



Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Why did the apostles have to come down?, on: 2007/5/22 8:49

Acts 8:14; Now when the apostles who were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John to them, who, when they had come down, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. 16; For as yet He had fallen upon none of them. They had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. 17; Then they laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit. 18; And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Spirit was given, he offered them money, 19; saying, "Give me this power also, that anyone on whom I lay hands may receive the Holy Spirit."

Why didn't they receive the Spirit until the apostles came? Why not when Phillip prayed for them? He was obviously a man of faith and moved in the power of the Holy Spirit.

The only thing that I can think of is that it was to confirm that they had received the same Spirit that the apostles, Cornelius' family etc had received. I.e. that the Spirit is One. At that early stage of the Church people might have imagined that the Spirit conveyed through Phillip was a different Spirit than the apostles received.

Or was the Spirit given *only* through the Apostles while they were still living? This seems unlikely to me. Although the first apostles were special (again I don't want to argue here about how special or whether there are still apostles these days) I can't see that others might not have been able to pray for people to receive the Spirit if necessary?

If you are humble in heart, filled with the Spirit, and the Lord so directs, I see no reason that you couldn't pray for someone and they would receive the Spirit. Although I don't believe that tongues is the only evidence of this.

The fact that it was mentioned in Acts that they hadn't yet received the Spirit suggests that this wasn't the norm. Suggesting that people were usually baptized and received the Spirit automatically after they believed.

I'm not talking about cessationism now, but the fact that people received the Spirit (whatever the manifestation, or however you interpret this), *when someone prayed for them*.

Simon the sorcerer wanted the power to bestow the gift by paying for it!

I think it's the motive of the one who prays for people that is the important thing. Love of money or love of power are probably the main wrong motives.

That's as far as I've thought about it so far anyway, and would value comments.

Thanks

In Him

Jeannette

Re: Why did the apostles have to come down?, on: 2007/5/22 9:30

Simple... this was to show Peter and John that even the Gentiles could be saved, and receive the Holy Spirit.

This is why Paul wrote that tongues were a sign "unto the Jews". Why? Because the Jews had a hard time believing that God could save Gentiles. So He proved it by showing them that they received the Holy Spirit.

However, at this point (2007 AD), that sign for the Jews is not necessary.

Fact is, since that time... you receive the Holy Spirit at the moment you are saved. This is taught in scripture. **You can not be saved and not have the Holy Spirit.** I've seen people even on this forum say "I'm saved, but now I'm seeking the Holy Spirit"... well, the truth is, if you dont have the Holy Spirit... you are not saved.

But in Acts, in those couple of instances where they had not received the Holy Spirit, it was a sign for the Jews (apostles) that God was moving among the Gentiles. In one instance, the people were not even followers of Christ yet, they were followers of John. But these examples are very few, and were not the norm.

Yet, thanx to playing loose with scripture, the Charismatic and Pentecostal movements have made these very few and v ery rare occasions into dogma. And people go along with it because we listen more than we study.

Krispy

Re: Why did the apostles have to come down? - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/22 10:02

Quote:

-----Why didn't they receive the Spirit until the apostles came? Why not when Phillip prayed for them?

This I can't completely understand but I personally believe that that baptism of the Holy Ghost is different than conversion. Under the preaching of men full of the Holy Ghost often the conviction is so powerful that one is baptized with the Holy G host immediately after conversion. However many times (I believe from lack of understanding.)even in the lives of men f ull of the Holy Ghost they don't seem to get the listeners to the place where God fills them right away. If you study the liv es of the men who have shaken christian history like the Wesleys, George Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, Charles Finne y, Moody, etc. Each one of them came to a point in time where God poured out his Spirit on them *after* conversion. But, I don't believe that that should be the norm. I think that God intends it to happen upon conversion.

Quote:

-----Or was the Spirit given only through the Apostles while they were still living?

I don't think God's way of operating has changed and that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is available to all who sincerely desire it and seek God for it. However, God cannot fill a vessel that isn't empty. Only those completely given up to God f or His glory without their own benefit in mind are the ones to ascend into the hill of the Lord. Psalm 24. I might also add t hat we are not to seek an experience, but rather God Himself. We want God to fill us with all the fullness of God so that He might use us to shake this world for Him. After all what is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost? God taken complete posse sion of a man or woman.

Quote:

-----Although I don't believe that tongues is the only evidence of this.

Excellent. You are absolutely correct on that one. There are only two consistant evidences of someone being Full of the Holy Spirit.

1. Holiness. And by that I mean Christ-likeness. People like Stephen whose face shone like an angel. That's not an unc ommon testimony if you study the lives of men like the above mentioned list. When you around people like that they are so Christ like you can feel the presence of God around them.

2. Jesus said when He (the Holy Ghost) is come upon you He will convict the world of sin and of righteousness and of j udgment. Again looking at history we find that when God fills a person they start to see God convicting people and they start getting born again. D.L. Moody's testimony was that before God filled him he'd preach a sermon and maybe a doze n people would become born again. After God filled him sometimes as much as 400(!!!!) people would get saved. Is that

not revival?

In this day and age there are almost no men anywhere full of the Holy Ghost and Power as it says of the apostles in Acts. I think Acts is there so that we can look at it to compare our lives and ask "what's missing in my life?" The answer is in God baptizing his people with the Holy Ghost so that they once again have the power to turn the world upside down.

Oh God make me one of those men whatever the cost may be! For your glory and so that your testimony might once again be made great amongst the heathen. God I ask it in the name of your glorious Son and my precious Saviour. Amen.

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/22 10:07

Quote:

-----You can not be saved and not have the Holy Spirit.

True. After the resurrection when Jesus appeared to the disciples He breathed on them and said "receive ye the Holy Ghost." But just because someone is saved and has the Holy Spirit in them does not by any means mean that they are FULL of the Holy Spirit. True we receive Him at conversion but there is more than that also. Please now though that I'm not a sensationalist or an experience seeker. Just a redeemed sinner who wants to be all that he can for his Almighty maker.

Re: Why did the apostles have to come down? - posted by elanham (), on: 2007/5/22 10:33

I believe that the Lord wanted to emphasize the foundational and essential need of Apostolic oversight in the conferring of this most precious gift.

The lack of such oversight can give rise to noxious happenings as we in our time have come to see.

I think if true Apostolic men of the stature of Paul and the early Apostles were giving oversight over some of our modern day "moves of the Spirit" we would have had less hamburger helper and more Heaven blessed expressions of that eternal realm.

Be well.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/22 10:40

Quote:

-----You can not be saved and not have the Holy Spirit.

We would need to carefully define 'saved' in this kind of statement.

The believers in Samaria...Acts 8:12 (KJVS) But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.

1. They had believed
2. They had been baptised by Philip.

Now as it happens we know exactly what Philip's criteria for water baptism was...“Now as they went down the road, they came to some water. And the eunuch said, “See, here is water. What hinders me from being baptized?”

Then Philip said, “If you believe with all your heart, you may.”

And he answered and said, “I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.”

So he commanded the chariot to stand still. And both Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, and he baptized him.” (Acts 8:36-38 NKJV) This 'continued' is the 'continued steadfastly' of Acts and is a much used word in Acts; Acts 1:14; 2:42, 46; 6:4; 8:13; 10:7

Philip was a man who knew how to hear God's voice and yet Simon was baptised. Was Simon 'saved'? Well he seems to have had the same experiences as the others in Samaria; were they 'saved'?

I know this is controversial but we need to be prepared to read the scripture as it has been given to us and not 'reverse engineer' passages from the epistles into this narrative. I don't mean that the epistles are not valid, of course they are. I

simply mean that we have to look at the situation in Acts 8 honestly, as we find it.

There is no doubt that these Samaritans, including Simon, had had an experience which sounds much like that of many a 'saved' man in contemporary Christianity. But there is something seriously amiss here when we read of Peter's subsequent description of Simon...
"But Peter said to him, "Your money perish with you, because you thought that the gift of God could be purchased with money! You have neither part nor portion in this matter, for your heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this your wickedness, and pray God if perhaps the thought of your heart may be forgiven you. For I see that you are poisoned by bitterness and bound by iniquity." (Acts 8:20-23 NKJV)

We need a serious definition of 'saved'.

Re:, on: 2007/5/22 10:55

Let me clarify something... I do believe that there comes a time when we go to a deeper level with the Lord. I think where we all get messed up is in terminology. Some call it "baptism of the Holy Spirit", some call it "a second touch". I believe it's wrong to say it's "receiving the Holy Spirit" because it's clear in scripture that you receive the Holy Spirit at salvation. There is not a single saved person who has not received the Holy Spirit.

For me, the "next level" happened 5 years after my salvation. It was very simple, I surrendered. I told God I was tired of living my Christian life through teachers, experiences, etc etc. I wanted truth, and nothing more. I wanted God, and not programs, activities, conferences, concerts, etc.

Ironically, this is when my personal theology on tongues changed. I used to be in the camp of "tongues are the evidence of being filled".

But I digress... tongues is not the issue here.

In reading "No Compromise: The Keith Green Story" he seemed to go thru a similar experience. In fact, he informed people that he had finally gotten saved... even tho he'd been saved for a couple of years. It was his way of saying that God had taken Him to a different level.

I don't deny that, I've been there myself. But I think we're mistaken when we say something that implies that we have just received the Holy Spirit when in fact we received Him at salvation.

Some would call that being "filled". I don't know that I agree with that either because we're commanded by Paul to be filled daily. I take that to mean daily upon salvation.

I think a good analogy of what I am saying about a different level is raising kids. While they are young you only give them so much freedom... but when they turn 16 you hand them the car keys. I think that's what God does with us.

Krispy

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/22 11:08

Quote:
-----But I think we're mistaken when we say something that implies that we have just received the Holy Spirit when in fact we received Him at salvation.

You're absolutely right. If the Holy Spirit isn't in a person then that person is not God's child. No if, ands, or butts about it.

Re: Why did the apostles have to come down? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/22 11:11

Quote:

I can't see that others might not have been able to pray for people to receive the Spirit if necessary?

Well, such activity is not limited to the apostles in the book of Acts. Acts 9:17 mentions the prophet Ananias (well, he's not called a prophet, but it is clear his activity is such) who comes to Saul so that he could regain his sight and receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, in 1 Tim 4:14, Paul reminds Timothy that a spiritual gift was bestowed upon him through the laying on of hands and accompanying prophetic utterance by a group of presbyters. So, it is clear from the Scriptures such a thing is not limited to apostolic ministry.

I don't believe Acts attempts to give us any insight into why it was that the new converts in Samaria didn't receive the baptism of the Spirit through the miracle working ministry of Philip the evangelist. If anything can be deduced, it is possible that the "authority" of apostolic and prophetic ministers- being foundational ministries in the church (Ephesians 2:20)- tend to flow more in such an equipping ministry more than others. However, Ephesians 4:11-13 makes clear apostles and prophets are not the only such individuals given to equipping the saints for the work of service. And such men are not needed to receive the baptism, as Luke 11:13 makes clear, it is possible to receive the Holy Spirit simply through prayer.

So, to get back to your original question. I think the Samaritan account we read in Acts is much more a description of how things just so happened to work out in this particular instance.

Re: Why did the apostles have to come down? - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2007/5/22 11:16

Reply to Jeff

Jeff wrote:

Â“Why didn't they receive the Spirit until the apostles came? Why not when Phillip prayed for them?Â”

Would you tell us which time you referenced in your post Jeff, thanks Eddie

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/22 11:23

Quote:

-----Would you tell us which time you referenced in your post Jeff, thanks Eddie

I feel kind of ignorant asking this brother, but to which time of what were you referring?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/22 11:24

Quote:

-----I believe it's wrong to say it's "receiving the Holy Spirit" because it's clear in scripture that you receive the Holy Spirit at salvation. There is not a single saved person who has not received the Holy Spirit.

Suppose we start from the other end of this issue...Â“But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. Now if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His.Â” (Romans 8:9 NKJV) Many use this verse to prove the idea that all 'saved' people have the Spirit but this is not what Paul says. He starts from the other end of the issue and says "whoever does not have the Spirit is not Christ's". This may not necessarily be a reversible equation. Paul's starting point is 'people who have the Spirit' not 'people who are saved'; this is a serious challenge to much traditional evangelical theology but I think we have to face it if we want honest exegesis.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

The question then is not "do all saved people have the Spirit" but what does it mean "to have the Spirit"? As far as I can see every instance of 'having the Spirit' in post-Pentecost narrative is of a conscious event. The 'believers' in Samaria had not had a 'conscious event' of receiving the Spirit. So, in the terms of Rom 8:9, were they Christ's?

If you're not using your helmet, Robert...?

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/22 11:34

Quote:
-----I believe it's wrong to say it's "receiving the Holy Spirit" because it's clear in scripture that you receive the Holy Spirit at salvation. There is not a single saved person who has not received the Holy Spirit.

Are you talking about being saved from sin or justified? Or do you equate the two?

Just asking questions... :-D

EDIT: I didn't realize Ron had quoted the same thing from you Krispy... Sorry!

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/22 12:03

Krispy wrote:

Quote:
-----Simple... this was to show Peter and John that even the Gentiles could be saved, and receive the Holy Spirit.

This is why Paul wrote that tongues were a sign "unto the Jews". Why? Because the Jews had a hard time believing that God could save Gentiles. So He proved it by showing them that they received the Holy Spirit.

However, at this point (2007 AD), that sign for the Jews is not necessary.

Fact is, since that time... you receive the Holy Spirit at the moment you are saved. This is taught in scripture. You can not be saved and not have the Holy Spirit. I've seen people even on this forum say "I'm saved, but now I'm seeking the Holy Spirit"... well, the truth is, if you don't have the Holy Spirit... you are not saved.

Well said brother.

I am reminded of 2 Cor. 13:5 "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?"

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/22 13:56

Quote:
-----I believe it's wrong to say it's "receiving the Holy Spirit" because it's clear in scripture that you receive the Holy Spirit at salvation. There is not a single saved person who has not received the Holy Spirit.

I think this has been quoted fairly frequently in this thread. I wonder if someone will now tell me where the scripture says that you receive the Holy Spirit at salvation? :-)

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/22 14:35

Philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----I wonder if someone will now tell me where the scripture says that you receive the Holy Spirit at salvation?

You might be using the word 'salvation' in a way other than the moment of regeneration, but if not what do you say about these verses?

Romans 8:14-17 (NKJV)

"14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. 15 For you did not receive the spirit of bondage a gain to fear, but you received the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry out, "Abba, Father." 16 The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17 and if children, then heirs— heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together."

Are we to conclude that the 'receiving of the spirit' in this context is something other than the moment we believe?

Ephesians 1:11-14 (NKJV)

"11 In Him also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestined according to the purpose of Him who works all things according to the counsel of His will, 12 that we who first trusted in Christ should be to the praise of His glory. 13 In Him you also trusted, after you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, having believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, 14 who is the guarantee of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, to the praise of His glory."

Does verse 13 not clearly say that a person who hears the word of truth and believes is 'sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise who is the guarantee of our inheritance'?

I don't understand where you are going with this Ron.

Re: Why did the apostles have to come down? - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/22 15:17

LittleGift

Quote:

Why didn't they receive the Spirit until the apostles came? Why not when Phillip prayed for them? He was obviously a man of faith and moved in the power of the Holy Spirit.

I think John and Peter had the specific power (anointing/capacity) to pray for other to receive (the baptism in) the Holy Ghost, while Philip did not.

1Co 12:4 Now there are **diversities of gifts**, but the same Spirit.

1Co 12:5 And there are **differences of administrations**, but the same Lord.

1Co 12:6 And there are **diversities of operations**, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.

I think it pleases God to have the body of Christ made up of different individuals with different capacities all 'doing their part' under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

PassingThru

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/22 15:30

JaySaved

Quote:

Does verse 13 not clearly say that a person who hears the word of truth and believes is 'sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise who is the guarantee of our inheritance'?

The KJV is more suggestive that the 'sealing' occurs after belief, not exactly at the same moment :-

Eph 1:13 In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise,

If all who believe are sealed, wouldn't it be fair to say by the structure of the verse, that all who heard the truth also believed?

Perhaps the verse is merely summarizing the spiritual state of the letter's audience.

PassingThru

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/22 15:43

Quote:
-----Eph 1:13 In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise,

Perhaps the verse is merely summarizing the spiritual state of the letter's audience.

Of course. But Paul is not only summarizing their spiritual state, but is summarizing all Christians spiritual state.

If a person has trusted in Christ, this happening after they heard the gospel, then after the person believes, he/she is sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

What we cannot take away from this verse is the belief that the 'sealing of the Spirit' is a second work of blessing that can only be obtained if the person truly seeks after it.

Looking at the text, we see belief then sealing. What we also gather from this verse is that all who believe are sealed. (I say this because Paul says "ye were sealed" Ye being all who believed and trusted.)

It is wrong to say that all who hear believe because Paul is not talking to all who heard the gospel, he is only talking to all who believe the gospel.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re:, on: 2007/5/22 15:59

Back to the original post by Jeanette:

Quote:
-----Why didn't they receive the Spirit until the apostles came? Why not when Phillip prayed for them? He was obviously a man of faith and moved in the power of the Holy Spirit.

The reason why Peter and John were summoned to Samaria is because Peter had the keys of the Kingdom.

Quote:
-----Matthew 16:19 And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

He was the one who had the Keys to unlock the door to the Jews at Pentecost, the Samaritians in Samaria, and to the gentiles at Cornelius house. After the gentiles were filled, the attention is drawn away from Peter and is turned to Paul.

I hope this helps a little in your studies.

Re:, on: 2007/5/22 16:03

Quote:
-----However, at this point (2007 AD), that sign for the Jews is not necessary.

Are there no more Jews in the world?

Re:, on: 2007/5/22 16:52

Quote:
-----Are there no more Jews in the world?

Sure... but this was at a time when the church was being established. It's interesting that when Jerusalem was destroyed in 70AD, it was about that time that the early church "fathers" were recording that the gift of tongues seemed to be fading out.

I'm conjecturing here... but here's a thought... once the Jews were scattered to the wind, it seems that history records the "sign" gifts began to fade. Is this just coincidence...?

(Some Charismatics have been lied to, and have been taught that tongues was active all down church history, but that just isn't true.)

Pentacostals at least can admit that tongues was "revitalized" around 1900 at Azusa Street... which implied it was at least somewhat dormant up until then.

And even if tongues are legit for today... interesting that it's re-emergence on the scene seems to coincide with the re-gathering of the Jews in Israel.

Just something to think about.

Krispy

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/22 17:20

Quote:

-----Romans 8:14-17 (NKJV)

"14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God. 15 For you did not receive the spirit of bondage again to fear, but you received the Spirit of adoption by whom we cry out, 'Abba, Father.' 16 The Spirit Himself bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God, 17 and if children, then heirs—heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, if indeed we suffer with Him, that we may also be glorified together."

Are we to conclude that the 'receiving of the spirit' in this context is something other than the moment we believe?(NKJV)

The norm of New Testament experience seems to have been that people consciously received the Spirit. We can see this particularly in... "This only I want to learn from you: Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun in the Spirit, are you now being made perfect by the flesh?" (Galatians 3: 2-3 NKJV) The point here is that Paul is working on the basis that his hearers had consciously received the Spirit.

Quote:

-----Ephesians 1:11-14 (NKJV)

"11 In Him also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestined according to the purpose of Him who works all things according to the counsel of His will, 12 that we who first trusted in Christ should be to the praise of His glory. 13 In Him you also trusted, after you heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also, having believed, you were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, 14 who is the guarantee of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, to the praise of His glory."

Does verse 13 not clearly say that a person who hears the word of truth and believes is 'sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise who is the guarantee of our inheritance'?

Were these the same Ephesians that Paul asked "When you believed did you receive the Spirit?" For this question to make sense it must be possible to believe and yet not receive AND it must be possible to know whether or not they had received the Spirit, otherwise there can be no answer to the question.

Quote:

-----I don't understand where you are going with this Ron.

I am trying to persuade people to think about the implications of so much that we take for granted as evangelicals. For many the pattern is believe, confess your sin, ask Christ into your life, believe he has come... go on your way rejoicing. I am asking is this really New Testament Christianity or is an evangelical culture that we have embraced.

I can understand no Christianity apart from the Spirit of God but every record we have concerning the early Christians indicates that receiving the Spirit was a conscious event, not 'a logical deduction drawn from proof texts'. (that is a classic A W Tozer quotation, BTW)

The New Testament letters were not written to people who had gone through our evangelical counselling procedures but to people who had 'received the Spirit'. It is not automatically true of every reader but only those who fulfil the pattern of the Ephesian recipients. If a 'stranger to the covenant' were to open Ephesians and read its contents would its contents be true of the reader? And yet we think we can apply the truths of Ephesians to our own lives because it says them in the book.

We CAN apply them if we are the same kind of people as those to whom the letter was sent, but are we? Are we genuine 'saints' in the New Testament sense or are we the products of an evangelical system which has created a kind of Christian of which the New Testament knows nothing?

I know these are challenging questions, but I think we need to ask them. Many have adopted a pattern which assures people that they have 'received the Spirit' because they have gone through an evangelical process. I am asking whether we have any justification for giving people such an assurance. The oft-repeated statement that 'every one who is saved has received the Spirit' is not a biblical statement.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

The Bible question is not 'are you saved?' but 'did you receive the Spirit?'

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/22 17:50

Quote:

The norm of New Testament experience seems to have been that people consciously received the Spirit.

This might be slightly off topic, but this reminds me of the phrase 'praying through' I've read mostly in a text by G.C Bevington. (I know nothing about GC Bevington, but I've also seen the phrase elsewhere) He remarked a lot on people successfully 'praying through' and some that didn't succeed. The striking point was the certainty of whether someone had succeeded or not.

He didn't explain the phrase, so I guess it was common terminology at one point. Any ideas on what is meant by this phrase? Baptism in the Holy Ghost, a supernatural answer to prayer, a supernatural assurance that the prayer was heard or of salvation itself?

PassingThru

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/22 18:12

Quote:

-----GC Bevington

...was a Holiness preacher at the turn of the century. He believed and experienced healings and was a great pray-er. He used the phrase 'Baptism in the Spirit' in the terminology of 'second blessing holiness'.

The book

(http://www.amazon.com/Remarkable-Miracles-C-G-Bevington/dp/0882707035/refsr_1_1/103-8306081-1252661?ieUTF8&sbooks&qid1179871920&sr1-1) "Remarkable Miracles" is well worth reading.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/22 21:59

Quote:

-----The point here is that Paul is working on the basis that his hearers had consciously received the Spirit.

Who doesn't consciously receive the spirit when they believe?

What Acts records is the receiving of the Spirit designed to help the Jewish Disciples understand that the Gentiles are included in the gospel kingdom. Only a few instances are highlighted and as Krispy said earlier, these were designed by God to help the Jewish believers understand that this was a worldwide gospel.

When I believed, I received the Holy Spirit. This was a conscience event on my part. I have the Spirit of God within me right now, I have never sought a 'second blessing' of any type.

Quote:

-----Were these the same Ephesians that Paul asked "When you believed did you receive the Spirit?" For this question to make sense it must be possible to believe and yet not receive AND it must be possible to know whether or not they had received the Spirit, otherwise there can be no answer to the question.

Yes, the ones who had only received the baptism of John. What this shows was that it was possible to receive the baptism of John and not receive the Holy Spirit.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/22 22:21

Here is an excerpt from a Study I did earlier: My words are in the brackets.

Acts 19

Paul in Ephesus

1While Apollos was at Corinth, Paul took the road through the interior and arrived at Ephesus. There he found some disciples 2and asked them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?"

They answered, "No, we have not even heard that there is a Holy Spirit."

3So Paul asked, "Then what baptism did you receive?"

"John's baptism," they replied.

4Paul said, "John's baptism was a baptism of repentance. 5On hearing this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. 6When Paul placed his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied. 7There were about twelve men in all.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/23 0:23

Quote:

philologos wrote:

I am trying to persuade people to think about the implications of so much that we take for granted as evangelicals. For many the pattern is believe, confess your sin, ask Christ into your life, believe he has come... go on your way rejoicing. I am asking is this really New Testament Christianity or is an evangelical culture that we have embraced.

The New Testament letters were not written to people who had gone through our evangelical counselling procedures but to people who had 'received the Spirit'. It is not automatically true of every reader but only those who fulfil the pattern of the Ephesian recipients. If a 'stranger to the covenant' were to open Ephesians and read its contents would its contents be true of the reader? And yet we think we can apply the truths of Ephesians to our own lives because it says them in the book.

I know these are challenging questions, but I think we need to ask them. Many have adopted a pattern which assures people that they have 'received the Spirit' because they have gone through an evangelical process. I am asking whether we have any justification for giving people such an assurance. The oft-repeated statement that 'every one who is saved has received the Spirit' is not a biblical statement.

The Bible question is not 'are you saved?' but 'did you receive the Spirit?'.

Excuse me for editing your post in the above quote, Philologos, which leaves out much of what you have said. But what you have said needs to be listened to. Considering the hour we are in, and the apostasy around us, we need to be brave enough to take "challenging questions" to heart.

We are so often very short of what we read in the Scriptures. And I wonder, is it fear of missing out on the vastness of it all that makes us want to say we have got it all at the moment of regeneration? Or at the moment of "the Baptism"?

This whole matter of the Spirit of God is a very big thing. Jesus Himself was born of the Holy Spirit. Was that enough? But when He was baptized in water the Holy Spirit came upon Him "in bodily shape like a dove." Was that enough? Or after the resurrection, when He breathed upon His disciples, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." Was that enough? Was He satisfied yet? But then when He ascended, He received from the Father "the Promise of the Holy Spirit..." (Acts 2.33). Was that enough for Him? But He calls that just "the earnest" of the Spirit He poured out at Pentecost: the "down payment," the "engagement ring," is what it signifies (2 Cor. 1.22). Is that enough? It seems, from our point of view, it is often enough. "Take my cup, Lord, fill it up, Lord... Thank you, Lord, we have it all now." But from His point of view? Not enough. He continues to move forward-- for His own Name's sake-- till we shall be filled "unto all the fulness of God."

Jesus said those who believe on Him, out of their innermost being would flow rivers of living water. "This spake He of the Spirit...:

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

What I am saying is that the Holy Spirit is a River, not a puddle. We must have Him from the moment of new birth till... when? The earnest, then the adoption, then... glorified... When does it end? "That in the ages to come He might shew t he exceeding riches of His grace in His kindness toward us through Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2.7).

...So I think it very likely that the apostles had something deeper in the Holy Spirit back then than anything the Church has YET experienced. They had an anointing, an authoritative anointing, that by the laying on of their hands men received the Holy Spirit. That's what Scripture seems to say. That's what Simon the sorcerer obviously saw. "And when Simon saw that through laying on of hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, Saying, Give me also this gift, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost."

I want to leave the Scriptures where they are, and ask God to bring my experience up to the Scriptures, not the other way around, and try to "lower" the Scriptures down to my experience. There is a very powerful authority God desires to restore to His church. He will yet do it. I think there was a taste of it at the Battleford revival in 1948, when they experienced once again prophesy and the laying on of hands. In a measure. There is more, much more, to come. When God sees we are ready for it. (By His own preparing work, I mean.) As someone has said, the world will yet see what God will do with men who will not touch the glory.

Lord, open us up to face "challenging questions" without fear that our doctrinal puddles will be drowned; let us, like Ezekiel, seek out that River that cannot be passed over, waters to swim in... "And this we will do if God permit."

AD

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/23 1:19

Quote:

-----Yes, the ones who had only received the baptism of John. What this shows was that it was possible to receive the baptism of John and not receive the Holy Spirit.

the Samaritan incident shows that it is possible to receive Christian baptism and still not have the Spirit.

Quote:

-----Who doesn't consciously receive the spirit when they believe?

Well, I certainly didn't, for one. And I doubt that many folks are told that the essence of Christianity is 'receiving the Spirit'. We are told to believe certain facts. Sometimes even that we must repent but that God's coming is a conscious event, not many are told this I think.

Simon the Magician, saw something which he identified as 'giving' and 'receiving' the Spirit. He was not a Jew and did not need to be convinced that God was including the Samaritans. What did he see? Would he have offered money to buy the ability to do what happens in most counselling contexts? I think not.

I am not talking about tongues or tingles, BTW

Re: - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2007/5/23 6:23

Reply to Jeff
Jeff wrote:

Â“Why not when Phillip prayed for them?Â”

In what chapter and verse did the one whom the Apostle Philip lay hands on and pray for fail to receive the Holy Spirit?
Sorry Eddie

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/23 9:00

Eddie, I wasn't actually referring to scripture but rather the experiences of mighty men of God in the past. I also wasn't thinking about the laying on of hands but the preaching and leading souls to God after they would make an appeal. I think I didn't explain myself very well. Sorry about that.

Quote:
-----I want to leave the Scriptures where they are, and ask God to bring my experience up to the Scriptures, not the other way around, and try to "lower" the Scriptures down to my experience.

Oh brother your words are exactly what has been burning in my heart for the last year and a half. This is exactly what we need in this day and age. The church now knows nothing of what the New Testament church was really like and so we come up with all these shallow explanations of the things that went on there instead of asking "God why doesn't my life look like that?". **WE NEED WAY MORE THAN WHAT WE HAVE!** Let me tell you brothers a little bit of my life story. A year ago in January I went to a three week bible seminar type of thing where Denny Kenaston preached his "Attributes of God" series (that's just for reference, it's not what changed my life). Being there at the "Three Week Bible Institute" I made the decision that I was going to go all the way with God no matter what. I came home and went back to work doing everything in my power to be holy and blameless in the sight of God trying not to grieve God by even the smallest little remarks that might be cutting or the smallest act of irreverence. I listened to literal hundreds of sermons from SI learning everything I could about what a disciple should be. I quickly found out that I don't have what it takes to be what the Christians were back in Acts. So I started studying the lives of men like the Wesleys, Edwards, Moody, Whitefield, Campbell and so on, to see what made the difference in their lives. I found that in every one of them without exception God brought them to a place where he poured out his spirit on them like he did the disciples on the day of Pentecost. I started tearing through the scriptures to see how it lined up there and found that they were full of the same thing. Everywhere I looked I found it. I also found that God is not a respecter of persons. WHOAH! That means God can make a Finney out of any one of us! If we want it bad enough and for the right and proper reasons. "Ye shall seek me and SHALL find me when ye shall search for me with all your heart." "Out of your belly shall flow RIVERS of living water." Brothers I found that I have to pump so hard that I get exhausted to the point of giving up and all I would get were trickles. That was enough to convince me that I need God to "bring my experience up to the scriptures" like our brother said. We all know that the church needs revival but do we realize that it needs to start in us? Oh God make us EVERYTHING that we can be for YOU!!! Again I say brothers, I'm not an experience seeker but rather I seek after God Himself to make me what I ought to and can be as a Christian. Oh please consider these things with an open mind.

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/23 9:54

Quote:

In what chapter and verse did the one whom the Apostle Philip lay hands on and pray for fail to receive the Holy Spirit? Sorry Eddie

I think Acts 8:14-17 shows that Philip didn't have the capacity to impart the 'Fullness of the Spirit' upon them, even if he had the fullness himself. Otherwise the Apostles in Jerusalem wouldn't have sent Peter and John.

Act 8:14 Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John:
Act 8:15 Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, **that they might receive the Holy Ghost:**
Act 8:16 (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.)
Act 8:17 Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.
Act 8:18 And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles' hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money,

In my understanding these were fully saved men before Peter and John's arrival. There is no reason to believe that Philip baptized unsaved men, nor that he preached anything less than the full Christ centered gospel. These men responded

d to the full gospel with repentance, and believed.

Act 8:12 But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, **and the name of Jesus Christ**, they were baptized, both men and women.

On the existence of a second experience, the first salvation experience these men had, prior to the Peter and Johns arrival, would already be a big deal in most of our churches today :-

Act 8:6 And the people with one accord **gave heed unto those things which Philip spake**, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did.

Act 8:7 **For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed.**

Act 8:8 And **there was great joy** in that city.

I respect that others have different convictions on this, but to me it's clear that Acts Chapter 8 documents a second experience, regardless of whatever terminology we use to explain it.

PassingThru

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/23 10:48

Quote:

-----the Samaritan incident shows that it is possible to receive Christian baptism and still not have the Spirit.

Anyone who tries to take a dogmatic approach to Baptism and the Holy Spirit from the book of Acts will drive themselves mad. Acts is not meant to provide us a step by step instruction manual of receiving the Holy Spirit and being baptized (and which must come before the other.)

For example, in Acts 8:4-25 the Samaritans:

1. Believed
2. Were Baptized
3. Received the Spirit by the laying on of Hands at a later date.

Is this how it must always occur?

Not according to Acts 8:26-40, the Ethiopian eunuch:

1. Believed
2. Was Baptized
3. Did not receive the Spirit by the laying on of Hands (not recorded)

Does this mean the Ethiopian eunuch never received the Spirit? Acts 8:39 says, "Now when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught Philip away, so that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing. The Spirit was there...are we to assume that since John or Peter was not present the eunuch didn't receive the Spirit?"

But what about Cornelius in Acts 10? He:

1. Believed
2. Received the Spirit (without the laying on of hands)
3. Was Baptized

Acts 10:47-48:

"47"Surely no one can refuse the water for these to be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit just as we did, can he?"

48And he ordered them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Then they asked him to stay on for a few days."

So Acts tell us the following:

1. It is possible to be baptized and not receive the Spirit.
2. It is possible to receive the Spirit without being Baptized.

We cannot look at one of these events, ignoring the others and say 'This is how it always happens.'

So can we now take a step out of Acts for a moment and move to one of Paul's epistles...namely the letter to the Ephesians. Read what Paul wrote here:

"In Him, you also, after listening to the message of truth, the gospel of your salvation--having also believed, you were sealed in Him with the Holy Spirit of promise, who is given as a pledge of our inheritance, with a view to the redemption of God's own possession, to the praise of His glory." (Ephesians 1:13-14)

Why is the Spirit given? He is a seal, a promise, a pledge of our inheritance. This is given because God has redeemed us and made us His own possession.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/23 11:58

Quote:

JaySaved wrote:

Anyone who tries to take away a dogmatic approach to Baptism and the Holy Spirit from the book of Acts will drive themselves mad. Acts is not meant to provide us a step by step instruction manual of receiving the Holy Spirit and being baptized (and which must come before the other.)

JaySaved, I think you meant "take a dogmatic approach," and not "take away a dogmatic approach"?

I fully agree. (That to take a dogmatic approach trying to find an "always the same" pattern will end in failure.) It is a living God with whom we have to do: He is always the same, He changes not: He is always unsearchable, His ways past "mapping out."

Running2Win, I appreciated your post. Considering the hour we are in, we DO need way more than we presently have in our experience. I think we need way more than the Church, generally speaking, has ever experienced, throughout history, and even in the Book of Acts.

More than the Book of Acts or what the early apostles had attained to? Yes, our day is certainly calling for it! The Day of the Lord which is at our doorstep is certainly calling for it! God's glory is certainly calling for it! Or is God too small for this kind of hope?

This is maybe starting to get beyond the original intention of this thread. But I remember reading years ago something Leonard Ravenhill wrote: that England entered WW II expecting to fight it with WW I weapons. There they were, heading into battle with horse-drawn artillery, and suddenly were up against tanks! He gave a few other illustrations along this line, and then said this a picture of the Church of our day! We are trying to fight today's battle with yesterday's provision. The measure of the Spirit we have is yesterday's provision. We need more! And God has more, way more! He has what we need for OUR day! And we need to be very open-hearted toward Him so that He will have vessels through whom He can reveal Himself afresh.

Frank Bartleman, one of the leaders of the Pentecostal move back in the early 1900's, said something that has stuck in my heart. God had put in the hearts of a few a hunger for more, and they were seeking Him for more. But they were being severely reproached and resisted by others in the Church who felt they already had it all. But Bartleman would not be turned. He said, "Believe in your own heart's hunger, and go on with God." History tells us God loved that kind of attitude, and met them.

AD

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/23 13:01

Quote:

-----JaySaved, I think you meant "take a dogmatic approach," and not "take away a dogmatic approach"?

Yes, thanks for catching that.

Re: - posted by PreachParsly (), on: 2007/5/23 14:18

Quote:

Anyone who tries to take a dogmatic approach to Baptism and the Holy Spirit from the book of Acts will drive themselves mad. Acts is not meant to provide us a step by step instruction manual of receiving the Holy Spirit and being baptized (and which must come before the other.)

For example, in Acts 8:4-25 the Samaritans:

1. Believed
2. Were Baptized
3. Received the Spirit by the laying on of Hands at a later date.

Is this how it must always occur?

Not according to Acts 8:26-40, the Ethiopian eunuch:

1. Believed
2. Was Baptized
3. Did not receive the Spirit by the laying on of Hands (not recorded)

Does this mean the Ethiopian eunuch never received the Spirit? Acts 8:39 says, "Now when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught Philip away, so that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing. The Spirit was there...are we to assume that since John or Peter was not present the eunuch didn't receive the Spirit?"

But what about Cornelius in Acts 10? He:

1. Believed
2. Received the Spirit (without the laying on of hands)
3. Was Baptized

Acts 10:47-48:

"47'Surely no one can refuse the water for these to be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit just as we did, can he?'
48And he ordered them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. Then they asked him to stay on for a few days."

So Acts tell us the following:

1. It is possible to be baptized and not receive the Spirit.
2. It is possible to receive the Spirit without being Baptized.

We cannot look at one of these events, ignoring the others and say 'This is how it always happens.'

I don't think anyone is arguing that it has to be done in a certain order, but the argument is that they are all different events and that a certain amount of time may be inbetween the 3.

- *) Faith to be Justified
- *) Baptism in Water
- *) Receiving the Spirit

I don't know if I agree with the argument, but I believe that is the argument.

Here is what the argument believes to be possible.

John believes in the work of Christ and is now justified. 3 weeks later John gets baptized in water. 4 weeks after that John receives the Spirit.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/23 17:40

Quote:
-----Why is the Spirit given? He is a seal, a promise, a pledge of our inheritance. This is given because God has redeemed us and made us His own possession.

So... unless the Spirit has been given we are not redeemed?

Romans 8 seems to suggest that the criteria which indicates 'being his own possession' is 'having the Spirit'; But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. Now if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His. (Romans 8:9 NKJV) A 'seal' was a way of putting your name on something to show that you acknowledged it as yours. If we do not have the seal what would that mean? You are reasoning as though 'we must have the seal' because we are 'his', but that is the reverse of the argument. Those who ARE 'his' are given the seal.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/23 20:31

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:
-----Why is the Spirit given? He is a seal, a promise, a pledge of our inheritance. This is given because God has redeemed us and made us His own possession.

So... unless the Spirit has been given we are not redeemed?

A 'seal' was a way of putting your name on something to show that you acknowledged it as yours. If we do not have the seal what would that mean? You are reasoning as though 'we must have the seal' because we are 'his', but that is the reverse of the argument. Those who ARE 'his' are given the seal.

So what does the seal mean, then? Having the seal, what is it that we actually have, as far as redemption is concerned?

"...In whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession..." (Eph. 1. 13,14).

"And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 4.30).

What I am asking is, what is the relationship between the seal of the Holy Spirit and the redemption of the purchased possession (which is yet to come)?

The seal is the "guarantee" of redemption. In what sense, then, am I presently redeemed? Or, to put it another way, in what sense am I now "saved" when Peter talks of the salvation "ready to be revealed in the last time" (1 Pet. 1.5).

(Maybe this thread is going in a different direction, and I'm not sure of the site rules on that: should this be a new thread?)

AD

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/24 15:16

Quote:
-----A 'seal' was a way of putting your name on something to show that you acknowledged it as yours. If we do not have the seal what would that mean? You are reasoning as though 'we must have the seal' because we are 'his', but that is the reverse of the argument. Those who ARE 'his' are given the seal.

I agree. How is this any different than what I was saying? The Holy Spirit is the seal as Ephesians tells us. The seal is given to those who belong to Christ. You cannot belong to Christ without the Spirit...without the seal.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/24 16:42

Quote:
-----I agree. How is this any different than what I was saying? The Holy Spirit is the seal as Ephesians tells us. The seal is given to those who belong to Christ. You cannot belong to Christ without the Spirit...without the seal.

You seem to be saying that when a person is Christ's they have the seal of the Spirit. I am saying that when a person has the seal of the Spirit, they are Christ's.

Yours sounds like a logical deduction drawn from a biblical text. Mine begins with the experience.

It makes no sense to say that you cannot belong to Christ without the Spirit. The scripture defines 'belonging to Christ' in terms of having the Spirit. The question is 'how does a man or woman know that they have the Spirit?' and that was the Biblical question of the early church. Not are you Christ's but 'when you believed did you receive the Spirit?'. Having 'received the Spirit' is the definition of belonging to Christ.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/24 16:54

I have read and re-read your last post and it all seems like the old phrase 'six of one, half a dozen of the other'.

You say, 'When a person has the seal of the Spirit, they belong to Christ'

I say, 'When a person belongs to Christ they have the seal of the Spirit.'

I am just trying to understand how we differ so please bear with me for a moment:

Are you saying that a person can belong to Christ without having the Spirit?
Are you saying that a person can have faith in Christ without belonging to Christ?
Are you saying that a person can have faith in Christ without having the Spirit?

Re:, on: 2007/5/24 17:14

Quote:
-----Romans 8:9 But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

In this portion of scripture Paul equates that the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ are the same thing.

If the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ is one in the same, who is the Holy Spirit?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/24 18:35

Quote:

-----Are you saying that a person can belong to Christ without having the Spirit?
Are you saying that a person can have faith in Christ without belonging to Christ?
Are you saying that a person can have faith in Christ without having the Spirit?

I am saying that only those who have the Spirit are Christ's in the sense that Paul uses it in Romans 8. The criterion is 'do they have the Spirit?' The criterion is not if they have gone through some evangelical processing or prayed a sinner's prayer. The question is 'do they have the Spirit?' If they do they are Christ's.

The real question is 'how does a man or a woman know if they have the Spirit?'

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/24 19:00

Ron, I believe we are saying the same thing...differently.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/25 3:46

Quote:

-----Ron, I believe we are saying the same thing...differently.

I don't think we are, although I may be mistaken.

I think, and please tell me if I am mistaken, that you are saying when a person 'becomes a Christian' ie 'belongs to Christ' he automatically receives the Spirit. I am saying I question this definition of 'becoming a Christian/belonging to Christ' if we are talking about the normal evangelical experience of being counselled and praying the sinner's prayer.

When God took up residence in the Tabernacle and later in Solomon's Temple there was no doubt but that the Spirit of God had come. They did not say we have done everything that we were supposed to do therefore the Spirit 'must have come'. The presence of God, by the Spirit, was not a logical deduction but an observed fact.

I am saying that the 'observed fact' of 'belonging to Christ' in Biblical terms is that a man or a woman 'has the Spirit of God'. I think you are saying that if a man is reckoned to be a Christian because he has gone through certain evangelical processes then he can be said to 'have the Spirit'. I am saying the 'observed fact' is not that he has 'responded' or 'prayed' but that the Spirit has come. A seal was a visible evidence.

I am saying that it is the 'visible' (and I am still not talking about tongues or tingles) evidence of the Spirit that authenticates that a man or woman is 'owned by God' and hence 'His'. Or to restate it in the 'negative' as we have it in Romans: But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. Now **if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His.** (Romans 8:9 NKJV) This does not say 'if we are His we have the Spirit of Christ' it says, effectively, 'if we have the Spirit of Christ we are His.'

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/25 8:48

I believe we are saying the same thing, because I agree with this statement:

Quote:

-----I am saying I question this definition of 'becoming a Christian/belonging to Christ' if we are talking about the normal evangelical experience of being counselled and praying the sinner's prayer.

When I refer to becoming a Christian I am talking about truth faith and repentance, not the 'walk the aisle/repeat after me' experience that is so prevalent in our churches.

I agree that true Salvation comes when a person has received the Spirit of God. The terminology I used was that the Spirit of God comes when a person becomes a Christian (in the biblical sense, not the modern evangelical sense.)

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

What I am against is the belief that a person can truly believe, have faith and repentance and not receive the Spirit of God. I do not see the receiving of the Spirit of God as being distinct from Salvation.

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/25 9:18

Quote:

What I am against is the belief that a person can truly believe, have faith and repentance and not receive the Spirit of God. I do not see the receiving of the Spirit of God as being distinct from Salvation.

Acts 8 shows that the people Philip preached to people had faith and repented, however hadn't yet 'received the Spirit'. I don't doubt they were saved at this point.

I don't think it is saying that they were without the Holy Spirit prior to 'receiving the Holy Spirit', as much as it would be wrong to say that Jesus was without the Holy Ghost before the Holy Ghost came upon Him in the form of a dove.

The main question then is: What exactly is 'receiving the Spirit' as a separate experience to salvation as described in Acts 8?

PassingThru

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/25 9:35

Quote:

-----The main question then is: What exactly is 'receiving the Spirit' as a separate experience to salvation as described in Acts 8?

I agree with you, this is what we ought to be looking into. I have studied it and come to some of my own beliefs and opinions but I fully realize that I may be mistaken on what I see.

I look forward to some discussion on this question.

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/25 9:54

Quote:

-----Acts 8 shows that the people Philip preached to people had faith and repented, however hadn't yet 'received the Spirit'. I don't doubt they were saved at this point.

Acts 8 is not the norm. Acts 10 proves that.

I should have been more specific and said:

"In our day, I do not believe that a person can truly believe, have faith and repentance and not receive the Spirit of God."

Re: - posted by JaySaved, on: 2007/5/25 10:16

Quote:

-----The main question then is: What exactly is 'receiving the Spirit' as a separate experience to salvation as described in Acts 8?

John 7:38-39

38Whoever believes in me, as the Scripture has said, 'Out of his heart will flow rivers of living water.'" 39Now this he said about the Spirit, whom those who believed in him were to receive, for as yet the Spirit had not been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.

Jesus clearly combines belief with the receiving of the Spirit. The event that must come before the receiving of the Spirit is the glorification of Jesus.

John 14:16-17

16And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Helper, to be with you forever, 17even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees him nor knows him. You know him, for he dwells with you and will be in you.

The Spirit of God is received only by the children of God. The lost world cannot receive the Spirit. The Spirit is the Christian's helper/Counselor.

John 20:21-22

21Jesus said to them again, "Peace be with you. As the Father has sent me, even so I am sending you." 22And when he had said this, he breathed on them and said to them, "Receive the Holy Spirit.

The Holy Spirit was given to some Disciples before Jesus ascended into heaven through His breath. This was not the event of Pentecost but was in fact a forerunner to the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost.

Acts 1:8

But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you, and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the end of the earth."

Jesus tells His disciples to wait in Jerusalem until the Holy Spirit comes upon them to give them power to be witnesses.

Acts 2:33

Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this that you yourselves are seeing and hearing.

Peter told the crowd who had seen the outpouring of the Spirit, that this came from God.

Acts 2:38

And Peter said to them, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Peter tells the people that if they repent and are baptized they will receive the Spirit of God. Does repentance and baptism have to come before the receiving of the Spirit?

Acts 8 gives the impression that one must repent and be baptized before the Spirit is received.

Acts 10 tells us plainly that the Spirit can be received before baptism.

Acts 19 tells us about some people who were disciples who never even heard of the Spirit of God. They only had John's baptism. So, Paul baptized them into the name of Jesus and placed his hands on them and they received the Spirit of God. The Spirit of God was not received at baptism but on the placing of Paul's hands.

Paul asks a very interesting question in Galatians 3:2:

Let me ask you only this: Did you receive the Spirit by works of the law or by hearing with faith?

Paul plainly states that the Spirit of God is received by faith in God.

Galatians 3:14 says,

"so that in Christ Jesus the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles, so that we might receive the promised Spirit through faith."

Once again Paul says that the Spirit is received through faith.

This is how Christians today receive the Spirit of God...through Faith. The Spirit is not received through baptism, but through

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

ough faith. The Spirit is not received apart from faith, but by faith.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/25 10:35

Quote:

-----I do not see the receiving of the Spirit of God as being distinct from Salvation.

I 'do not see the receiving of the Spirit of God as being distinct from Regeneration'. You will notice I have changed the terminology. ;-)

...and having taken the can of that particular 'can of worms' I am heading off to a Conference in Devon, UK and will not be back at my Mac until Monday 4th... don't go away, this is getting interesting. ;-)

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/25 10:39

JaySaved

Quote:

Acts 8 is not the norm. Acts 10 proves that.

I should have been more specific and said:

"In our day, I do not believe that a person can truly believe, have faith and repentance and not receive the Spirit of God."

Even if Acts 8 isn't the norm it still shows what is possible and gives us some insight into this topic. It clearly shows people that were at one point in their lives saved without having 'received the Spirit'.

I think the main differences in view here revolve around what is understood by 'receiving the Spirit'.

PassingThru

Re: - posted by PassingThru, on: 2007/5/25 10:48

Quote:

I 'do not see the receiving of the Spirit of God as being distinct from Regeneration'. You will notice I have changed the terminology.

I remember David Wilkerson saying in 'The Cross and Switchblade', or perhaps it's sequel, that they only saw permanent success with freeing addicts from drugs once they were baptized in the Holy Spirit.

His editor wanted him to drop the chapter containing these comments, but fortunately he stuck to his colours.

PassingThru

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Why did the apostles have to come down?

Re: - posted by running2win (), on: 2007/5/25 10:55

Quote:
-----I remember David Wilkerson saying in 'The Cross and Switchblade', or perhaps it's sequel, that they only saw permanent success with freeing addicts from drugs once they were baptized in the Holy Spirit.

Quote:
-----His editor wanted him to drop the chapter containing these comments, but fortunately he stuck to his colours.

Praise God for men like that willing to stand their ground on touchy subjects like that.