in a moment of time
1) this is the position of Thomas Cook, Samuel Chadwick, Paget Wilkes
ii. Keswick Holiness teaches that the power of sin (or the old nature) remains but may be overpowered daily by the Spirit's life
1) this is the position of J.C.Ryle, Andrew Murray, Donald Barnhouse, The Billy Graham Organization

6. the Pentecostal Holiness position
a. conversion/regeneration > pure heart/sanctification > power for service/baptism in Spirit

i. the first "Pentecostals" were Wesleyan Holiness with a subsequent "empowering" experience of the Spirit

7. the Pentecostal/Charismatic position
a. conversion/regeneration > power for service/baptism in Spirit
i. Charismatics are Pentecostals in non Pentecostal denominations
1) some Pentecostals insist on tongues as the initial evidence of baptism in Spirit
2) NB the idea of a crisis in which the Spirit deals with the root of sin has no real place in Charismatic teaching.
b. some Anglo Catholic and Roman Catholic Charismatics believe in baptismal regeneration of infants

8. RB position as at 6 Jan 2004 !!
a. conversion > (regeneration + union + full repentance + pure heart/sanctification + power for service + assurance) = baptism in Spirit
i. i.e. full immersion into all the flowing, living life of God!
ii. Galatians 3:27
For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.
iii. 2 Corinthians 5:17
Therefore if any man in Christ, a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.

In my personal pilgrimage through this Theological Algebra I have been Keswick, followed by Pentecostal/Charismatic, f ollowed by Pentecostal-Holiness, and have held my current understanding for about 30 years, however 'watch this spac e....' ;-)

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/1/6 11:38

I have to be honest here.

1. I hate algebra.
2. This is likely because I was stoned (not the biblical kind) through all of High School.
3.My biggest concern in regards to regeneration is that of brain cells!
4.This is very helpful, I think, (see #3)
5.Surely I jest, though the statements are true.
6.Lastly MB's postion as of Jan. 6,2004:
a)On my face before God

:-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/6 13:52

Quote:
----------I have to be honest here.

Quote:
----------1. I hate algebra.

Mike,
I hated arithmetic but loved algebra and geometry. They are the 'logic' of mathematics. Here's an algebra problem for y ou to try your skill on.

Here are a couple of equations based on Paul's letter to the Galatians...

(a) if Christ's death + 0 = salvation
and
Christ's death + law-keeping = salvation
if these two equations are true then what is the 'value' of law-keeping?

(b) if law-keeping + 0 = salvation
and
law-keeping + Christ's death = salvation
if these two equations are true then what is the 'value' of Christ's death?

I don't know whether or not Paul liked algebra but his 'logic' was flawless. Salvation by grace through faith, and salvation acquired by merit are mutually exclusive. Either law-keeping has no value, or Christ's death has no value; there is no thi rd option of mixture.

Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/1/6 13:56

Wow, I think I kinda got that. I thought this thread was going over my head. :-)

Thanks!

~Chanin

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/6 14:56

Hi Chanin
Good for you! That little 'woolly headed' avatar of yours never had me fooled for a minute. :-D

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/1/7 0:06

Quote:
----------I hated arithmetic but loved algebra and geometry. They are the 'logic' of mathematics.

That's funny, I loved math and then they started adding letter's to it and I thought "Well, this is just confusing, what will I ever need this for?" :-)

As to the example:
Quote:
----------if these two equations are true

Right there you lost me, since they are not both true (a), my brain just goes into battle mode and sticks on 'if'.
I still hate algebra.
 :-D
P.S. The premise still holds true.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/7 4:28

Hi Mike
It is interestng that if you say "what do you get if you add 3 to 4" most people will have a try, but if you say "if it takes a man 3 hours..." their eyes glaze over. :-o

Arithmetic and Trigonometry answer the question 'what'. Algebra and Geometry answer the question 'why'. The numbers or size of things never interested me much, but 'why' has been my life's theme!

That said, I'll stop. A wise preacher knows that when he has to start illustrating his illustrations it is time to change direction. :-D

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/1/7 10:10

Hi Ron,

All in good fun...
Your illustration is sound and in no need of being illustrated. Actually like word problems.

Thought maybe we were verging away from the topic of speaking in tounges until it dawned on me that algebra *is speaking in tounges*!

'bout ran this one into the ground, will go away now. :-)

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/1/7 15:40

'Theological Algebra' I love it! Of course I always did enjoy math.

Let me try my hand at it.

During a sermon, a Roman Catholic priest in Las Vegas, Nevada was speaking on the death of Christ. He said, "Jesus did almost all the work for our salvation, I would say about 90%."

If this priest is correct;

Jesus(90%) + Me(10%) = 100% sure of Heaven

However, if his mathematics are correct then I have to be 10% as good as Jesus. Now we know that Jesus is the infinite Son of God, God the Son. Therefore;

I must = 10% of infinity
10% of infinity = infinity

Therefore I must be infinite. Hmmm...that priest has made heaven unobtainable for us all!

In Christ,

Ron :-D

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/7 17:36

Hi Ron
I've just added another little bit of theological algebra to the Evolution debate. :-P

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/9 12:52

Hi brother Ron,

I see your equation. Sometimes we start with assumptions which lead us astray. If I may change one variable, it would be this:

Christ's death + Christ's life = Salvation

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/9 15:05

Christ's death is salvation purchased; His life is salvation imparted. My algebra was relating to Paul's teaching in Galatia ns

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/9 16:01

New equation: mercy+grace+faith= salvation

Many in Christ=1
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/9 18:27

New equation based on Ron's quote:

salvation purchased = blood of Christ= x
all world= all who ever lived= y
grace=a
faith=b
heirs of Christ= 7

{X(Y) + A} /B =7

in Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/9 18:48

Jeff
I have worked a lot through translators in many different countries. I accept responsibility for my own words but not for t hose of my translators. I remember a story of one hard-pressed translator who confessed "I didn't understand what he was saying, so I preached my own sermon"

I don't know whether your algebra is a good translation or not, so I will leave you to make your own statements and trans late them as you will. :-P

Re: - posted by almondBranch (), on: 2004/1/9 18:48

I have enjoyed the algebra, being a programmer I like logic :-). However, here is a little illustration of a different nature to sum up my understanding of the baptism of the Spirit.

Picture a fish swimming in the sea, you are the fish, the sea is lost humanity. One day you find yourself with a hook in yo ur mouth and are subsequently yanked out of the sea and unto the shore.

The moment the hook is in your mouth is conversion, the yanking out is the baptism. You are brought out of one humanit y and into another (to borrow a phrase from Sparks)

So in that sense I would see conversion and immersion (spiritual that is) as two seperate "events" but one leads logicaly to the other and in fact the latter is the goal of the former not an add on for some extra power.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/9 23:17

Sorry Ron,

When I wrote "based on Ron's statement," I was addressing your point of salvation purchased. I did not intend for it to e xplain what you meant. However, salvation that was purchased by Jesus was for all. This is what I endeavored to equa te in my statement. This is my statement.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/9 23:59

Back on the thread:

I really enjoyed the discussion topic. I have one comment pretaining to these three statements:

Taka wrote: John the Baptizer was filled with the Spirit from his mother's womb (Luke 1:15), yet this Spirit filled man did no miracles and never spoke in tongues (John 10:41).

Todd wrote: I often hear this example (Ravenhill, etc.) and I wonder how relevant it is to the discussion. Because John the Baptist was a transitional figure (in between Old and New Testament times).

Husley wrote: One is John the Baptist and his being filled with the Holy Spirit in the womb. John's filling must be understood from the position of the covenants in which he appears. He was the last of the O/T prophets and so was filled like they were...Jeremiah etc.

In my belief the teachings of dispensational theology are men's attempts to cut up the Scriptures. The definition or parameters by which this doctrine frames the work of God will cause one to stumble and the veil remains.

Second, throughout this thread, the gifts of the Holy Spirit have been discussed. As Taka observed in Scripture, John performed no signs. Yet as many have written, there are other gifts of the Holy Spirit besides tongues and miracles. "And God has appointed these in the church; first apostles, second **prophets**, third teachers,.." 1 Corinthians 12:28. Als o, "to another the working of miracles, **to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits,**" 1 Corinthians 12:10. Al so, "Pursue love, and desire spiritual gifts, **but especially that you may prophesy."** 1 Corinthians 14:1.

In Hebrews 11:1, "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." I know that Jesus w as the substance of John's hope, and we all know the evidence of the power of God in John's life. The evidence of the s piritual gifts of prophesy and discerning of spirits can not be denied. Dispensational theology limits ones understanding when one denies the work of the Holy Spirit in the saints prior to Christ's death on the cross. Yet as you can see the Hol y Spirit chooses the gifts He gives to all saints. This has been discussed in great lengths in this thread.

The Old Testament reveals the mysteries of God. Once you see the law of faith in Christ weaved throughout the books of the law and the prophets, you will begin to see that God through Jesus has always enabled the saints to be faithful thr ough the work of the Holy Spirit. One must remember this, the law given to Moses on Mount Sinai condemned all of Isra el. It taught the Jews about their iniquities. It was only meant to lead them to Christ.

Where does Scripture say that the filling of the Old Testament saints differs from the New Testament saints?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by jeremyhulsey (), on: 2004/1/10 0:54

Hello rookie,

I'll try to answer a couple of your questions about John the Baptist and why we have painted such a portrait of him in our descriptions.

"Husley wrote: One is John the Baptist and his being filled with the Holy Spirit in the womb. John's filling must be underst ood from the position of the covenants in which he appears. He was the last of the O/T prophets and so was filled like th ey were...Jeremiah etc. "

At various times through certain individuals in Israel's history God filled men with His Spirit. This was not a general outpo uring, but more of a sporadic type. These men prophecied, wrote scripture, and even commanded armies, but mainly cal led the nation back to holiness. As far as being Spirit filled, the filling was identical to the New Testament. That is, they li ved a Spirit filled life, and bore the fruit of the Spirit. The difference is that the Old Testament fillings could not claim the f ullfillment of Joel's prophecy of the Spirit being poured out on all flesh. This was proclaimed as being fullfilled in Acts Ch. 2 By Peter. Peter then went on to preach that the promise was for all who would believe. The promise of the New Coven ant is that God would place in us a new heart and a new spirit, and fill us with His Spirit (read Ezek. ch.36).

You were wondering why John the Baptist is considered the Last O/T prophet. He is given that title because he is the m ain herald of Christ in his time. While others did prophecy in the temple, no one made a public profession of Christ's iden tity quite like John. He was the final man in a long line of men AND women who longed and searched for the coming of t he messiah. His may have not been the only prophetic voice of his time, but it was the culmination of the hope of Israel made alive in the revelation of God's Lamb. Jesus even called him the Elijah to come. Certainly in that sense he was the last and final O/T prophet.

In Christ,
Jeremy Hulsey

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/10 9:23

Jeff
I think Hulsey and myself are very much on the same wavelength on this thread. I think I have commented on another thread that the phrase 'filled with the Spirit' is unique to Luke. (Paul's Ephesians phrase has a different form and purpose). Luke uses 'filled with the Spirit' in a generic sense, that is, it is an all purpose phrase which serves as an umbrella term for several different and distinguishable events and states.

Because Luke uses the term in this way when we read it we need to ask 'what does this mean in this context'. We do this all the time in Bible study eg.Peter once cries 'Save me' does that mean that from that time we was 'saved'? We would have to examine the context to know.

Jesus spoke of a new and different relationship with the Spirit that could not be experienced until He had gone to the Father and sent the Spirit. Jesus made this distinction by saying 'he dwelleth with you and shall be in you'. He said is was expedient that He went away because unless He went the Spirit (and this experience of Him would not be possible).

What we have here is a clear indication that as a result of the coming events; his death, resurrection, ascension a new era would be inaugurated. Now I know that Jeff doesn't like dispensationalism, so call it what you will, something different was on the way.

John's gospel speaks very clearly of the coming of the Spirit as an event that must be preceeded by Christ's glorification. Whether you regard Christ's glorification as the Cross or the Resurrection or His ascession to the throne, doesn't matter at this point. The point that Hulsey is making is a simple and fundamental one. John Baptist died before Christ was glori fied and hence before the 'Spirit was given'.

Christ Himself regarded John as the greatest 'born of woman' but continued that he who is least in the Kingdom of God i s greater than John. What can this mean other than to say, as the time it was spoken, John was not in the Kingdom of God? and that those who are in some sense are 'greater' than those were not in Kingdom of God.

John was a great man and we do not diminish his greatness by making the distinction that Christ came to inaugurate a New Covenant through the shedding of His own blood. He was a great man but he did not have Christ within, how could he Christ was there on the earth with him?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/12 11:17

Husley wrote;

"As far as being Spirit filled, the filling was identical to the New Testament. That is, they lived a Spirit filled life, and bore the fruit of the Spirit. The difference is that the Old Testament fillings could not claim the fullfillment of Joel's prophecy of the Spirit being poured out on all flesh."

I agree with you in terms of what you say about the prophesy of Joel. The Spirit was poured out at Pentecost and at oth er times in the generations since then. Like the history of Israel, the last 2000 years has seen times of revival and then t he falling away of the His church. Also Peter in Acts 2:17-21, while identifing Pentecost as a fulfillment of Joel's prophes y also identifies a future work of God. "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the comi ng of the great and awesome day of the Lord." Acts 2:20. Throughout the Scriptures there is a sense of minor and majo r fulfillments of prophesy.

As far as the gifts and evidence of the fruit of the Spirit within the Old Testament saints, I believe there are more than a f ew who have been filled and indwelled by the Spirit in the Old Testament. "Women received their dead raised to life aga in. Others were toutured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. Still others had trial of mockings and scourgings, yes, and of chains and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn in two, were tempt ed, were slain with the sword. They wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented o f whom the world was not worthy, they wandered in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth. All of these having obtained a good testimony through faith, did not receive the promise, God having something better for us, that th ey should not be made perfect apart from us." Hebrews 11:35:40

As one reads through the major and minor prophets, as one reads the Psalms, one will hear of the faithful who have the witness of the evidence of the filling of the Holy Spirit.

The day of Pentecost does not exclude those who lived before or after.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/12 18:24

Old Testament enablings of the Spirit were to equip men and women to do specific tasks. When the Spirit came they 'did '. The fundamental difference in the Spirit's coming at Pentecost is captured in the words of Jesus, The Spirit coming up on you, you shall be...

The OT was give supernatural gifts; the NT to give supernatural life.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/13 12:26

Ron wrote:

"The OT gave supernatural gifts; the NT gives supernatural life." I sort of paraphased your thought.

Chapter 11 of Hebrews gives us an example of OT saints who lived by faith. We see the evidence of the supernatural gi fts God gave them. This chapter is given to set for us an example of how faith should change our lives in the NT era.

Within the context of this thread we are talking about the power of the Holy Spirit and His effect in the life of the believer. You distinguish between the supernatural gifts of the OT and the supernatural life of the NT promises. Again according to this thread, I have heard, where are the mature Christians? Where is the power of this supernatural life promise foun d within the New Covenant? I have asked this same question in the area I live in. There are few who are following hard after God. So I have come to understand that faith comes by hearing God's voice. But today, few hear His voice. We h ave become dull of hearing. We all seek our own ways. His way through the cross is not preached. His way for the mo st part has been rejected by skillful manipulation of the word of God. Where is the power that was poured out on the day

of Pentecost?

I know that the Spirit is working in India and China.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/13 14:35

I am very sorry to have missed out on this discussion until now. I have tried to catch up by skimming through it. This topic troubles and interests me greatly.

I am surprised that no one has brought up a few specific issues, though. One being that there is reason to believe that the gift of tongues was a gift of human languages that had a pagan counterpart of ecstatic speech. It is well-known that ecstatic babbling has been a part of false religion since Babylon. It has always been a part of mystical trances where people feel close to God and actually has a lot in common with the modern Charismatics. There is a case to be made that Paul was distinguishing between these in I Cor by using the singular and plural at different points. There are different types of human language (plural), but only one non-language of babbling (singular). It seems that the KJV translators caught on to this distinction and many theologians have as well. This is mentioned by Dr. John MacArthur in his book Charismatic Chaos as well as in his study Bible notes.

Another point that no one has brought forth is the explanation that Paul gave of the purpose of tongues.

Tongues a Sign to Unbelievers
20 Brethren, do not be children in understanding; however, in malice be babes, but in understanding be mature.
21In the law it is written:
"With men of other tongues and other lips
I will speak to this people;
And yet, for all that, they will not hear Me," says the Lord.
22Therefore tongues are for a sign, not to those who believe but to unbelievers; but prophesying is not for unbelievers but for those who believe.

Not much I can add to that except it seems to argue against both a need for tongues today and argue against the idea that it is for a "private prayer language."

Tozer has a good sermon on this site about the perpetuation of Pentecost. We need to live powerfully in the Spirit without expecting everyday to be like the one on which He arrived. I love my wife but I don't expect the emotional peak of my wedding to be matched everyday of our marriage.

If I preach the law and wrath of God to people some will repent and others won't. There is scriptural evidence to suggest that if I had the Spirit raising the dead through my hand that my witness wouldn't have any more effect. Plus I'd be heaping more judgement on the unbelievers. Charismatics need to give up the notion that we are to be characterized by continual supernatural phenomena to be the true Bride. The lie that supernatural signs are better is refuted in the story of Lazarus and the rich man.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/13 15:25

Does Dr. John MacArthur teach that the gifts of the Holy Spirit given at Pentecost still do or do not apply today?

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/13 17:33

Jeff
I have listened to a couple of audio files in sermonindex here and didn't pick up any cessationist vibes.

Re: - posted by almondBranch (), on: 2004/1/13 19:37

Quote:
----------Does Dr. John MacArthur teach that the gifts of the Holy Spirit given at Pentecost still do or do not apply today?

Its my understanding that MacArthur is adamantly cessationist.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/14 14:21

MacArthur is a cessationist. He believes that God still providentially heals of His own will, but not through "healers." He b
elieves that biblical tongues were human languages as recorded in Acts and therefore it is a statement of historical fact t
hat they have ceased, which fits with the purpose given for them as described in my earlier post. He believes that we rec
ieve the Holy Spirit at the time of conversion and should be continuously filled with the Spirit. He believes that God's spe
cial revelation is the Bible and that the canon of Scripture is closed and not in need of anything more. To embrace extrab
iblical revelation (using "thus saith the Lord" for anything other than a direct quote from Scripture) is to jump out of the bo
at of orthodox Christianity and right into the laps of the Catholics and Mormons. He also believes that the current Pentec
ostal movement needs to get very serious about examining their practices biblically. His main call in Charismatic Chaos i
s not to get people to hate Pentecostals or anything ridiculous like that. He simply wants to show many of the Pentecost
al beliefs and practices for what they are and send a message that even if you aren't a cessationist you had better at lea
st get some discernment fast. He basically calls the people who believe in these gifts for today to at the minimum adhere
to the biblical constraints and purposes for the gifts. It is so easy to tear down many of the ridiculous teachings that have
been put out there by Branham, Hagin, Copeland, etc. These people are the fathers of the movement for many branche
s and all were clearly heretical in many ways! It is very hard to find a Pentecostal leader who hasn't made up bizarre doc
trines and then told everybody who questions them that they're blaspheming the Holy Spirit. This stuff is crazy and peopl
e need to be taught the Bible well enough to be able to stand up to these leaders and challenge their teachings.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/14 15:50

thanks nobody
that is very concise and helpful.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/14 16:19

I have found that many who label themselves as cessationists base their stance on 1 Corinthians 13:10. "But when that which is perfect has come, then that which is in part will be done away." The cessationist believes that the Scriptures, w hen completed by the writing of Revelation, marks the end of God's work through the gifts of the Spirit during the time of the apostles. I believe this interpretation is wrong. In addition, I am not aware of any other Scripture which teaches the cessationist position.

Secondly, I have also heard the cessationist arguement that, one cannot base their relationship with God on experiential evidence. I believe a cessationist's doctrine also bases his arguement on experiential evidence. His experience is that he has not experienced the Holy Spirit in the way Scripture gives testimony to.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/14 19:50

"Those who label themselves as cessationists" apparently refers to all of orthodox Christianity for the last 1900 years. Th ese misinterpreters of Scripture must include all the Reformers, the Puritans, and most of the theologians and bible scho lars of today. Don't pretend for a moment that the Pentecostal isn't arguing with every great Christian thinker in church hi story. Don't pretend for a moment that the orthodox haven't stood up to the test of time against a hundred times more sc rutiny by gifted men. The Pentecostal have almost never been scrutinized by their own followers due to fear of blasphem y of the Holy Spirit or touching the Lord's anointed or whatever else they dream up to control people with. Against all of t his the Pentecostal jumps up and says "Your doctrines disagree with my experiences." The funny thing about your state ment involving the orthodox Christian following their experience is that all Christians who don't specifically seek the Pent ecostal experience never have it. So you go and seek a mystical experience, then base a theology on it, and then tell m e that my theology is wrong due to a lack of the experience that you've had? The orthodox Christian views are from the Scripture whether they have been experienced or even hated. Many Christians hate the doctrines of predestination and hell but still preach them because they are biblical and therefore true. I once got my best friend, an AG youth pastor, to a dmit that his theology was based on experience. After that there is nothing left to argue about. He has admittedly forsake n Scripture as tha authority and inserted mysticism. Following your experiences over truth will always lead to false religio n. It will also lead to the Pentecostal church splitting that happens when two people have conflicting "thus saith the Lord"' s. There is one truth and it is not determined by whether you feel God or even see Him. How is the Antichrist going to de cieve the people? By healing! You can't say something is from God because it happens when there is a deciever on the l oose! If Benny Hinn and the Antichrist have the same sign then how do you discern?

Sola Scriptura was a principle of the Reformers and anyone who rejects it is in serious danger. Does the Scripture itself not make many claims to be completely sufficient? Does it not say over and over again to be on guard against anyone w ho has something new or different to say?

Let me finish for now by mentioning that all the important gifts remain. Teaching, charity, faith, etc. It is only the ones tha t no longer have a place that have ceased. The prophecy of tongues has been fulfilled and the church has been establis hed.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/15 0:11

I think that in your search for a scripture to back up cessationism you missed ICor 13:8. It establishes the fact that tongu es will at some point permanently cease (pauo). Couple this together with the fact that tongues did in fact cease within th e NT and I think my cessationism to be very biblical. Paul mentions tongues in ICor which was an early epistle. After that he writes at least 12 epistles often addressing the gifts and never brings it up. Peter, James, John, and Jude never menti on tongues. There is no evidence of tongues in the period following the NT and by the time of Chrysostom and Augustin e the gift was so far gone and obscure that they only knew of it what was in Acts and ICor. Funny that such a huge part of the Pentecostal experience is one of the smallest parts of the NT. Even when it is mentioned it is spoken of as an infe rior gift that many misuse to puff up their egos and show off with.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/15 6:05

What you have done is help me out with your highlighting. You say that all the things that will pass away use the same w ord. Very interesting that tongues ceasing is a different word! I see this as supporting the view that tongues ceasing was viewed as somehow different than all the rest. Maybe that difference would be that tongues served its purpose and beca me useless before prophecy and knowledge.

An interpretation must be one that was intelligible to the original recipients. Fair enough I think. How does that apply her e since the meaning of his words was obvious? Love endures forever. Gifts of prophecy and knowledge will pass away a nd tongues will cease. How was this unintelligible to them?

The way that I see the tongues issue is as follows. Paul said they would cease. They in fact historically did. Now the bur den of proof is on the Pentecostal to prove that this new outpouring that looks nothing like the original is valid!

The Pentecostals sought to revive tongues in the beginning so they could get away with less missionary training (Charle s Fox Parham in Kansas). They sought to recieve the biblical gift in the way it oprated in Acts, but they were so strongly desiring the experience that when the mystical tongues of false religion came instead they accepted that just as happily as if it were the real thing. It is still the case in Pentecostal experience that one must seek the gift. They teach you to turn off your mind and even to "prime the pump" by babbling. Pure mysticism! Did Peter "prime the pump" before His sermon or did the Spirit just work in His own way?

It is true that the view that tongues have ceased is somewhat open for debate. Philologos brings up a few references of t ongues at work in the first couple hundred years. There were also heretical movements reviving it after the 1700's. I thin k that one must take that debate and then couple it with the debate of what the gift of tongues actually was. No one has spoken the gift of languages as Peter did since the early church. All claims in the Pentecostal movement to have actuall y done this are unsubstatiated (just like those stories of seeing Jesus and raising the dead). To say that mystical babblin g has existed since Babylon is probably a very true statement. It has moved into fringe groups of the church several time s in history. These accounts do not add up to the biblical gift of tongues.

Even if it were possible that somehow they have not ceased and the Spirit has simply chosen to keep the gift from us for nearly 2 millenia and now He wants to pour it back out I would expect to see the biblical gift and people moved to use it within biblical constraints. We in fact see nothing even close to this in the current Pentecostal movement. We see the ab uses taught and the real purposes untaught. Paul was not encouraging the Corinthians in ICOR 14 to use the gift to edif y themselves- He was rebuking them! He just finished the greatest work on love ever recorded and then attacked them f or their abuse of the showy gifts to puff themselves up rather than edify the church. The fact that no gift was given for th e edification of the gifted person is clear in Scripture. They are all for edification of the church and building up of each ot her. If Paul's assessment of prophecy being above tongues is correct as well as his rhetorical question implying that not all speak in tongues, then why the modern doctrine? If you get the baptism of the Spirit and speak in tongues and some one else speaks prophecies is not the latter better? If not all speak in tongues then how did this doctrine start? By a man who taught many false things (Charles Fox Parham). His other belief was that total sanctification was possible on earth after such an experience. Show me a single modern Pentecostal living in perfect holiness and I might convert to your bel iefs.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/15 6:28

nobody wrote I think that in your search for a scripture to back up cessationism you missed ICor 13:8. It establishes the f act that tongues will at some point permanently cease (pauo).

We need to see the verse in its whole context.

1Cor 13:8-11 Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.
For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall b e done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things.

The emboldened words are different translations of the verb katargeO which I posted on the Word Studies some time ag o. For a consistent interpretation we would have to give a consistent translation, particularly when they are in the same sentence. Be careful what you conclude about Â‘propheciesÂ’ because the same fate is predicted of Â‘knowledgeÂ’. I never yet met a cessationist who believed that Â‘knowledgeÂ’ had already become redundant (a valid translation for kat argeO btw).

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/15 6:28

nobody wrote There is no evidence of tongues in the period following the NT and by the time of Chrysostom and Augusti ne the gift was so far gone and obscure that they only knew of it what was in Acts and ICor.

nobody
a couple of comments.
First. There is an axiom in the study of history that 'absence of evidence is not evidence of absence'. We have to be ver y cautious about 'arguments from silence'. One of the chief spoils of victory is that you get to write the history! Most of o ur knowledge of church history comes from hostile witnesses; the state church of Christendom. Besides which there are sporadic references to supernatural gifts in much early chuch history.

Clement of Rome (died c.96), and Ignatius (c.35-c.107) document the continued operation of spiritual gifts among avera ge Christians.

Irenaeus of Lyon (c.130-202) describes charismatic gifts, especially prophecy, in his church in southern Gaul (modern Fr

ance), warning against Gnostics who fabricate the gifts to win the naive.

Tertullian (c.160-c.225) and the Montanist "New Prophets" (whose condemnations as heretics has recently been questio ned) practice healing, prophecy, and tongues.

Second. It is also an axiom of biblical exegesis that, other than in the case of predictive prophecy, an interpretation must be one that was intelligable to the original recipients. An interpretation cannot mean what it could never have meant to th e Corinthians. I am presuming in this that you hold that the 'canon of scripture' is the perfect thing that would come? Bu t this interpretation could have had no meaning to the original Corinthians. They would have had no concept of 'canon' n or is there any indication elsewhere in scripture that one day 'the canon' would be 'closed'.

Yes, I do believe the canon is now closed because I see that the original witnesses who were the guarantee of authentic ity have now passed on; John being the last and with the Johanine contribution there is no more 'scripture' that could be authenticated by those who were authorised to authenticate it.

However, to conclude, your exegesis of this chapter stands on very shaky ground, arguments from silence and an herm eneutic that could never have been understood by the original readers.

Re: - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2004/1/15 7:03

Quote:
---------- But this interpretation could have had no meaning to the original Corinthians. They would have had no concept of 'canon' nor is the re any indication elsewhere in scripture that one day 'the canon' would be 'closed'.

Excellent point Ron. It seems clear that when we look at verse 10 in context of 11-13 that "that which is perfect" refers to a state of heavenly perfection, a future life.

Paul illustrates the difference of these two states with the child/man example in verse 11. In verses 12 and 13 he speaks of seeing God face to face and knowing as we are known; this seems to be speaking of much more than just the closing of canon.

It was Matthew Henry who said; "It is the light of heaven only that will remove all clouds and darkness from the face of G od. It is at best but twilight while we are in this world; there it will be perfect and eternal day."

In Christ,

Ron

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/15 11:35

hi nobody
I think our webmaster has shuffled the postings for us. Certainly makes for some interesting discussions. :-)

you wrote What you have done is help me out with your highlighting. You say that all the things that will pass away use t he same word. Very interesting that tongues ceasing is a different word! I see this as supporting the view that tongues c easing was viewed as somehow different than all the rest. Maybe that difference would be that tongues served its purpo se and became useless before prophecy and knowledge.
It doesn't say 'prophecy' but 'prophecies'; this is a reference to the kind of 'prophecy' found elsewhere in this same letter, and on that basis would you say 'knowledge' has now passed away?

you wrote An interpretation must be one that was intelligible to the original recipients. Fair enough I think. How does that apply here since the meaning of his words was obvious? Love endures forever. Gifts of prophecy and knowledge will pa ss away and tongues will cease. How was this unintelligible to them?
Not the passing away but the arrival. How could they possibly have thought that the 'perfect' which would come would m ean the closing of the canon?

you wrote The way that I see the tongues issue is as follows. Paul said they would cease. They in fact historically did. N ow the burden of proof is on the Pentecostal to prove that this new outpouring that looks nothing like the original is valid!

I am not a Pentecostal, but you will be aware that for many centuries the truth of justification by faith seems to have drop ped out of the picture too. Its absence in the records does not mean that folks were not experiencing the blessing. I rep eat, absence of evidence does not mean evidence of absence.

The Pentecostals sought to revive tongues in the beginning so they could get away with less missionary training (Charle s Fox Parham in Kansas). They sought to recieve the biblical gift in the way it oprated in Acts, but they were so strongly desiring the experience that when the mystical tongues of false religion came instead they accepted that just as happily as if it were the real thing. It is still the case in Pentecostal experience that one must seek the gift. They teach you to turn off your mind and even to "prime the pump" by babbling. Pure mysticism! Did Peter "prime the pump" before His sermon or did the Spirit just work in His own way?
It just is not true that Pentecostals sought to revive tongues as an alternative to missionary training.

It is true that the view that tongues have ceased is somewhat open for debate. Philologos brings up a few references of t ongues at work in the first couple hundred years. There were also heretical movements reviving it after the 1700's. I thin k that one must take that debate and then couple it with the debate of what the gift of tongues actually was. No one has spoken the gift of languages as Peter did since the early church. All claims in the Pentecostal movement to have actuall y done this are unsubstatiated (just like those stories of seeing Jesus and raising the dead). To say that mystical babblin g has existed since Babylon is probably a very true statement. It has moved into fringe groups of the church several time s in history. These accounts do not add up to the biblical gift of tongues.
Peter did not 'preach' in foreign languages. Read Acts 2 again. Almost certainly he preached in koine Greek, the lingua franca of the time, particularly in Galilee of Gentiles, his home turf. Those who recognised their mother tongues heard th em 'praising God' as elsewhere in Acts.

Even if it were possible that somehow they have not ceased and the Spirit has simply chosen to keep the gift from us for nearly 2 millenia and now He wants to pour it back out I would expect to see the biblical gift and people moved to use it within biblical constraints. We in fact see nothing even close to this in the current Pentecostal movement. We see the ab uses taught and the real purposes untaught. Paul was not encouraging the Corinthians in ICOR 14 to use the gift to edif y themselves- He was rebuking them! He just finished the greatest work on love ever recorded and then attacked them f or their abuse of the showy gifts to puff themselves up rather than edify the church.
The solution to abuse is not non-use but correct use. Paul is not attacking them, but putting the gifts into a context of sub missive love. The problem with the Corinthian church was their individual self-centredness. Paul, himself, spoke with ton gues more than any of them, but in the church the priority is the building up of the body not the individual. Someone wh o speaks in tongues edifies themselves, so says Paul. But the Corinthians were effectively denying the 'one body' by the ir egocentricity. Paul is correcting that.

The fact that no gift was given for the edification of the gifted person is clear in Scripture.
sorry don't understand this one.

They are all for edification of the church and building up of each other. If Paul's assessment of prophecy being above to ngues is correct as well as his rhetorical question implying that not all speak in tongues, then why the modern doctrine? I f you get the baptism of the Spirit and speak in tongues and someone else speaks prophecies is not the latter better? If not all speak in tongues then how did this doctrine start? By a man who taught many false things (Charles Fox Parham). the key to interpreting these chapters is 'in the church'. In private devotions tongues edify the individual. I know some of Parham's doctrines. Luther taught justification by faith but was a rabid anti-semite.

His other belief was that total sanctification was possible on earth after such an experience. Show me a single modern P entecostal living in perfect holiness and I might convert to your beliefs.
You have misread history here. It was the otherway around. The early Pentecostals came from a background of secon d blessing holiness. They already believed that had a experience to deal with 'the root of sin'. They still felt a lack of pow er and asked a foolish question. "What is the initial evidence of the baptism in the Spirit?" Ask a foolish question and you will get a foolish answer. It was their presupposition that there was "an initial evidence" that got them off on that trail.

As regards entire sanctification, the notion that God can keep us from falling, that He is able to save us to the uttermost, is a challenge to God's character and power, not the individuals themselves. We have an interesting list of speakers on s ermondindex, among those who believe that God can empower us to "serve Him in holiness and righteous, all our days"

we could list: Duncan Campbell, Leonard Ravenhill, Paris Reidhead, many others and even your humble servant! If we had their voices we could add George Fox, John Wesley, John Fletcher, William Booth, Barclay Buxton, Gypsy Smith, P aget Wilkes, Oswald Chambers, Thomas Cook, A B Simpson, Campbell Morgan, and many others.

In the words of a lovely Charles Wesley hymn... "let my lot be cast with them, the least of Jesus' witnesses.

Re: - posted by sevenplaces4all (), on: 2004/1/15 11:39

rookie stated

Quote:
---------- think that in your search for a scripture to back up cessationism you missed ICor 13:8. It establishes the fact that tongues will at so me point permanently cease (pauo).

I think that particular passage is not stating that tongues will cease to be a gift of the Holy Spirit, but that people will not c onstantly speak in tongues. I think it is trying to say that individuals who are gifted with tongues will not constantly speak in tongues, they will return to their "normal" language, but that love will always be in everything that they do. 1 Cor 13 is famous for being the love chapter, and I think that it is obvious that the main point of that passage is that the GIFT (fruit of the Holy Spirit) of love should never cease, while the other gifts have their own time and place.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/15 13:12

Hi sevenplacesforall:

Just a clarification, I didn't write that, "nobody" did.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by sevenplaces4all (), on: 2004/1/15 14:48

Oh, I'm sorry about that. There's so many people talking in this thread I just got it mixed up. Won't happen again

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/17 11:36

Philologos-

I wasn't there in 1900 so I can't give firsthand reports, but this idea that Parham was actually seeking human tongues for missions seems to appear many places. MacArthur would not put it in his book if he didn't have evidence and a quick internet search brings up many other sites claiming this same thing.

"Parham formulated the doctrine that tongues was the "Bible evidence" of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. He also taught that tongues was a supernatural impartation of human languages (xenolalia) for the purpose of world evangelization. Henceforth, he taught, missionaries need not study foreign languages since they would be able to preach in miraculous tongues all over the world. Armed with this new theology, Parham founded a church movement which he called the "Apostolic Faith" and began a whirlwind revival tour of the American middle west to promote his exciting new experience. "
http://www.fwselijah.com/Parham.htm

Early Pentecostals claimed the gift of tongues was not primarily the speaking of a heavenly language (glossalalia) but other human languages (xenolalia). The purpose? Early leader Charles Parham said, "I had felt for years that any missionary going to the foreign field should preach in the language of the natives, and that if God ever equipped his ministers in that way , he could do it today." Though many anecdotes of xenolalia exist, none have been confirmed
http://www.ctlibrary.com/ch/1998/58/58h002.html

Parham formulated the doctrine that tongues was the "Bible evidence" of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. He also taught th at tongues was a supernatural impartation of human languages (xenolalia) for the purpose of world evangelization.
http://www.iphc.org/docs/timeline/topeka.html

I know that internet sites aren't good historical references, but where there is this much smoke I'm sure one can find a fire. The claims of xenolalia still are told today by Pentecostals.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/17 11:44

Hi nobody, you wrote in an earlier posting The Pentecostals sought to revive tongues in the beginning so they could get away with less missionary training (Charles Fox Parham in Kansas).

It was this statement that I was challenging, not that early Pentecostals claimed isolated evidence of tongues being recognised, or even that some hoped it would expedite missionary advance.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2004/1/17 16:11

For those who say the gifts, such as tongues ceased in the first century, is completely wrong, and contrary to historical evidence. While the Church seemed to be experiencing the gifts less and less, they still experienced them just the same. There is an interesting book out called "Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries" by Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague that documents the baptism of the Holy Spirit through 8 centuries.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/18 9:34

Philologos-

You are not a Pentecostal. Therefore I assume you have reasons to reject the movement. All of your reasons are apparently new ones to me since you refute all of mine. I am interested in knowing what your reasons may be in order to satisfy my curiosity and possibly open my mind up to another aspect of this discussion which I have not considered before.

To those who would make out a cessationist to be a dull lifeless follower who has no idea what the Spirit is let me admit that those people exist but not all cessationists are that way. I live in as much righteousness and admiration of the Holy God as possible. I believe he is Sovereign and can do whatever he likes. I don't need to constantly hear stories of healed headaches and backpain to bolster my faith in Him. It seems that the movement talking the most about faith actually shows themselves to have the least. If you believe and study Scripture enough your faith wouldn't need to be bolstered by signs. Surely Peter and Paul saw magnificent things that no one else has seen anything close to since (don't pick this apart and miss the point - obviously John's revelation followed) and they went from there to preach Christ crucified and never spent much time proclaiming what they had seen. In fact God ordered Paul to keep quiet about the third heaven. It is reasonable to assume that this is because his going out and reasoning with people about Christ and exhorting the church with doctrine was more important than stories of fantastic experiences. After Peter briefly recounted seeing the Transfiguration he went on to say that we have the more sure prophetic Word. The Word is the basis for our faith- not even seeing the glory of Christ is a good enough experience to add to it.

It seems very possible that by chasing after signs you are actually fighting the Spirit by replacing His quiet peaceful comfort in your soul by allowing your belief to rise and fall weekly based on what signs occur. The fruits of the Spirit do not seem to be any more evident in the "zapped" churches than in the "unzapped" ones.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/19 1:19

nobody wrote You are not a Pentecostal. Therefore I assume you have reasons to reject the movement. All of your reasons are apparently new ones to me since you refute all of mine. I am interested in knowing what your reasons may be in order to satisfy my curiosity and possibly open my mind up to another aspect of this discussion which I have not considered before.

Well, how much time have you got? ;-) The original Pentecostal and later Charismatic position is that the Baptism in the Spirit is an experience distinct from and subsequent to New Birth which imparts power for service. Some groups of Pentecostals further insist that the initial evidence of this experience is speaking with tongues. I cannot agree with either

of these fundamentals of the original Pentecostals, which is why I say I am not a Pentecostal.

I was an early leader in the so-called Charismatic movement in the UK in the early 60s. At that time I would have endorsed both fundamentals of the original Pentecostals. My only modification would have been to say that 'speaking with tongues' will accompany this experience but not necessarily at the exact moment of receiving the Spirit.

In the midst of the Charismatic early days I came under profound conviction of Sin at a level previously unknown to me. I saw my heart as I had never seen it before and was 'sick to death of myself'. I asked God to either do something within me now or take me home and do it there. I felt I couldn't live with myself any longer. I had no knowledge of second blessing Sanctification teaching and no clear expectation of what I was asking God to do. God answered me from a verse of scripture spoken into my heart; ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. It did not come as a doctrinal enlightening of truth but as a word from God's heart to mine; it was done as He said it. I still had no theological explanation but I knew God had heard the prayer. I discovered that the power of Sin in me had been broken. I was no longer carried along by the old passions. If I were forced to point to a day in my life when I became 'a new creation, with old things passed away and all things became new' that would have to be the day.

My theology was now in a shambles (some think it still is :-P) I had a list of definite experiences; a time when I knew my sins were forgiven and I was accepted with God, a Pentecostal/Charismatic experience in which I had spoken in tongues, and now an experience in which indwelling Sin had received its death blow.

Shortly after this I went to Bible College and in the course of Systematic Theology came across the teaching of Secong Blessing Holiness. I was excited; it seemed to match exactly what had happened to me. It was a difficult time; the charismatics were suspicious of me because I preached that God could free us from Sin, and the holiness people were suspicious because I had a reputation as a charismatic.

For about 5 years I preached a kind of 3 stage gospel. Justification, Empowerment, Sanctification. I was in constant theological tension as to the proper order of the last 2 stages. How could the Holy Spirit come to empower a life which was still ruled by Sin? But then how could the indwelling Sin be dealt with unless the Spirit was within?

Over a couple of years I started afresh in my theology of the Spirit. I began to think more in terms of the New Covenant, its inauguration and impartation. I began to see the work of the Spirit as inauguration into all the blessings of a New Covenant. My definitions of the New Covenant came from Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel and its inception through the shed blood of Christ, and its impartation through the conscious reception of the Spirit.

I look for no physical manifestation proof of the Spirit's coming, although I am not shocked or embarassed if they appear. The most profound thing we know about the Spirit is that He is Holy. The gospel according to Zacharias promises salv ation from the hand of all that hate us; Sin, Satan, self, the world and the assurance that I shall serve Him without fear, i n holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of our life. This is my gospel too, a full salvation that doesn't have to wait for 'heaven' for some of its promises to be fulfilled but promises them now all the days of our life

If you would like a longer explanation :-P then Greg has a number of my 'sermons' on this site. There is one called Rege neration which will give a fuller account of some of my convictions. It is part of a series called 'having received the Spirit' and I distinguish between Justification and Regeneration. It was part of conference held in Devon UK, last summer. If y ou have the time, the whole 4 part series opens out my understanding.

To summarise my current understanding perhaps an illustration from the Trinity. Theologians say we must not divide th e substance but we must distinguish the persons. For me the Baptism in Spirit is similar. I can distinguish aspects whic h are often experienced as unique events in the life of the individual, but my understanding of the Baptism is holistic in th e sense that when I use the phrase I mean 'everything' that the Spirit has come to accomplish. Perhaps another illustrati on.. Gen 2 speaks of a single river which becomes 4 rivers. I suppose that, according to the paricular geography, some one crossing could experience 1 river, 2 rivers, 3 rivers or 4 rivers. For me, to be transplanted from one side to the other is Baptism in Spirit, and am not worried about how many experiences it takes.

One final comment. In experiential terms my key phrase is 'conscious reception'. I believe in a receiving of the Spirit wh ich is not a logical deduction drawn from proof texts (Tozer) but a time of absolute and unmistakable God-consciousness . If you ask me what I was conscious of when I was water-baptised I would tell you 'water'. If you ask me what I expect a Spirit-baptised person to be conscious of I will say 'God'. "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" deman ds a conscious receiving of the Spirit, otherwise the question makes no sense.

Sorry for the long post, but 'you asked for it'. :-D

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/19 1:47

now for the rest of the letter, nobody wrote:

To those who would make out a cessationist to be a dull lifeless follower who has no idea what the Spirit is let me admit that those people exist but not all cessationists are that way. I live in as much righteousness and admiration of the Holy God as possible. I believe he is Sovereign and can do whatever he likes. I don't need to constantly hear stories of healed headaches and backpain to bolster my faith in Him. It seems that the movement talking the most about faith actually shows themselves to have the least. If you believe and study Scripture enough your faith wouldn't need to be bolstered by signs. Surely Peter and Paul saw magnificent things that no one else has seen anything close to since (don't pick this apart and miss the point - obviously John's revelation followed) and they went from there to preach Christ crucified and never spent much time proclaiming what they had seen. In fact God ordered Paul to keep quiet about the third heaven. It is reasonable to assume that this is because his going out and reasoning with people about Christ and exhorting the church with doctrine was more important than stories of fantastic experiences. After Peter briefly recounted seeing the Transfiguration he went on to say that we have the more sure prophetic Word.

I don't see why it has to be 'either/or' why not both? It was for the early Christians. I think we have to choose our words carefully here too; Paul's experience was not 'fantasy' it was spiritual reality. And Paul was not 'ordered to keep quiet about the third heaven'. I can't imagine where you got this idea. He heard some words that he was not 'authorised to repeat' but God never ordered him not to tell of his experience. I think, for his own sake, he was wise not to publish it for 14 years but including it in a letter which has since been read by millions was not a very good strategy for 'keeping it quiet'.

The Word is the basis for our faith- not even seeing the glory of Christ is a good enough experience to add to it.

It seems very possible that by chasing after signs you are actually fighting the Spirit by replacing His quiet peaceful comfort in your soul by allowing your belief to rise and fall weekly based on what signs occur. The fruits of the Spirit do not seem to be any more evident in the "zapped" churches than in the "unzapped" ones.

I never chased a sign in my life, and my belief does not rise and fall in proportion to their occurence. However, I do believe that 'signs will closely follow those who believe' not as proofs of anything, and not as evidence of greater spiritu ality but simply because Christ said they would. I believe, I expect signs to accompany, but I put no faith in the signs.

I have been through a few experiences which were fairly rigorous testings of the quiet and peaceful comfort in my soul. His peace abides. I don't really understand why you are working so hard to separate Christians into 'either/or' compartm ents. Is my expectation of signs a threat to you? BTW I remain personally 'unzapped' and am opposed to any induced 'z apping'.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/19 12:20

I brought up the issue of Paul's third heaven experience because the retelling of it stands in contrast to the typical Pente costal MO. Paul had this experience but yet he only mentions it very briefly in no detail whatsoever and he may not ever have mentioned it if he didn't feel the need to out-brag his false-teaching accusers. He tells us he is not permitted to tell what he heard, thus my paraphrasing which may have been put better as "ordered to keep quiet about what he heard in the third heaven." That is what I meant to say but I don't have all day to write this stuff. I'm assuming if Paul was forbidde n something that such a thing would have come from God. Even it was lawful for him to speak it I think that from the bre vity of this description and his emphasis on its worthlessness he would have chosen not to.

I wish that more non-cessationists viewed things as you do Philologos. I'm not attacking your beliefs at all, but I do wond er if you realize the huge numbers of people that have taken this Pentecostalism to an extreme. Are things so different o n that side of the ocean? Do you not have people who hold experience above the Word there? How about those who ch ase signs and claim to be the only people with the Spirit yet they don't know the first thing about Christ or any of His teac hings? These are the people I want to differentiate myself from and question. Maybe you don't get TBN there- I don't kno

w. How do you feel about the teachings propagated by Branham, Hagin, Copeland, and their new generation of follower s? Did the rich young ruler really miss the best financial opportunity of a lifetime? Did Jesus go to hell to be tortured for o ur sins by Satan for three days?

I'm not about bickering with the mild Charismatic at all. I leave the AG alone for the most part even though I think they br eed a lot of the ones that end up on the extreme fringe of the movement later. It is mostly the people who lie on this oute r fringe of heresy and mysticism that need to question their thinking.

There is a good quote that says something about putting the existential cart before the historical horse leading to mystici sm where putting LSD in the communion wine is fair play. From some of the things I've heard going on in these groups it seems they might actually be trying this.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/20 2:09

nobody wrote I wish that more non-cessationists viewed things as you do Philologos. I'm not attacking your beliefs at all, but I do wonder if you realize the huge numbers of people that have taken this Pentecostalism to an extreme. Are things so different on that side of the ocean? Do you not have people who hold experience above the Word there? How about t hose who chase signs and claim to be the only people with the Spirit yet they don't know the first thing about Christ or an y of His teachings? These are the people I want to differentiate myself from and question.

nobody
Yes, we have them over here and fairly regular imports from your side of the water to keep the pot boiling. Some years ago I used to get very distressed about the mixture and nonsense that was on every side. I came to that verse of scriptu re when the disciples complained to the Lord about some who were casting out demons in Christ's name but 'follow not with us'. I felt the Lord's answer was very signigicant. "forbid them not". He didn't say oppose them, and he didn't say jo in them, he just said 'leave them alone'. Sometimes, of course, you have to speak out but I will not become obsessed wi th what this folks are doing. I'm just going to get on with what I am supposed to be doing. When I first passed my driving test I remember my father saying to me "now the car you have to be careful of is the one behind the one in front". Still s eems like good advice.

Maybe you don't get TBN there- I don't know. How do you feel about the teachings propagated by Branham, Hagin, Co peland, and their new generation of followers? Did the rich young ruler really miss the best financial opportunity of a lifeti me?

if you have the time listen to Hezekiah. It has a few comments on the prosperity movement.

Did Jesus go to hell to be tortured for our sins by Satan for three days?
I oppose this strongly whenever I have the opportunity. It is one of the most serious of their confusions. It switches the whole focus from the cross and makes our salvation dependent on GodÂ's trickery. This is a very old heresy usually call ed the Â'ransom to the devilÂ' theory which was throughout mediaeval Europe and is actually built in to some of C. S. Le wisÂ's teaching in the Narnia Chronicles.

I'm not about bickering with the mild Charismatic at all. I leave the AG alone for the most part even though I think they br eed a lot of the ones that end up on the extreme fringe of the movement later. It is mostly the people who lie on this oute r fringe of heresy and mysticism that need to question their thinking.

There is a good quote that says something about putting the existential cart before the historical horse leading to mystici sm where putting LSD in the communion wine is fair play. From some of the things I've heard going on in these groups it seems they might actually be trying this.

I still have good friends in traditional Pentecostal denominations although I am saddened to see what I sometimes call th e Â"Gospel according to Barnum and BaileyÂ" (no relation, as far as I know). I think I said in an earlier post that the rem edy for abuse is not non-use but right use. I think that is what Paul is doing in 1 Corinthians. He is not trying to eliminat e but to bring into order and in particular to remedy the fatal sickness of the Corinthians, there fierce ego-centricity. The

whole problem is epitomised in the phrase Â“each one of says Â‘IÂ’Â”. They were using the local gathering of the saints as a platform to develop and display their own individualism. In consequence their actions were denying the truth that we are Â“one body, by the crossÂ”. We can only remain Â“one bodyÂ” by the cross. Only as we embrace GodÂ’s Â“fond crossing of our willsÂ” (as Wesley called it) can we be in Â“broken bread and poured out wineÂ”.

More than most, the Pentecostals/Charismatics have become victims of the Â‘starÂ’ system. Tozer once wrote that evangelicals would drift further and further from the truth as long as they perpetuated the religious star system. But the correct use of spiritual gifts in their appropriate context can be a source of very rich blessing. In fact I go further, the church cannot afford to become a Â‘non-prophet organisationÂ’.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/20 5:33

Finally we have found agreement on something! I know the forum is labeled for debates but sometimes it is nice to agree on something.

I will now admit that I have been attending a somewhat Pentecostal church for awhile now. I have problems with "personal prayer language" and that sort of stuff, but these people are what Pentecostalism should aim to be. They occasionally have one person speak in tongues and it is always interpreted. The pastor preaches a Reformed soteriology usually yelling something convicting from the gospels with some support from the epistles. The members know their scripture very well and no one seeks to bring attention to themselves with any ridiculousness. That is due in part to the Reformed soteriology being mixed with the Pentecostalism that keeps the people very humble. They know they weren't smart or good enough to choose God but were rescued from their march to hell by a gracious God. I attend there for the preaching because there is nowhere else nearby that has any convicting preaching and I hold that above my differences on tongues, etc. I just wanted to point out that there can be some unity between a weak cessationist and a biblical church that believes the apostolic signs are for today but keeps them within the constraints of the Scripture and magnifies God a thousand times higher than His ecstatic gifts. I have much in common and few differences with these people. It is their distant cousins who raise the question of the authenticity of their faith.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/20 5:42

To return to ICor 13 I don't see how one has to believe that knowledge and prophecy has passed away to believe that tongues has. That is why I pointed out the different word used for tongues. Prophecy and knowledge will be abolished when that which is perfect has come- heaven. Tongues will cease by itself (which is what the Greek scholars say the wording implies). Is this such a difficult belief to hold? I'm sorry you wasted so much time attributing a belief to me that I don't necessarily hold - although I do think that belief is defensible as well - so that you could try to demolish it before I claimed it. The fact of this passgage is that regardless of when you think knowledge and prophecy will be abolished you can still believe that it said that tongues will cease permanently on their own. From there it ia a matter of when this would happen. That is a far cry from the modern Pentecostal view that says "Okay, maybe tongues did cease for awhile but now they're back because we're in the last days and there is a new working of the Spirit as prophecied by Joel- we're in the latter rain!" One has to admit that this is actually the mainstream Pentecostal view- not the one that says the gifts were always available but no one had holiness to attain them or the sense to seek them.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/20 10:14

nobody wrote:To return to ICor 13 I don't see how one has to believe that knowledge and prophecy has passed away to believe that tongues has. That is why I pointed out the different word used for tongues. Prophecy and knowledge will be abolished when that which is perfect has come- heaven. Tongues will cease by itself (which is what the Greek scholars say the wording implies). Is this such a difficult belief to hold?

which Greek scholars would these be? The word is used often in the New Testament, read through the list and see if you think it means something 'stops by itself'. It is the word followed by the Strong Number 3973 in this list.
Luke 5:4 Now when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught.
Luke 8:24 And they came to him, and awoke him, saying, Master, master, we perish. Then he arose, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water: and they ceased , and there was a calm.
Luke 11:1 And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased , one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples.

Acts 5:42 And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ.
Acts 6:13 And set up false witnesses, which said, This man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place, and the law:
Acts 13:10 And said, O full of all subtilty and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt th ou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?
Acts 20:1 And after the uproar was ceased , Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia.
Acts 20:31 Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.
Acts 21:32 Who immediately took soldiers and centurions, and ran down unto them: and when they saw the chief captai n and the soldiers, they left beating of Paul.
1 Corinthians 13:8 Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease ; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away.
Ephesians 1:16 Cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers;
Colossians 1:9 For this cause we also, since the day we heard it, do not cease to pray for you, and to desire that ye mi ght be filled with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding;
Hebrews 10:2 For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should h ave had no more conscience of sins.
1 Peter 3:10 For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they spea k no guile:
1 Peter 4:1 Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind: for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin;

---

nobody wroteTo return to ICor 13 I don't see how one has to believe that knowledge and prophecy has passed away to believe that tongues has.

Well, for those who believe tongues have ceased because the perfect (the scriptures) have now come this should pose a problem as knowledge, prophecies (not prophecy) and tongues are due to pass away when the perfect arrives. As the se three phenomena are all in one sentence we would expect them to pass away together. The cessationist believes pr ophecies and tongues have passed away. Has that passed away too?nowledge

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/1/20 10:37

Hi Ron,

I enjoyed your testimony concerning the work of the Holy Spirit in your life. I look forward to reading the sermons posted in this thread.

You wrote:" I was in constant theological tension as to the proper order of last 2 stages..."

Also, "It was a difficult time; the charismatics were suspicious of me because I preached that God could free us of sin, a nd the holiness people were suspicious because I had a reputation of being a charismatic.."

I know of the tension you speak of. I know of the feelings of not belonging. You can probably pinpoint the tension in my walk.

My distaste for the teachings of Systematic Theology, Dispensational Theology, Calvin vs Armienian (sp) are quite clear in what I attempt to communicate to others. I believe we as Christians have fallen into following men and not God. That is what faith is all about. Furthermore, I have found, in my short time with the Lord, that there are no methods by which God works within man. It is always man who tries to benchmark God's work. It is man who seeks to imitate what anoth er has already done. Through the revelation of Scripture, we have been given the knowledge to know only that we must follow Him. Where He wants to take us is up to Him.

Again, I loved your testimony of living on the edge. Those who follow Christ will always be on the edge. That is how He keeps us looking to Him for the Highway of Holiness.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/21 16:59

Philologos caught me in sloppiness again! I'm kicking myself for posting so late at night now. Here is what I was referring to in the "cease of themselves" thing:

This is an excerpt of an article on the Grace Online Library which has many theological articles from a Reformed perspe ctive.

"Some things are definitely spoken of as ceasing. The Bible does not say that giving shall cease. But it does say that tongues shall cease. To make this cessation to occur in glory is nonsense, for giving will also cease in glory. There is a d istinction to be made between the permanent gifts to the church and those which revelation clearly states shall cease, a nd this is especially true of the tongues where the middle voice is used in the Greek, which could be translated "cease of themselves." The tongues ceased of themselves when the revelation of God was completed."

Greek is all Greek to me so I can't verify this with my own knowledge. If anyone can disprove it I would love to know!

Here is another quote I'd like to add:

"The last recorded miracles in the New Testament occurred around A.D.58, with the healings on the island of Malta (A cts 28:7-10). From A.D.58 to A.D. 96, when John finished the book of Revelation, no miracle is recorded. Miracle gifts lik e tongues and healing are only mentioned in 1 Corinthians, an early epistle. Two later epistles, Ephesians and Romans, both discuss the gifts of the Spirit at length- but no mention is made of the miraculous gifts. By that time miracles were al ready looked on as something of the past (Heb 2:3-4). Apostolic authority and the apostolic message needed no further confirmation. Before the first century ended, all the New Testament had been written and was circulating through the ch urches. The revelatory gifts had ceased to serve any purpose. And when the apostolic age ended with the death of the a postle John, the signs that identified the apostles had already become moot (2 Cor 12:12)." --Dr. John MacArthur, Charis matic Chaos, 1992

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/21 23:14

nobody quotes MacArthur The last recorded miracles in the New Testament occurred around A.D.58, with the healings o n the island of Malta (Acts 28:7-10). From A.D.58 to A.D. 96, when John finished the book of Revelation, no miracle is re corded.

This seems a strange argument in that the history of the early church only goes on to Acts 28:31, which at the most is on ly a matther of months from the 'last recorded miracle' . Another way of interpreting this evidence would be to say that th e record of 'Jesus continuing to do and teach' (which we call the Acts) shows that miracles continued until our records ce ase. Other than James and 3John, Acts is the only book in the NT that doesn't end with an 'amen'. Perhaps that is beca use the writer knew it wasn't finished and we are supposed to be writing the next chapters. :-P

Re: - posted by Saint_Ferg (), on: 2004/1/22 1:53

I find this rather frustrating because as I speak in tongues my desire is very simply to have my brothers and sisters enjoy that same blessing. Also as I look at scripture I see the only talk of any cessation is to quote 1 Corinthians 13 vs 8-12

Love never fails. But where there are prophecies, they will cease; where there are tongues, they will be stilled; where the re is knowledge, it will pass away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when perfection comes, the imperfe ct disappears. When I was a child, I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a m an, I put childish ways behind me. Now we see but a poor reflection as in a mirror; then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I am fully known.

The cessation of tongues, prophesy etc is very clearly in the context of seeing our Lord face to face. Indeed when perfec tion comes cannot be reasonably thought of as now because even in the church we cannot really attest to seeing a perf

ected work of the Lord. As I look in scripture therefore and reason the need for a gift of tongues that being the idea both of building oneself up in the Lord (praying in the Holy Spirit) and in accordance with interpretantion to bring a word from God. There is of course also the tongue that was used at pentecost to bring the word of God to people in their own langa uge or if you like as a sign to unbelievers.

Also the thought that giving should cease in heaven I don't understand because surely we will in a position where our he arts are so consumed with the Love and Compassion of the Lord that that will be the most obvious outworking of that Lo ve - giving unto the Lord everthing that we have and worshipping him for eternity - (giving him his worth)

I hope that was of benefit but most of all I pray that the Lord will be your teacher and your sufficiency!
:-)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2004/1/22 3:04

Quote:
----------"The last recorded miracles in the New Testament occurred around A.D.58, with the healings on the island of Malta (Acts 28:7-10). From A.D.58 to A.D. 96, when John finished the book of Revelation, no miracle is recorded. Miracle gifts like tongues and healing are only mentioned i n 1 Corinthians, an early epistle. Two later epistles, Ephesians and Romans, both discuss the gifts of the Spirit at length- but no mention is made of th e miraculous gifts. By that time miracles were already looked on as something of the past (Heb 2:3-4). Apostolic authority and the apostolic message n eeded no further confirmation. Before the first century ended, all the New Testament had been written and was circulating through the churches. The r evelatory gifts had ceased to serve any purpose. And when the apostolic age ended with the death of the apostle John, the signs that identified the ap ostles had already become moot (2 Cor 12:12)." --Dr. John MacArthur, Charismatic Chaos, 1992

That is simply a serious, and deliberate lie. MacArthur must be deliberately ignoring countless documents through the c enturies that talk of the supernatural gifts still occuring. He must be saying that all these documents are lying. One doe s not have to read very far in early church history alone to find this is the case. E.g. the martydom of Polycarp, the didac he, tertullian, etc.

Cessationism -- the Other Extreme - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/1/22 4:54

Regarding the debate on cessationism, I thought Jack Deere did a great job of bible exposition in his book, *Surprised By the Spirit*.

Deere was a New Testament professor at Dallas Theological Seminary, which is one of the last strongholds of cessation ism (i.e. the doctrine that the miraculous gifts have ceased after the apostolic period). However, through the ministry of J ohn White, he became sympathetic to the Third Wave charismatic movement, and had subsequently left the seminary.

I do not fully embrace the Third Wave charismatic movement (with John Wimber, John White, and C. Peter Wagner bein g the crucial figures). However, I think Jack Deere's assessment of biblical evidences is correct.

Cessationism does not have a long history. The first systematic presentation of this doctrine probably came from B. B. Warfield (a Princeton theologian). The doctrine was more a result of inferences from the scripture than the direct messa ge of the Bible.

It holds that the miraculous gifts were necessary in the apostolic period because the New Testament scripture had yet to be finished, therefore they were necessary to vindicate the authority and witnesses of the Apostles. However, upon the c ompletion of the New Testament, this vindicative purpose was fulfilled by the Word of God; therefore, the miraculous gift s were no longer necessary. Therefore, the cessationists believed that the miraculous gifts have largely ceased after the first century, even though some might allow for infrequent exceptions.

I think it is quite apparent from the above that the doctrine of cessationism emerges more from inferences than direct scr iptural evidences. However, at this time, I still believe that the charismatics' preoccupation with supernatural gifts is not h ealthy for the Church.

Re: Cessationism -- the Other Extreme - posted by nobody, on: 2004/1/22 5:34

So the fact that the apostolic sign gifts were not mentioned in any epistle after I Cor even when the gifts were specifically being discussed apparently isn't convincing?

How about the other two points? Scripture specifically states that these gifts were the sign of the apostles. We only ever apostles or people specifically equipped by them doing these things in scripture. We have record of the seven sons of S ceva and Simon who tried but didn't have apostolic authority. Are there still apostles today? I don't think so! Paul calls hi mself an apostle out of due time because he was the last one and sort of appended to the end.

2 Corinthians 12
12Truly the signs of an apostle were accomplished among you with all perseverance, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds.

What about the perspective of Hebrews 2? Every writer that I have read on this passage says that the wording implies th at the writer was looking back on the signs and wonders as something done through the apostles in the past. I'm going t o investigate this more thoroughly, but once again I'm no Greek scholar!

3how shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was conf irmed to us by those who heard Him, 4God also bearing witness both with signs and wonders, with various miracles, an d gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to His own will?

Finally, let me say to Preaching to Cannibals that you didn't read the quote very well! It is talking about NT record, not no n-canonical writings. He is making the point that 19 epistles don't mention these miraculous gifts, most of which were wri tten after I Cor. These are the books that instruct the church on how to live.

Many Pentecostal theologians admit that there are serious problems with taking events from Acts and declaring them no rmative for today. Are we to cast lots? Some would say no because we have the Spirit now. Others couldn't answer bec ause they think that the disciples got the Spirit in the upper room when Jesus breathed on them. So how do you say that one event is normative and another is not from this historical narrative? There is no consistent record in Acts for the "Ba ptism of the Holy Spirit" anyway. Not all cases had subsequence, not all cases had tongues, not all cases had earnest s eeking.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/1/22 9:06

nobody wrote Finally, let me say to Preaching to Cannibals that you didn't read the quote very well! It is talking about NT record, not non-canonical writings. He is making the point that 19 epistles don't mention these miraculous gifts, most of which were written after I Cor. These are the books that instruct the church on how to live.

1 Corinthians is the only letter which has the local church meeting together in its view. Paul's phrase makes it clear 'if th erefore the whole church be gathered together'. Certainly other epistles tell the church how it should live, 1 Corinthians t ells the church how to behave when it meets together. This is the most logical place for the topic to be addressed. No ot her letter has the gathered church as its focus. It's like saying they are not selling pineapples at Old Navy, which proves t here are no longer any pineapples being sold.

After Romans and Galatians Paul hardly ever mentions justification by faith. John never mentions it at all. Does this me an the teaching of justification by faith had ceased by the end of the 1st Century?

I don't know MacArthur, other than having listened to a couple of audio files, but this really is most peculiar reasoning.

Re: - posted by Saint_Ferg (), on: 2004/1/23 14:09

I was wondering why "nobody" assumes that there where no apostles since Paul, as the word means sent one so theref ore I would contend that today we still see that apostolic calling in effect today, particularly in missionarys who go in to a situation with God only and establish the church(term in its children of God sense)in that place; surely that is the very thi ng that Paul and, I might add, Barnabas who was equally sent out just somewhat less prolific in his writings.

Re: - posted by three9, on: 2004/1/25 17:36

lol, yes... speaking in tounges. why all this debate.

there comes a time when we no longer watch Christ move from a distance, but instead he calls on us to watch *with* Him.

 - that is relationship.

Re: Interesting But Not Convincing - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/1/26 4:51

Quote:
----------So the fact that the apostolic sign gifts were not mentioned in any epistle after I Cor even when the gifts were specifically being discussed apparently isn't convincing?

This is an argument from silence, which is generally speaking, not a strong kind of argument. The fact that a particular topic is not discussed in later epistles could be due to many other reasons. For instance, it could simply mean that it is no longer an issue of contention within the other local churches. Paul did not discuss the Lord's Table in other epistles, does this mean the practice had ceased beyond the apostolic age?

Quote:
----------2 Corinthians 12:12Truly the signs of an apostle were accomplished among you with all perseverance, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds.

This reference deserves consideration. First, I simply note that it says nothing about "signs and wonders and mighty deeds" being exclusive to the apostles. Stephen the deacon and Philip the evangelist both were said to have done "great wonders and miraculous signs." Second, it says nothing directly about signs and wonders to cease after the apostolic period. Cessationism cannot be solely justified by this verse alone.

Quote:
----------Hebrews 2:3-4 This salvation, which was first announced by the Lord, was confirmed to us by those who heard him. 4God also testified to it by signs, wonders and various miracles, and gifts of the Holy Spirit distributed according to his will.

Using this verse as a proof of cessationism is subject to similar criticisms above. The author asserts that the signs and wonders testify to the truth of salvation. Again, there is no mention of cessation of the gifts! We know that the written Word also testifies to this salvation, yet it does not cease. So, given this verse alone(Hebrews 2:3-4), why should we think that since the signs and wonders testify to this salvation, they should cease after the apostolic period? The case cannot be established unless we *assumed a priori* the fact of cessationism--that the written Word has replaced the role of signs and wonders. That's why I said cessationism requires indirect inferences from the Bible.

Indeed, this same verse is used by the Third-Wave charismatics to justify "power evangelism". They argued that the signs and wonders validated the gospel message that they preached from the Bible. I believe in certain cases (though not all the time), God uses miraculous signs to this end.

I should repeat my stance, I do not think the over-emphasis on signs and wonders among some charismatics is biblical. However, neither do I think cessationism is a clear teaching from the Bible.

Re: - posted by skab, on: 2006/4/26 20:52

~WOW! There's a lot here! I was only able to read from the beginning of the posts until a little after the "fun with math" stuff. I would have read more, but alas, I have two English papers to type!

~This all really is very interesting to me. I've recently been calling on the Lord to point me in the right direction, when it c omes to tounges.

~My question to those who claim a needing of tounges as a sign of Baptism in the Holy Spirit:
What about those who are deaf and unable to talk since birth? Must they be healed before? What if the Lord does not heal them?

~I've been raised non-denominational and generally not very charasmatic. When I was very young, my family had a ver y bad experience with a missions base that was started by a man who's sermons are on here. That man passed away b efore these things happend and I really think he would have frowned upon them. My family was thoroughly judged abou t gifts. It was unpleasant as you may have guessed, and my Father kept us a distance from the "Charasmatics" after tha t.

~Recently, though, I've been dating a girl, who is not "charasmatic", herself, but has been raised in a family that is. I've been faced with many of the same judgements, all of which were in love :-D which makes a world of a difference

~Oh! I almost forgot! What about a math/number system that replaces the symbols and numbers with theological terms ! I've always been a fan of reverse engineering and hardware hacking. I've always thought about a "How Jesus Hacked Death", thingy to handout at events, but I'm don't know. That might be a little sacreligious. This math stuff is great!

~This is my third edit....sorry....I don't know how that effects this type of forum. Anyways, What is the consequences of s aying that some of things that are claimed as tounges by some and babblings as other, as being merely emotional outlet s. What's wrong with sharing your emotions with the Lord? I don't know if it should always be done in public, though.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/4/27 14:27

Just a small question, did Jesus use signs and wonders? I believe He did. Mat 12:15 But when Jesus knew , he withdr ew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; Pretty simple, Christ is the Gifted O ne.

He also said, "Only an evil and adulterous generation (seeks) a sign. If given by the Holy Spirit, not sought, it is valid.

Sign: 4592. semeion
Search for G4592 in KJVSL
shmeion semeion say-mi'-on

neuter of a presumed derivative of the base of 4591; an indication, especially ceremonially or supernaturally:--miracle, si gn, token, wonder.

Don't seek a token or sign of baptism in the Holy Spirit by speaking in unknown tongues.

If Christ is the Gifted One and He is our Spirit, can we boast of any gift? I don't believe so.

1 Corinthians 12:4-11 Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations , but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manif estation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal. For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to anothe r the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; To another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the sa me Spirit; To another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kin

ds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues: But all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will.

Administration of the Gifts is of the Lord Jesus Himself for He is the Gifts.

God The Father is the Operations manager and All works by Him.

The manifestation of the Spirit is to all, and the operation and power of the Gifts is by the Holy Spirit when He chooses to use them as He wills.

What is "divers tongues"? It is certainly not a babbling of unknown tongues. To another divers kinds of tongues. The po wer of speaking various languages. See Ac 2:4,7-11. This passage also seems to imply that the extraordinary endowme nts of the Holy Spirit were not conferred on all alike.

To another the interpretation of tongues. The power of interpreting foreign languages; or of interpreting the language whi ch might be used by the "prophets" in their communications.

Divers kinds; 1085. genos
Search for G1085 in KJVSL
genoV genos ghen'-os

from 1096; "kin" (abstract or concrete, literal or figurative, individual or collective):--born, country(-man), diversity, genera tion, kind(-red), nation, offspring, stock.

Tongues; 1100. glossa
Search for G1100 in KJVSL
glwssa glossa gloce-sah'

of uncertain affinity; the tongue; by implication, a language (specially, one naturally unacquired):--tongue.

The only unknown tongue is one not acquired from birth by language spoken by kindred. I speak in tongues of America. I don't speak in tongues of Greek, unless the Holy Spirit gifts me to do so as He wills for the upbuilding of the Body of C hrist. Paul says it only takes three words.
Jesus is Lord. Only two in Greek: IhsouV kurioV

In Christ: Phillip :-o IhsouV kurioV

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2010/5/20 10:12

This is one of the threads that enjoys a wealth of information.